



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
HELD AT PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL  
ON 16 MARCH 2016**

**Members Present:** Councillors Shelton (Chairman), Coles (Vice Chairman) McGuire, Shellens, Bullen, Criswell, Sinnott and Independent Co-opted Members Francesca Anderson and Edward Leigh.

**Officers Present:** Paulina Ford Secretariat Peterborough City Council  
Ian Phillips Lead Officer 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

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Shaheed, Councillor Lane, Councillor Pearson, Councillor Oliver and Councillor Herbert. Councillor Sinnott was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Herbert.

**2. 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 2016-002: Delegation of an element of the Casualty Reduction and Support Fund to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership.

**3. Minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2016 were approved as an accurate record subject to the following amendments:

- Page 4 under agenda item 2, Election of Vice Chairman it stated that Councillor Coles represented South Cambridgeshire and it should have stated that Councillor Coles represented Peterborough City.
- Page 10 under agenda item 11. Decisions by Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner, CPCC 2015-040 Developing a Restorative Justice Approach in Cambridgeshire – Extension of Delivery Partnership. Members noted an omission of

the following words: *and conditional caution*. The wording therefore to be changed to the following

- *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**.*

The Chairman noted that a letter had been received from the Police and Crime Commissioner in response to requested actions from the last meeting.

### **Chairman's Statement**

The Chairman thanked the Commissioner and his deputy for all they had achieved over the last four years and made reference to the fact that the post of Police and Crime Commissioner had been a new concept both in Cambridgeshire and nationally. This had led to numerous challenges especially in the first few months in post as both the public, the Constabulary and the Panel adjusted to this new way of working. The Chairman noted a number of achievements that the Commissioner had made and in particular two areas which was the Victims Hub and the robust financial stewardship which had been critical to protecting front line services. Members of the Panel also noted the good work that had been done with regard to domestic violence.

On behalf of the Panel, the Chairman wished the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner best wishes for the future.

The Commissioner thanked the Panel for their good wishes and said that it had been one of the most rewarding jobs he had ever taken on.

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

No public questions or statements were received.

### **2. Review of Complaints**

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

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

### **3. Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel – Administrative Costs and Member Expenses**

The Lead Officer for the Panel introduced the report which provided the Panel with details about the budget claimed to support the Police and Crime Panel including the expenses and allowances of Panel Members.

As there were no questions or comments the Panel AGREED to note the report.

### **4. Police and Crime Plan Variation – Appendix 1 Finances Update**

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which provided the Panel with an update of the Police and Crime Commissioners Police and Crime Plan, Appendix 1 – Finances. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner accompanied by the Chief Finance Officer gave a presentation to provide context to the report. Key areas highlighted included:

- Year by Year savings
- Balance sheet effects of policy

- Breakdown of Budget 2016/17
- Real purchasing power of gross revenue expenditure (GRE) in %
- All Police Officers compared to Constables (PCs)
- National vs local officers
- Trends in overall recorded crime per 1000 households
- Trends in recorded crimes by type per 1000 households
- Victim satisfaction
- Delivery of pledges
- Transforming the service
- The Future and efficiency and effectiveness

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members congratulated the Commissioner on a prudent budget.
- Reference Page 23, Risks and Uncertainties, final bullet point "*Overtime claims for undercover officers – the claim is passing through the courts at present and the outcome remains uncertain*". How much has the Commissioner had to budget for this claim and was there an upper limit to the claim. Why were undercover officers claiming overtime?
- Reference page 52, slide titled "*Future, Savings planned through BCH Collaboration*". How will devolution and the possibility of the Fire Service coming under the Police and Crime Commissioner affect the Commissioner's office and finances. Will either of the above improve finances of the Constabulary.
- Reference page 24, table referring to Revenue Budget 2015/16 and 2016/17 and page 28 Workforce projections (establishment) 2015/16 – 2016/17. It was noted that there was a reduction in local policing for 2016/17. Members sought further clarification.
- Page 50, table showing Trends in Recorded Crimes by type per 1000 Households. Why was Domestic Violence not listed as a separate category.
- Page 27, paragraph 10.12, Seven-Force Collaboration. Clarification was sought on whether the budget for the collaboration team would come out of the Police and Crime Commissioner's office budget or the Constabulary's budget.
- Members commented that the number of constables per 1000 population would need to be kept track of historically and going forward to ensure it was in line with population growth.
- A Member of the Panel had attended the recent Cybercrime Conference hosted by Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Cambridgeshire's Police and Crime Commissioner and sought the Commissioners views on the balance between central activity and local activity on cybercrime and if there had been any reactions received since the conference took place.

