



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
HELD AT PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL
ON 29 JUNE 2016**

Members Present: Councillors B Shelton (Chairperson) E Leigh, Independent Co-opted Member (Vice Chairperson), M McGuire, M Shellens, R Howe, A Miscandlon, D Baigent, D Giles, E Murphy, R Bisby,

Officers Present:	Paulina Ford	Secretariat, Peterborough City Council
	Alison Stuart	Assistant Director, Legal and Democratic Services, Peterborough City Council
	Jason Ablewhite	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner
	Josie Gowler	Director of Finance, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
	Dr Dorothy Gregson	Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
	Alec Wood	Chief Constable

1. Election of Chairperson

The Secretariat asked for nominations for the role of Chairperson. Councillor Baigent was nominated by Councillor Murphy and seconded by Edward Leigh. A second nomination was received from Councillor McGuire and seconded by Councillor Howe for Councillor Shelton. Having received two nominations each were put to the vote. Councillor Shelton received 6 votes in favour and Councillor Baigent received 4 votes in favour. Councillor Shelton was therefore appointed Chairperson for the municipal year 2016-2017.

2. Election of Vice-Chairperson

The Chairperson asked for nominations for the role of Vice Chairperson. Edward Leigh was nominated by Councillor McGuire and seconded by Councillor Murphy. There were no other nominations and therefore Edward Leigh was appointed as Vice-Chairperson for the municipal year 2016/17.

3. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Oliver, Councillor Pearson and Councillor Lillis. Councillor Miscandlon was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Oliver.

4. Declarations of Interest

Item 12. Review of Complaints

Councillor Murphy declared an interest in that he used to be a member of the National Executive Committee of Travellers Rights.

Item 7. Police and Crime Commissioners Approach.

Councillor Giles declared an interest in that he was a member of the Fire Authority.

5. Minutes of the meeting held 16 March 2016.

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2016 were agreed as an accurate record and the action points were noted.

6. Public Questions/Statements

Two questions had been submitted to the Panel from Mr Richard Taylor and are attached at Appendix 1 of the minutes with the responses given. Mr Taylor was in attendance to present and receive the response to his questions.

The Chairperson welcomed the new Police and Crime Commissioner. The Commissioner introduced Josie Gowler, Director of Finance, Dr Dorothy Gregson, Chief Executive, and Alec Wood, Chief Constable who were also in attendance.

7. Police and Commissioners Approach

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with an overview of his role and how he intended to take this forward and how the Police and Crime Panel would be developed.

The Commissioner informed the Panel that he would be taking a new approach to the role and would be working more collaboratively with the Panel. The move of his office from its current location to the Cambridgeshire Constabulary Headquarters at Hinchingsbrooke would also be a step forward to working more collaboratively with the constabulary.

The Commissioner wished the Panel to note that any questions for the Chief Constable should be addressed through him.

The Chief Constable gave a brief introduction which provided the Panel with context as to his background and also informed the Panel that he welcomed the opportunity to work more closely with the Panel.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- The Chairperson welcomed the attendance of the Chief Constable and reiterated to the Panel that he was in attendance by invitation and that it was not a requirement for him to attend the Panel. Any questions for the Chief Constable must be addressed through the Chairperson in the first instance and then through the Commissioner. The Chairperson also welcomed the opportunity for the Panel to work more closely with the Commissioner and that it was essential that the Panel obtained a good scrutiny style working relationship.
- The Panel welcomed the Commissioners proposed new way of working.
- A response was requested from the Commissioner regarding the proposal of a forward plan of decisions and business considered.
- Better communication and stakeholder engagement would be required going forward.
- Clarification was sought on plans for using the savings made through moving the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to Hinchingsbrooke.
- Comments were sought with regard to the Commissioners plans for community relations, Race relations and the reported rise in Hate Crime.

