



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
HELD AT CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
ON 4 NOVEMBER 2015**

Members Present:	Councillors J Ablewhite, (Chairman) B Shelton (Vice Chairman), M McGuire, M Shellens, P Reeve, V Campbell, A Sinnott, A Coles, S Lane, Edward Leigh and Francesca Anderson	
Officers Present:	Paulina Ford Ian Phillips Alison Stuart	Peterborough City Council Peterborough City Council Peterborough City Council
Others Present:	Sir Graham Bright Brian Ashton Dr Dorothy Gregson Josie Gowler	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Deputy Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Finance Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Pearson, Councillor Bullen, Councillor Herbert and Councillor Shaheed. Councillor Campbell was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Pearson, Councillor Reeve was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Bullen and Councillor Sinnott was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Herbert.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the meetings held 16 September 2015

The minutes of the meeting held at 10.00am on 16 September 2015 for the Chief Constable Confirmation Hearing were agreed as an accurate record.

The minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 16 September 2015 at 2.00pm were agreed as an accurate record subject to one change. Edward Leigh, Independent Co-opted member of the Panel had noted an omission of the word 'and' and requested that the following amendment be made with regard to Paragraph 9. Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Annual Report. The last line of the third bullet point stated the following "satisfaction detection rates" and should be changed to "satisfaction and detection rates".

The Secretariat to correct the minutes accordingly prior to publication.

4. Public Questions

There were no public questions submitted.

5. Review of Complaints

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

ACTION

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

6. Rules of Procedure

The report was introduced by the Chairman which provided the Panel with the opportunity to review the Rules of Procedure as required in paragraph 1.4 of the Rules of Procedure and consider the suggested changes proposed by the Working Group which were highlighted in red in the Rules of Procedure document attached at Appendix 1 of the report.

The Chairman thanked the Working Group and Officers for their work in reviewing the Rules of Procedure and invited Edward Leigh, Independent Co-opted Member of the Panel and member of the Working Group to provide the Panel with context to the proposed changes. The Panel were informed that the proposed changes were mainly to provide further clarity to and enhancement of the public participation section. This included allowing more time for the public to submit questions following publication of the agenda and the addition of allowing the submission of statements as well as questions.

The Chairman suggested two further amendments:

1. The wording 'and Statements' to be added to the section heading Questions and the wording 'and statement' to be added at paragraph 7.7 after the word 'question' and to follow this format throughout the section where applicable after the word question.
2. That paragraphs 7.5 and 7.6 under the section Questions be combined as one paragraph to provide further clarity regarding the timeframe for members of the public to submit questions.

Following discussion the Panel AGREED to adopt the revised Rules of Procedure proposed by the Working Group with the above additional amendments proposed by the Chairman as set out in Appendix 1 to the minutes.

7. Procedure for the Appointment of the Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire Constabulary

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with further information regarding the appointment process for the position of Chief Constable.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Clarification was sought as to whether the criteria for the position had excluded overseas applicants from applying.
- Had the Commissioner considered inviting Leaders, Deputy Leaders or Chief Executives of the local authorities to sit on the interview panel to provide local representation.
- Was the Commissioner disappointed in the number of applicants that had applied and what more could have been done to encourage more applications.

- What more could have been done to have made the interview panel more representative of the local communities for which the Chief Constable will be representing.
- Members commented that it had not been clear who the stakeholder engagement had included and therefore if the 7 responses were a good percentage.
- Members noted at paragraph 9.3 of the report that it was a national issue that there was only a small pool of possible candidates for the role of Chief Constable.
- Clarification was sought as to who was responsible for the appointment of the Deputy Chief Constable.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- Applicants from overseas could apply but none had been received. Possible applicants would have self-eliminated if they did not have the necessary qualifications and experience.
- The Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner were responsible for the makeup of the interview panel however advice was taken from the College of Policing. Views were also sought from the various Chief Executives and a variety of other people on what should be considered when appointing a new Chief Constable.
- A limited number of people were eligible to apply and it was not unusual for only one applicant to apply. The College of Policing were asked to distribute the advert twice directly to senior police chiefs.
- The interview questions were pulled together from the views sought prior to interview.
- Only 7 responses had been received which had been disappointing. There was an Independent Member on the interview panel to provide an additional perspective.
- The appointment of the Deputy Chief Constable was the responsibility of the Chief Constable and there were a few possible applicants.

