



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
HELD AT PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL  
ON 19 JUNE 2014**

**Members Present:** Councillors McGuire (Chair), Ablewhite (Vice Chair), Hunt, Oliver, Shellens, Sinnott, Stokes and Christine Graham.

**Officers Present:**

Paulina Ford	Peterborough City Council
Ian Phillips	Peterborough City Council
Kim Sawyer	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
Robert Vickers	Interim Chief Finance Officer

**1. Election of Chairman**

Councillor McGuire was nominated and seconded. There were no other nominations and Councillor McGuire was named as chairman for 2014/15.

**2. Election of Vice-chairman**

Councillor Ablewhite was nominated and seconded. There were no other nominations and Councillor Ablewhite was named as vice-Chairman for 2014/15.

**3. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Reeve, Herbert, Shelton, Fletcher and Over. Councillor Sinnott was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Herbert and Councillor Stokes was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Over.

**4. Declarations of Interest**

Christine Graham read out the following statement:

*Prior to the last meeting of the Panel I believed I had a pecuniary interest in one of the decisions taken by the PCC and contacted the Officer to enquire about how I should handle this. I was advised that I should tell the panel that I had an interest in one of the items (but that I did not need to declare the interest or the item) and leave if, and when, that item was discussed. When the item was reached there were no comments or questions so I did not leave the meeting.*

*Following the meeting it has come to my attention that I have never been asked to complete a declaration of interests in respect of this committee. As I had not completed this form, I should therefore have stated what the interest was. I would like the committee to know that the PCC has awarded £2,500 to Peterborough Neighbourhood Watch. My Community Interest Company, Transforming Local Communities, has been contracted by PNHW to carry out some training at a cost of £950 which will be paid from this grant from the PCC. I have now completed the Declaration of interest form as I should have been requested to when being appointed to the Panel.*

No other declarations of interest were given.

## **5. Minutes of the meeting held 19 March 2014.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2014 were agreed as an accurate record and the action points were noted.

### **1. Independent Co-opted Member**

The Chair advised the Panel that the Co-opted Member Mr Raj Ali had not attended a meeting of the Panel for over a year and that under the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel arrangements, section 3.17 Co-opted Members, paragraph 3.25 the Panel may decide to terminate the appointment. The Chair read out the paragraph:

*The Panel may decide to terminate the appointment of a co-opted Member of the Panel if at least two-thirds of the persons who are Members of the Panel at the time when the decision is made vote in favour of making that decision at any time for the reasons set out below and on doing so shall give written notice to the co-opted Member:*

- a) if the co-opted Member has been absent from the Panel for more than three months without the consent of the Panel;*

The Chair advised that Mr Ali had been written to on two occasions to ask if he would be attending meetings and continuing in his role but there had been no response.

The Chair therefore proposed that Mr Ali's membership of the Panel be terminated and recruitment of a replacement independent co-opted Member take place. All those in attendance agreed.

The Chair also proposed that the recruitment for a new independent co-opted Member should be conducted in the same way as previously and that a panel of three members taken from the membership of the Police and Crime Panel should be set up to conduct interviews and oversee the recruitment process. All those in attendance agreed.

The Chair sought volunteers for the recruitment panel and the following Members of the Panel put their names forward: Councillor Jason Ablewhite, Cllr David Oliver and Councillor Tom Hunt. The Chair requested that the recruitment process start as soon as possible and would therefore hopefully be concluded by the next meeting in July or at the very latest the November meeting.

### **ACTION**

The Lead Officer to start the process for recruiting a new Independent Co-opted Member.

### **2. Public Questions**

Ten questions had been submitted to the Panel and are attached at Appendix 1 of the minutes. Any responses given to those questions presented by persons not in attendance

are also included in the attachment. Those not in attendance would receive written responses. Mr Taylor was in attendance to receive the response to his questions.

## **ACTIONS**

The Rules of Procedure to be amended with regard to the section 7, Public Participation, Questions.

### **3. Complaints Report**

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

#### **ACTION**

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

### **4. Rules of Procedure**

The Lead Officer supporting the Panel introduced the Report which provided the Panel with an opportunity to review the Rules of Procedure at its Annual Meeting as required at paragraph 1.4 of the Rules of Procedure. The Chair advised the Panel that any proposed amendments made at the meeting would need to be approved at the next meeting before the changes would be implemented.

