



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
HELD AT CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
ON 17 JUNE 2015**

Members Present: Councillors J Ablewhite, (Chairman) B Shelton (Vice Chairman), M McGuire, M Shellens, P Reeve, D Oliver, V Campbell, L Herbert, A Coles and Edward Leigh

Officers Present: Paulina Ford Peterborough City Council
Ian Phillips 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. Election of Chairman

Councillor Ablewhite was nominated and seconded. There were no other nominations and Councillor Ablewhite was therefore named as Chairman for 2015/16.

2. Election of Vice-Chairman

Councillor Shelton was nominated and seconded. There were no other nominations and therefore Councillor Shelton was named as Vice-Chairman for 2015/16.

3. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lane and Councillor Shaheed.

4. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

5. Minutes of the meeting held 18 March 2015.

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2015 were agreed as an accurate record and the action points were noted.

6. Public Questions

Two questions had been submitted to the Panel from Mr Richard Taylor and are attached at Appendix 1 of the minutes. Mr Taylor was in attendance to present and receive the response to his questions.

- A member of the Panel wished it noted that the Panel appreciated Mr Taylor's engagement with the Panel and his comments as a critical friend.
- Members commented that there had been poor attendance at Panel meetings from Members representing Peterborough City Council over the past year which had meant that the views of Peterborough had not be properly represented. Members requested that a letter be sent to Peterborough City Council requesting that appointed members to the Panel attend all meetings and if they could not attend then a nominated substitute should be found.

ACTIONS

The Panel requested that the Lead Officer:

1. Follow up the request that all councils represented on the Panel had ensured that the Co-Opted Member vacancy had been advertised on their own council website.
2. Write to the Leader and Chief Executive of Peterborough City Council requesting that appointed representatives from Peterborough attend each meeting of the Panel to ensure the views of Peterborough are represented. If the appointed representative cannot attend then a nominated substitute should be sent to the meeting.

6a Chairman's Announcement

The Chairman announced that he would like to invite the Police and Crime Commissioner to make a statement in regard to the recent announcement that the Chief Constable was to retire.

The Commissioner addressed the Panel and advised that the Chief Constable had been considering retirement for some time. He had stayed on for an extra year to complete the IT project but had now decided that it was an appropriate time to retire. The Chief Constable was originally leaving at the end of August but he had a considerable amount of leave to take so would probably leave on 31 July 2015. There was an excellent Deputy Chief Constable in place that would cover the role until a new Chief Constable could be appointed? The intention was to make an appointment to the role by the autumn.

- Members wished to thank and acknowledge the excellent work of the current Chief Constable and sought assurance that a robust and transparent recruitment process was in place for the new Chief Constable. *Members were informed that they would be working with the College of Policing with regard to the recruitment process and would be using their Tool Kit for Selection of Chief Officers. This could be shared with the Panel.*
- Members were keen to engage with the outgoing Chief Constable to obtain his views on current policing and challenges of the role and to understand what the key skills and attributes were required for the role of Chief Constable.
- Would the replacement Chief Constable be a standalone role or a shared one? *Members were informed that it would be a standalone appointment.*
- Members asked if the Panel could have some involvement in the recruitment process but the past Chairman of the Panel advised that this was not the role of the Panel and had to be seen to be independent from this. It was the role of the Commissioner to appoint the Chief Constable. The Panel did however have the power to veto the appointment at the Confirmation Hearing.

ACTION

1. The Panel requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with a copy of the Tool Kit for Selection of Chief Officers.
2. The Lead Officer to contact the current Chief Constable to ask if he would engage with the Panel so that they may obtain his views on the role of a Chief Constable.

7. 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.

8. Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Annual Report

The Panel received a draft of the Annual Report for consideration and approval.

ACTION

The Panel approved the report for publication.

