



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
HELD AT CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
ON 16 SEPTEMBER 2015**

**Members Present:** Councillors J Ablewhite, (Chairman) B Shelton (Vice Chairman), M McGuire, M Shellens, P Bullen, A Pearson, L Herbert, A Coles, A Shaheed, S Lane, Edward Leigh and Francesca Anderson

**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  
Josie Gowler Chief Finance Officer

**Chairman's Announcement**

The Chairman announced that the Panel had agreed to change the order of the agenda and bring forward item 7, Vacancy for Independent Co-opted Member to item 5 and item 8, Community Safety Partnerships to item 6. Item 6, the Rules of Procedure would be moved to item 11.

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Oliver.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. Minutes of the meeting held 17 June 2015.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2015 were agreed as an accurate record and the action points were noted.

**4. Public Questions**

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

Having received the response Mr Taylor commented that he felt the Rules of Procedure had in this case been suspended with regard to considering his suggestions for the work programme in public. Mr Taylor suggested that going forward if the Rules of Procedure were to be suspended again that a clear explanation as to why should be given.

## **5. Vacancy for Independent Co-opted Member**

The report was introduced by the Chairman which provided the Panel with an update on the vacancy for an Independent Co-opted Member. The Chairman advised the Panel that the interview panel who consisted of Councillors Ablewhite, McGuire, Shellens and Reeve had interviewed three candidates. The interview panel had unanimously agreed that Francesca Anderson was the strongest overall candidate and therefore recommend that the Panel appoint Francesca Anderson to the vacancy of Independent Co-opted Member of the Panel.

The Panel unanimously AGREED to endorse the recommendation to appoint Francesca Anderson as the second Independent Co-opted Member of the Panel.

Following the Panels endorsement of the recommendation the Chairman invited Francesca Anderson who was present in the public gallery to join the Panel for the remainder of the meeting.

## **6. Community Safety Partnerships**

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with information regarding Community Safety Partnership's (CSP's). Key areas within the report included:

- CSP model and engagement
- CSP funding, outcomes and impact
- Cambridgeshire Constabulary support to CSP's
- Multi-agency working models
- Strengthening the role and performance of CSP's

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Paragraph 5.3 of the report stated that CSP's set their local priorities but the local priorities within the Police and Crime Plan had not changed since 2012. Did this mean local priorities had not changed or was there a time lag in updating the plan to reflect the local priorities.
- The report stated that the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) had recently taken over the administration of the Cambridgeshire Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board meetings, would this provide an opportunity to re-profile how the Board worked and assess how effectively it was operating.
- The CSP's undertake a huge amount of work but it did not appear to be integrated within the wider police force priorities.
- What support was given to CSP's in terms of data?
- There was no mention of CSP's in the Commissioners Annual Report. It would be helpful to see a clearer plan for the future on where CSP's sit on plans both county and Peterborough wide. There appeared to be a missing link with local and force wide priorities.
- Clarification was sought on how 'Star Chambers' operated and how frequently a grant recipient was called before a 'Star Chamber'.
- Members noted that approximately £900,000 was allocated across the county but that Peterborough CSP received half of the Community Safety Partnership funding.

- Clarification was sought as to why no Panel members were invited to an event held on 24 July 2015 hosted by the four Commissioners with the BeNCH Community Rehabilitation Company.
- Members were concerned that crime data was not adequately broken down and in particular the different types of violent crime. Members requested that the Commissioner provide a detailed breakdown of different types of crime and how the collection of data could be improved based on district areas and in particular violent crime and how this was being tackled and reduced.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- CSP's set their own priorities within the frame work of the priorities in the Police and Crime Plan.
- The OPCC had not started to administer the Cambridgeshire Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board yet but this would provide an opportunity to co-ordinate the Board in a more effective way.
- The Commissioners role was not to take leadership of the CSP's. There would be a review of the Board and a report would come back to the Panel with proposals at a future meeting.
- Grant recipients were called before a 'Star Chamber' annually in rotation to review how the money was being spent, what impact it was having and if value for money was being achieved.
- The event held on 24 July was an operational event attended by key organisations in the criminal justice system across the four counties. It was intended for frontline workers and therefore no Police and Crime Panels were invited.

Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report and requested that the Commissioner provide the following:

1. A further report on the outcome of the review of the CSP's and the Cambridge Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board at the next meeting of the Panel.
2. A detailed breakdown of different types of crime and how the collection of data could be improved based on district areas and in particular violent crime and how this was being tackled and reduced. This to be provided at the next meeting.

