



The minutes of the Complaints Sub Committee held on 11 July 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

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

No public questions or statements were received.

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

The Panel received a report which stated that no complaints had been made against the Police and Crime Commissioner since the Panel met on 29 June 2016 and the outcome of the Complaints Sub Committee which met on 11 July 2016.

The Panel received a verbal update from the Legal Officer informing Members that a response had been received from the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) regarding the complaint made against the Commissioner which the Complaints Sub Committee had referred to the IPCC for consideration . The Panel were informed that the IPCC concluded that no investigation was necessary and the complaint should now be referred back to the Complaints Sub Committee to determine if any further action was necessary; it was agreed for this to be arranged.

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.

The Panel AGREED to note the outcome of the Complaints Sub Committee which met on 11 July 2016 and the subsequent response from the IPCC.

### **3. Developing A Police and Crime Plan (Community Safety & Criminal Justice) For Cambridgeshire**

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner who informed the Panel:

- The Plan was a very early first iteration
- The Panel, community and strategic partners would now have the opportunity to feed into the development of the Plan to reflect local views
- The next iteration would be in November which would include more detail, finance information, and how the performance framework would be developed

Proposed approach to Cambridgeshire Plan:

- Vision – All agencies ‘Working together to keep Cambridgeshire safe’
- Overarching strategic themes – ‘Police and Crime Objectives’
  - Victims – Safeguarding the vulnerable
  - Offenders – Attacking Criminality
  - Communities – Preventing crime and reassuring the public
  - Transformation – Achieving the best use of resources

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- There were no targets within the Plan and therefore what targets and figures would be included at the next draft in November? There was a need to include clear objectives on each theme; for example, traffic; with a plan and figures to reduce fatalities and other themes.

- Police and Crime Objective 3 – Communities stated an action of “Re-defining and re-stating the neighbourhood policing position” yet Members were of the opinion that PCSOs and Police Panels have been taken away over previous years and therefore stated it would be helpful if this was looked into especially in areas where fear of crime outweighed the crime. Team working and collaboration was essential whilst avoiding the duplication of work, especially with the various Safer Partnerships.
- How does low level crime fitted into the Plan as it is was often not reported due to the public believing that the Police will not respond to these.
- What did the Commissioner think needed improving and what would be his top key targets.
- Can the Chief Constable attend future Panel meetings especially when the Plan comes back before the Panel in February.
- Was it still the intention for the OPCC to take over the Fire Authority?
- It was noted that the Plan did not contain outcomes and aims and therefore the question was asked as to where the OPCC saw itself in four years’ time and how it planned to get there; Members wanted to see actions, methods and stepping stones in order for the Panel to follow and know if the progress was on track.
- It was noted that the wording ‘shared outcomes’ was confusing and therefore needed context and explaining differently.
- It was suggested it would be beneficial to consult the general public with regard to jargon and long words as it is important that this becomes a document that the public can relate to and understand.
- There was a focus on reoffending within the Plan which was confusing as it was clearly not only reoffending that was being looked at but the “would be” offender too, yet these were “lumped” together. Members thought that the approach to the “would be” offender should be made separately to the approach for an identified offender who already had a track record.
- It was noted that the word “detection” had not been mentioned in the Plan and it was Members’ opinion that the public would think this was the police’s number one duty followed by the prevention of crime therefore it was suggested that it should have a section within the report. Did the Commissioner have a view on this?
- Efficiency and cost savings are very different and should not be used to mean the same thing; this needs to be made clearer within the Plan.
- Paragraphs 7.5.1 and 7.5.2 within the report should be reworded to ensure the public understood them.
- The content within the graphics was great but had not been presented clearly and therefore it was suggested this be looked at by an infographic designer to convey succinct and important information in a clearer way.
- Was the graphic on page 35 a typical day?
- There were some major areas of concern that were not in the Plan, these included migrant and migration issues.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The performance indicators would be finalised ready for February’s meeting. Road safety has already been recognised and would be included; the Commissioner explained he had used part of the Road Casualty Reduction and Support Fund to bring in an additional dedicated Casualty Reduction Officer. How fatalities would be reduced would be included in the Plan.
- The work involved in reducing traffic fatalities would include education, enforcement and working with partner agencies.
- The Safer Peterborough Partnership is impressive and this would be looked at in order to help find a model that would suit the district areas. With regard to the loss of PCSOs, the possibility that special constables could be utilised in a more meaningful way in communities could be looked at.