9. Police and Crime Plan Variation – Performance Framework – Appendix 2

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with a variation to Appendix 2 (Performance Framework) of the Police and Crime Commissioners Police and Crime Plan. The variation sought to update the Plan to reflect changes to performance reporting.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- The revised Performance Framework provided unspecific aspirations with no data or timeframes. The targets and aspirations needed to be firmer.
- The outcome “*We will maintain high standards of local policing through the effective and efficient management of resources*” listed under “*Deliver Policing within the available budget*”, was not clear. Clarification was also sought on the phrase ‘*High Standards*’.
- The new Performance Framework was not a Performance Framework and replaced a table which was a measurable framework with performance indicators. The public would expect to see if targets were being achieved and if not a justification of why. This was not possible under the new framework. Performance indicators should be included.
- Some Members felt that performance targets distracted from the quality of work.
- Clarification was sought regarding the various Boards mentioned throughout the report and listed within Annex B, Key Controls Assurance Mechanisms. There were approximately 15 different Boards and Groups. Members requested a diagram to illustrate how all of the Boards and Groups fitted together.
- A definition of the Finance Governance Board was requested.
- Two outcomes: “*A Police and partnership response to crime and anti-social behaviour to protect individuals and communities from harm caused by crime and anti-social behaviour*” and “*Road traffic collision data*” both seemed to be victims support rather than “continue to tackle crime and disorder” or “maintain the resilience of protective services”.
- Statistical information on areas such as murders, assaults, domestic violence incidents and child sex abuse should also be provided.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The Police and Crime Plan set out very clearly what the Police were expected to achieve and the Performance Framework provided a clear vision. The Police were held to account on delivery at the monthly Board meetings.
- Local policing was about decisions made on a local basis and it would be difficult to put a target on these. Local policing was important as there was a difference between areas an example of which was Ely compared to Peterborough. Keeping people safe was the main outcome.
- High standards was about getting it right and instilling public confidence.
- When holding the police to account at the Board meetings reports were received on all issues of policing so that they could be monitored and measured against performance.
- Clarity would be provided on the structure of the various Boards and Groups which was complex as it covered three counties.
- Information such as statistics on areas such as murders, assaults, domestic violence incidents and child sex abuse were reported to the Board.

Following debate the Panel AGREED to the variation to Appendix 2 – Performance Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

The Panel recommended that the Police Commissioner consider including some measurable performance indicators within the Performance Framework.

ACTION

The Panel requested that the Police Commissioner provide a diagram of the linkages and definitions of the various Boards listed in the Key Controls Assurance Mechanisms.

10. Police and Crime Plan Variations – Objective 3, Continue to Tackle Crime and Disorder and Objective 4, Keeping People Safe

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with a variation to Objective 3 – (Continue to Tackle Crime and Disorder) and Objective 4 – (Keeping People Safe) of the Police and Crime Commissioners Police and Crime Plan. The variations sought to update the Plan to reflect delivery of the Objectives.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Clarification was sought with regard to the Commissioners powers under the heading “Reducing crime by reducing reoffending” on page 31 of the report.
- Which crimes were being offered restorative justice?
- Page 30, clarification was sought on the following statement “*working with partner agencies to manage those offenders who present a risk of serious harm to their local communities*”. Did this refer to low level offences or one serious crime?

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The Commissioner was working with fellow Police and Crime Commissioners across Bedfordshire, Northamptonshire, and Hertfordshire (the BeNCH area) and partners including the Community Rehabilitation Company (Sodexo Justice Services) which was a provider of innovative justice services to change people’s lives. A lot of money was also being invested into working with youth groups to try and change behaviour. Peterborough prison was also doing a lot of innovative work with prisoners in rehabilitation and getting them back into the community.

- Restorative justice was victim driven and there had to be agreement from both the victim and the offender.
- All crimes were serious and particularly offenders who persistently committed crime. A lot of time was being put into this area of work.

Following debate the Panel **AGREED** to the variation to Objective 3 – (Continue to tackle crime and disorder) and Objective 4 – (Keeping People Safe) of the Police and Crime Commissioners Police and Crime Plan.

11. Crime Data Integrity – Update On Actions Following Her Majesty’s Inspectorate Of Constabulary Inspection of Cambridgeshire Constabulary

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with an update on actions following Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary’s (HMIC) Inspection of Cambridgeshire Constabulary’s Crime Data Integrity practices. The Commissioner assured the Panel that a lot of training had been put in place to ensure improved accuracy which was now at 94%.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members were assured by the improvement in accuracy and congratulated the Commissioner on the improvement.
- Cambridgeshire Constabulary’s Action Plan. Members requested that the action plan be brought to the Panel at a future meeting.
- More transparency and clarification was required with regard to recording of incidents and crime codes as there had been incidents where people had reported a crime but it had been logged as an incident. *The Commissioner noted this and advised that he would look into this.*

ACTION

The Panel noted the report and requested a further report on the Cambridgeshire Constabulary’s Action Plan at a future meeting.

