



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
HELD VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM
ON 02 DECEMBER 2020**

Members Present:	Edward Leigh (Chairperson), Councillors A Sharp, E Murphy, H Smith, N Massey, M Shellens, D Giles, S Bywater, S Warren, C Wiggin, and Claire George.	
Officers Present:	Jane Webb Fiona McMillan	Secretariat, Peterborough City Council Monitoring Officer, Peterborough City Council
Others Present:	Ray Bisby Jim Haylett Christina Strood Nicky Phillipson Christina Strood Matthew Warren	Acting Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Acting Chief Executive from the OPCC Head of Policy, OPCC Head of Strategic Partnerships and Commissioning Head of Policy for Fire & Police, OPCC Chief Finance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Ali, Tierney and Daunton.
Councillor Smith was in attendance as a substitute on behalf of Councillor Daunton.
Councillor Murphy was in attendance as a substitute on behalf of Councillor Ali.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Wiggin declared an interest in the fact that he shares a house with a member of staff of the Cambridgeshire Fire Service.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 30 September 2020

Minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

9.1 – Location of Police Station in Cambridge City Centre – an updated was asked for as to when a consultation would be carried out for the Cambridge City station. Jim Haylett, Acting Chief Executive answered stated that the planning permission was due on the new site in January, but discussions were still taking place with other public authorities about the replacement location for Parkside within the city. Once these were progressed sufficiently then consultation would commence with the public but at this stage the options had not been finalised; this would be expected in the New Year.

4. **Public Questions/Statements**

No public questions or statements were received.

5. **Review of Complaints**

No complaints have been received since the last report.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report

6. **Acting Police and Crime Commissioner's Responses to Questions from the Police and Crime Panel**

The Panel received a report to provide them with responses to questions they had raised both on reports submitted to the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner's Business Co-ordination Board meeting and on other matters.

The Acting Commissioner gave a short update:

"He stated, he had now been in position for just over a year, shortly after there had been a general election that had delayed the annual settlement which had then impacted the precept. This gave the OPCC just three working days to produce the precept. Then the work began in earnest on the election when covid struck and everywhere was suddenly brought into lockdown. Prior to lockdown we ensured we had the means to continue to work and the technology was working, our partners were well supported, we worked with the specials, with the warning and informing group, and with the witness hub and as you are aware, my CEO was working with Public Health on the track and trace, so it reduced the number of people within the office meaning extra work for everybody. The Government then cancelled the elections and brought in a law that allowed me to remain in my role; I have ensured I remained transparent with the Panel by attending extra meetings, above and beyond what was required, with Edward Leigh, the Chairman via telecoms meetings. I would like to thank the Chief Constable, his senior staff, all the police officers and all the staff behind the scenes for all their hard work throughout this."

Edward Leigh took the opportunity to thank the Acting commissioner for taking on the responsibility that he had not signed up for, at possibly the most difficult time for policing in a very long time and certainly during the time that there has been a commissioner in place and the fact that he had accepted the responsibility as a sense of public duty should be highly commended.

Councillor Bywater – 6.1 – Is this something the Panel still needed to be concerned over or have your conversations with the chief constable given you reassurance that there were no major problems or pitfalls within the criminal justice system as a result of covid. The Acting Commissioner responded stating he had held the criminal justice board meeting yesterday and was satisfied that the force was doing what was needed and was even slightly ahead of many parts of the country with the court cases.

Councillor Massey – How many speed watch teams were there across the county and could these be broken down by areas, how many speed watch sessions take place, how many speedwatch groups were active; to enable the Panel to see how impactful the true nature of speedwatch was and what the Panel could do to encourage more people to take up speedwatch. The Acting Commissioner agreed this would have to be a report requested through the Panel as these details were not to hand but the Speedwatch group was increasing, and the Acting Commissioner did promote them but Speedwatch was not part of the Panel's statutory remit. Edward Leigh stated it would be useful for the Panel to receive a

report on Roads Policing/Vision Zero. Councillor Shellens stated it would be helpful if the Acting Commissioner could give an idea of what the adequate number of teams needed to cover the county would be as this would be of great interest to many people. The Acting Commissioner stated this was something that the communities were involved in and getting behind and asked if anyone else wished to get involved then to go to his website to make contact. The success of the Speedwatch scheme shows in the fact that there were over 2,000 members which was more members than there were police officers. Progress was being made as these were volunteers that cannot be forced into it; I encourage volunteers via the radio, newsletters, talking to councillors, parish councillors and asking communities to get involved. The Acting Commissioner asked the Panel Members in their role as Councillors to get involved in spreading the word and make their communities aware of the scheme and direct them to get involved as the whole community need to get behind this, not just the police; so, he positively encouraged Panel to step forward and take part.