Responses by the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- It was unknown how much the overtime claim would be for undercover officers which was passing through the courts and therefore could not budget for this. The Panel were informed that a case had been lodged about whether undercover officers should have been paid overtime whilst undertaking undercover operations. The case concerned historical undercover work undertaken. It was therefore difficult to know what the outcome of this would be and therefore how to budget for it. A note would be put in the accounts identifying this as a risk. This was not a problem solely for Cambridgeshire but a national problem.
- Devolution could possibly offer more efficiencies but would not have any serious effects financially.
- The Commissioner explained that consideration had already been given to the proposals for the Fire Service and Blue Light Services to come under the Police and Crime Commissioners office. He advised the Panel of several scenarios where savings could

be made by bringing them together including the Police and Fire Service sharing accommodation and amalgamating the call centres.

- The tables on pages 24 and 25 showing a reduction in local policing was due to the collaboration of forces and there had actually been an increase of 93 officers through collaboration.
- The Trends in the “Recorded Crimes” table had not listed Domestic Violence as a separate category as the categories listed were Home Office categories. The Commissioner advised that he had taken this up with the Home Office.
- The budget for the Seven-Force Collaboration would come out of the Constabulary’s budget.
- The request was noted for historical and future tracking of constables per 1000 population but Members were informed that it would be easier to keep track of constables per 1000 households rather than population as the data would be more current.
- Cybercrime was growing rapidly however 80% of cybercrime could be stopped by people taking precautions. The Commissioner had convinced the Chief Constable to set up a specialist cybercrime unit. There had been a good response from companies attending the Cybercrime Conference offering to come forward as volunteers to work on cybercrime and Cambridge University had offered to work with the police.

Following debate the Panel AGREED to the variation to Appendix 1 - Finances of the Police and Crime Plan.

The Panel also requested that in future reports the number of constables per 1000 households should be tracked both historically and going forward to ensure it was in line with population growth.

## 5. Public Engagement

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which provided the Panel with an update on how the Commissioner was engaging with the public to obtain greater public participation and what value this was having.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Page 57, Listening and Responding, paragraph 7.1. Did the Commissioner have a service level agreement on how requests for information from the public, the media and partners is handled? A member of the Panel had written to the Commissioner’s office in February but had not received a response or acknowledgement of the correspondence. The Panel felt that an acknowledgement of an initial request should be automatically sent even if the request could not be answered straight away.
- Page 57, Working with Others. The Commissioner provided grants to Community Safety Partnerships. Did the Commissioner have an overview and understanding of what was working well and what was not working well within the Community Safety Partnerships. *The Commissioner advised that further detail on this would be provided in the report on Community Safety Partnerships later on in the agenda.*
- Page 57, paragraph 8.3 regarding road safety and the Speedwatch scheme. It was noted that in the Outcomes section of the report there had been no mention of the outcome from this scheme. There were particular problems in Cambridge with regard to speeding cars, unroadworthy bicycles, people riding their bicycles without lights and ignoring traffic light signals.
- Page 56, paragraph 6.3, *“The Commissioner monitors public opinion and public satisfaction through both the Performance Working Group and through the Business Coordination Board (BCB)”*. How do you measure public satisfaction and what is the Working Group and BCB scrutinising. What is being done to survey people who do not generally come into contact with the police.

- The Panel noted that the Commissioner had asked the Constabulary to review how Special Constables might be used in some communities to patrol their local patch and increase visibility. The Panel requested a report on how this was progressing at a future meeting.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The Commissioner apologised for the delay in a response from his office to the Panel member who had sent in a request for information and would look into it and ensure a response was sent.
- Responses to correspondence received at the Commissioner's Office were sometimes delayed as research often had to be undertaken to establish the facts to provide the response. Some enquires were quite complex and lengthy. All enquiries were handled as quickly as possible. The Commissioner noted the request from the Panel that an acknowledgement of any request for information sent to the Commissioner's office should be sent out on receipt of the request.
- PCSO's were out and about in Cambridge issuing tickets to cyclists behaving dangerously and not having their lights on. The issue with cyclists in Cambridge was that it was more of a problem in term time. Unroadworthy bicycles with no breaks etc. were taken off the road.
- The Police Force conduct extensive telephone surveys to measure public satisfaction of victims of crime. Police surgeries provide an opportunity for feedback from members of the public and also through police positioned in supermarkets. Most people were happy with the service provided.

Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report and requested that a report be brought back to the Panel on the use of how Special Constables were being used in some communities to patrol their local patch and increase visibility.

The Panel requested that any communication sent to the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office from a member of public should be sent an automatic acknowledgement on receipt of the request.

## 6. Rural Crime

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which provided the Panel with details on how Cambridgeshire Constabulary tackle rural crime and what support mechanisms were in place for Special Constables in rural areas.

As there were no questions or comments the Panel AGREED to note the report.