The Panel then discussed the Rules of Procedure. Comments included:

- The Public Participation part to be up to a maximum of 30 minutes.
- Questions not answered within the 30 minutes would be answered in writing within seven days.
- The Panel could look at ways of improving openness.
- Rules of Procedure to be clearer regarding questions for the Panel and questions for the Commissioner.
- Questions to be presented in the order that they were received.
- Police Operational questions could not be considered by the Panel.

The Chair requested that if Panel members thought of any further amendments after the meeting they should contact the Secretariat.

#### **ACTION**

The Rules of Procedure to be amended and presented to the next meeting of the Panel for approval.

### **5. Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Annual Report 2013-2014**

The Panel received a report to enable it to review the annual report issued by the Police and Crime Commissioner under Section 12 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- It was a challenge to do more with less and protect the front line.
- Cambridgeshire Constabulary is one of the lowest costing forces with one of the highest percentages of time spent on the frontline.
- The Commissioner had been achieving his pledges as stated in the plan.

- Victims support was a new responsibility of the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- Local engagement and the outreach worker had been successful.
- The numbers of specials had increased but the high turnover had been due to the fact that they were volunteers and often moved into the force as a regular officer.
- Operation METIS had been a driving force in reducing time that officers spent inside.
- The collaboration between Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire had been successful.
- It was the Chief Constable's decision as to whether he gave the PCSO's additional powers but the Commissioner would support this decision. Giving PCSO's more powers would make them more effective.
- Members were concerned about cyclists and their behaviours and persistent misuse of the traffic light system and asked the Commissioner if he had any plans to extend laws regarding cyclists. *The Commissioner informed the Panel that it was more about educating cyclists. Police did issue tickets to cyclists.*
- Members asked if the Commissioner or any of his advisers attended the Police Panel meetings. *The Commissioner advised that he and his staff did occasionally attend Police Panel meetings and that it was important for public engagement.*
- Recruitment of Special Constables was a challenge but there was a new Commander in place with new ideas and was engaging with the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- Members referred to page 66 and the performance table relating to Hate Crime and noted that it had dropped. *The Commissioner informed Members that it was a low number but was taken very seriously however there was concern was that it might grow.*
- A lot of effort was being put in to large organisations to raise awareness of cybercrime but some did not want to admit that cybercrime was an issue.
- The Youth Crime Fund was £40K and had been targeted at areas which had problems. It had been a success but there was a need to measure the outcomes. The Commissioner would speak to the Cambridge Community Trust about the next tranche of funding.
- Police Cadets had been looked at to ensure the right people were being targeted and includes young people at risk of entering the criminal justice system or being socially excluded e.g. those who were likely to go off the rails. A pilot scheme was being set up at an Academy in Peterborough and the Commissioner's office were providing uniforms. If successful the scheme would be rolled out to other areas.
- A Member of the Panel referred to the visibility of the PCSO's and public perception and asked if it was possible to publish when and where the PCSO's go. *The Commissioner responded that this could possibly be done in the future with new technology being put in place. This would need to be looked into. The PCSO's went from village to village on a rota. Operation METIS would be rolled out in one year and would free up police to be outside more.*
- Members noted that the call handling performance for calls to be answered within target was not always met and a Panel Member quoted a recent example of someone who had been kept on hold for seventeen minutes. *The Commissioner advised that he was keen to hear about the example quoted to see what had gone wrong and would make contact outside of the meeting for details.*
- Members referred to the performance of Victim Based Crime and noted that the report did not specify the different types of victim based crime. *Members were informed that a victim of crime was a big issue regardless of the crime and all types of victim based crime were as important as each other.*
- Members responded that some crimes were easier to deal with than others and the concern was that data gathering on different types of crime was being lost. *The Commissioner responded that data gathering was important and required to make sure crime was reported properly.*
- Members sought assurance that within the Victim Hub Pilot Scheme there would be specialist knowledge to deal with victims of different crimes. Victims of rape and abuse needed specialist skills to help them. *The Commissioner assured Members that there were trained specialist staff. All agencies were being used and specialists in each field were available. It was a partnership operation.*

- Members referred to Operation METIS and were concerned about police absence rates which were high and the reduction in the number of officers. Research had shown that not having their own base to go back to could have an impact and asked the Commissioner if he was going to collect data on the wellbeing of the police themselves. The wellbeing of police officers was important and they needed respite. *The Commissioner responded that the policeman would have everything he needed on his slate or mobile and trials had shown that police were delighted with it and it made the police officers life a lot easier. Looking after the wellbeing of the police officers was very important and the Chief Constable took this very seriously.*

The Chair reminded the Panel of its responsibilities in scrutinising the Police and Crime Commissioner as stated in the Police Reform & Social Responsibility Act 2011 under Chapter 13, Part 1, Chapter 4 section 28.