- Page 12, paragraph 5.7, “*collaboration with the Fire Service and youth offending*”. What was the Commissioner’s plans for the Fire Service and if taking on the Fire Service what could the Commissioner bring to the role of Commissioner of the Fire Service.
- How did the Commissioner propose to deal with youth offending?
- How did the Commissioner propose to get more involved with the community?
- Hate Crime. Was there any proactive public engagement to make it clear to people who may be in fear of being sent home following the EU Referendum that the police were ready and willing to assist them if required?
- Members requested that the Panel be kept informed about any information regarding the possible move of the Fire Service over to the Police and Crime Commissioner when it happened and not just at the Panel meetings.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- All requests from the Panel would be considered and if they could be accommodated they would be put in place. The new collaborative approach to working with the Panel should assist with this.
- The Commissioner had been in post for seven weeks and had hopefully demonstrated that since being in post stakeholder engagement and public engagement had increased with the use of social media and other forms of communication. Going forward this would further increase and at least two days of the week would be spent on stakeholder and public engagement.
- The Commissioner acknowledged that there had been unintended consequences following the recent EU Referendum with regard to the rise in Hate Crime and that he had issued a clear public statement at how appalling this was. There had also been a lot of pressure put on local businesses and local communities as a consequence. The issue had been prioritised to try and keep everyone as calm as possible. The Chief Constable also responded advising the Panel that he had been in contact with Chief Constables across the country to look at the national picture around cohesion. Particular incidents against the Polish community had been reported locally. The Safer Peterborough Partnership Hate Crime Coordinator had met with members of the Polish community in Huntingdon to reassure them. Investigations were currently being undertaken into all reported incidents including where the inflammatory leaflets had come from and the perpetrators would be dealt with in accordance with the law. The situation was being monitored on a daily basis.
- The legislation to allow Police and Crime Commissioners to take responsibility for their local fire services was currently going through Parliament and was likely to be enacted by December 2016. The Commissioner advised that it was his intention to be an early adopter with respect to the Policing and Crime Bill powers. Over the last few months there had been a huge shift in front line collaboration with the constabulary and fire service. The benefits that the Commissioner would bring to the role would be by mapping out the estates and look where collaborative working could bring best value.
- There was already a lot of collaborative working between various agencies, including Children’s Services, families and vulnerable adults to find new solutions to tackle youth offending.
- There would be more public engagement events, closer working with stakeholders and identifying best practice in other areas of Cambridgeshire where community engagement had worked well to improve engagement across the whole of Cambridgeshire.
- Hate Crime. The Commissioner informed the Panel that the police were already working with affected communities to try and give them some assurance. When the government is able to provide a statement of assurance to those communities that they would not be sent home the situation would settle down.
- Any announcements regarding the Fire Service would go to staff in the first instance before going into the public domain. The Commissioner confirmed that he would be working as collaboratively with the Fire Service as he did with the Police Force.

Following debate the Panel **AGREED** to note the report.

8. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary Inspection Reports

The report was introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner and provided the Panel with an overview of how the findings of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) Police Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Legitimacy (PEEL) reports have been addressed and how the Police and Crime Commissioner intended to address these in the future.

