

# Public Document Pack



## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL HELD AT HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 3 FEBRUARY 2016

<b>Members Present:</b>	Councillors Shelton (Chair), McGuire, Herbert, Shellens, Reeve, Criswell, Oliver, Pearson, Over, Francesca Anderson and Edward Leigh.	
<b>Officers Present:</b>	Paulina Ford Ian Phillips	Peterborough City Council Lead Officer Peterborough City Council
<b>Others Present:</b>	Sir Graham Bright Brian Ashton Dr Dorothy Gregson Josie Gowler	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Deputy Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Finance Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

### 1. Election of Chairman

The Secretariat informed the Panel that Councillor Ablewhite had decided to stand as a candidate in the forthcoming elections for the Police and Crime Commissioner and had therefore decided to resign from the Panel. The position of Chairman was therefore vacant. Councillor Criswell who was in attendance would be replacing Councillor Ablewhite as a member of the Panel.

The Secretariat asked for nominations for the role of Chairman of the Panel. Councillor McGuire seconded by Councillor Criswell nominated Councillor Shelton. There were no other nominations and Councillor Shelton was therefore elected as Chairman for the remainder of the 2015/16 municipal year.

Some members whilst in agreement with the appointment felt that consideration should be given to appointing one of the co-opted independent members to the role of Chairman in the future.

Councillor Shelton confirmed his acceptance of the role and thanked everyone for their nomination and vote of confidence.

### 2. Election of Vice Chairman

The Chairman asked for nominations for the role of Vice Chairman. Councillor McGuire seconded by Councillor Criswell nominated Councillor Coles. Councillor McGuire explained that whilst Councillor Coles was not in attendance at the meeting he had spoken to him and

he had agreed to be nominated. A second nomination was received from Edward Leigh seconded by Councillor Shellens for Councillor Herbert. Having received two nominations each were put to the vote. Councillor Coles received 5 votes in favour and Councillor Herbert received 5 votes in favour. As there was an equality of votes in favour of each nomination the Chairman had a casting vote. Councillor Reeve requested that the Chairman take into consideration that the Panel was a cross party Panel and that choosing a Panel member from a different political group would help public perception and confidence in the Panel. The Chairman voted in favour of Councillor Coles explaining that he had voted for him because he was a former Police Constable and represented Peterborough City.

Councillor Coles was therefore elected as Vice Chairman for the remainder of the 2015/16 municipal year.

### **3. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Coles, Councillor Shaheed, Councillor Lane, and Councillor Bullen. Councillor Reeve was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Bullen and Councillor Over was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Coles.

### **4. Declarations of Interest**

#### Item 11. Decisions by Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner

Councillor Criswell declared an interest in that he was the Chairman of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership which was mentioned under Decision notice CPCC 2015-045: Operation of the Road Casualty Reduction and Support Fund.

### **5. Minutes of the meeting held 4 November 2015**

The minutes of the meetings held on 4 November 2015 were agreed as an accurate record with the following correction noted:

Councillor Oliver had been in attendance at the meeting held on 4 November but this had not been recorded. The Secretariat to amend the minutes to reflect this.

Councillor McGuire noted an omission in regard to an issue that had been raised by Councillor Reeve at the meeting regarding an arrest and no action being taken. Councillor Reeve responded that he had mentioned this at the meeting and the Commissioner had since been in contact with him to find out more information but that it was not necessary to amend the minutes to include his statement.

### **1. Public Questions/Statements**

The Secretariat informed the Panel that two questions had been received from Mr Richard Taylor but they had been received after the deadline for receipt of questions which was 12noon on the third working day following the publication of the meeting agenda. However in accordance with the Rules of Procedure the Secretariat had informed the Chairman. The Rules of Procedure state that submissions received after the deadline may be accepted at the discretion of the Chairperson. The Chairman advised that he would not accept the late submission in this instance.

One Member commented that they were disappointment that the Chairman had not allowed the questions to be asked. Another Member commented that it may not be immediately apparent to members of the public from the Rules of Procedure when the agenda would be published and suggested that when the Rules of Procedure are reviewed at the Annual Meeting further clarification is provided. Members further suggested that in the meantime a

notification could be put on the Panels website to make it clear when the agendas are published.

