



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
HELD AT PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL  
ON 6 SEPTEMBER 2017**

**Members Present:** Edward Leigh (Chairperson), Councillors R Bisby (Vice-Chairperson), D Baigent, D Conner, T Sanderson, A Dickinson (Substitute), A Sharp, M Shellens, E Murphy, K Cuffley, Susan Hartropp (Independent) and Claire George (Independent)

**Officers Present:** Jane Webb                      Secretariat, Peterborough City Council  
Stephen Gerrard                Monitoring Officer, Peterborough City Council

**Others Present:** Jason Ablewhite            Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner  
Dr Dorothy Gregson        Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner  
Matthew Warren             Interim Chief Finance Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

**16. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Shelton, Bull, Oliver and Bond.

- Councillor Dickinson was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Bull.
- Councillor Cuffley was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Shelton.

**17. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of Interest.

**18. Minutes of the meetings held on 14 June 2017.**

The minutes of the Panel meeting held on 14 June 2017 were agreed with the following amendment to:

Item 11 – Decision by the Commissioner – Decision Record – CPCC 2017-008 – Capital Programme for 2017/18 to 2020/21.

The Panel asked if the Commissioner was replacing seeking a replacement for his ex-deputy, to which he confirmed he was.

## **19. Public Questions/Statements**

No public questions or statements were received.

## **20. Review of Complaints**

The Panel received a report which stated that no complaints had been made against the Police and Crime Commissioner since the Panel met on 14 June 2017.

## **21. Update on HMICFRS Legitimacy Inspection Report 2016**

The Panel received a report to assure them that the Police and Commissioner ensured that Cambridgeshire Constabulary had:

- Progressed the recommendations and areas for improvement from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) Legitimacy inspection report 2016; and
- Complied with the current national guidelines for vetting and the systems and checks that were in place to ensure that vetting had been actioned.

The Panel made comment, asked questions and received responses from the Commissioner with regard to the Report, these included:

- a) Could the Commissioner confirm how issues were dealt with and what the next steps would be? The Commissioner explained that most of the information received would relate to issues from six months to two years previous. The Inspection had been good, with Leadership having been classed as outstanding and this was because the issues were already being addressed. The Commissioner received assurance from his Chief Constable that there were ongoing processes in place to support the steps that had been taken to deal with the concerns. The inspection report was complimentary on the way the Commissioner and Chief Constable now worked together to address issues.
- b) The Commissioner gave his assurance that any corruption of standard of policing was dealt with robustly.
- c) The collaboration with Bedfordshire Police and Hertfordshire Constabulary ensured greater resilience but the Commissioner did accept the findings of the report and would continue to monitor these through the process of the Business Coordination Board, the Professional Standards Department (PSD) Governance Board and dip sampling of complaints.
- d) The Commissioner gave his assurance that measures had been put into place to rectify all the issues brought up by HMICFRS.
- e) The report stated all the recommendations stemming from the HMICFRS reports had been incorporated in the Vetting Unit and Anti-Corruption Unit (ACU) Delivery Plans. Did this mean they had not yet been implemented? The Commissioner explained that ongoing meant that the Constabulary were currently working towards a position where they would be delivered.
- f) With regard to vetting; was the Constabulary more in line with the national thought process or were they working in a completely new way. The Commissioner stated that the PSD and ACU were set up in line with national procedures.
- g) The College of Policing's Vetting Code of Practice and Authorise Professional Practice would be published shortly.
- h) Could the Commissioner clarify where a deliberate decision had been made to depart from national standards, as this implied compliant was not complete and a judgement call had been made? The Commissioner stated that re-vetting was one of his main concerns as it was a slow process that could take three months. He reassured the Panel that he had fed back his concerns; they were currently still using the old vetting procedure until the new procedure comes in.

- i) Had the Commissioner received any feedback from HMICFRS as to whether they were satisfied with the measures that have been implemented? The Commissioner explained that HMICFRS would inform them of this and the inspection was “a snapshot in time” therefore if an action could not be demonstrated then it would not have been taken into account within the report.

## **ACTION**

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

## **22. Fire and Rescue Governance – Local Business Case**

The Panel received a report which provided an update on the consultation process being undertaken by the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner in relation to the Local Business Case on the future governance arrangements for the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service.

The Commissioner presented the report and stated that 2391 responses had been received, of which:  
53% were in favour of the PCC taking over the responsibility of the Fire Authority  
39% were against the PCC taking over the responsibility of the Fire Authority; and  
8% were neutral.