Councillor Bywater – 11.1 – Asked what discussions the Acting Commissioner had and what strategic thinking had taken place in relation to maybe raising the minimum rate. Matthew Warren, Head of Finance, responded stating it was guidance that comes from the National Police Chiefs Council and was reviewed on an annual basis albeit the comparison had not been done across the board, therefore he would take this away as it was something that should have been reviewed as they should not be at the lower end and if that was the case, this could be done across all of the charging. In terms of those fees and charges this year there had been a significant hit but the government were looking to put in provision to soften the impact of the loss of income therefore towards the end of the year we would understand in more detail and be able to bring a report back to the Panel.

Cllr Nicky Massey – 12.1 – Does the Acting Commissioner feel satisfied that all partner agencies have responded to the consultation and how will the Acting Commissioner make sure that the outcome of the reduction of the PCSOs and community safety teams will not affect the outcome of the police and crime plan. The Acting Commissioner responded stating that the consultation was enforced with those people that were affected so it was not an external consultation but an internal one and we await to see those results. Regarding the reduction of staff, the Acting Commissioner stated he was in discussions with the Chief Constable; when the Chief Constable took over, there were 57 neighbourhood police officers and as a result of the proposals by April there will be over 130 police officers who are in neighbourhood policing, this was positive. Jim Haylett, Acting Chief Executive clarified; the actual number of officers quoted in the BCB report and the minutes from the last BCB meeting where the Chief Constable and Acting Commissioner had their discussions is that the actual number of neighbourhood policing officers that were dedicated into the neighbourhood teams and that 57 in 2018 to 132 by the end of this year; this is separate from the number of PCSOs. Currently it is reported by the Chief Constable there are currently 72 PCSOs and the proposal will be to reduce that to 40. He stated that the number within the headlines had been around 80 to 40 but the reality was there was only 72 actually in post at the moment therefore the overall offer in neighbourhood policing, the chief constable informs us, is going up, despite the proposed losses of the PCSOs. The Acting Commissioner added that the Chief Constable stated he will monitor any positive/negative/neutral outcomes and he would be challenged on this.

Councillor Nicky Massey asked if the Acting Commissioner was satisfied that partner agencies affected by the proposed reductions of PCSOs, and community safety team had responded to the announcement. The Acting Commissioner responded stating yes, he was and questions he had been asked by partner agencies, he had then put to the Chief Constable; further questions would be put to the Chief Constable next week when there was another meeting scheduled before any decision was made. Until these questions are answered, and a decision made the Acting Commissioner stated it was not the right time for him to give a fully qualified answer, but he did state that all the agencies you would expect to be responding along with the obvious stakeholders, community safety partnerships boards, district and county councils had submitted responses. He confirmed that the Chief

Constable had meetings and briefings with all Chief Officers and Leaders within Councils, briefings had also been given to Parish Councillors and MPs.

Councillor Murphy – 12.1 – Asked that other partners are consulted about these proposals. The Acting Commissioner reiterated that the Chief Constable had consulted with all councils, with all CEOs, with leaders and he was satisfied this had happened but ultimately it was up to the Chief Constable how he organised the staff within the force and not for the Acting Commissioner to involve himself in operational decisions. The Acting Commissioner ensures that he takes the concerns of the public and he has asked the public for these concerns and would take these to the Chief Constable; it is then his role in whatever decision the Chief Constable makes to hold him accountable and that is what he will be doing and whoever is elected after him would continue to do the same.

The Acting Commissioner explained that he was the link between the police and the public communities, representative bodies and elected members and was here to listen to the views and concerns regarding the constabulary and to convey these to the Chief Constable; the Chief Constable is accountable to the Acting Commissioner and as such he scrutinises, supports and challenges him on the overall performance of the force. He cannot and will not fetter the operational independence of the Chief Constable. Jim Haylett, Acting Chief Executive referred the Panel the Policing Protocol which stated that the Chief Constable has operational independence from the Acting Commissioner, it specifically states that the civilian staff and police officers are under the direction and control of the Chief Constable and that includes decisions in relation to the appointment and dismissal of officers and staff, decisions concerning the configuration and organisation of policing resources and decisions taken with the purpose of balancing and competing operational needs. This is where the Acting Commissioner is trying to tread a very careful line of representing the views of the public because he has asked for any concerns to be raised, he has had a number of concerns raised and he has had concerns raised by some CSPs who clearly are aware of this, which he has put to the Chief Constable but at the same time trying to tread that fine line of not breaching the legislation of interfering with the Chief Constable's operational independence.