## **ACTION**

1. The Secretariat to put a notification on the Panels website to make it clear when the agenda for any public meeting of the Panel will be published.
2. The Secretariat to note that an amendment would be required to the Rules of Procedure when next reviewed to provide clarification of when the agenda is published prior to a meeting.

## **2. Review of Complaints**

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.

## **3. Precept Report 2016-2017**

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which notified the Panel of the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioners proposed budget and precept for 2016/17 to enable the Panel to review the proposed precept. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Finance Officer gave a presentation to provide context to the report. The presentation provided highlights on the following areas:

- 2015/16 Outturn to November (month 8)
- Year by year savings
- Estimates in MTFP – information awaited
- Budget Assistance Reserve
- Future Savings 2017/18 to 2019/20
- Precept 2016/17

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members sought clarification regarding the use of reserves and if the use of reserves was required to ensure the books balanced. Had the Commissioner considered increasing the precept to above 0.99% to ensure a level budget and therefore not have to use the reserves?
- Reference was made to the slide: Precept 2016/17 quoting Consumer Price Index and Retail Price Index. As far as inflation had affected the constabulary was the proposed precept a fair reflection.
- It was noted that the proposed precept had been announced publically on 6 January 2016 prior to the Panel debating and approving it. This had given the impression that it had already been agreed and that it was just a formality for the Panel to ratify it. A member of the Panel provided clarification on the role of the Panel in the process of approving the Precept.
- Members were concerned that £2.8M of savings were being taken out of the reserves and clarification was sought regarding local savings and where they would be and if the reserves would be adequate.
- There had been no mention within the report regarding the recent announcement of the possible merger with the Fire Service and the consequences of such a merger.

- Further clarification was sought regarding the breakdown of the £2.6M total savings figure and in particular the £0.9M for police staff.
- The Commissioner was congratulated on the sensible proposal of a 0.99% precept but it was hoped that some of the savings would provide an opportunity for more officers in rural areas.
- Clarification was sought as to why there was a separate budget reserve as well as a general reserve.
- What is a collaborated policeman?
- Members noted the workforce projections (establishment) of 1,352 police officers for 2016/17 and wanted to know if they would all be available all of the time in Cambridgeshire.
- Members commented that it would be better to show the budget figures as an annual figure rather than as compounded figures over a number of years. It would be helpful to show this year's precept rise with this year's inflation rise to show a more transparent budget.
- Are there other reserves that the Police hold in addition to the two reserves within the Commissioners budget.
- It was noted that the cost of the Police and Crime Commissioners Office of £1.2M had not reduced. Why?
- Members commented that the information received by the Panel over the year regarding the budget had been much better than previous years and congratulated the Commissioner on a prudent budget and managing it so effectively.
- Members were however concerned that the budget might be too prudent. The council tax base had increased by 2% which reflected an increase in the population, more houses and more cars and therefore a greater requirement for policing.
- Members commented that the figures for the 'state of the force' as mentioned in the Business Coordination Board minutes did not correlate with those listed in the budget papers.

3.20pm. Councillor Shellens left the meeting at this point.

- What resources had been put into the 101 service to assist with improving the 30 second response time?
- Concern was raised regarding the fact that Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) had stated that the constabulary were still not doing what it could with its powers to safeguard vulnerable victims of domestic violence. What resources had been put into sorting out domestic violence?

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- Increasing the precept to above 0.99% had been considered but the Commissioner had not wanted to put further burden on the taxpayer. The use of reserves was just a bridge until the expected savings came through.
- The proposed precept was a fair reflection of inflation rates. Whilst there may be slight variations in inflation it was important to ensure that resources were available to do the job and therefore keep the level of resources the same.
- The statement regarding the proposed precept which had been announced on 6 January had stated that it was a proposal before being approved by the Panel. It had been necessary to announce the proposed precept to obtain comments and views from the public before being presented to the Panel.
- Members were referred to page 39, Table 1, Budget Changes 2015/16 to 2016/17 and the projected savings of £0.2M under estates and informed that there would be further savings of £0.7M in estates later in the year which would mean savings would be in hand for 2017/18. This was the methodology used throughout the budget.