The Commissioner explained that the majority of MPs were in support though some had not responded (some had responded privately that they supported the Commissioner). There was also support from the NHS, the Mayor James Palmer, Huntingdonshire District Council and other statutory organisations.

The Commissioner’s office would now collate and respond to the 800 comments through the consultation response submission to the Home Secretary. The Commissioner had already responded to the Fire Authority’s concerns. He stated he was pleased with the direction of travel and the way in which the public had interacted with the consultation. The business case and the consultation response would now be submitted as the Commissioner’s proposal to the Home Secretary. As a consequence of the two upper tier authorities not being supportive of the Commissioner’s proposal, the Home Secretary now has to obtain an independent assessment of the Commissioner’s proposal and then have regard to this assessment when making a decision on the Commissioner’s proposal. . The Commissioner hoped for a takeover date of 1 April 2018 or possibly as late as July 2018.

The Panel made comment, asked questions and received responses from the Commissioner with regard to the Report, these included:

- a) The Commissioner’s Office confirmed that the report written by PA Consultancy had been published on their website.
- b) The Commissioner explained that once the Business Case as part of the proposal submission was submitted to the Home Office that an independent assessment would be triggered; the Government have yet to set this process up. The Ministers would be looking for good reasons for rejection.
- c) The Commissioner stated their response to the Fire Authority’s comments on the consultation should have been published by the Fire Authority but he would ensure it was circulated to Panel Members.
- d) The Commissioner stated he was happy to work with the Panel in order to help the transition process into a Police, Fire and Crime Panel.
- e) The Commissioner explained that an Order would be issued from the Home Secretary that would include a start date; this would give a time provision to allow the transition into a Police, Crime and Fire Panel.

- f) Would the discussions that take place between the Commissioner and the Fire Authority be a public debate and would the Panel have an opportunity to input into the process during the transition period? The Commissioner stated he would keep the Panel fully apprised of the transitional processes and would be happy to answer any questions.
- g) The Commissioner was asked what implications he could foresee in terms of his own time management with regard to extending his role. The Commissioner stated his diary management skills were excellent as his role was already full time plus more. He added that there would be movement to ensure he could take on the added responsibility and in time these responsibilities would come together ie management meetings. He envisaged his new Deputy would take on the added responsibility of Fire.
- h) Did the Commissioner envisage his Deputy to be a full time role? The Commissioner explained this would be reviewed and gave his assurance that this would not be decided until the workload was known.
- i) The Commissioner was asked why he had not taken the advice of Cambridgeshire County Council, Peterborough City Council and the Fire Authority and pursued the representation option rather than the governance option. The Commissioner explained that with regard to the Representation Option, he already attended the Fire Authority meetings and his proposal was a new model; he could easily absorb five meetings a year therefore it was not an issue. The Fire Authority's finance meetings could also be easily absorbed into the police's existing meetings.
- j) Would the Deputy role be a political appointment to which the Commissioner stated it would be as this was set in legislation.
- k) Did the Commissioner see his role as taking over all the responsibilities that the Fire Authority had; to which the Commissioner stated he did.
- l) The Panel had concerns regarding the timetable set out for submitting the proposal including the Business Case to the Home Office and felt there had been undue haste and that it would be beneficial for further discussions to take place prior to the submission of the Business Case to the Home Office
- m) Councillor Baigent proposed the following recommendation:

*This panel views with some concern the haste by the PCC to place the fire service within his portfolio, given that the consultation ends on the 4<sup>th</sup> September and he plans to take his recommendation to the BCB on the 21<sup>st</sup> September and the Home Office on 30<sup>th</sup> September.*

*We consider that this haste gives the appearance of a lack of consideration and flexibility to address legitimate concerns and objections raised during the public consultation and/or to consider the views of the Fire Authority, and Peterborough and Cambridgeshire County Council (who have all opposed change).*

*We would recommend that the PCC pauses to establish a focus group of the main players in the area to include at least the Fire Authority, CFO, FBU and Peterborough, Cambridge and Cambridgeshire County Councils to further discuss this matter before coming to a decision.*

- n) The Panel suggested the recommendation should include all the district Councils and it should be noted that Huntingdonshire had voted in support of the Commissioner.
- o) The Panel felt the recommendation would give the Commissioner time to 'build bridges' with both Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council and a chance to persuade them to support his Business Case thus removing the need for an independent assessment arbitration to take place.
- p) The Commissioner explained that in terms of engagement he had carried out more than other areas had; he had visited both sets of councils and briefed Members who had then debated the subject and he had responded to their comments (these would be circulated to the Panel). The Commissioner stated the public had had their say and that the Panel should have made their recommendation earlier as it was now too late and would not add further value to what had already been agreed. This had not been rushed and the decision had not been made overnight.