Cllr Alan Sharp – 12.1 – Asked for clarification on numbers of officers – Jim Haylett, responded stating the issue around the number of officers is perennially a difficult one to track through because there are different criteria used in terms of whether it is a head count which is the number of police officers or full-time equivalent; what is referred to in this paper is the full-time equivalent. In terms of neighbourhood policing, the number quoted from the Chief Constable was from April 2018 was 57 and will be 132 which is officers who are specifically deployed on the neighbourhood teams which is separate to the response teams and any other officers. The uplift officers, the 62 this year and the forecast 140 over the next 2 years, are officers for the whole of the constabulary, so it will be a matter for the Acting Commissioner and the Chief Constable as they go forward in terms of precept setting and other issues in determining what the future resourcing would look like. The Acting Commissioner's role is to provide the budget for the Chief Constable who sets the strategic parameters through the police and crime plan; as we know the Acting Commissioner cannot alter or vary the Plan and the Chief Constable operates within that and the Acting Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account for that overall delivery of the totality of policing within the county; so there is no discrepancy in the numbers, it is just counting differently over a longer period of time. Councillor Sharp is correct that the number of uniformed officers or staff within neighbourhood policing net has gone up. Jim Haylett added that the government announced 20,000 officers and these are allocated to 43 forces within a proportionate matter according to the size of the grant received by the government. Effectively Cambridgeshire were forecast just over 1% of those officers, around 200 when the announcement came out; the government towards the end of the last financial year, released some money to enable commissioners and chief constables to start recruiting those 62 in our case, therefore some came through at the end of the last year and the remainder for this first year's tranche. The 140 forecast is based upon the assumption that we will continue to receive that number of officers, but the uplift number will put inflexibilities within

the constabularies budget because effectively what that has done is the government have given chief constables or commissioners the money for these officers but it effectively red circles the entire police officer budget.

Edward Leigh clarified that the 140 officers follow on from the 62, therefore if the funding comes forward at the end of the process there would be 200 additional to which the Acting Commissioner confirmed this was correct and therefore it was hoped that there would be 200 at the end of the three years if the process progressed.

Jim Haylett stated there were several budget setting papers coming forward in the new year and he would be happy to give a clear narrative on this as there was a good news story in this for Cambridgeshire in terms of officer numbers across the county, ten years compared to now, have managed to protect and increase its officer numbers, probably one or two other forces within the country have managed to retain officers during the austerity years. There is clearly a need for the public to have confidence in the availability of police resources; the chief Constable's announcement has caused some concern across the public which is very unfortunate given that officers are at the highest they have ever been within the constabulary and going up by another 140.

Councillor Shellens – 12.1 – Asked the Acting Commissioner what type of views he had received from the public regarding the Chief Constable's decision. The Acting Commissioner stated he had receiving conflicting views, some against but it was hard to give an exact view, but he was there to represent those people who have concerns and taking those concerns to the Chief Constable. Some of the main concerns are visibility and not losing the knowledge and experience that PCSOs have.

Councillor Massey – Asked for a point of clarification when Jim Haylett spoke about the pressures on non-officer pay lines within the budget; did this include all of HR etc so that with the uplift of officers, if there was not enough of the support for non-officer pay lines HR etc, that would be where the pressure was? Matthew Warren, Head of Finance responded stating the way government distributed funds is they give an amount per officer that includes an element for the overhead which will include all of the support, this works out about £67,000/£68,000 per post.

Edward Leigh proposed, seconded by Claire George that the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner write to all the Community Safety Partnerships asking if they have any further questions, they wish to put to the Chief Constable at the extra-ordinary BCB meeting on the 8th December regarding the reduction of PCSOs.

Councillor Murphy – 13.1 – Asked if a pandemic was the correct time to be making cuts to policing staffing. Jim Haylett explained that under the Policing Protocol there are specific duties as the Chief Executive and the Monitoring Officer, and he had to ensure that all the PCC's office runs in accordance with the law and the government framework. In the Policing Protocol there are eight references to operational independence of the Chief Constable, there are two references to political independence of the Chief Constable and the Policing Protocol makes it very clear that the staff mix within the constabulary is a matter solely for the Chief Constable under his direction and control and that the Acting Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account for the totality of policing. Where something is so clearly articulated in legislation it becomes a very important issue to me in advising the Acting Commissioner about what his remit within that should be; he has started this process and will be finishing it next week by considering the concerns raised but my advice is, that it is a direct contradiction of the Policing Protocol to direct the Chief Constable in this matter. The Chief Constable must comply with HR which means there is an internal consultation with the staff affected and he must consider the result of this before coming to his formal decision. The whole thrust of the Policing Protocol is for the Chief Constable to be independent and therefore whilst the Chief Constable is coming to a decision, we need to ensure that his independence is protected. Jim Haylett reminded Panel Members that we were also in a