The Chair thanked the Commissioner for an informative report.

The Panel having reviewed the Annual Report had no further suggestions for the Commissioner and was content with the report.

## **ACTION**

The Panel noted the Annual Report 2013/2014.

### **6. Objective One – Maintaining Local police Performance**

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with an update on the progress made towards Objective One of the Police and Crime Plan – Maintain Local Police Performance.

Members were informed that the Commissioner was currently conducting an online survey of users of the 101 service to help identify what the specific issues were with call handling. It had however improved considerably and was now 7 seconds on the first pick up.

The Chair noted that most of the information in the report had already been covered and discussed during item 10, the Annual Report.

Additional items raised by the Panel included the following:

- Members referred to the report and the mention of the Commissioners 'monthly Board meetings' and asked who was on the Board and who chaired it. *The Commissioner responded that he chaired the Board and the following people sat on the Board: Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner, Chief Executive, Director of Estates, Finance Director, Engagement Director, Chief Constable and Deputy Chief Constable.*
- Members referred to the Commissioners Pledge of 'Holding the Police to Account' and requested that the Commissioner provide examples of how he held the Police to Account at a future meeting.

## **ACTION**

The Commissioner to provide a report detailing examples of how he holds the Police to Account at a future meeting.

### **7. 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 referred to decision CPCC 2014-015: *To approve the current interim OPCC Head of Finance* and requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with a report on the role of the Chief Finance Officer at the next meeting.

The Panel were informed that the Commissioner was recruiting for a permanent Chief Finance Officer and dependent on timescales there may be a requirement for the Panel to hold a Confirmation Hearing by the time the next meeting is held.

**ACTION**

The Panel noted the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner and requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with a report on the role of the Chief Finance Officer at the next meeting.

**8. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2014-2015**

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

**ACTION**

The Panel agreed that the following items be included on the Agenda Plan:

- A report from the Commission on the role of the Chief Finance Officer.
- A report from the Commissioner on how he holds the Police to Account.

**ACTIONS**

<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>UPDATE</b>
19 June 2014	Independent Co-opted Member	The Lead Officer to start the process for recruiting a new Independent Co-opted Member.	Update report on recruitment process to be presented to the Panel at the meeting on 30 July 2014.
	Public Questions	The Rules of Procedure to be amended with regard to the section 7, Public Participation, Questions.	Amended Rules of Procedure to be presented to the Panel at the meeting on 30 July 2014.
	Rules of Procedure	The Rules of Procedure to be amended and presented to the next meeting of the Panel for approval.	Amended Rules of Procedure to be presented to the Panel at the meeting on 30 July 2014.
	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Annual Report 2013-2014	The Panel noted the Annual Report 2013/2014.	No further action.
	Objective One – Maintaining Local police Performance	The Commissioner to provide a report detailing examples of how he holds the Police to Account at a future meeting.	Report to be presented to the Panel at the meeting on 30 July 2014.

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
	Decisions by the Commissioner	The Panel noted the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner and requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with a report on the role of the Chief Finance Officer at the next meeting.	Panel to receive an update report at its meeting on 30 July 2014.
	Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2014-2015	<p>The Panel agreed that the following items be included on the Agenda Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A report from the Commission on the role of the Chief Finance Officer.</li> <li>• A report from the Commissioner on how he holds the Police to Account.</li> </ul>	Agenda Plan updated.