- q) Councillor Bisby stated that had this been an election then the result would have been accepted and therefore he was in favour of the Commissioner's Business Case and would be happy for it to go ahead.
- r) The Commissioner stated he already worked closely with the statutory partners and this would continue.
- s) Councillor Shellens stated he was not a member of the Fire Authority and his view was that to bring both groups together would be a potential mismatch to the needs and calibre of the Commissioner; the current Commissioner did a great job but the Panel had experienced previous commissioners; it would be too risky to leave it up to the nomination of a single party of someone to take over the job and therefore he preferred the Fire Authority.

## **ACTION**

Having reviewed the Report of the Police and Crime Commissioner the Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the Report and made the following **RECOMMENDATION** in response.

*This panel views with some concern the haste by the Police and Crime Commissioner to place the fire service within his portfolio, given that the consultation ends on the 4<sup>th</sup> September and he plans to take his recommendation to the Constabulary Business Co-ordination Board on the 21<sup>st</sup> September and the Home Office on 30<sup>th</sup> September.*

*We consider that this haste gives the appearance of a lack of consideration and flexibility to address legitimate concerns and objections raised during the public consultation and/or to consider the views of the Fire Authority, and Peterborough and Cambridgeshire County Council (who have all opposed change [as proposed by the Commissioner]).*

*We would recommend that the PCC pauses to establish a focus group of the main players in the area to include at least Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council [the two statutory consultees], along with Cambridge City, Fenland, Huntingdonshire, East Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire District Councils, the Fire Authority, Chief Fire Officer and the Fire Brigades Union to further discuss this matter before coming to a decision.*

## **Reasons for the decision**

The Panel understood that the Police and Crime Commissioner intended to proceed with his proposal to assume the role of the Fire Authority. However the two statutory consultees, Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, both opposed the proposal. Because of this, the matter would have to go through an arbitration process. The Home Office has yet to set this up, and preparing for it would inevitably require time and resource for the participants.

The Panel therefore made a recommendation that the Commissioner make one last effort to seek consensus with the statutory consultees, thereby avoiding the need for arbitration.

The Panel noted that Huntingdonshire District Council were supportive of the Commissioner's proposal, and that the public consultation indicated 53% supported and 38% opposed it.

## **23. Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018-19 to 2021-22**

The Panel received a report to update them on the Commissioner's approach to setting the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19 to 2021/22 (MTFS).

The Commissioner asked if the Panel would appreciate a briefing on the Local Policing Review in the near future to which they agreed they would. The OPCC would arrange this.

The Panel made comment, asked questions and received responses from the Commissioner with regard to the Report, these included:

- a) The Commissioner explained that inflation was indicative and the inflation figures were realistic. The Council tax cap had been beneficial as it had made organisations think about efficiency. The Commissioner stated he had already identified costings within the budget that would help with the demand to increase the number of constables. The Commissioner did not see himself in a position where he would need to raise the 2% precept cap.
- b) In response to a statement that had been made by the Chief Constable, the Commissioner stated that the number of constables would be increased by October 2018 under the Local Police Review. Efficiencies would drive out a considerable amount of cost that could be reinvested into demand management and protecting the vulnerable.
- c) The Commissioner stated that if the officer pay cap was lifted then he would be expecting the government to fund it.
- d) The Commissioner explained that ICT (Athena) would be aligned across Bedfordshire Police, Hertfordshire Constabulary and Cambridgeshire Constabulary and would be fully implemented by May 2018; the seven forces would then be looked at.
- e) The Commissioner stated procurement should be looked at across the emergency services; this would include ICT, licences and how the service was delivered as there were correlations between services. Aligning these would make it easier for each service to help one another and thus create greater collaboration.
- f) The Commissioner was asked about merging police areas and he explained that he had not seen evidence through the three way collaboration with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire that it had fulfilled any better service but it had produced greater resilience; he was not convinced that a merger would be the answer; had Cambridgeshire stayed in-house then it would be in a better financial position.
- g) The Panel asked for clarification, as it had seemed the Commissioner had stated that collaboration has not produced a better service. The Commissioner explained it had driven out savings and given increased resilience in specialist services; Hertfordshire benefited from HR as their HR had been larger and more expensive but Cambridgeshire had not saved and possibly did not receive the same level of HR service. The Commissioner had voiced his concerns and challenged the Chief Constable and Tri-Force Board stating that it was easy to strip out too much of the back office. Collaboration had not resulted in a better service but was now more resilient.
- h) The Commissioner was asked if he had attempted to quantify the shortfall that would be needed to meet the level of demand and what the additional funding gap was. The Commissioner explained that the Local Policing Review did exactly that; he had been given £300k to look at demand management; the police respond to all calls and as a consequence 80% of these were non-crime issues. This increase in demand meant that another 100 officers would be needed on the ground. The average cost of an officer was £40k with training (totalling £4m) and the Local Policing Review would deliver that over the planned period.
- i) The Commissioner stated that collaboration had created concerns with regard to staffing with the removal of some management posts. The Commissioner explained that two Superintendents currently looked after two key areas; Cambridge City and Peterborough, with the other sectors having Chief Inspectors. It was envisaged that there would be one Chief Superintendent for the North and South with savings being made from specialist groups that would be in each 6 constituent parts. The Commissioner suggested that the Panel may want a briefing/paper on this subject. There was a Rural Action Crime team of eight but the effect they had was profound; managing a 7% reduction in rural crime in the last year over Cambridgeshire. Where there were 178 policing teams across Cambridgeshire, these would be more concise and be able to hit an area hard to deal with an issue and then move to the next area; resulting in an increased resilience and the management of demand.
- j) The Commissioner was asked if he should approach the Home Office to request more money for officers due to the fact that the service was tightly stretched. The Commissioner explained that this was being done through the Local Policing Review.