pre-election period with candidates for several political parties having declared themselves, therefore his advice to the Acting Commissioner in terms of his role and remit was the same now but stronger within this period; therefore, any questions put to the Acting Commissioner would be answered reflecting that.

Edward Leigh suggested if Panel Members had any further questions regarding the reductions in Police staff then to send them directly to the Acting Commissioner to be answered at his meeting on the 8th December 2020.

Edward Leigh proposed, seconded by Derek Giles that given the public interest in the extra-ordinary BCB meeting scheduled on 8th December; that the agenda be published at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report and made the following recommendations:

- The Acting Police and Crime Commissioner to write to all the Community Safety Partnerships asking if they have any further questions, they wish to put to the Chief Constable at the extra-ordinary BCB meeting on the 8th December regarding the reduction of PCSOs.
- Given the public interest in the extra-ordinary BCB meeting scheduled on 8th December; that the agenda be published at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

A Road Policing Paper to be brought to a future meeting

7. Police and Crime Plan – Offenders Theme – Employment, Education and Training

The Panel received a report to enable it to question how effective the Acting Commissioner feels the Government's Education and Employment Strategy 2018 for adult prisoners has been, and will be, in future years in which unemployment rates may exceed 10%.

Edward Leigh – 5.2 – Page 24 – Do the 4,500 work coaches receive specific training regarding the challenges of prejudices faced by ex-offenders. Christina Strood explained there were specific work coaches for those that are vulnerable and those that work in prisons and these would receive specific training. The Acting Commissioner added that he wanted to make sure that reoffending is reduced and if someone is given a home and a job, they are less likely to offend therefore he would continually monitor this to ensure it was still happening.

Councillor Shellens – 5.2. – What view did the Acting Commissioner have of the likely prospects for finding jobs for offenders in the current situation both now and in the future? The Acting Commissioner responded stating he thought everyone was aware of what had happened over the last few days with 13,000 people potentially losing their jobs, it will be hard but the effort going into this from the OPCC and from every partner is to ensure that there is every opportunity for an ex-offender to have a home and a job if possible. Christina Strood added that they recognised the challenges in the current economic situation particularly for this vulnerable group who were often excluded from employment opportunities, but they were also aware there were links that could be built on, alongside some of the Brexit impacts as there were still gap skills locally, like construction. The OPCC were working with partners to develop options around skills training both before and after people leaving prison.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report.

8. Early Intervention Youth Fund – Outcome Monitoring

The Panel received a report to provide them with a headline evaluation report on the Safe team which is hosted and run by the county's Youth Offending Service. The report also provides the context of the current operation of the project.

Councillor Massey stated this was a good report and it was excellent to see what work had been going on. Councillor Massey commented that 84 referrals had been accepted but 39 rejected and asked what the reasons were for those rejected and also why was the demographic split 90 male and 10 females? The feedback is excellent, but she questions how accurate it could be, so what measures were taken, and then how could this work be expanded as it finished in April 21 and this this much good work, is there an intent to expand it. Nicky Phillipson replied stating there could be several reasons as to why those 39 were rejected; they could be going into a youth secure unit or already working with several agencies. The demographic split matches the similar split that is seen within the wider cohort so that is not unusual. Regarding the outcome monitoring report that is where the key worker ask questions of the young person so is a legitimate form of capturing feedback used a lot. The funding for this project ends in June 2021.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report and to provide a written response to the following:

- What was the reason for those being rejected?
- Why split was 90% and 10% female?
- How accurate is the feedback?
- How can this work be expanded?

9. Budget Update Report

The Panel received a report to update it on the budget setting process for 2021/22.

Edward Leigh – 4.2. – Was there anything of serious concern regarding the cost pressures emerging in some of the collaborated functions? Jim Haylett explained there was nothing of great significance and the first draft of the budgets have been prepared considerably in advance of when they would normally be prepared. So, the purpose of including that reference was to give the Panel the heads-up that the budget setting process was going to be very difficult this year, some of the functions within the collaborated environment are impacted by the uplift programme.