- The Home Office were expecting Commissioners to join up with Blue Light services but no figures had been announced yet. The Policing and Crime Bill would be published next week but discussions with the Fire Service were already being organised.
- The budget establishment at the end of 2015/16 was 825 and the position was now 803 showing a reduction overall of approximately 20 personnel. Changes in technology and changes in processes of working through Operation Metis had provided opportunities for changes in staffing.
- Rural policing was being tackled in that more specials were being put in place to specifically look after rural and village life.
- There was a separate budget reserve as well as a general reserve as there needed to be clarity as to what might be an operational requirement for the money and that a reserve was retained against the risk of needing to spend against exceptional expenditures for operational policing need. The budget reserve was built up to provide sufficient resource to get through the transition to gaining the savings. This was a prudent approach and there would be a redefinition of the reserves in the future.
- A collaborated police officer was someone who was employed by the county but would be working in a policing unit which covered all three counties or the Eastern Region e.g. road policing unit.
- The workforce projections of 1,352 police officers would not all be available at any one time in Cambridgeshire but they could be called upon if required according to operational need.
- The budget figures were presented as compounded figures to show a trajectory to ensure that the public were not paying more than they should. The budget had been presented in a transparent way during the term of the office of the Commissioner over the four year period. This had been presented by showing what the starting figure was and what the end figure hoped to be.
- All reserves were listed on page 54, Appendix 6, General and Earmarked Reserves within the report. Members were also informed that the historic debt of the constabulary had been reduced over the four years as well as building reserves.
- The cost of the Police and Crime Commissioners Office had not been reduced as it had taken on the responsibility for the provision of certain victims' services and the continued scrutiny and oversight implications of the large collaboration projects being undertaken to deliver the savings required over the next few years.
- The Deputy Commissioner assured the Panel that the number of police in proportion to the budget had not only been maintained but had increased. The Deputy Commissioner provided further context regarding the makeup of the budget.
- The figures provided at the Business Coordination Board were the figures provided by the Force Executive Board Report that was produced by the constabulary and were the numbers actually employed at that moment in time not the establishment. The numbers that the force wished to recruit did not always instantly match with the number available as some would still be in training.
- Additional resources had already been put into the 101 service and calls were now being answered within 10 seconds.
- Acknowledging the HMIC report and comments the Commissioner advised that work was being done with other constabularies to look at best practice. Further investment had been put into better body worn cameras in order to capture evidence and the procedure to deal with domestic violence had been improved. There were currently 200 trained officers in how to deal with domestic violence and this was being extended.

Following discussion the Chairman put the recommendation to approve the 0.99% increase for the Precept for 2016/2017 to a vote.

The recommendation to approve the proposal of a 0.99% increase for the Precept for 2016/2017 was APPROVED. (9 in favour, 1 vote against from Councillor Reeve, 0 abstentions). Councillor Reeve requested that his vote be recorded.

## **ACTION**

The Panel requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with the following information at the next meeting:

- Numbers involved in territorial policing
- The numbers of police officers per 1000 population
- Expenditure per head by population

### **4. Police and Crime Plan Variation**

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which provided the Panel with a variation of the Police and Crime Plan for approval. The sections being varied included:

- Executive Summary – the one page summary had been updated to reflect the variations to the Plan which had been previously approved by the Panel.
- Foreword from Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner – the variation allowed the Commissioner to welcome a new Chief Constable who is responsible for the operational delivery of the Plan.
- Foreword from Chief Constable – the variation enabled the new Chief Constable Alec Wood to respond to his appointment and share his vision for the future of Cambridgeshire Constabulary.
- How we developed the Police and Crime Plan – the change to this section acknowledged that the influences remain the same but refreshed and simplified the content.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members highlighted that there appeared to be different sets of priorities within the police force e.g. priorities of the Chief Constable, priorities of the Superintendents of each area, priorities of the Community Safety Partnerships, neighbourhood priorities and district priorities. It was hoped that within the next Police and Crime Plan there would be a clearer focus on crimes by issue and priority.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The Police and Crime Plan was in place to hold the police force to account. There were six commanders in place and they had to take note of what was in the Police and Crime Plan. There was also a performance working group in place which looked at performance of burglary, domestic abuse, sexual offences etc.