The Chairman stated that the College of Policing had been invited to attend the meeting to provide further context about the Chief Constable interview process. The College of Policing had responded that they would not be able to add any further value to what had already been provided within the report and that there would be a charge for them attending. The Chairman wished to record his disappointment to this response.

The Panel AGREED to note the report, and

1. to make reference to the report that was submitted to them for the Chief Constable's Confirmation Hearing on the 16th September 2015 and the report of the Independent Panel Member, Carolyn Dhanraj, and
2. to refer to their report 'Determination of Appointment of Senior Staff following a Confirmation Hearing', 18th September 2015, which gave their formal recommendation that the Commissioner appoint Alec Wood as Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire Constabulary.

8. Update of Violent Crime

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with an update on violent crime. The report highlighted overall crime recording, violent crime, Cambridgeshire Constabulary's response and focus, the Commissioner's response and future challenges. The Commissioner informed the Panel that it was important to assure the people of Cambridgeshire that it was a safe place. The Commissioner pointed out to the Panel that if two people were involved in an affray it had to be recorded as two separate incidents.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members wanted to see a more detailed breakdown of the types of violent crime and noted that incidents of domestic violence were recorded separately and there were issues recording repeat incidents.
- Members sought assurance as to how adequately domestic violence was being recorded.
- Referring to page 62 and the table showing Violence with injury. Members noted that 4032 crimes had been recorded over 12 months. How was the Commissioner holding the Chief Constable to account and ensuring that action was being taken to reduce this number.
- Members were concerned that the accuracy and reporting of violent crime was not a true reflection of what was happening on the street. What was being seen in A & E was not an accurate picture as most people did not go to A & E unless it was an emergency. Was there a better benchmark that could be used.
- Detection rates and successful prosecutions should be shown when crime rates were being reported as these would be a good indication of how successful the police were at dealing with crime. The measure of effective policing was having this information and the Chairman urged the Commissioner to continue to request more detailed data on crime rates and detailed information on the different types of violent crime.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- Violent crime covered a very broad spectrum from poking someone to murder. This needed to be broken down further and this was being looked into.
- The Commissioner agreed that there needed to be better data regarding domestic violence incidents.
- Police officers were trained to identify domestic violence incidents. Domestic violence was one of the new Chief Constables areas of focus.
- It was difficult for the police to prevent crime happening but by catching the criminals it would act as a deterrent. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have a diverse and rapidly growing community and the police were unable to be everywhere and that was why there was local policing in place to adapt to the local environment. An example of this was in Peterborough where the police were based in with other services who deal with areas like homelessness and truancy to try and deal with issues straight away and prevent further incidents happening.
- The Commissioner confirmed that the best route to report a violent crime was to call 999 for an immediate response.
- The detection rates were regularly reported through the performance monitoring reports.

Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report.

9. Cybercrime

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which provided the Panel with an update on the work that was being undertaken to prevent and deal with cybercrime within Cambridgeshire. The report highlighted the Commissioners response to cybercrime, Cambridgeshire constabulary's response to cybercrime, education and training and support for victims. The Panel were informed that this was a relatively new area of crime and it was changing the face of crime and crime figures would therefore rise.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- How important was it for people to report bogus telephone callers requesting things like bank details and how should this be reported? Were telephone scams classed as cybercrime.