Councillor Massey highlighted that the government has allowed both county councils to their precept and they are looking at allowing district/city councils to increase their precepts; the concern on our residents' perspective that if everybody is increasing their precept, the pressure that will put on our residents to pay and the possibility of an increased number of people who do not pay as we have already seen at previous budgets. There is quite a significant amount of unrecovered council tax. Edward Leigh suggested the Panel look at this point at the next meeting when considering the precept.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

10. Public Confidence in the Service Received from Cambridgeshire Constabulary

The Panel received a report based on their request - Can the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner reassure the Panel that the public feel satisfied and have confidence and trust with the service they receive? There have been several news reports that indicate a fall in trust in the police, and this may be reflected in the fall in Cambridgeshire stats - 60.8%

"agreed that the Constabulary was dealing with the things that matter to people in their local community" compared with 73.3% in April. We need to understand how Cambridgeshire Constabulary is addressing this.

Councillor Massey stated that the Panel would be noting there had been a fall in public confidence and asked how the Acting Commissioner was monitoring the response to the report and how would he monitor whether the public confidence was increasing or not. The Acting Commissioner stated he was concerned about confidence within Cambridgeshire Constabulary, and he had raised it with the Chief Constable on a regular basis

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

11. Engagement Strategy during Covid

The Panel received a report is to provide it with a response to their questions as follows:

- the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner's (OPCC) and Cambridgeshire Constabulary's (the "Constabulary") communication strategy through Covid to ensure they are reaching people who are potentially in need of support (from the police, or from the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner (the "Acting Commissioner") if they have a question or potential complaint to make about the police); and
- the penetration rates for each type of communication, and what communications are being used to reach people who are not on social media and not subscribed to the Neighbourhood Alert newsletter.

Edward Leigh – 5.5 – Regarding the Warn and Informing group, was this a standing committee of was this only formed in times of emergency. The Acting Commissioner stated it was arranged due to Covid and was where all partners came together to spread one message out to the public. Nicky Phillipson explained that the Warn and Inform was a standard group that has always been in existence and it is all the communication leads from across the statutory sectors and they come together to create single messages on certain topics to ensure the public do not get confused, which has been invaluable during covid.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

12. Reporting Crimes

The Panel received a report to provide it with a response to their question as follows:

- how effective does the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner (the "Acting Commissioner") feel the current ways of reporting crimes are relayed to the public; what channels does he use, how is this monitored, does this include social media?

Edward Leigh made an observation that the OPCC communications teams had provided a reporting tool kit using community media platforms to promote crime reporting but he was unaware of local authorities using the kit. He had carried out a quick search via twitter and seen nothing therefore it may need more than just a tool kit, probably need a mechanism by which communication messages are authored and distributed in order to remove the onus off the individual authorities to draft messages which can take some considerable time.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

13. Response to Recommendations from Last Meeting

Councillor Massey stated she did not have questions, just disappointment, in the fact that at the last meeting, the majority of Panel Members had stated that the graphics were difficult to read and yet they have not been changed.

Edward Leigh stated that the Panel had asked to see a final draft of the report before it was published, would that still be possible. The Acting Commissioner responded stating that it was in its final amendment stage and it would be on the OPCC website very shortly. Edward Leigh asked if the Panel would see the report first, as requested previously, to which the Acting Commissioner stated that the Panel would not see the draft version and the OPCC needed to publish the report

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

14. Decisions by the Acting 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.

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

The Acting Commissioner and his staff left the meeting.

15. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2020-2021

Reminder – OPPC Budget Briefing – 22nd January @ 2pm – PLEASE ATTEND
Precept Meeting – 3 February 2021
Veto Meeting (if necessary) – 17 February 2021
March Meeting – 24th March 2021
June Meeting – 23rd June 2021

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

16. Re-Appointment of Independent Co-opted Panel Member

(Claire George Co-opted Independent Member left the meeting for this item.)

Panel Members received a report to seek members' views on the re-appointment of an Independent Co-opted member with effect from 1 February 2021.

Edward Leigh stated the Panel were very grateful that Claire George had served four years as a co-opted independent member and were thankful that she had offered herself for re-appointment. (At this point Claire left the meeting.) Edward Leigh asked if any members had any thoughts or concerns, they would like to discuss before they moved to a vote; no hands were raised.

Edward Leigh proposed that Claire George is reappointed for a further 4 years as an Independent Co-opted Member. This was unanimously agreed.

The Panel **AGREED** to re-appoint Claire George for a further four years as an Independent Co-opted Member.

The meeting began at 3:00pm and ended at 5:00pm

CHAIRPERSON