There being no further discussion and having reviewed the draft variation to the Police and Crime Plan the Panel AGREED to ENDORSE the variation of the following sections of the Police and Crime Plan.

- Executive Summary
- Foreword from Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner
- Foreword from Chief Constable
- How we developed the Police and Crime Plan

### **5. Estates and Front Line Policing**

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which provided the Panel with an outline of the strategic direction of the Estate having regard to agile working, contact points and collaboration and demonstrating how an annual saving of circa £700,000 could be

identified by the end of the 2016/17 budget year. The Deputy Commissioner provided further context to the report.

3.35pm. Councillor McGuire left the meeting at this point.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members were pleased to note that with the new technology in place police officers were out and about more and spent less time in the office. There was however concern that officers would be pre booked for long periods of time therefore not allowing them time to engage with members of the public.
- The Commissioner was congratulated on the disposal of some assets.
- Members requested the following information:
  - Breakdown of the targeted workforce numbers and the minimum number that the workforce reaches at any point in the year
  - An explanation of why the targeted workforce figures are significantly higher than the actual workforce figures.
  - The number of police officers per 1000 population
  - How many of the police officers were shared between other forces and by which police forces.
- Members noted and understood that some buildings were no longer needed but sought clarification on the future of Parkside in Cambridge as it was felt that city's like Cambridge and Peterborough required central city facilities.
- Members referred to page 68, Appendix A, Cambridgeshire Constabulary Estate assets identified as surplus to requirements. What message did the Commissioner feel was being portrayed to people in rural communities by closing their police stations as well as there no longer being a police presence in rural villages. Members were concerned that the public perception was that rural communities would no longer have a police presence.
- Members were pleased to have seen the Police Contact point launch in Tesco's.
- Could the signage on buildings no longer being used as police stations be removed? The old police station at Werrington was given as an example.
- Had consideration been given to the police sharing buildings with other services e.g. fire stations?

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The Deputy Commissioner advised that the information requested on numbers of police officers would be provided at the next meeting of the Panel in March.
- Parkside in Cambridge City would remain and there were no plans to close the facility in the foreseeable future. There were plans in place to refurbish the building.
- The Commissioner commented that police officers protected localities not police station buildings. If some of the buildings were kept this would impact on the number of frontline police officers. Contact points within rural communities were being put in place so that people had somewhere to go to report any issues. Agile working of police offices meant that they could work anywhere e.g. coffee shops, supermarkets. If there was an emergency a call to 999 would still apply. The number of frontline police still remained the same.
- The removal of signage on old police buildings would be brought to the attention of the Estates Manager.
- Consideration was being given to the police sharing buildings with other emergency services.

## **ACTION**

1. The Panel noted the report and requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with the following information at the next meeting of the Panel on 16 March 2016:

- a. Breakdown of the targeted workforce numbers and the minimum number that the workforce reaches at any point in the year
  - b. An explanation of why the targeted workforce figures are significantly higher than the actual workforce figures.
  - c. The number of police officers per 1000 population
  - d. How many of the police officers were shared between other forces and by which police forces.
2. The Panel requested that the Commissioner look into the removal of signage from police station buildings no longer being used.

## 6. Decisions by Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner

The Panel received a report to enable it to review or scrutinise decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner under Section 28 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The Panel was recommended to indicate whether it would wish to further review and scrutinise the decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner taken since the previous Panel meeting.

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

### **Business Coordination Board Approved Minutes – 30 September 2015**

- Page 81, paragraph 6.3. Members sought clarification of the statement “*Areas of concern were discussed, these being: prosecution possible for Domestic Abuse, victim based crime and secondary call handing*”. Did the statement mean that there was a serious underperformance in those key areas. The HMIC December 2015 report had mentioned Cambridgeshire Constabulary’s use of Domestic Violence Protection notices as low and was concerned that the constabulary was not using its power available to safe guard vulnerable victims. *Members were informed that it had been highlighted because Domestic Abuse, victim based crime and secondary call handing were areas of priority and the HMIC comments within the report had been taken on board.*
- Making further reference to the HMIC report Members highlighted other areas of concern which had been highlighted within the report and specifically: voluntary attendance of perpetrators and not arresting them. *Members were informed that this was being looked into.*

### **CPCC 2015-040 Developing a Restorative Justice Approach in Cambridgeshire – Extension of Delivery Partnership**

- Members sought assurance that the private company being hired to deliver restorative justice would be fully integrated in the system. *Members were informed that the company would not be delivering restorative justice but would be delivering training on restorative justice as part of a cultural change programme.*
- Members requested that there be consistency and clarification when using the term restorative justice as it was sometimes confused with both community remedy and conditional caution.

