



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
ON 23 MARCH 2022**

<b>Members Present:</b>	Edward Leigh (Chair), Councillors S Baigent, S Ferguson, C Hogg, A Lynn, A Sharp, S Warren, and Claire George.	
<b>Officers Present:</b>	Philippa Turvey Fiona McMillan	Secretariat, Peterborough City Council Monitoring Officer, Peterborough City Council
<b>Others Present:</b>	Darryl Preston Jim Haylett Jack Hudson Catherine Kimberley	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Executive OPCC Head of business Development Communications and Engagement Manager

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Collis, Bradnam, Daunton, Bywater, Tierney, and Ali. Councillor Baigent was in attendance as a substitute for Councillor Collis.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were declared.

**3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 2 February 2022**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

**4. Commissioner's Response to Recommendations**

The Commissioner stated:

Response to Precept Proposal – The Commissioner was grateful that the Panel did not adopt its powers of veto over the precept, and he had written to the Panel expressing this.

Delivery Plan – Moving Forward – After discussions at the last meeting, this now formed part of today's meeting.

The Commissioner also gave clarification around several points raised at the previous panel meeting:

- Funding of Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) – There was currently a Home Office led review on DHRs, which the Commissioner had been engaged in. Funding was not part of the review, but it was raised and therefore was still work in progress.
- Funding of Constabulary from core grant from Home Office – the Panel were, at the last meeting, informed that the Chief Constable and Commissioner were to meet with the Home Office in relation to funding, an extremely useful meeting took place in early March where the case was robustly made for Cambridgeshire. The Commissioner appreciated the Panel's support and explained this issue needed to be tackled country-wide, with partners across government, to make the best case going forward. The Panel would be kept informed of progress and it was hoped the best settlement would be achieved for the residents of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

## 5. Public Questions/Statements

One question had been received from Antony Carpen:

### The Question

"Following the announcement by the Criminal Bar Association of 13 March 2022, and their announcement of a 'no returns' policy from 11 April and given the issues that they have raised regarding pay and resourcing in the Criminal Justice System, what assessment has the PCC and his officials made on the potential impact on the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Police and Crime Plan."

I note the Plan states:

"[The PCC] will work with partners within the criminal justice system to ensure those who break the law are brought to justice efficiently and effectively and are less likely to reoffend."

I would be grateful if his response could address this specific point directly including what actions he proposes taking.

<https://www.criminalbar.com/resources/news/cba-ballot-result-13-03-22/>

### The Response (from the Commissioner)

"Within Cambridgeshire we have excellent working relationships amongst the different criminal justice agencies. The Commissioner chairs the Local Criminal Justice Board that oversees joint working arrangements and ensures that where there are local problems and issues that they are swiftly resolved.

We know that the restrictions brought on due to covid have impacted on backlogs in the court system and this is something that we as a Board have been working to mitigate as far as possible.

In that context, any disruption in our ability for trials to progress would be regrettable. Although this is a national matter over which the Commissioner has no direct control, the Commissioner has already discussed this with government at Ministerial level and the Commissioner would hope that this matter is resolved as my concern is about local justice proceeding and providing a service to victims and witnesses."

The Commissioner stated this was a good question to ask as the issue posed a significant risk, with victims and witnesses having to wait longer (potentially for trials), and there were backlogs due to the pandemic. The Commissioner also stated this was very much an issue for the Ministry of Justice, but the Commissioner was confident that the conversations with the criminal bar were still proceeding at pace. As reassurance, the Commissioner explained that the Efficiency Group of the

Criminal Justice Board for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, was meeting today with the main agenda item being mitigation on this item and he hoped the issue would be resolved prior to the April date.

## **6. Review of Complaints**

The Chairman confirmed that on the date the agenda was published, 15<sup>th</sup> March 2022, there had been no complaints received since the last report.

### **ACTION**

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report

## **7. Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach to Communications and Engagement**

The Panel received a report on the Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach to Communications and Engagement. The Panel were recommended to note the contents of the report.