The Chief Constable at the request of the Commissioner provided the Panel with an update on actions that had been taken with regard to the recommendations made by HMIC following on from the PEEL assessment as published in February 2016.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- The Panel were pleased that the HMIC had made some recommendations and that they were being actioned.
- Was there any scope for the Panel to observe any future inspections?
- Members were concerned at the '*requires improvement*' rating received for '*Effective at keeping people safe and reducing crime*'.
- How did Cambridgeshire Police Force perform in comparison to Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire?
- It was noted that the dedicated officer who used to deal with vulnerable people was no longer in place. Could this be looked at and additional resources be put in place to work with migrants.
- There was concern about the fear of crime and its impact. Areas where street lighting had been switched off had provided an increase in the fear of crime. Members requested that a report looking at the fear of crime and if there had been an increase in crime figures in areas where street lighting had been switched off be brought to a future meeting.
- Domestic abuse. Would Operation Sherlock assist with improvement in the quality of investigations of domestic abuse?
- The terms 'restorative justice', 'conditional caution', 'community remedy' needed to be clearly explained to ensure that members of the public understood the distinct difference between them.
- It was noted that police officers were often sent to deal with people with mental health issues. An example was a recent attempt by someone to jump of a bridge. There was a need for a rapid response mental health team to attend such incidents rather than a team of police officers.
- The HMIC Vulnerability report from December 2015 made two specific observations:
 - 1) Not all victims of crime in Cambridgeshire are being offered the opportunity to make a victim personal statement (VPS)⁷ at the appropriate time and to explain how the crime affected them
 - 2) The use of domestic violence protection notices (DVPNs)¹² and DVPOs is low. Had these been addressed?
- It had been noted in the press that police staff sickness levels had increased. Did this indicate that officers were overworked and off with stress?
- Was the multi-agency referral unit (MARU) based at Godmanchester still in place which had dedicated officers based in Wisbech and Peterborough that dealt with domestic violence?

Responses by the Commissioner and Chief Constable to questions from the Panel included:

- The Chief Constable responded to questions and welcomed further scrutiny around inspections but advised that it would be up to the HMIC and Commissioner to decide if there could be any involvement by the Panel.

- The Chief Constable further agreed that it was important to improve being effective at keeping people safe and reducing crime as this was the core role of the police force. The Chief Constables vision was very clear: safeguard and protect the vulnerable and protect them from criminality and bring the perpetrators to justice.
- Bedfordshire had received similar grading's to Cambridgeshire following inspection and there were several other forces around Cambridgeshire that had also received at least one grading of 'requires improvement'.
- 84% of demand was non crime related and a disproportionate amount of time was being spent on people with mental health issues which did not necessarily require police intervention. All of this impacted on the ability of the police to carry out their core roles. Mental Health nurses had now been employed to work in the control room to advise officers on the most appropriate way of dealing with people with mental health issues.
- It was clear that further new solutions needed to be found for dealing with people with mental health issues which included a multi-agency approach. The police may still have to attend an incident in the interests of public safety.
- The Commissioner assured the Panel that all the recommendations that had been made by the HMIC would be dealt with and an update report would be brought back to the Panel on progress made.
- There had been a significant increase in the fear of crime from vulnerable people and in particular the elderly but the statistics had not shown an increase in crime in areas where the street lighting had been switched off.
- Operation Sherlock was about sustained improvement, training and providing a holistic approach in the way all crimes were investigated.
- The Chief Constable confirmed that the two areas highlighted in the HMIC Vulnerability inspection report had been addressed and an improvement plan was in place and the DVPOs were increasing.
- The significant increase in sickness was related to police staff not police officers. There were some long term sickness cases which affected the overall sickness rate and the collaboration of police forces had had some effect on police staff.
- The Commissioner confirmed that the MARU unit was still in place and that dealing with domestic violence was a key priority.

ACTION

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

The Panel further requested that the Commissioner provide reports on the following items at a future meeting:

- 1) Public perception regarding the fear of crime in areas where street lighting had been switched off and if this has had an impact on the crime figures in those areas.
- 2) HMIC Inspection recommendations update report.

9. Police and Crime Commissioners Annual Report

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the Annual Report for 2015-16 and advised the Panel that although he was presenting the Annual Report it was not his report but the report of the outgoing Commissioner Sir Graham Bright. Under Section 12 of the Police and Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 the Panel were required to review the Annual Report and comment on it.

The Commissioner commented that he had been left with a strong financial platform to work from.

The Commissioner invited comments from the Panel on how future Annual Reports should be presented and delivered to the Panel.