- Could the Commissioner provide details of the type of response that was being provided to tackle cybercrime locally.
- One of the key challenges with cybercrime is case management. If it is reported at a local level it is essential that feedback is given to encourage the public to continue reporting cybercrime.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- It was important to report all telephone scams and this could be done by phoning 101. There would also be a new portal which was being introduced specifically to report such scams. This was currently being tested in Hertfordshire. Telephone scams were also classed as cybercrime.
- If an incident of cybercrime is identified locally the local constabulary would trigger an investigation. The National Crime Agency (NCA) is responsible for leading the overall response to cybercrime. The Constabulary worked closely with NCA.
- The Commissioner agreed that it was important to feedback to people when they had reported a cybercrime incident and would ensure that this was done where possible but it was not always easy to do when it involved a major fraud case.

Following debate the Panel AGREED to note the report.

10. Budget Strategy

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which provided the Panel with an update on the budget strategy. Also in attendance to present the report was the Chief Finance Officer and Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Chief Finance Officer advised that the report provided a briefing on the budget strategy in preparation for the Panel to consider the Precept in February and the Medium Term Financial Plan in March 2016. Members were advised of the key principles for setting the budget strategy and key risks. The budget setting process was ongoing and constantly reviewed with the Constabulary's Director of Finance and Resources.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner highlighted the following:

- Front line policing numbers had remained almost the same since 2009.
- The number of constables had slightly increased.
- Underspend against the budget had been managed each year.
- There was a Budget Assistance Reserve of £9.8m in cash.
- Projected underspend for this year was £1.5m.
- Total level of long term borrowing was reducing each year.
- 2016/2017 would be a peak year for pressures.
- Work was being done with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire to look at back office functions which would produce approximately £20m savings each year. An estimated £7.4m would be Cambridgeshire's share of the savings.
- It is estimated that there would not be a reduction in front line policing over the next year.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- Members welcomed the early discussion on the budget.
- Members noted the mention of the new formula funding and that there could be extra funding available. Would Cambridgeshire gain from this?
- Were the budget predictions based on the effects of what might happen to other police forces.

- Members commented that there could be a possible reduction of grant funding from central government of between 25% to 40%. What effect would a 25% reduction in the government grant have on the budget predictions.
- Members referred to page 70 of the report. It had been noted that rural areas of Cambridgeshire rarely saw any police. Were PCSO's filling the gap and could more resources be redeployed to rural areas. *The Commissioner responded that this was an operational question but advised that PCSO's had been given more powers and PCSO's were used countywide and deployed where activities were taking place. Significant gains in the productivity of police officers and PCSOs on the front-line have been achieved and every effort will be used to maintain this increase in effective capacity. In addition to this there was a programme to recruit more Specials within the rural villages but this would take time to recruit and train the right people.*
- Clarification was sought regarding the £19.3m saving. Was the savings against the current budget or next year's budget.
- Clarification was sought regarding the statement within the report "*The guiding principle in setting the precept is to achieve value for money policing whilst not increasing the burden on the taxpayer*".
- The report mentions the Constabulary's operational policing strategy. Would the Panel be able to see the Chief Constables operational policing strategy?
- Members commented that at a recent presentation by the new Chief Constable he had stated that with the reduction in government funding there was likely to be a reduction in frontline policing in future years. *The Commissioner responded that the Chief Constable had been reflecting on what might happen in other areas but that Cambridgeshire was committed to not reducing frontline policing.*
- A member commented that some people might consider a 2% increase in the precept if this were to ensure that frontline policing would not be reduced.

The Chairman stated that the Panel was there to provide challenge and support to the Commissioner and if it was possible to see more information on the budget at an earlier stage it would be most welcome. *The Commissioner responded that more information than had been provided previously had already been presented to the Panel in advance.*

Responses by the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and Chief Finance Officer to questions from the Panel included:

- There had been indications from the Home Office that there might be a small potential of extra funding for Cambridgeshire. However no presumptions had been included in the budget predictions with regard to this.
- The Deputy Commissioner advised that his understanding was that the 25% reduction in government funding would affect government departments. A total of £73.3m was received in Cambridgeshire last year and within the local precept there was an increase in band E properties which had been a welcome increase to assist in bridging the gap. It was difficult to predict what or if there would be a reduction in grant funding this year.
- The £19.3m savings was against next year's budget 2016/2017 onwards and based on this year's baseline figure of £129.1m.
- The statement regarding not increasing the burden on the taxpayer meant that the council tax precept would be set at a rate that did not increase the burden on individual households.
- The operational policing strategy was led by the Police and Crime Plan.
- There was currently no pressure to reduce frontline policing.