- Reducing fear of crime would involve partnership working and collaboration and a future review of Neighbourhood policing.
- It was acknowledged that Police visibility in the local community was essential in helping the wellbeing of the public to overcome their fears but it was also a challenge to find the balance between visible policing and tackling serious crime which includes organised crime, counter terrorism, child sex exploitation and domestic violence which all take a huge amount of resource.
- The reality was that police being more visual to the public did not solve crime; crime and criminality is dealt with by investigations which cannot occur if the police are on the street therefore there is a balance that needs to be achieved through the Plan
- With regard to collaboration, there was a challenge around local authorities taking responsibility of their own services and this would be emphasised within the Plan. His top four objectives were already included within the Plan which would enable the Commissioner to hold the Chief Constable to account and look for positive outcomes.
- It was unnecessary for the Chief Constable to attend every meeting but where the Panel felt it was helpful then the Chief Constable would be happy to attend.
- A collaborative approach to building strategic relationships would enable him to have a better understanding to develop a more deliverable Plan.
- The Commissioner would not be taking over the Fire Authority but was looking at possibly of being an early adopter with respect to the Policing and Crime Bill powers. The Bill was likely to become legislation by the end of the year.
- One of the priorities for action against Objective 2 within the Plan – Police investigations deal with the offenders while ensuring the best outcomes for victims; the next iteration would include more detail around the detection of crime.
- The next draft Plan would contain far more detail.
- The graph “Statement about demand on Policing in Cambridgeshire” was a typical average day in policing.
- The Commissioner thanked the Panel for their very helpful comments and explained that a consultation was already taking place with some feedback, positive and constructive, already received.

Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the direction of travel and progress made on the Plan and requested that the Commissioner consider the following:

1. Targets, figures, actions and methods to be included in the Plan.
2. “Re-defining and re-stating the neighbourhood policing position” be looked at to help reduce the fear of crime.
3. The Chief Constable attend future Panel meetings which involved the Plan and any other relevant issues.
4. A consultation with the general public to include their understanding of the jargon and long wording to ensure it becomes a Plan they can relate to.
5. Offenders and “would be” offenders to be dealt with separately.
6. Detection to be included within the Plan.
7. Efficiency and cost savings to be made clearer.
8. Paragraphs 7.5.1 and 7.5.2 to be reworded.
9. The graphics to be presented in a clear way.
10. Migrant and migration issues to be included.

#### **4. Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary Inspection - Update**

The Panel received a report which provided an update on how the findings of the Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) Police Effectiveness, Efficiency, and

Legitimacy (PEEL) reports are being monitored by the Police and Crime Commissioner (the "Commissioner")

The Commissioner explained that often the data from these inspections is outdated by the time the information is received, with some actions having already been completed and therefore offered to facilitate a full briefing to the Panel to enable Members to have a more in-depth, detailed overview and understanding of HMIC with the complexities around it and the background of the national scene which is quite often driving the inspections through.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- It was agreed that a briefing session would be beneficial whereby questions could be asked to gain more in-depth knowledge.
- Would the Commissioner consider allowing one or two key Members of Panel to observe the inspection process?
- Thanks were given to the Commissioner for the Appendix as it was exactly what the Panel required and asked if something similar could be seen on a regular basis, which would include how things had improved and what was still in progress, with completed items being removed; this way the Panel would see what was still being worked on.
- What work had been done against the area of improvement "The Constabulary should use evidence of 'what works' drawn from other forces, academics and partners to continually improve its approach to the prevention of crime and anti-social behaviour."
- The Constabulary should use evidence to explain what work has been carried out.
- It was noted that there was now a Gold Group, chaired by the Assistant Chief Constable which is also responsible for governance and scrutiny around the legitimacy of the use of stop and search by the Constabulary and asked where this was held and was there any reason this meeting should not be made public.
- Members asked for an explanation of paragraph 8.6 in the report.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- Members of the Panel were invited to a full briefing with regard to HMIC.
- An inspection has just commenced but as to whether Panel members could observe this was outside of the Commissioner's remit and not part of his role, but he would liaise with the Chief Constable
- Senior staff already visit other forces to look at best practice therefore the mechanism is in place, this works well and good feedback has been received. The Deputy Commissioner explained he was due to visit three separate events to see how another force was working which he could report back on.
- The Gold Group meetings deal with operational issues around stop and search and are held in private at the Police Headquarters; the question about these being made public may be a question for the Chief Constable.
- Paragraph 8.6 of the report showed there had been more acknowledgement that domestic violence was a crime as there had been an increase in the level recorded but not much evidence to support that there is an increase in the actual act of domestic violence. There was a national target in place and is being pushed by central government.

Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report.

## **ACTIONS**

The Commissioner's Office to facilitate a full briefing for Panel Members with regard to HMIC.