The Commissioner and his staff presented the information contained within the report to the Panel.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner, and his staff, these included:

- 1) Councillor Ferguson thanked the OPCC for their face-to-face engagement in St Neots and asked what the OPCC's plans were to better engage with the 18- to 24-year-old demographic, which were a hard group to reach. The Commissioner explained that only a certain demographic would complete surveys and it should not be that difficult to reach younger people. There were plans to reach out to more schools and universities, as this had not been previously possible over the last two years. The Commissioner also stated he had attended events at the Cambridgeshire Youth Advisory Panel. The Plan now, was to, rather than wait to have to statutorily consult, but for ongoing consultation throughout the year, not just for a particular issue. Catherine Kimberley explained it was about using different tactics for diverse groups – digital media and opportunities where the OPCC could present to schools, different community groups, disabled groups, and young people representatives to enable receiving feedback by their preferred approach.
- 2) Councillor Sharp thanked the OPCC as he had received good positive feedback from the farming community about their engagement with the OPCC. The Commissioner stated that 90% of the county was rural and those areas often felt isolated, but the good news was that rural crime was down and hare-coursing was down 50%, as Cambridgeshire has an excellent Rural Crime team, the envy of other forces.
- 3) Edward Leigh asked about E-cops, now known as Neighbourhood Alert; and asked the Commissioner what his strategy was for expanding the mailing list as it was a key communication channel and what analysis did the OPCC have on the geographical and social reach of it. The Commissioner stated although e-cops had a large following, it would include a certain demographic that would be captured within the surveys. The team had received more training on digital platforms (Facebook), and these could be targeted at a low cost therefore this was being progressed. Catherine Kimberley clarified that the traditional uptake of Neighbourhood Alert had been a particular demographic and despite ongoing campaigns it had been difficult to engage the younger age group and diverse communities therefore the plan was to have face to face meetings with these groups to ask them what

format they would prefer to receive updates in. New software was being developed that would allow an e-newsletter to be spread out to stakeholders, councillors, and community groups.

- 4) Edward Leigh asked the Commissioner what process was in place to triage one-to-one meeting requests with the Commissioner. The Commissioner stated he did not triage requests and had serviced every request, although there had been one or two that he had not engaged with after advice from the monitoring officer or the force or by risk assessment. Currently there was no process in place, this may change if there were vast numbers of requests, but he was happy to take ten minutes to talk if requested.
- 5) Councillor Hogg asked if there had been an increase in people unsubscribing from E-cops and were the open rates and click rates monitored. Catherine Kimberly explained that monitoring did take place and there had been no decline in numbers, but the approach had changed to a blended approach, everything was not distributed via e-cops now, all available digital channels were used instead. E-cops was a police licence and the OPCC now had a separate licence therefore they were looking at re-branding, this would involve the e-newsletter being sent to all E-cops members enabling the OPCC to reach more of the community than at present. Catherine Kimberly confirmed there had been no un-subscribers and no negative feedback, only positive.

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

## **8. Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach to Complaints and Conduct**

The Panel received a report on the Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach to Complaints and Conduct. The Panel were recommended to note the report.

The Commissioner and his staff presented the information contained within the report to the Panel.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner, and his staff, these included:

- 1) Claire George asked what outcomes from the two Ethical Policing Panels were in the public domain. The Commissioner explained information on the stop and search and the use of force scrutiny panels was available on the constabulary website, as the Panels were a collaboration with the OPCC and constabulary. This information was not yet available on the OPCC website, but this would be addressed immediately (there was currently a technical issue).
- 2) Edward Leigh asked what the process was to make a referral to the IOPC (Independent Office for Police Conduct) and were some referrals bounced back to the PSD (Professional Standards Department), did the Commissioner have oversight of these referrals or was there an internal decision-making process that kept some of the more sensitive cases to be investigated in-house and not referred to the IOPC, in which case, was he satisfied that the decision-making process was robust. Jack Hudson explained there was a set criteria as to which cases needed to be referred to the IOPC and which needed to be investigated locally, this criteria was set within statutory guidance. Death or severe injury all needed to be sent to the IOPC initially for oversight. The Professional Standards Accordance Board inform the OPCC of all complaints received with a confidential brief around themes/issues included. These were monitored on a quarterly basis and there were regular meetings with the IOPC at a practitioner's level as well as with the commissioner around the progress of complaints. It is PSD's responsibility to make decisions on complaints and not the OPCC. Edward Leigh asked for clarity around the referral of cases within the serious and sensitive category that

were still be investigated by the PSD. Jack Hudson explained that the sensitive cases were those that would be in the public interest, and these would be reviewed by the IOPC and either taken on by the IOPC or referred to the PSD for further investigation, depending on the level of the issue. The IOPC would look at and take on the more sensitive, complex matters that would be in the public interest. Edward Leigh asked the Commissioner if he was satisfied that the decision to refer complaints to the IOPC was always a sound decision. The Commissioner explained this formed part of the briefing, but the decision was made by the Chief Constable, who was held to account by the Commissioner, whereby these complaints were looked at. He was confident but he would ensure everything was in place in relation to the referral process.