The Panel AGREED to note the report.

11. 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:

CPCC 2015-031- Bottisham Police Station Site and CPCC 2015-032 – Papworth Police Station Site

- Members were concerned that the Papworth site would go to auction without outline planning permission. *The Deputy Commissioner responded that they had thought that outline planning permission was being sought and this was the preferred route. Clarification would be sought to see what was happening.*
- Why were two valuable assets being disposed of by taking them to auction. It would be better to place them on the open market to gain as much money as possible. *The Deputy Commissioner responded that both sites would probably go forward as development sites and therefore there would be a number of ways that people may take advantage of the outline planning permission. The auction contained parcels of land which had been widely published and the evidence suggested that this was the best approach. The parcels of land have a reserved value.*

CPCC 2015-034 – Variation to the Police and Crime Plan (Objectives 3 and 4) 2013-16

- Clarification was sought as to what this decision was for. *Members were informed that it was to formally adopt the changes after receiving comments and confirmation of approval from the Panel.*

CPCC 2015-029 – S22A Agreement under the Police Act 1996 (as amended to be a member of the Midlands and South Fleet Buying Group.

- Clarification was sought as to whether the schedule of 135 minimum committed vehicle requirements applied to the Group or was for Cambridgeshire Constabulary. *Members were advised that it was for Cambridgeshire Constabulary.*

CPCC 2015-033 – Funding for tuServ and Metis Developments

- Clarification was sought regarding paragraph 4.2 page 87 of the report and the statement *“It is proposed that the additional £599k of Metis expenditure will be financed by the additional receipts from vehicle sales and the increased vehicle usage charges to collaborated units”.* *Members were informed that there was a cross charging arrangement between constabularies to ensure an equitable arrangement.*

The Chairman thanked the Commissioner for including a forward plan of decisions to be made in the future within the report as requested at the previous meeting by the Panel. The Chairman also requested that it would be helpful if target dates for each decision could also be included going forward.

ACTION

The Panel AGREED to note the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner and requested that the Commissioner provide target dates against future decisions where possible in future reports.

12. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2015-2016

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 suggestions were made and agreed to.

- A report on the Modern Slavery Act – explanation of the act and how this was being implemented locally
- A report from the Commissioner on Surveillance & ANPR - What has the Police and Crime Commissioner done on ensuring safeguards are in place in relation to the force's use of surveillance technology, including Automatic Number Plate Recognition ANPR, and on the collection of data from electronic devices during searches and when individuals are brought into custody. Has the Police and Crime Commissioner set a clear strategy and policy in this area and is assured himself, and can assure the public, that the force's activities are lawful and proportionate.
- Review of cost effectiveness of the offices of the Police and Crime Commissioner
- Child Sexual Exploitation

Members suggested that as the agendas were already full for the next two meetings of the Panel then the items proposed should be scheduled into the work programme for the next municipal year.

Following discussion the Panel AGREED to the proposed items being scheduled in to the work programme for the next municipal year.

ACTIONS

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
4 November 2015	Decisions By the Commissioner	The Panel AGREED to note the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner and requested that the Commissioner provide target dates against future decisions where possible in future reports.	
	Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2015-2016	The following items for scrutiny to be programmed into the work programme during 2016/2017. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A report on the Modern Slavery Act• A report from the Commissioner on Surveillance & ANPR• Review of cost effectiveness of the offices of the Police and Crime Commissioner• Child Sexual Exploitation	

Appendix 1 – Rules of Procedure

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 4.20pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank