



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
ON 15 NOVEMBER 2021**

Members Present: Edward Leigh (Chair), Councillors S Bywater, A Bradnam, A Collis, C Daunton, S Ferguson, C Hogg, A Lynn, E Murphy, A Sharp, S Warren, and Claire George.

Officers Present: Jane Webb Secretariat, Peterborough City Council
Fiona McMillan Monitoring Officer, Peterborough City Council

Others Present: Darryl Preston Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner
John Peach Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner
Jim Haylett Chief Executive OPCC
Nicky Phillipson Director of Commissioning OPCC

30. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Tierney and Ali.
Councillor Murphy was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Ali.

31. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were declared.

32. Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 November 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

33. Public Questions/Statements

No public questions or statements were received.

34. Review of Complaints

No complaints have been received since the last report.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report

35. Police and Crime Commissioner's Draft Police and Crime Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

The Panel received a report with the Police and Crime Commissioner's draft Police and Crime Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The Panel were recommended to review the draft Plan and make a report or recommendation on the draft Plan to the Commissioner.

The Commissioner presented the Plan to the Panel.

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

- a) Councillor Daunton asked what success looked like to the Commissioner and asked for a general overview of whether this would contain KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) etc and asked the Commissioner for an example. The Commissioner stated that success was simply cutting and reducing crime, which was complex in nature and not just a police matter. The Commissioner explained there were already many KPIs in place that he held the Chief Constable account to, there were also five new measures from government – homicide, drugs and county lines, burglary, vehicle crime and robbery, that were already in place that the Commissioner held the Chief Constable to account for. The Commissioner added that HMICFRS held the constabulary accountable and currently Cambridgeshire Constabulary were rated “good,” but it was both his and the Chief Constable's ambition to bring this rating up to “outstanding.” The Commissioner stated that an example would be the work carried out around Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) as it had become clear that local issues were key to communities. There were now more police in post than ever before and a commitment from the Chief Constable and part of the Commissioner's plan that these police posts go into local policing. The Commissioner was keen to work with partners through the CSPs; planning for this had taken place, along with some magnificent work, to deal with some of the lower-level local issues. There would be a full supportive package, available to the CSPs with increased financial support along with the Commissioner's support and legislative convening powers therefore success would be the CSPs solving the local issues that were important to the communities across the county within 2.5 years.
- b) Councillor Daunton asked the Commissioner if he would be looking at the issue around 101 calls. The Commissioner confirmed he had already looked at this issue albeit an operational problem for the Chief Constable to resolve and this was discussed regularly with the Chief Constable; the issue was not with the initial pick-up of the call but with the triage of the call and an action plan was being worked on to make improvements within the DemandHub, there had also been a recruitment drive along with other processes being looked at. The Commissioner explained there would be national league tables for both 101 and 999 calls.
- c) Edward Leigh asked the Commissioner what would be measured within the national league tables for 101 and 999 calls and was he confident it would not have the perverse outcome of encouraging behaviours that achieve good statistics but did not address the issue (the substantial response to calls in this case). The Commissioner stated he would be interested in the national tables, and both he and the Chief Constable would be held to account over these but he was most concerned that those who dialled 999 and 101 received the absolute best service.
- d) Councillor Hogg asked for reassurance that Road Policing was a priority within the Commissioner's Plan. The Commissioner explained that Road Safety was a priority and was not just the responsibility of the constabulary. The Commissioner stated he was engaged with the Vision Zero Partnership and had already invested substantial funds into tackling speeding in conjunction with the Chief Constable and a team of special constables, fully equipped with

vehicles to carry out enforcement, which supported the work of the volunteers of Speedwatch. The Road Policing team were a collaborated unit who did a brilliant job, and the Commissioner was very keen that they were resourced appropriately. He had recently challenged the Chief Constable as the unit recently held some vacancies, to ensure these were filled. The Commissioner added the largest part to Road Safety was education, careful driving within speed limits as speeding was the number one reason for the fatalities and serious injuries sustained on the roads.

- e) Councillor Hogg stated there was a need that there was not a 'churn' in warranted officers within neighbourhood policing. The Commissioner explained that the Chief Constable had made a promise that those PCSOs (police community support officers) that left the constabulary but then became warranted police officers were then put back into the neighbourhoods that they came from, in order to keep the experience and skills developed in those communities: this has happened. The Commissioner added he would take Councillor Hogg's feedback to the Chief Constable.
- f) Councillor Sharp stated that residents were not receiving the necessary response when reporting crimes therefore they were left disappointed and unlikely to report anything in the future. Councillor Sharp also asked The Commissioner how he would improve the waiting times for court appearances within the Ministry of Justice, rehabilitation and how he would measure this if he succeeded. The Commissioner explained that regarding reporting crimes, communication was the issue therefore investment was needed into communication of honest feedback, and this would help resolve people's perception and increase confidence in policing. The Commissioner explained there was currently a review commissioned by the Home Office looking at the issues around the Criminal Justice System (probation, crown prosecution service and courts). The Commissioner stated he chaired the Criminal Justice Board which was a useful platform to make strong representations across the Criminal Justice System around improving processes, he did not have specific detail on court times but could provide this later. In Cambridgeshire Magistrate court times are normal although there is still an issue with Crown Court times, but Cambridgeshire is better than most. There is a government plan to tackle this as it was unacceptable that victims of serious crimes, particularly sexual offences, are having to wait long times for a court date, the impact and outcomes on those victims is wrong.
- g) Edward Leigh asked if the Commissioner was seeking to enlarge the role of the Commissioner in terms of having direct responsibility for probation and other areas of justice. The Commissioner stated he had responded to the review, along with the APCC who responded collectively for PCCs. He stated if it was a good fit for the public and it increased the services then he would be open to the discussion.
- h) Councillor Warren asked the Commissioner how he would encouraging local partners to intervene earlier regarding vulnerable young people. The Commissioner stated he was passionate about early intervention as it could make such a significant difference for individuals. The Commissioner was already focussed on some multi agency projects; one was in a school at St Neots to keep the school open in the evening to keep those disadvantaged children in a safe place with services in order to give them a better chance. The Commissioner explained a Serious Violence Reduction Strategy was currently being worked on by the constabulary and partners to which he would all partners to account for to drive down serious violence in the county.
- i) Councillor Collins asked how the Commissioner would tackle domestic violence and violence against women and girls and which partners would be involved. The Commissioner stated that a Strategy was currently being written which he would then hold the constabulary to account over, this was also happening within central government. The Commissioner's office was also funding and supporting numerous projects, and this would continue.