Observations and comments raised by the Panel included:

- The report was a mixture of forensic fact and vague generalities. Whilst there was great detail in certain areas some of the commentary was rather subjective and bland and did not match the Police and Crime Plan and aspirations and therefore how the Commissioner could hold the police to account for their performance.
- Would the Commissioner be willing to work with the Panel and the police to devise a means by which the Panel are content that the Annual Report serves the purpose of informing the public on the performance of the Police Force?
- The presentation of data was extremely confusing which made it difficult for the Panel and members of the public to understand. The Commissioner should consult with the Panel and / or an expert to ensure better presentation and quality of data making it easily digestible.
- The data should be presented in a way which answers the questions that the public want to know the answers to.
- It was important to state all statistics as per 1000 households as this was more meaningful and a comparative figure.
- When comparing the Cambridge Constabulary with other police forces the national average was not a meaningful comparison. Comparison should be made with similar forces.
- Edward Leigh advised that he would be willing to take up the offer of working with the Commissioner on the presentation of data and information going forward to ensure it was more meaningful, accessible and digestible.
- Members referred to page 14, Youth Fund and Cadets and page 20, Police and Crime Reduction Grants in the report and was pleased to note that the grants had been ring fenced. Members requested examples of how the £2000 grant had been spent on Youth Fund Projects.
- Assurance was sought from the Commissioner that if budgets were being reduced the grant funding for the Youth Fund and Cadets would not be reduced and if possible increase the funding.
- Members referred to page 14 of the Annual Report, Modern Day Slavery. It was noted that there was funding for a migrant support worker and that the Commissioner's office had outreach support workers. The Commissioner was asked for views on also getting a dedicated police officer. Peterborough had lost a dedicated officer who had been dealing with modern day slavery and working with migrant communities. Would there be any dedicated officers going forward?
- What would the Commissioners top three priorities be for the Police Force over the next two years?
- Members referred to public perceptions and the public wanting to see more police officers on the street. Was the Commissioner considering increasing the size of the police force?
- Members requested a definition of Front Line Policing be provided in future Annual Reports.
- Members commented that Whittlesey police station had been closed and there were no longer any resident police officers as they had all been moved to Wisbech. Why had this change been made?
- It was noted that the current Annual Report had already been made public and therefore could not be amended.
- Some of the graphs were misleading and it would be helpful to members of the public for these to be made clearer, in particular by showing the number of police officers per year per 1000 households.

Responses by the Commissioner to questions from the Panel included:

- The Commissioner confirmed that he would be happy to work with the Panel collaboratively to ensure the Annual Report was presented in a format acceptable to the Panel going forward.

- The Chief Constable stated that many Chief Constables had made representation to the HMIC about the unusual groupings of the different police forces. The Cambridgeshire Constabulary was being compared with police forces that were not similar. There needed to be a bench mark but a more comparative one and the HMIC were currently looking into this.
- Tackling youth offending was about engaging with young people who did not necessarily have the same opportunities as some others early and getting them involved in local organisations such as the Police Cadets. The Commissioner advised that he could provide a report to the Panel giving an overview on how the funding was being spent on the various initiatives.
- Where possible budgets would be protected and in particular with regard to youth projects as it was a priority to provide early intervention. It was also important to look at where other grant funding could be obtained and this was being looked at on a continual basis.
- In terms of priorities the Commissioner stated that his manifesto had been clear and these would be built in to the Police and Crime Plan which would be developed over the next few months. The Commissioner invited the Panel to be involved in the development of the plan and a draft would be provided to the Panel at the September meeting.
- In terms of individual operational officers and support workers the Commissioners priority was to ensure that there were police officers first and foremost. Outreach workers provided extra help within the communities. An outreach worker was currently being replaced and the role was currently being further defined. All staff employed by the Commissioner added value.
- The Chief Constable responded to the question raised regarding the loss of a dedicated officer who had been dealing with modern day slavery and working with migrant communities in Peterborough. The police were currently working very closely with communities in Wisbech and Peterborough in a special operation dealing particularly around gang masters. The Chief Constable advised that he would look into the loss of the dedicated officer in Peterborough.
- The Commissioner confirmed that his priority was front line policing. The population had increased and this needed to be taken into account going forwards. Every option would be looked at to ensure that resilience was created.
- One of the key roles in policing was to have public confidence and the Commissioner was committed to increasing this throughout Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. If there were local communities where this was not the case it would need to be addressed. The Chief Constable added that the District Commander for Fenland had made a decision to relocate police officers from Whittlesey to other locations to improve the response times in the Fenland area. The Chief Constable would speak to the District Commander to advise him of the concerns.
- In light of the request for dedicated resources for Migrant Workers the Commissioner suggested that a separate report be presented to the Panel on Migrant Workers.