## 5. 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:

Funding allocations from Road Casualty Reduction and Support Fund to part-fund resource for three years to look in detail at crashes that cause severe injury and death, in particular examining the types of drivers that are involved in these – CPCC2016-030

- Had the Commissioner considered any further work on this issue? *The Commissioner responded that a Casualty Reduction Officer would be taken on and funded via the surplus funds from Driver Awareness Courses. This post was very much welcomed bearing in mind the amount of casualties on rural roads.*

Police Office at 11/12 Ferrars Road, Huntingdon – CPCC2016-031

- Had the Commissioner considered collaborating with other authorities to enable estates to be run more effectively. *The Commissioner responded stating the Constabulary had spoken to the council to look at getting best value for money and explained that where there was an opportunity for revenue then assets would be rented out; these monies could then be ploughed into frontline services like local visual policing. The Commissioner explained that work was being carried out in Wisbech as there was a need for an operational station but the previous building, a magistrates building owned by the Ministry of Justice was too old and expensive to run and therefore an agreement had been made with Fire Authority to build another station on the back of the Fire Station in Wisbech. Another example was with regard to an ambulance station in St Ives, they currently rented a property on the industrial estate but it would make more sense for them to utilise the fire station. The Panel requested having foresight of a forward plan of key decisions, like the disposal of assets to enable the panel to have the opportunity to scrutinise decisions before they are made. The Commissioner advised that where possible this information would be given to the panel.*

Areas for Future Decisions

- The Panel thanked the Commissioner for supplying this information but requested that this be expanded to give approximate date ranges and a short explanation of what the crux of the decision would be.
- Devolution – Were there any discussions regarding merging the Mayors with the Police and Crime Commissioner role. *The Commissioner commented that he did not intend to be the Mayor of Cambridgeshire. He explained that there were some criminal justice elements that would become his responsibility therefore it was important that he had a voice at the table.*

## 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, to include dates and explanations of decisions.

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

## 6. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2016-2017

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.

### 9 November 2016

- Pre-budget Report
  - Update on Budget Strategy – as per last year
- Hate Crime Report
  - What Strategy does the Commissioner have for dealing with hate crime
- Fire Service Adoption (Collaboration) Update
  - How the Commissioner sees the collaboration working
  - Initial report to understand direction of travel

### February 2017

- Budget Report
- Custody Suites

### March 2017

- Disposal of Property Assets
  - List of current assets and their status/future proposal
  - What is the Commissioner's objective with disposal of assets
  - Invite Property Officer

## ACTIONS

| DATE OF MEETING  | ITEM   | ACTION   | UPDATE |
|------------------|--|--|--------|
| 7 September 2016 | <b>Review of Complaints</b>  | <p>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.</p> <p>The Panel AGREED to note the outcome of the Complaints Sub Committee which met on 11 July 2016 and the subsequent response from the IPCC.</p>   |        |
|                  | <b>Developing A Police and Crime Plan (Community Safety &amp; Criminal Justice) For Cambridgeshire</b> | <p>Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the direction of travel and progress made on the Plan and requested that the Commissioner consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Performance indicators, figures, actions and methods to be included in the Plan.</li> <li>2. "Re-defining and re-stating the neighbourhood policing position" be looked at to help reduce the fear of crime.</li> <li>3. The Chief Constable attend future Panel meetings which involved the Plan and any other relevant issues.</li> <li>4. A consultation with the general public to</li> </ol> |        |

| DATE OF MEETING | ITEM  | ACTION   | UPDATE |
|-----------------|---|--|--------|
|                 |   | <p>include their understanding of the jargon and long wording to ensure it becomes a Plan they can relate to.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Offenders and “would be” offenders to be dealt with separately.</li> <li>6. Detection to be included within the Plan.</li> <li>7. Efficiency and cost savings to be made clearer.</li> <li>8. Paragraphs 7.5.1 and 7.5.2 to be reworded.</li> <li>9. The graphics to be presented in a clear way.</li> <li>10. Migrant and migration issues to be included.</li> </ol> |        |
|                 | <b>Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary Inspection - Update</b> | <p>Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report.</p> <p><b>Action</b> - The Commissioner’s Office to facilitate a full briefing for Panel Members with regard to HMIC.</p>   |        |
|                 | <b>Decisions By the Commissioner</b>                                  | <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, to include dates and explanations of decisions.</p>   |        |
|                 | <b>Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2015-2016</b>                        | <p>The Panel received and noted the agenda plan including dates and times for future meetings.</p>   |        |
|                 |   |  |        |

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 3.55pm

CHAIRPERSON