## **ACTION**

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

### **24. Performance Monitoring Update**

The Panel received a report to update them on the Commissioner's approach to performance monitoring of the Constabulary and to inform the Panel's approach to scrutinising how the Commissioner carried out this function.

The Panel made comment, asked questions and received responses from the Commissioner with regard to the Report, these included:

- a) The Commissioner explained that Councils could play a role in communicating key messages and challenges. 80% of police time was spent on non-crime issues and if this could be reduced then it would have a significant impact on the frontline; drug and alcohol services were being recommissioned and Members should ensure they are engaged in that process and that they put robust cases forward for these services.
- b) The Panel requested a breakdown of the 80% non-crime issues to which the Commissioner agreed to provide.
- c) The Panel requested a briefing regarding the Local Policing Review to which the Commissioner agreed.
- d) Had the Commissioner considered rolling out the PES service in Peterborough to other areas and was it financially viable? The Commissioner explained that the PES was a collaboration between Peterborough City Council, the Fire Service and the Police teams who work alongside Council officers (housing, licensing and enforcement); Peterborough being a unitary council made this easier. Early reports had shown it to be very effective with regard to low level ASB issues. There were plans to roll this out over 2 tier areas and therefore extend the service into Fenland.
- e) Could the Panel receive a report on how the Casualty Reduction Officer work had progressed and what effect it had on road traffic accidents in the area? The Commissioner stated this could be actioned.
- f) The Panel noted that hate crime satisfaction was an unsung good news story; satisfaction had dropped with regard to Brexit but had now recovered and it should be noted that this was a very good example of how the constabulary had adapted. The Commissioner thanked the Panel for acknowledging and highlighting this.
- g) The Panel noted that staff side sickness absence had reduced which in turn provided more support for the officers on the ground so was good to see.
- h) The Panel informed the Commissioner that they would take a thematic view to each panel meeting, covering the objectives within the Plan and a question would be appropriately formulated to ensure the Panel that each objective had been met.

## **ACTION**

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

### **25. Police and Crime Commissioner's Community Engagement**

The Panel requested and received a report displaying how the Commissioner approached community engagement including examples of activities that had taken place and showed how the Commissioner engaged with communities within the county to ensure that all communities were engaged with, and that both their voices and the Commissioner's were heard.

The Panel made comment, asked questions and received responses from the Commissioner with regard to the Report, these included:

- a) How would the Commissioner address rural communities and engagement as it was very different to urban areas? The Commissioner explained this was taking place constantly; via parish council forums, regular surgeries that moved around the area. If there were any specific issues to be looked into then Panel Members should inform the Commissioner.
- b) The Panel's view was that rolling out PES teams into different communities and assisting the start-up of neighbourhood watch schemes would be beneficial.
- c) The Panel stated it would be interesting to see the impact on the change of makeup within the force and around the impact on pensions in particular.
- d) The Panel asked for more detail around Community Safety Partnerships and how they fed back into the system. The Commissioner stated he could only refer the Panel to the County Partnership as the others were scrutinised at a local level. The Panel's view was that these should also concern the Commissioner as these truly reflected local need.