## **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. Police Outturn 2014/15 and Looking Forward to 2015/16**

The presentation was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner. The Director of Finance and Deputy Commissioner were also in attendance and provided the Panel with context behind the detail in the presentation. The following key areas were highlighted:

- Key figures for 2014/15
- Breakdown of outturn 2014/15
- Capital expenditure
- Reserves
- OPCC Budget and Outturn 2014/15

- OPCC Changes in spend 2014/15
- Grants
- Challenge ahead
- Savings in Commissioners first three budgets
- 2015/16 Quarter 1 Outturn
- 2015/16 and beyond
- 

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members referred to the slide titled 2015/16 and beyond. Concern was raised regarding the possibility of a significant deficit in pension schemes and wanted to know if this had been prepared for. *The Panel were informed that a presumption had been made with regard to the possible pension deficit. There was also an additional aspect in that as staff numbers declined there would be a smaller pool to pay for those who had an entitlement from previous employment. It would be difficult to say if the assumptions made were correct until the actuarial results were received.*
- Members requested assurance that a more detailed budget dialogue would be held with the Panel when presenting the budget in February to allow the Panel to provide effective scrutiny and support to the Commissioner in the budget process. *The Deputy Commissioner responded that the objective was to maintain an efficient and effective capacity of front line policing with the tools they needed to do the job, in a way that would be the most beneficial within the resources available. The Deputy Commissioner agreed that it was helpful to provide the Panel with information on the 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr. and highlight the strengths and pressures, and then for the Panel to provide comments on where they thought a little less pressure or a little more pressure could be taken on those costs. However it was more difficult to provide the same sort of detail when presenting the overall budget as it was ultimately the responsibility of the Police and Crime Commissioner to set the budget.*

Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report.

Councillor Shellens left the meeting at this point.

## **9. Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Annual Report**

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced his Annual Report 2014-15 and highlighted the key areas within the Annual Report providing the Panel with the opportunity to review and comment on it.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- There was no reference to or statistics on violent crime. What strategies were in place to reduce violent crime.
- 101 service. It was still very difficult to get through to 101.
- Overall good report but lacking statistics and very little historical data included. More consistent reporting of statistics was required including police activity, crime reporting and satisfaction and detection rates. Trends and geographical context should also be included.
- The Panel asked the Commissioner if he would endorse the request that the Panel had made at the Confirmation Hearing earlier that the Chief Constable accompany the Commissioner at least once a year to a Panel meeting. *The Commissioner responded that it might be valuable to have a separate seminar for the Panel to look at operational matters. There needed to be caution when discussing operational matters in public as this may affect the outcome of some of the work the police were doing. The Commissioner advised that he would look into this request.*

- The Chairman pointed out that the new Chief Constable had stated that he was willing to attend a Panel meeting providing the Commissioner was happy for him to attend. The Panel had become aware from attending a recent Police and Crime Panel National Conference that other Panels have their Chief Constable in attendance at Panel meetings on a regular basis. Those Panels had felt it was beneficial to have the Chief Constable in attendance on some occasions to talk about financial and tactical aspects. It was acknowledged that operational matters could not be discussed.
- Concern was raised about the lack of information regarding out of court disposals. Could there be more information provided on out of court disposals and whether they were increasing or decreasing, what crimes they were being used for and trends.
- The report had stated that Public confidence in Cambridgeshire Constabulary had improved moving from 68.9% to 72.0%. How was this figure arrived at?
- Why was there such a discrepancy in the award of grant funding for drug intervention between Peterborough (£184,500) and Cambridgeshire (£104,400).

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The biggest rise in violent crime was domestic abuse. There was a performance review being undertaken to dig deeper and try and find out why there had been a rise in domestic abuse. This would provide very useful information.
- The Commissioner advised that the 101 service had been a consistent problem but had improved greatly since he had reviewed it. The main issue was the secondary call and a QueueBuster system was now in place. It had also been agreed to provide extra people to handle the calls but recruitment had been difficult as this was a specialist role. The Commissioner assured the Panel that he would continue to monitor the service.
- The Commissioner acknowledged that some more statistics could be included within the report but there would need to be a balance and the public often preferred to see narrative which the report had provided.
- Information on out of court disposals would be looked into and there would be a report back to the Panel.
- Public confidence was measured by the police.
- The grant funding was an historical figure but would be reviewed and information provided to the Panel on why there was a difference between Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. It should be noted however that Peterborough had a larger population.

Having reviewed the Police and Crime Commissioners Annual Report the Panel AGREED to endorse the Annual Report for 2014/15. In doing so, the Police and Crime Panel made the following recommendation:

1. That the Commissioner should consider publishing key statistical crime data (particularly around violent crime) showing comparisons to other similar areas to allow the public to make their own judgements on the performance of the Commissioner.

## **ACTION**

The Panel made a number of requests for further information to the Commissioner when considering the annual report. These were:

1. That the Commissioner should provide more information on the numbers and trends of out of court disposals.
2. That the Commissioner should provide more information on the levels of public confidence in the police and how these figures are arrived at.
3. That the Commissioner should provide more information on why Peterborough and Cambridge drug intervention grants are at different amounts.