### **Finance Sub-Group Approved Minutes – 27 August 2015**

- Page 76, paragraph 3. Force Revenue Monitoring report Month 3 2015/16. Members noted the statement “*The DPCC had heard that an increasing number of young police officers were not taking up the offer of a police pension*” and that a Federation Research Report would be commissioned to look at this issue. Members requested that when complete it could be provided to the Panel.
- Page 136, paragraph 3.8. Members sought clarification as to why no further action was required in respect of the National Police Volunteer Cadet team bid into the Innovation



Fund. *Members were advised that the Commissioner had supported the bid but that no further action was required from Cambridgeshire.*

- Members noted that the Commissioner had intended to set up a Cybercrime Conference and asked if it was his intention to invite Panel members. *The Commissioner advised that he would extend an invitation to Panel members.*
- Members congratulated the Commissioner on the Innovation Fund Bids.
- Members provided a note of caution with large IT projects as they could be risky and suggested a more tactical approach.

**CPC 2015-037 S22A Agreement under the Police Act 1996 (as amended) – Civil Nuclear Constabulary.**

- Members asked for further information as to what the Civil Nuclear Constabulary was. *Members were informed that some of the information was sensitive but that some information could be provided.*

**ACTION**

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

The Panel requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with the following information:

1. A copy of the Federation Research Report into why young police officers were not taking up the offer of a police pension when completed.
2. An explanation of what the Civil Nuclear Constabulary was.

4.05pm. Councillor Criswell left the meeting at this point.

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

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

**ACTION**

The Panel agreed that the following items be included on the Agenda Plan at a future meeting:

- A report on the use of police drones which are being piloted in Cambridgeshire. The information to be included within the report on surveillance and ANPR to be scheduled in during the new municipal year.

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 4.10pm

CHAIRMAN

## ACTIONS

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
3 February 2016	<b>Minutes of the meeting held 4 November 2015</b>	The Secretariat to amend the minutes to reflect Councillor Oliver's attendance at the meeting.	Completed
	<b>Public Questions/State ments</b>	<p>The Secretariat to put a notification on the Panels website to make it clear when the agenda for any public meeting of the Panel will be published.</p> <p>The Secretariat to note that an amendment would be required to the Rules of Procedure when next reviewed to provide clarification of when the agenda is published prior to a meeting.</p>	Completed
	<b>Precept Report 2016-2017</b>	<p>The Panel requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with the following information at the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numbers involved in territorial policing</li> <li>• The numbers of police officers per 1000 population</li> <li>• Expenditure per head by population</li> </ul>	
	<b>Estates and Front Line Policing</b>	<p>The Panel noted the report and requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with the following information at the next meeting of the Panel on 16 March 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakdown of the targeted workforce numbers and the minimum number that the workforce reaches at any point in the year.</li> <li>• An explanation of why the targeted workforce figures are significantly higher than the actual workforce figures.</li> <li>• The number of police officers per 1000 population.</li> <li>• How many of the police officers were shared between other forces and by which police forces.</li> </ul> <p>The Panel requested that the Commissioner look into the removal of signage from police station buildings no longer being used.</p>	

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
	<b>Decisions by Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner</b>	<p>The Panel requested that the Commissioner provide the Panel with the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A copy of the Federation Research Report into why young police officers were not taking up the offer of a police pension when completed.</li> <li>2. An explanation of what the Civil Nuclear Constabulary was.</li> </ol>	
	<b>Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2015-2016</b>	<p>The Panel agreed that the following items be included on the Agenda Plan at a future meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A report on the use of police drones which are being piloted in Cambridgeshire. The information to be included within the report on surveillance and ANPR to be scheduled in during the new municipal year.</li> </ul>	To be programmed into the 2016/2017 work programme.

This page is intentionally left blank