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 3.44pm

CHAIRMAN

## Appendix 1

### CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL MEETING HELD ON 19 JUNE 2014

### PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1.	<p><b>Question from Paul Lythgoe (not in attendance)</b></p> <p>To the Chair</p> <p>Is the Chairman aware that I submitted to the Panel questions as listed below that were not permitted to be put before the panel, and that it was stated in the March meeting that no such questions had been posed or refused following a question to this affect from Councillor Ablewhite?</p> <p>On 30/01/2014 17:46, Ford Paulina wrote:</p> <p>Dear Mr Lythgoe</p> <p>Thank you for your email and questions. I have consulted with the Rules of Procedure regarding questions for the Panel and also the Lead Officer supporting the Police and Crime Panel regarding your questions and he has responded as below:</p> <p>“The questions submitted by Mr Lythgoe are inappropriate for the Panel for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. It is addressed to the Commissioner. Public questions to the Police and Crime Panel are questions for the Panel about its roles and responsibilities; not questions for the Commissioner.</li><li>2. It is a series of multiple questions which is in breach of the rules of procedure.</li></ol> <p>"No person may submit more than two questions to a Panel meeting and no more than two such questions may be asked on behalf of one organisation."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. The only aspect over which the Commissioner could reasonably be asked to comment (and not in this format) is the distinction between 'priority setting and non-interference in operational matters'. All of the other issues raised are operational issues.</li></ol> <p>The most appropriate and effective way for the author to have his question answered is for it to be tabled to the Commissioner in writing by the author or addressed to one of the Panel members in their scrutiny role or and in an amended format which meets the rules of procedure.”</p> <p>I hope that this has been of help to you. If you have any questions with regard to this response please come back to me.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Paulina Ford Senior Governance Officer Scrutiny Democratic Services Team Legal and Governance Peterborough City Council Town Hall Bridge Street Peterborough PE1 1HQ</p>
----	---



	<p>Email: <a href="mailto:paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk">paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk</a>  Tel: 01733 452508</p>
	<p><b>Answer</b></p> <p>As Chairman I was unfortunately unaware of the questions submitted by yourself for the January meeting. I accept that you had asked a question of the Panel and for the reasons previously stated, the Panel was not able to respond to the points raised. I do appreciate that the Panel should be aware of all questions asked of it, even if it is unable to answer them. On this occasion, our processes for recording your question were not as robust as they could have been for which I apologise.</p> <p>The Panel recognises that its processes for dealing with public questions can be improved and to that end, the Panel has agreed to alter its rules of procedure. In future, all questions whether they fall within the remit of the Panel or not will be brought to the attention of the Panel and a list of all questions will be provided at the meeting for the public to view.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>Question from Paul Lythgoe</b></p> <p>To the Chair</p> <p>I would like to ask the Panel, and in particular the Chairman, why they have not raised with Sir Graham Bright during panel meetings the failure of the PCC to recruit a replacement for Mr Humersome as CFO given.</p> <p><i>The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act (PRsRA) 2011 under paragraph 6 of Schedule 1 requires every PCC outside London to appoint a CFO. An identical duty under paragraph 4 of Schedule 2 and paragraph 1 of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 the Chief Constable is also required to appoint a CFO. The Police and Social Responsibility Act 2011 requires both CFOs to comply with relevant provisions within the Local Government Acts.</i></p> <p>The failure to recruit and the criticism of the PCC by the HMIC is reported in agenda item 5 of the PCC's May Business Co-ordination meeting prompting the appointment of Mr Vickers as interim CFO. The shared use of Nicki Howard is mentioned in these minutes and it is clearly at odds with the act that even as a stopgap that the PCC shared Financial officer with the force and particularly in the submission of the budget. Further it can be concluded that given the notice period for Mr Humersome and the criticism of his contractual arrangements the panel would have had good grounds to question the PCC on his failure to recruit for the primary function in his office. To date 7 months after Mr Humersome left office the PCC has still failed to appoint a permanent CFO.</p>
	<p><b>Answer</b></p> <p>The response is in relation to the PCC Chief Finance Officer (CFO) position only.</p> <p>The PCC CFO position was occupied by Mr Hummersone until being vacated on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013. A short term arrangement was put in place, in which Niki Howard (who is also Director of Resources for the Chief Constable) agreed to undertake the role and responsibilities of this function until an alternative solution was found.</p> <p>The PCC CFO position is a full time permanent established position within the PCC Office structure and Sir Graham is determined that this position will be filled permanently</p>