- 3) Councillor Hogg asked what percentage of complaints the IOPC returned that had been referred to them. Jack Hudson confirmed that most complaints were returned to the PSD. Jim Haylett added for clarity, that when a complaint was returned to be investigated, the IOPC would still have a role of oversight of the cases. If the complainant was not happy with result of the complaint, they could ask the OPCC to review the complaint to see whether it was a reasonable and proportionate outcome. If it was a more serious matter, then the appropriate body to review the complaint, would be the IOPC.
- 4) Edward Leigh asked the Commissioner if he was aware of the EPIC programme (Ethical Policing is Courageous) which started in New Orleans Police Department and was a peer intervention training programme which empowered officers and staff to step in when they saw a colleague make a mistake, to avoid the situation arising in the first place. Edward Leigh quoted from EPIC, "it is a peer intervention programme developed by New Orleans Police department in collaboration with community partners to promote a culture of high quality and ethical policing. EPIC educates, empowers, and supports the officers on the streets to play a meaningful role in policing one another. It is a programme that teaches officers how to intervene to stop the wrongful action before it occurs. At its core, EPIC is an officer survival programme, a community safety programme, and a job satisfaction programme. EPIC represents a cultural change in policing that equips, encourages, and supports officers to intervene to prevent misconduct and ensure high quality policing, everyone benefits when potential misconduct is not perpetrated or when a potential mistake is not made." Edward Leigh asked the Commissioner if he had any thoughts on the role of EPIC within Cambridgeshire. The Commissioner replied stating he had not heard of EPIC but would be happy to look at it. Ethical policing was a priority and forms a key pillar within the force, it was a national priority, and the Commissioner was in conversation with other Commissioners over ethical policing, he added that the greater proportion of the police force were ethical and did go about their jobs to the highest ethical standards.
- 5) Edward Leigh asked the Commissioner if he knew the process that the chairs of the Community Scrutiny Panels took for selecting instances for scrutiny and what information they were provided with to help them make the decision. Jack Hudson explained that the Chair looked at the Constabulary's Stop and Search records over the last month and identified which ones they would like to take to the Panel, usually nine or ten. Claire George asked if the Independent Chair chose ten cases what proportion of searches would that be of a month. Jack Hudson stated there were usually between two hundred and three hundred cases per month.

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

## **9. Delivery of Police and Crime Plan – Forward Plan**

The Panel received an update report on the approach for successfully delivering the Police and Crime Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan 2021-24.

The Commissioner and his staff presented the information contained within the report to the Panel.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner, and his staff, these included:

**1) Putting Communities First**

- a) Councillor Hogg welcomed the aspect of a briefing pack in relation to the workings of the CSPs for the benefit of Councillors and for the swift referral and resolution of community concerns. He stated he had concerns over the 101 service and of the changed appearance of webchat logo as the public had given up using these services due to the poor service. The Commissioner stated he agreed with Councillor Hogg as he heard the same from residents, but there was work being done within the demand centre and more people employed to take the calls but there clearly needed to be more work carried out in this area, to which he would be holding the Chief Constable to account for. He would take the feedback of the webchat logo back and investigate the issue immediately. The Commissioner did clarify there was now a mechanism to report issues to your local policing team, and if members did not have this information, then he would ensure this was circulated. This would allow Members to report areas of concern which would be picked up by the local policing teams, to help form an intelligence picture to which police could be deployed to.
- b) Councillor Hogg stated that he categorically thought the decision to reduce the number of PCSOs (Police Community Support Officer), was a strategically poor decision. This decision resulted in the disposal of years of integration and experience embedded within the communities which cut off the supply of information where residents did not want to report crimes as they wanted to have a conversation with someone that they knew and trusted in an anonymous way so that they were not directly involved. This has been replaced with younger police officers in the early part of their careers, who would move on to other areas and the investment into communities has been lost. Neighbourhood policing used to be older officers who had achieved a lengthy career that were looking for a more stable working arrangement, who had an expanse of policing knowledge. The opposite has now occurred, and Councillor Hogg was not sure it was working due to the churn of police officers. The Commissioner stated he recognised these concerns, but these were operational decisions for the Chief Constable. However, the Chief Constable had committed to local neighbourhood policing and there were now more police officers within these teams tackling local issues and crime. Crime is down in most areas, particularly those neighbourhood crimes and there was investment in neighbourhood policing, but this was a matter for the Chief Constable and how he decided to go about this. The Commissioner reiterated he would hold the Chief Constable to account for bolstering the neighbourhood policing teams. The Commissioner agreed there were some excellent PCSOs that did excellent work in the communities and a number of these did apply to become warranted officers, were successful and a commitment was made to put them back into the neighbourhoods they came from, this was happening.
- c) Edward Leigh asked a question on behalf of Councillor Daunton who was unable to attend the Panel meeting. Councillor Daunton felt in South Cambs that they had not seen the level of improvement in neighbourhood policing that had been seen elsewhere and was keen to understand how the Commissioner was monitoring the effectiveness of the delivery of neighbourhood policing plan to ensure it was up to the Chief Constable's delivery promises of good, effective neighbourhood policing. The Commissioner was aware there would be areas of the community that would feel they were not getting their fair share in relation to local neighbourhood policing, but the Commissioner had seen the figures, and these showed that far more officers had gone into local neighbourhood policing teams. This was part of the Commissioner's "holding to account," through the Business Board with the Chief Constable, along