The Panel had a brief discussion on the way forward for the Panel to input into the design and improvement of narrative and content of future Annual Reports and agreed that a working party should be formed to meet with the Commissioner to discuss the points raised at the meeting. Councillor Howe and Edward Leigh put themselves forward to be members of the working party.

Having reviewed the Police and Crime Commissioners Annual Report the Panel **AGREED** to endorse the Annual Report for 2015/16. In doing so, the Police and Crime Panel made the following recommendations:

1. The Panel recommend that the Commissioner implement the suggested changes made by the Panel to future Annual Reports to improve the quality of the Annual Report going forward. Specifically to

- Ensure better presentation and quality of data making it more meaningful, accessible and easily digestible.
- To avoid vague generalities and bland subjective commentary to ensure improvement in the narrative and content.
- Present data in a way which answers the questions that the public want to know the answers to.
- Provide all statistics as per 1000 households.
- Compare if possible Cambridge Constabulary with other similar police forces rather than the national average.
- Provide a definition of Front Line Policing within the Annual Report to provide clarity for members of the public.

2) In response to the invitation from the Commissioner to work collaboratively with the Panel in designing the Annual Report going forward the Panel recommend that a small working group be set up of Panel members for this purpose.

ACTION

The Panel to consider as part of its work programme the following suggested reports from the Commissioner:

- A report providing an overview on how the £2000 grant funding was being spent on the Youth Fund initiatives.
- A report on Migrant Workers to include information on resourcing to support Migrant Workers.

10. 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:

- A member of the Panel referred to paragraph 8.2 of the report, *Future decisions to be taken by the Commissioner* and specifically the appointment of a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner and suggested that this might be relevant to item 12 on the agenda, Review of Complaints and suggested to the Chief Executive that the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner should be withdrawn until matters relating to item 12 had been dealt with. The Chairperson sought advice from the Legal Officer in attendance who advised the Panel that matters outside of the report should not be taken into consideration when considering matters within the context of the report currently being considered.

ACTION

The Panel noted the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner.

11. Rules of Procedure

The Secretariat introduced the Report which provided the Panel with an opportunity to review the Rules of Procedure at its Annual Meeting as required at paragraph 1.4 of the Rules of Procedure. The report requested that the Panel also consider suggested amendments to paragraph 7.5 and 7.9 of the Rules of Procedure.

ACTION

Following a review of the Rules of Procedure the Panel **AGREED** to approve the Rules of Procedure and accept and **AGREED** to the suggested changes at paragraph 7.5 and 7.9 as highlighted in red in Appendix 1 of the report.

12. Review of Complaints

The Assistant Director Legal and Democratic Services introduced the report which provided the Panel with an update on any complaints made against the Police and Crime Commissioner since the last report to the Panel. Two complaints had been received against the Commissioner and had been referred to the Panel by the Chief Executive of the Police and Crime Commissioners Office. In accordance with the Panels Complaints Procedure a Complaints Sub- Committee would need to be established to consider the complaints.