## **ACTION**

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

### **26. 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.

#### **Decision Record – CPCC 2017-19 – Section 22A Agreement under the Police Act 1996 (as amended) for the collaboration for Covert Human Intelligence Sources function**

The Panel asked what covert human intelligence was and what the safeguarding issue was.

The Commissioner explained it was a way of tracking criminal and gangs and there was a very robust process through RIPA; the governance surrounding it was very tight as to how it could be used and who had permission to use it.

#### **Decision Record – CPCC 2017-12 - Section 22A Agreement under the Police Act 1996 (as amended) for the updated collaboration of the Criminal Justice and Custody functions between Bedfordshire Police, Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Hertfordshire Constabulary**

The Panel asked for a short update and asked why Cambridgeshire had not participated in the Crown Court File Preparation Team in Herts and the Crown Court Liaison Officers in Beds and Herts.

The Commissioner explained that ATHENA would be implemented in May 2018 as they had now received assurances that all the issues had been addressed; therefore they could now proceed with confidence. Other areas, Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex were now looking into where further efficiencies could be made.

The Commissioner explained that Cambridgeshire were not participating in certain functions as it had its own Witness Hub and therefore did not require these functions. Cambridgeshire had a high level of victim satisfaction and in some of these areas Cambridgeshire were also exemplary and therefore there was no need to collaborate.

## ACTION

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

*(At this point the Police and Crime Commissioner and his staff left the meeting.)*

### 27. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2017-2018

The Panel received and NOTED the agenda plan including dates and times for future meetings.

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
6 Sept 17	<b>Update on HMICFRS Legitimacy Inspection Report 2016</b>	Following discussions the Panel AGREED to note the report.	
	<b>Fire and Rescue Governance – Local Business Case</b>	<p>Having reviewed the Report of the Police and Crime Commissioner the Panel AGREED to NOTE the Report and made the following RECOMMENDATION in response.</p> <p>This panel views with some concern the haste by the Police and Crime Commissioner to place the fire service within his portfolio, given that the consultation ends on the 4th September and he plans to take his recommendation to the Constabulary Business Co-ordination Board on the 21<sup>st</sup> September and the Home Office on 30th September.</p> <p>We consider that this haste gives the appearance of a lack of consideration and flexibility to address legitimate concerns and objections raised during the public consultation and/or to consider the views of the Fire Authority, and Peterborough and Cambridgeshire County Council (who have all opposed change [as proposed by the Commissioner]).</p> <p>We would recommend that the PCC pauses to establish a focus group of the main players in the area to include at least Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council [the two statutory consultees], along with Cambridge City, Fenland, Huntingdonshire, East Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire District Councils, the Fire Authority, Chief Fire Officer and the Fire Brigades Union to further discuss this matter before coming to a decision.</p> <p><i>OPCC to circulate Fire Authority's comments to Panel Members.</i></p>	

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
	<b>Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018-19 to 2021-22</b>	Following discussions the Panel AGREED to note the report.  <i>OPCC to arrange a briefing on Local Policing Review &amp; Demand Hub for Panel Members.</i>	
	<b>Performance Monitoring Update</b>	Following discussions the Panel AGREED to note the report.  <i>OPCC to provide Panel Members with a breakdown of 80% of non-crime issues.</i>  <i>OPCC to provide an update on the work of the Casualty Reduction Officer</i>	
	<b>Police and Crime Commissioner's Community Engagement</b>	Following discussions the Panel AGREED to note the report.	
	<b>Decisions By the Commissioner</b>	The Panel <b>NOTED</b> the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner.	
	<b>Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan 2017-2018</b>	The Panel received and <b>NOTED</b> the agenda plan including dates and times for future meetings.	

#### Possible Topics for Future Reports

- Collaboration/Fire Governance Consultation
- Community Safety Accreditation Scheme
- Reducing re-offending
- Community Engagement
- Estate Disposal: review business cases
- Custody Strategy
- Mental Health Demand
- Out of Court Disposals (in particular conditional cautions)
- Use of surveillance: ANPR, drones, body cams etc
- Use of Tasers
- Collaboration: review business cases
- Child Sexual Exploitation
- Modern Slavery Act
- Youth Fund
- Migrant Workers
- Proceeds of Crime – How spent?
- Building Community relations
- Cyber-enabled crime

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 4:20pm

CHAIRPERSON