12. Services To Victims of Domestic Abuse – Update on Actions following Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary Inspection of Cambridgeshire Constabulary

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with an update on actions following Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary’s Inspection of Cambridgeshire Constabulary’s response to domestic abuse. Significant work had been undertaken since the inspection and good progress had been made. The volume of recording domestic abuse had been increasing year on year and victims were more willing to come forward.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Clarification was sought on paragraph 7.5, page 46 which referred to 49% of domestic abuse victims who were contacted as a follow up had no needs. A more detailed breakdown of data was requested in future reports.
- Resourcing of the Victims’ Hub could be an issue going forward if more people continued to come forward.
- What was the level of false reporting of domestic violence?
- What sort of training was given to police officers in dealing with domestic violence?

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The Victims' Hub followed up all incidents of domestic violence and the people who were contacted that had no needs were of low risk.
- There was no finite resource for the Victims Hub but it was such an important issue that resources would be found. The service would need to be constructed in such a way that the resources would be made available. The new mobile technology systems had provided substantial improvements on time on frontline policing. This had meant that there would be more time to deal with incidents of domestic violence on the front line in a sensitive way.
- There was some level of false reporting of domestic violence but figures were not available at the meeting.
- The Victims' Hub was made up of various bodies including voluntary bodies and specialists.
- The training provided to police officers was to enable them to identify if there an incident of domestic violence had occurred.

ACTION

The Panel noted the report and requested that the Commissioner provide the following information:

1. Provide more detailed statistics on reporting of domestic violence and follow up in future reports.
2. Provide figures on false reporting of domestic violence.

13. Call Handling Update

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with an update on Cambridgeshire Constabulary's 101 call handling function.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members welcomed the report which included statistical data.
- It was noted that the 101 service was also being used as a primary switchboard and wanted to know if there was an alternative number that could be used for these calls. This might be a public education issue about the service.
- A key issue raised was around the length of time it was taking for secondary calls to be answered.
- Members requested a schedule of when additional resources would become available and when the new systems would be implemented.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The new Interactive Voice Response system would allow callers to be routed to their required destination in a more timely and efficient manner. The Queue buster System being installed would assist the caller in providing the option of a ring back whilst retaining their place in the queue. The systems were currently being tested and it was hoped that the system would be implemented by July 2015.
- It was important to provide a good service and extra resources were being put into the service to ensure this.

ACTION

The Panel noted the report and requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with

1. A further report on secondary calls including an update on the progress of the call handling service at future meeting

2. A schedule of when the extra resources would be in place and when the new technology would be implemented.

14. 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.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel on the following decisions included:

Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2018/19 – CPCC 2015-009

- Capital Expenditure of approximately £11M over four years. Where is the main modernisation expenditure and was this going to continue in future years. *Members were informed that the two main areas of spend would be in this year and next year.*

Updated Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2015/16 – CPCC 2015-017

- Significant reserves were listed within the Year End Resources table on page 88 of the report. *Members were advised that they were reserves listed according to accounting practice and were not necessarily cash. A monthly cash flow report was produced which was between £10M - £15M.*
- How much did the report to the Commissioner from Capita Asset Services (treasury adviser) cost? *Members were advised that the report provided was a generic report and although the figure was not available at the meeting it was thought not to be too costly.*

Capital Spend for Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) – CPCC 2015-015

- The ANPR equipment was an important piece of equipment and Members wanted to know if there was a possibility of expansion of its use. *Members were advised that expanding the use would be expensive and it was felt that the current location of the equipment covered the area well.*
- Clarification was sought with regard to paragraph 3.2 and the statement “*This will give a corresponding reduction in on-going revenue*”. How did the £146K correspond with a reduction in on-going revenue? *Members were informed that the information was not available at the meeting but could be provided.*

Grant Fund the trial programme to provide equipment to allow breathalysing on entry to venues in Cambridge City Centre by venue security staff – CPCC 2015-010

- Members welcomed the use of the equipment but there was a need to be mindful of how it was used.
- A suggestion was made to also use the equipment on the way out of venues.

ACTION

The Panel noted the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner.

The Panel requested further information on the following:

1. Further detail on Revenue Capital and Revenue Resources investments.
2. How the £146K corresponded with a reduction in on-going revenue as referred to in the decision CPCC 2015-015 - Capital Spend for Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR).
3. The cost of Capita Asset Services treasury advice.

15. Rules of Procedure

The Chairman 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. A Member of the Panel proposed that due to the large agenda and lateness of the hour that the item be deferred to the next meeting to allow Members more time to consider the Rules of the Procedure and bring forward suggested amendments.

The Panel were all in agreement and therefore the item was deferred to the next meeting of the Panel to be held on 16 September 2015.

16. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2015-2016

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

ACTIONS

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
17 June 2015	Public Questions	The Panel requested that the Lead Officer: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow up the request that all councils represented on the Panel had ensured that the Co-Opted Member vacancy had been advertised on their own council website. 2. Write to the Leader and Chief Executive of Peterborough City Council requesting that appointed representatives from Peterborough attend each meeting of the Panel to ensure the views of Peterborough are represented. If the appointed representative cannot attend then a nominated substitute should be sent to the meeting. 	Completed Completed
	Chairman's Announcement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with a copy of the Tool Kit for Selection of Chief Officers. 2. The Lead Officer to contact the current Chief Constable to ask if he would engage with the Panel so that they may obtain his views on the role of a Chief Constable. 	Completed Completed
	Police and Crime Plan Variation – Performance Framework – Appendix 2	The Panel requested that the Police Commissioner provide a diagram of the linkages and definitions of the various Boards listed in the Key Controls Assurance Mechanisms.	PCC responded by letter on 4 September 2015

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
	Crime Data Integrity – Update On Actions Following Her Majesty’s Inspectorate Of Constabulary Inspection of Cambridgeshire Constabulary	The Panel noted the report and requested a further report on the Cambridgeshire Constabulary’s Action Plan at a future meeting.	Report to be programmed into the work programme.
	Services To Victims of Domestic Abuse – Update on Actions following Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary Inspection of Cambridgeshire Constabulary	The Panel noted the report and requested that the Commissioner provide the following information: 1. Provide more detailed statistics on reporting of domestic violence and follow up in future reports. 2. Provide figures on false reporting of domestic violence.	To be provided in future reports.
	Call Handling Update	The Panel noted the report and requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with 1. A further report on secondary calls including an update on the progress of the call handling service at future meeting 2. A schedule of when the extra resources would be in place and when the new technology would be implemented.	To be programmed into the work programme.
	Decisions By the Commissioner	The Panel requested further information on the following: 1. Further detail on Revenue Capital and Revenue Resources investments. 2. How the £146K corresponded with a reduction in on-going revenue as referred to in the decision CPCC 2015-015 - Capital Spend for Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR). 3. The cost of Capita Asset Services treasury advice.	PCC responded by letter on 4 September 2015

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 4.00pm

CHAIRMAN

Question/s for Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Meeting held on 17 June 2015

Questioner	Mr Richard Taylor
Questions addressed to which Member of the Panel	The Chairman
Date Question was submitted	10 June 2015
<p>Question 1</p> <p>At the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel on the 15th of December 2014 the chairman Cllr McGuire told the candidate for the position of Chief Finance Officer and Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner that they would not be called to appear before the panel if they were appointed.</p> <p>Chairman McGuire's statement suggested the Police and Crime Panel will not call any of the staff of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to appear before it.</p> <p>The panel did not minute the statement but I have published a video and transcript of it at: http://www.rtaylor.co.uk/7141</p> <p>Did chairman McGuire's statement reflect a policy position adopted by the panel of not using their power under S29 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 to require members of the commissioner's staff, to attend before the panel and answer questions put to them?</p> <p>Answer</p> <p>Question 1</p> <p>Whilst the Panel recognises that it has the power to require members of the Commissioner's staff to attend to answer any questions, our preferred method of working is to put all questions through the Commissioner in the first instance. The Commissioner may, and indeed does, call upon his team to answer detailed questions where appropriate. The Panel understands that it can ask specific members of staff to appear before it, should it become necessary in order for the Panel to discharge its functions.</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p>Question 2</p> <p>Why is there no mention within the agenda and papers for the 17 June 2015 Police and Crime Panel meeting of the apparent resignations of panel members Peterborough City Councillor Julia Davidson and Independent Panel Member Christine Graham?</p> <p>I note Cllr Davidson announced her intention to resign from the panel after being a member of the panel for a year and attending no meetings. https://twitter.com/JuliaDa2014/status/586491013717438464</p> <p>The panel has now had two members from Peterborough who've been absent for over a year citing difficulties getting to meetings in other parts of the force area.</p> <p>Previously the panel has considered, and agreed, arrangements for recruiting independent members as an agenda item at a public meeting.</p>	

Answer
Question 2

Councillors are appointed to the Panel for a period of one year by their council. Following Local Elections, the Panel has a duty to ensure that its membership is reflective of the political balance across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Each Local Authority then nominates a representative(s) annually to serve on the Panel. As a result Cllr Davidson has not resigned, but has been replaced by another Councillor as nominated by the Liberal Democrats Group in Peterborough City Council.

With regards to the vacancy for the independent member, the recruitment process is underway and a report will be made to the next Panel confirming the outcome and hopefully recommending an appointment.