The secretariat had already sought nominations for members of the Complaints Sub-Committee and the following names were put forward:

- Edward Leigh, Independent Co-opted Member
- Councillor Pearson
- Councillor Giles
- Councillor Bisby
- Councillor Murphy

Clarification was sought as to the number of members required to establish the complaints Sub-Committee. The Assistant Director Legal and Democratic Services referred to paragraph 9.4 of the Rules of Procedure which stated, "*the maximum size of a Sub-Committee shall be seven members. The minimum size is three members. Size shall be determined on a case-by-case basis at the point that the review is commissioned.*" It was therefore agreed that if all five nominations were available on the date that the Sub Committee met then the Sub-Committee would comprise of five members.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to:

1. Note that 2 complaints have been received against the Commissioner.
2. Agree to the complaints being referred to a Police and Crime Panel Sub Committee for consideration and a decision under Regulation 13 of the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 and the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel complaints procedure.
3. Agree that the complaints should not be disclosed at this time pending the decision of the Police and Crime Panel Sub Committee and/or any referral to the Independent Police Complaints Commission should this be necessary.
4. Agree in accordance with the Panels Complaints Procedure to establish a Sub Committee consisting of at least 3 members of the Panel one of whom should be an Independent Co-opted Member who will be Chairperson of the Panel.

13. Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Annual Report

The Secretariat introduced the report which provided the Panel with a draft of the Annual Report for consideration and approval.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to approve the report for publication.

14. Vacancy for Co-opted Member

The Secretariat introduced the report which advised the Panel of the resignation of Francesca Anderson who was an Independent Co-opted Member of the Panel. The report sought the Panels approval to go out to advertisement to recruit another Independent Co-opted Panel member as two Independent Co-opted Members were required under the Panels Arrangements.

The Panel had a short discussion on the previous recruitment process used to recruit an Independent Co-opted Member and all agreed that the same process should be followed.

The Chairperson wished to thank Francesca Anderson for her time and contribution towards the Panels work.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to advertise for an Independent Co-opted Member to fill the current vacancy.

15. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2016-2017

The Panel received and noted the agenda plan including dates and times for future meetings and agreed to meet before the next meeting of the Panel in September to discuss items for the work programme for the forthcoming year.

The Chairperson thanked the Panel for their contributions to the meeting and looked forward to working with all members of the Panel over the forthcoming municipal year.

ACTIONS

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
29 June 2016	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary Inspection Reports	The Panel AGREED to note the report. The Panel further requested that the Commissioner provide reports on the following items at a future meeting: 1) Public perception regarding the fear of crime in areas where street lighting had been switched off and if this has had an impact on the crime figures in those areas. 2) HMIC Inspection recommendations update report.	To be provided at 7 September meeting.
	Police and Crime Commissioners Annual Report	The Panel recommend that the Commissioner implement the suggested changes made by the Panel to future Annual Reports to improve the quality of the Annual	

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
		<p>Report going forward. Specifically to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure better presentation and quality of data making it more meaningful, accessible and easily digestible. • To avoid vague generalities and bland subjective commentary to ensure improvement in the narrative and content. • Present data in a way which answers the questions that the public want to know the answers to. • Provide all statistics as per 1000 households. • Compare if possible Cambridge Constabulary with other similar police forces rather than the national average. • Provide a definition of Front Line Policing within the Annual Report to provide clarity for members of the public. <p>In response to the invitation from the Commissioner to work collaboratively with the Panel in designing the Annual Report going forward the Panel recommend that a small working group be set up of Panel members for this purpose.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>The Panel to consider as part of its work programme the following suggested reports from the Commissioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report providing an overview on how the £2000 grant funding was being spent on the Youth Fund initiatives. • A report on Migrant Workers to include information on resourcing to support Migrant Workers. 	
	Rules of Procedure	Following a review of the Rules of Procedure the Panel AGREED to approve the Rules of Procedure and accept and AGREE to the suggested changes at paragraph 7.5 and 7.9 as highlighted in red in Appendix 1 of the report.	Updated Rules of Procedure published on the Panels website.
	Review of Complaints	<p>The Panel AGREED to:</p> <p>Note that 2 complaints have been received against the Commissioner.</p> <p>Agree to the complaints being referred to a</p>	Complaints Sub-Committee met to consider complaints on 11 July 2016

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
		<p>Police and Crime Panel Sub Committee for consideration and a decision under Regulation 13 of the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 and the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel complaints procedure.</p> <p>Agree that the complaints should not be disclosed at this time pending the decision of the Police and Crime Panel Sub Committee and/or any referral to the IPCC should this be necessary.</p> <p>Agree in accordance with the Panels Complaints Procedure to establish a Sub Committee consisting of at least 3 members of the Panel one of whom should be an Independent Co-opted Member who will be Chairperson of the Panel.</p>	
	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Annual Report	The Panel AGREED to approve the report for publication.	Annual Report published on Panels website.
	Vacancy for Co-opted Member	The Panel AGREED to advertise for an Independent Co-opted Member to fill the current vacancy.	Advert went out on Friday 12 August with a closing date of 2 September.

The meeting began at 10.30am and ended at 12.40pm

CHAIRPERSON

Question/s for Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Meeting held on 29 June 2016

Questioner	Mr Richard Taylor
Questions addressed to which Member of the Panel	Chairperson
Date Question was submitted	24 June 2016
Question 1	
<p>1. Will the panel make clear which decisions it expects the Police and Crime Commissioner to report to it for scrutiny?</p> <p>Currently the Police and Crime Commissioner decides what to report to the panel for scrutiny.</p> <p>I am surprised that only one decision taken by the new Police and Crime Commissioner has been reported to-date.</p> <p>I suspect many decisions, such as those relating to the Police and Crime Commissioner's operating arrangements will have been made since the Police and Crime Commissioner came into office. Material published on the Police and Crime Commissioner's website indicates for example that the new Police and Crime Commissioner has decided, like his predecessor, to hold private Business Coordination Board meetings to take decisions behind closed doors without pre-published papers.</p> <p>Perhaps the panel could request that where a recommendation is formally put to the Police and Crime Commissioner, for example by the Chief Constable or the Chief of Staff of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office, then the Police and Crime Commissioner's decision on it, or decision not to make a decision, ought be reported to the panel for scrutiny. Such a policy would, for example, have resulted in a decision on the relocation of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to Police HQ being reported to this meeting for scrutiny.</p> <p>I am also surprised no decisions relating to the appointment of a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner have been reported to the panel under the "decisions" item.</p>	
Response	
<p>Edward Leigh on behalf of the Panel responded and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were some valid points in the question presented. • The Panel were not driven solely by the decisions submitted to the Panel by the Commissioner and were free to exercise judgement and research more widely the minutes published on the Commissioners website. • The agenda was not set on the basis of the decisions reported to the Panel. • The Panel had asked the previous Commissioner to provide a forward plan of decisions and this request will be reiterated to the new Commissioner. • The Panel may also request a summary of business considered by the Commissioner to assist the Panel in identifying items for the work programme. • The Panel do commission reports from the Commissioner and an example of this 	

is the HMIC Inspection Report on the current agenda at item 8.

Question 2

Will the panel, at the confirmation hearing scheduled for the afternoon of the 29th of June, hold those elements of its deliberation on the proposed appointment of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner which do not involve a likelihood of disclosure of any specified exempt information in public?

In particular I would like to suggest any votes be held in public session; and if votes are held in private they should be recorded and minuted.

When the panel held a confirmation hearing in September 2015 for the Chief Constable it returned to a public session to announce its decision, I suggest this approach is taken again for the hearing in respect of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner appointment.

I note the Public Questions / Statements agenda item has been omitted from the agenda for the 29 June 2016 confirmation hearing.

Response

The Local Government Association Confirmation Hearings Guidance for Police & Crime Panels states that "Immediately following the confirmation hearing the panel should go into closed session to decide on its recommendations" Therefore the Panel is operating in accordance with this guidance.

The guidance also suggests that a five working day period should elapse between the hearing and the release of information about any recommendation from the panel whether positive or otherwise.