with the outcomes, which were shown through the measures - crime rates, attendance rates to incidents. The Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) were not stand-alone organisations; they were statutory partnerships and Councillor Daunton was a vice-chair on the South Cambs CSP, and the Commissioner was keen to support the CSPs to move forward. Therefore, if there were local issues or concerns, this would usually involve a joined up/multi-agency, whole system approach and this was where the CSPs needed to come together with their statutory hat on, he was keen to support them and encourage the leaders of the statutory partners of the CSPs to come together. The Commissioner stated he was aware that South Cambs had received more police officers, but it was how they were deployed by local communities, and he would like the CSP to be part of that. The Commissioner added that he had spoken to the Chair of the South Cambs CSP, who was a Chief Fire Officer, who was excited to move on with this therefore the Commissioner hoped that Councillor Daunton and others would see improvements moving forward.

- d) Edward Leigh asked about timescales with the work that involved the CSPs, would the new structure and new strategies be embedded and be able to report on them to the Panel by September. The Commissioner explained that all the CSPs had been engaged with, there was funding available to them all to take on a problem-solving post; four of the six had already started this process, the other two stated this was already in place. The Commissioner stated he could bring an update to the September Panel meeting as to the work carried out in relation to the CSPs was underway.
- e) Edward Leigh asked about the analysis of effective communication regarding 101 calls and the issue that users did not receive feedback, which residents found put them off using the system. The Panel were keen to receive information on the progress that was being made on improving the issue, would this be part of the Annual Report or would this come to the September meeting. The Commissioner stated he would come back on this, but he agreed that the two-way flow of information was necessary. He added that he had seen a change, there had been a lot more information on social media.
- f) Councillor Hogg stated that Peterborough had become the car cruising capital of East Anglia, maybe because other forces had been more robust in their response to the issue. This issue seemed to lay with the neighbourhood policing teams, which he did not think was appropriate as it was a road traffic situation. The Commissioner clarified the report was not about priorities. He explained this was where the CSPs should be involved, as this was not just a police issue, a Problem-Solving Group should be formed where the partners get together; local authorities can erect barriers, issue dispersal orders, prevention orders. The Safer Peterborough Partnership were well placed and currently have a group looking at this issue. The Commissioner was aware of the car cruising, although it was not just Peterborough that had suffered, both South Cambs and Sutton also had, and he was happy to help where he could, with convening powers and holding the police to account but it had to be a multi-agency joined up approach in relation to resolving the issue.
- g) Councillor Lynn stated he had seen huge improvements in Fenland, and this was due to good rapport being created with the neighbourhood policing teams, he was able to email his team regularly with updates and advised other members to do the same and discuss issues with their CSPs. Councillor Lynn did agree that the 101 system was the biggest hold up within the communities, if this could be improved then there would be huge improvements in the way the communities viewed the police.
- h) Councillor Ferguson echoed the same thoughts in Huntingdon as Councillor Lynn.

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

## 10. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2022/23

Forthcoming Meeting Dates:

20<sup>th</sup> July 2022

8th September 2022 – Training

14<sup>th</sup> September 2022

23<sup>rd</sup> November 2022

Early November 2022 – Police and Crime Annual Conference

1<sup>st</sup> February 2023

15<sup>th</sup> February 2023

	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1.	<b>Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach to Communications and Engagement</b>	The Panel <b>AGREED</b> to <b>NOTE</b> the report.
2.	<b>Delivery of Police and Crime Plan – Forward Plan</b>	The Panel <b>AGREED</b> to <b>NOTE</b> the report.

The meeting began at 1:30pm and ended at 2:56 pm

CHAIRPERSON