## 10. 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:

Cambridgeshire Constabulary Vehicle Workshop – CPCC2015-026

- Had the Commissioner considered outsourcing the work rather than providing an internal vehicle workshop. *The Commissioner responded that it would be a specialist garage dealing with police cars. There were currently three vehicle workshops located in Cambridge, March and Peterborough. The new vehicle workshop would provide a central location in St Ives and would provide an overall cost saving. The new workshop would be able to take on work from other areas such as the fire service and local authorities.*

The Commissioner was informed of a report published from the Committee on Standards in Public Life called 'Tone from the top - leadership, ethics and accountability in policing' and the recommendation within that report that as a matter of good practice: Police and Crime Commissioners should publish a forward plan of decisions identifying the subject matter of the decision, why it is key, the meeting at which the decision is due to be taken, who will be consulted before the decision is taken and what reports/papers will be available for inspection. The Panel therefore requested that the Commissioner provide a forward plan of Key Decisions at future meetings. *The Commissioner advised that he would consider this request.*

### **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 Forward Plan of Key Decisions at a future meeting.

At this point the Police and Crime Commissioner and officers left the meeting.

## 11. Rules of Procedure

The Chairman introduced the Report which provided the Panel with an opportunity to review the Rules of Procedure. The Rules of Procedure had previously been presented to the Panel at its Annual Meeting on 17 June 2015. Due to the number of suggested changes the report was deferred to the September meeting to allow further time for members of the Panel to consider them and the possibility of making further suggestions.

The Chairman thanked members of the Panel for providing further suggestions for amendments to the Rules of Procedure. Due to the number of suggestions received and the requirement to ensure that the proposed changes were in line with the Local Government Act the Chairman suggested that a small working group be formed. The working group would work with a legal officer to consider the proposed amendments and reflect on the current Rules of Procedure and report back to the Panel at the next meeting in November.

The Panel unanimously AGREED to form a working group.

The Chairman accepted nominations to the working group who were Edward Leigh, Independent Co-opted Member, Councillor Lane and Francesca Anderson, Independent Co-opted Member.

The Panel AGREED to the nominations and requested that the working group report back to the Panel at the next meeting on 4 November 2015.

**12. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2015-2016**

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

The Chairman asked the Panel if any additional items should be added to the work programme. The following suggestion was made and agreed to.

- A review of the Chief Constable Appointment procedure.

**ACTIONS**

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
	Community Safety Partnerships	<p>The Commissioner to provide the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A further report on the outcome of the review of the CSP's and the Cambridge Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board at the next meeting of the Panel.</li> <li>2. A detailed breakdown of different types of crime and how the collection of data could be improved based on district areas and in particular violent crime and how this was being tackled and reduced. This to be provided at the next meeting.</li> </ol>	<p>Report rescheduled to be presented at the 16 March 2016 meeting.</p>
	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Annual Report 2014/2015	<p>The Panel made a number of requests for further information to the Commissioner when considering the annual report. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Commissioner should provide more information on the numbers and trends of out of court disposals.</li> <li>2. That the Commissioner should provide more information on the levels of public confidence in the police and how these figures are arrived at.</li> <li>3. That the Commissioner should provide more information on why Peterborough and Cambridge drug intervention grants are at different amounts.</li> </ol>	
	Decisions by the Commissioner	<p>The Panel noted the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner and requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with a Forward Plan of Key Decisions at a future meeting.</p>	

<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	ITEM	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>UPDATE</b>
	Rules of Procedure	<p>The Panel unanimously AGREED to form a working group.</p> <p>The Panel AGREED to the nominations and requested that the working group report back to the Panel at the next meeting on 4 November 2015.</p>	<p>Report from the working group scheduled in for 4 November 2015 meeting.</p>

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 3.50pm

CHAIRMAN

## Appendix 1

<b>Questioner</b>	Richard Taylor
<b>Questions addressed to which Member of the Panel</b>	Question to the Chairman
<b>Date Question was submitted</b>	9 September 2015
<b>Question</b>	
<p>I submitted a number of suggestions for items of scrutiny to the panel in advance of its previous meeting on the 17th of June 2015.</p> <p>Were these considered by the panel under the process set out in section 8.2 of the panel's rules of procedure?</p> <p>I expected to see the items considered at under the item on the agenda titled: "Meeting dates and Agenda Plan" however the panel appeared to be in a rush to finish its meeting and the chair declared the "Meeting dates and Agenda Plan" item was "for information" preventing any debate. The chair went on to announce an "agenda setting meeting in private shortly".</p> <p>I filmed the meeting and the relevant section can be viewed at:</p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NPr6DNI9tDg&amp;t=111m05s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NPr6DNI9tDg&amp;t=111m05s</a></p> <p>I think the panel ought to operate openly and agenda items, and decisions, should not be taken in private meetings. Decisions on what aspects of the Police and Crime Commissioner's role to look into are important panel decisions.</p>	
<b>Response</b>	
<p>The Panel acknowledges receipt of your suggested scrutiny items. The Panel considered your suggestions at its last agenda setting meeting and will continue to consider these at future agenda planning sessions. Whilst we welcome suggested areas for scrutiny from the public, the Panel is responsible for setting its own agenda and is not obligated to accept scrutiny suggestions presented to it.</p>	