	<p>with the right calibre of person who can help drive Police and Crime Plan and the Office forward.</p> <p>The PCC has sought to recruit to the position and interviewed potential candidates for this position in February 2014. However, a successful candidate was not found. Following this an interim CFO was put in place. Refer to the decision record "Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Finance Officer" dated 15 May 2014 on the Police and Crime Commissioner website.</p> <p>A rigorous recruitment process is currently underway, with the engagement of Hays Recruitment. This involves a proactive search for potential candidates that meets the PCC criteria.</p> <p>The PCC is hopeful of making an announcement in the near future, however, in the meantime, has access to independent advice through current arrangements as set out above.</p>
3.	<p><b>Question from David Hankins – (Not in attendance)</b></p> <p>To the Chair.</p> <p>I have written twice to two of the Peterborough councillors who sit on the Panel and three times to the third about police community support officers and crime figures. I neither received a reply or acknowledgement about issues which should be important to those who represent the community's interest on the Panel. What is the role of the councillors on the Panel if they are not permitted to have a view on policing issues and share it through correspondence with someone like me who cares about public service?</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>As Chair, I am happy to answer questions that have been asked directly of the Panel regarding its work as set out in the Panel's rules of procedure. Panel members are encouraged to express their views on crime and police issues and routinely respond to questions asked by members of the public.</p> <p>The Panel has responded to all questions that it has received. As Chair, I will contact the individual Councillors and invite them to respond to you.</p> <p>If you wish to ask any questions regarding the Panel's work in future, please do address them to the Panel via <a href="mailto:paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk">paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk</a></p>
4.	<p><b>Question from David Hankins</b></p> <p>To the Chair</p> <p>A few weeks ago national figures were released indicating a significant fall in admissions to Accident and Emergency hospital wards. This was closely followed by crime figures revealing a major fall in overall crime. Neither of these events was seized upon locally to praise the work of the police and more important to ease the fear of crime. Why was this opportunity missed?</p>
	<p><b>Answer</b></p> <p>While crime statistics are an important measure with which the public can gauge the performance of their local force, they are nonetheless only part of the bigger picture. The Commissioner and Constabulary are forging ahead with work which puts real people -</p>

	<p>the victims of crime and anti-social behaviour – at the centre of what we do, as opposed to data and targets.</p> <p>Crime statistics are released quarterly and have consistently shown a reduction over a number of years both by local data and independent British Crime Survey data. They have therefore regularly featured in the media, with Cambridgeshire working proactively with the press in this respect. However, the integrity of crime statistics has increasingly been in the spotlight. News coverage of reductions in crime can, and has, been met with a degree of cynicism by the public. Many now question the validity of this information.</p>
5.	<p><b>Question from Darryl Goodlife (not in attendance)</b></p> <p><b>Question does not fall within the remit of the Panel.</b></p> <p>“In light of the recent demonstration held by the English Defence League and the provocative behaviour of some participants in this demonstration (chanting ‘Muslim pedos off our streets’, banners claiming 80% of child abusers are Muslim) and inflammatory speeches made by speakers from the platform which again clearly tried to establish the link between being a Muslim and a child abuser by claiming the majority of child abusers were Muslim and talked of the EDL being “footsoliders” in a “war”, what will be done by the police to ensure that all citizens of Peterborough can exercise their right to walk through the City Centre without feeling intimidated and free from fear if such an event were to be held in the City again?”</p> <p>If you require anything further from me please do not hesitate to contact me. I can be reached at this email address or on 07592129634.</p>
6	<p><b>Question from Councillor John Fox, Peterborough City Council – (Not in Attendance)</b></p> <p>To the Chair</p> <p>Would the Police panel please tell me how many new posts have been created since the introduction of the role of Police Commissioner was introduced and at what cost to the taxpayers of this City (Peterborough).</p>
	<p><b>Answer</b></p> <p>Upon taking up office on the 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2012, all police staff and former police authority staff became employees of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) in line with Government legislation and PCCs across the country. At this point the total number of staff employed by the PCC was 801.93 ftes (full time equivalents), which included 9.9 ftes working specifically within the OPCC.</p> <p>The legislation provided for a second stage transfer of staff which resulted in September 2013 with all police and crime commissioners notifying the Home Secretary of their draft staffing intentions with regard to who the employment of staff would fall under, Police and Crime Commissioner or Chief Constable. The Home Secretary approved the Draft proposals for Cambridgeshire. This, along with deciding whose responsibility assets, liabilities, contracts and bank accounts sit under is known as “Stage 2 Transfers”.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire submitted its final stage 2 staffing transfer schemes by the Home Office deadline of the 6th March 2014 for approval. This became effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014.</p> <p>Therefore on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014, the staff under the employment of the Police and Crime Commissioner was 791.2 ftes, including 11.97 ftes residing within the OPCC. The Commissioner retained functions relating to finance, communications and estates.</p>