## 7. Community Safety Partnerships

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which provided the Panel with the outcome of the Police and Crime Commissioner's review of Community Safety Partnerships and how they had used their crime and disorder reduction grants to help secure the reduction of crime and disorder in Cambridgeshire.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Page 66, paragraph 6.2, Understand – Developing an Evidence Base for Grant Funding. Members referred to the following statement "*Cambridgeshire Constabulary support this process by providing the detailed crime and incident data required to ensure a complete picture of reported crime and disorder is available. These reports are in turn shared with the Constabulary...*" Clarification was sought as to what was meant by "*shared with the Constabulary*" as it was the Constabulary who was providing the data. *The Commissioner*

*responded that the information was shared with other partners and then returned to the Constabulary as a different report.*

- Members referred to the funding provided for programmes for young offenders and asked the Commissioner if he felt earlier intervention programmes with children were more effective and more beneficial. *The Commissioner responded that the earlier the intervention the better the outcomes. An example of this was the Volunteer Police Cadet Programme at Thomas Deacon Academy which had provided good results. This programme was making an impact into various communities.*
- Star Chambers. Members asked if it would be possible for members of the Panel to attend and observe one of the Star Chamber meetings. *The Chief Executive responded that it would need to be the decision of the new Commissioner.*

Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report and requested that a request be made to the new Commissioner when in post that members of the Panel be allowed to attend and observe a Star Chamber meeting.

## **8. 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 since the previous Panel meeting.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

### **CPC 2016-002 – Delegation of an element of the Casualty Reduction and Support Fund to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership**

- Page 78, paragraph 4.1. *“£146K to upgrade static Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras.”* Clarification was sought as to whether Cambridgeshire County Council no longer contributed to the maintenance of the cameras. *Members were informed that this was correct and that the Commissioner’s Office now funded this.*

### **CPC 2016-004 – Finance, Human Resources, Learning and Development and Duties Management System Procurement**

- The decision referred to the appointment of a supplier for the IT system. The BCB minutes state that a supplier had been appointed. Was there a reason why the supplier had not been named. *Members were informed that the supplier could not be named until the cooling off period had passed.*
- Members referred to page 86, paragraph 7.8 and asked that congratulations be passed on to senior analysts Emily Doran and Amanda Huggins and Strategic Intelligence Analyst Sally Brierley for their outstanding achievement in being put forward for the Association of Crime and Intelligence Analysts awards for their work in developing a strategic risk matrix.

The Panel AGREED to note the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner.

## **9. Draft Agenda Plan and Meeting Dates for 2016/2017**

The Panel received and noted the draft agenda plan for 2016/2017 which provided dates and times of meetings for the next municipal year.

The Panel noted and AGREED the dates and time of meetings for 2016/2017.

A short discussion was held regarding the following areas:

- The Chief Constable to be invited the first meeting of the Panel in the new municipal year.
- The Panel to review any urgent issues raised within recent HMIC reports at the June meeting or another future meeting. Edward Leigh to identify any critical items requiring review within the HMIC reports and circulate via email to members of the Panel to assist the Panel in deciding which items should be brought to the first meeting of the Panel in June.
- That an agenda planning meeting be held prior to the start of the new municipal year to discuss the work programme for 2016/2017.

### ACTIONS

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
16 March 2016	<b>Police and Crime Plan Variation – Appendix 1 Finances Update</b>	<p>Following debate the Panel AGREED to the variation to Appendix 1 - Finances of the Police and Crime Plan.</p> <p>The Panel also requested that in future reports the number of constables per 1000 households should be tracked both historically and going forward to ensure it was in line with population growth.</p>	Police and Crime Commissioners Office to note for future reports.
	Public Engagement	<p>Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report and requested that a report be brought back to the Panel on the use of how Special Constables were being used in some communities to patrol their local patch and increase visibility.</p> <p>The Panel requested that any communication sent to the Police and Crime Commissioners Office from a member of public should be sent an automatic acknowledgement on receipt of the request.</p>	Report to be programmed in to the 2016/2017 work programme.
	<b>Community Safety Partnerships</b>	Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report and requested that a request be made to the new Commissioner when in post that members of the Panel be allowed to attend and observe a Star Chamber meeting.	
	<b>Decisions by Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner</b>	<p><b>CPCC 2016-004 – Finance, Human Resources, Learning and Development and Duties Management System Procurement</b></p> <p>The Panel also asked that congratulations be passed on to senior</p>	

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
		<p>analysts Emily Doran and Amanda Huggins and Strategic Intelligence Analyst Sally Brierley for their outstanding achievement in being put forward for the Association of Crime and Intelligence Analysts awards for their work in developing a strategic risk matrix.</p>	
	<p><b>Draft Agenda Plan and Meeting Dates for 2016/2017</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chief Constable to be invited the first meeting of the Panel in the new municipal year.</li> <li>• The Panel to review any urgent issues raised within recent HMIC reports at the June meeting or another future meeting. Edward Leigh to identify any critical items requiring review within the HMIC reports and circulate via email to members of the Panel to assist the Panel in deciding which items should be brought to the first meeting of the Panel in June.</li> <li>• That an agenda planning meeting be held prior to the start of the new municipal year to discuss the work programme for 2016/2017.</li> </ul>	<p>Report provided by the Commissioner at the meeting on 29 June 2016</p> <p>To be arranged after the Annual Meeting.</p>

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 4.07pm

CHAIRMAN