	<p>As of 1<sup>st</sup> April only those residing within the OPCC are under the employment of the Police and Crime Commissioner. It should be noted that this includes posts which are a shared resource between the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable. Below are the posts as at the October 2012 and those for the 2014-15 financial year.</p> <p>The number of posts inherited by the PCC after the election on 15 Nov 2012 was 9.9 ftes at a budget of £488,000. This excludes the budget associated with the 17 Police Authority Members.</p> <p>The Commissioner's 2014-15 staffing budget comprises 15.47 ftes (of which 3 historically sat within the Constabulary). The total staffing budget for 2014-15 is therefore £763,784. The functions of the Police Authority and the OPCC are not comparable.</p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Ed Murphy, Peterborough City Council – (Not in attendance)</b></p> <p>To the Chair</p> <p>What is the view of the Panel concerning the Conservative Commissioners decision to break his election promises and decide to increase the precept and spend more on his office, expenses, deputy and his personal staff than was under the previous police authority budget.</p>
	<p><b>Answer</b></p> <p>In the first financial year of operation, the Commissioner committed to reducing his office budget by 10 per cent compared to the former Police Authority's budget in its final full year. That reduction was achieved.</p> <p>The budget report and Medium Term Financial Plan submitted by the Commissioner to the Police and Crime Panel in February 2014 included information about OPCC costs. It stated that, going forward, it is impossible to compare like for like since the Commissioner's functions and duties are far wider than those of the former Police Authority. This information can also be found on the Commissioner's website at page 11, paragraphs 4.19 to 4.22 here <a href="http://cambridgeshire-pcc.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/MTFP-2014-18-FINAL.pdf">http://cambridgeshire-pcc.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/MTFP-2014-18-FINAL.pdf</a></p> <p>The Council tax proposals have been shared and commented on by the Panel in detail previously. The Commissioner's election wording was for 'no additional burden' on council tax. Sir Graham's below inflation rise in precept adheres to that principle. The level of precept was informed by what the Commissioner was told throughout the year by the public, who want to see the number of frontline officers protected. Sir Graham believes that the increase balances the public's expectations of police visibility with the affordability of a below inflation precept rise.</p>
8.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Ed Murphy, Peterborough City Council</b></p> <p><b>Question does not fall within the remit of the Panel.</b></p> <p>It has been reported and verified that Cambridgeshire police lied to those they tried to recruit as spies, threatening to prosecute a woman involved in Unite Against Fascism (UAF) if she told anyone about the attempt to recruit her. In recent months four people have come forward to say that Cambridgeshire Police officers tried to recruit activists to spy on Unite Against Fascism, UK Uncut and Cambridge Defend Education.</p> <p>Is the Police and Crime Panel aware of the video evidence which came to light in</p>

	<p>November last year and does the Panel agree that what the police said to that woman is completely despicable and it is important her story has finally come out; the actions taken by the Cambridgeshire police are human rights violations, specifically violating Article 8 of the Human Rights Act of 1998. What steps are the Cambridgeshire Police Service taking to ensure that they now comply with this legislation and what deliberations have been made to the Panel, what representations have been made to the panel and/or commissioner and how have these been dealt with?</p>
9.	<p><b>Question from Richard Taylor – (In attendance)</b></p> <p>To: Police and Crime Panel member Christine Graham, or in her absence, rephrased and addressed to the acting chair of the panel:</p> <p>Which of the Commissioner's decisions on the agenda for the panel's March 2014 meeting did you intend to declare an interest in, and leave the room for the consideration of, and why did you not declare the interest and leave the room as you indicated you would?</p> <p>At the March 2014 meeting of the Police and Crime Panel member Christine Graham stated:</p> <p>Background:</p> <p>"Mr chair I have to declare an interest in one of the decisions and I'll have to leave when that one is discussed."</p> <p>Christine Graham did not declare any interest, and didn't leave the room as she stated she would.</p> <p>I have made a video and transcript of the meeting available at:  <a href="http://www.rtaylor.co.uk/6716">http://www.rtaylor.co.uk/6716</a></p>
	<p><b>Answer</b></p> <p>Christine Graham made a statement under the Declaration of Interests with regard to this question.</p>
10.	<p><b>Question from Richard Taylor</b></p> <p>To: The chair, or acting chair, of the Police and Crime Panel:</p> <p>Why are the Police and Crime Commissioner's replies to the Police and Crime Panel's requests for written responses to matters raised during panel meetings not routinely published by the panel and considered by subsequent panel meetings?</p>
	<p><b>Answer</b></p> <p>Items discussed at the meeting are as a matter of course in the minutes of that meeting. Going forward written responses to questions could be recorded in the minutes of the meeting as an appendix with the questions. The Rules of Procedure can be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>Public Participation time could also be extended to be up to 30 minutes.</p> <p>Written responses to the Panel would also be published on the website.</p>