- j) Councillor Collis asked how the Commissioner saw Police Crime Sentencing and Courts Bill affecting the Plan. The Commissioner stated he was familiar with the new legislation that was currently going through the House of Lords, and he did not think that there would be any conflict. He welcomed whole life sentences for child murderers as well as other initiatives included within the Bill and supported the Bill.
- k) Councillor Bradnam asked to what degree the Commissioner was exploring the opportunities to encourage drivers locally to respect speed limits using, were there higher tech solutions that could be used to make it easier for smaller Speedwatch groups and could Speedwatch recordings lead to convictions. The Commissioner explained that he did not see this as a transfer of liability from the police to the local communities. Speedwatch do an excellent job and are well supported by the public and he would continue to fund Speedwatch. The Vision Zero Partnership also works with several partners on various initiative and the Commissioner would continue to support the partnership. If Vision Zero were aware of any technology available, then the Commissioner stated he would be keen to explore it. The education programme was the main way to tackle this issue, to try and make speeding morally wrong, the Commissioner explained he had funds available, and he would take the education programme to Vision Zero.
- l) Councillor Bywater thanked the Commissioner for his approach to CSPs and the consultations carried out as Huntingdonshire had found them helpful. CSPs were the way forward, a lot of work would be involved but Councillor Bywater welcomed this and stated he was happy to support the plan.
- m) Councillor Ferguson asked about the number of warranted officers. The Commissioner stated Cambridgeshire now had more warranted officers than ever, 1650 officers but was still an underfunded area. The government have stated the funding formula would be reviewed 2023 but the Commissioner would continue to lobby government for Cambridgeshire to receive a fair settlement.
- n) Councillor Ferguson agreed that CSPs were the way forward, but this was not apparent from the different CSP (Community Safety Partnerships) websites. The Commissioner commented that there were some excellent people working across the CSPs.
- o) Councillor Lynn asked the Commissioner what the support he would offer the CSPs. The Commissioner explained he would be supportive through engagement and his convening powers of partners. Councillor Lynn thanked the Commissioner for everything he had done for the CSPs and he was happy to support the Plan.
- p) Councillor Daunton asked the Commissioner how he would deliver ethical policing. The Commissioner explained the national uplift received from government covered ethical policing, which had become a national topic. The Chief Constable had undertaken a review in ethical policing and the Commissioner would hold him account for this.
- q) Claire George thanked the Commissioner for a clean, clear, open, and transparent Plan that clearly explained the relationship between the Commissioner and the Chief Constable.
- r) Edward Leigh agreed with Claire George and stated he had no difficulty commending an almost faultless plan and he looked forward to seeing the delivery plan.

The Panel **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan.

The Panel recommended clarification of the wording of the following points in the Plan:

- P15 "I will always support the police when they act lawfully." This perhaps needs nuance to acknowledge there is a grey area in the interpretation of the law and discretion in its application, in particular with respect to the proportionality of police actions and the public's perception of those actions (e.g. stop & search, management of protests and out-of-court disposals).

- “When standards fall short of expectations” on page 15 of the Plan should also include that the Commissioner would oversee changes that would assure that standards would not fall below expectations *in the future*.
- P34 “The capital budget is usually for spending in relation to the purchase, construction or improvement of assets such as buildings. It is a legal requirement to set a balanced budget, so that spending cannot be more than income.” The two parts of the paragraph appear contradictory, since capital spending does not have to balance within a financial year, unlike revenue spending.

The Commissioner agreed to provide the Panel with the following information:

- *Current court times*

36. Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach to Commissioning and Grants

The Panel received a report detailing the Police and Crime Commissioner's approach to commissioning and grants. The Panel was recommended to note the contents of the report.

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

- a) Councillor Bradnam asked where funding had been granted, how frequent was it monitored and would it be reported back to the panel. Nicky Phillipson, Director of Commissioning at the OPCC explained funding was monitored formally every six months. This data could not be shared with the Panel as it contained sensitive information but a link to the six-monthly report published on the website could be sent to Panel members when published.
- b) Councillor Bradnam asked how measures were assessed against indefinable milestones. The Commissioner explained that some outcomes were difficult to measure, for instance, funding mental health workers in the demand hub which was incredibly good for patients but how had it reduced demand on policing. There was always a need for professional judgement, but he was confident of the decisions made.

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

The Panel made the following recommendation:

- That the Commissioner consults with partners on how best to fund (DHRs) Domestic Homicide Reviews in the future.

37. Decisions by the Police and Crime Commissioner

The Panel received a report to enable it to review or scrutinise decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner under Section 28 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The Panel was recommended to indicate whether it would wish to further review and scrutinise the decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner taken since the previous Panel meeting.

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

The Reporting of Past Decisions

The Panel **AGREED** that decision notices would not automatically be included on Panel meeting agendas. However, if a Panel Member wishes a specific decision to be reviewed at a public meeting, s/he may notify the Secretariat within 10 working days of the decision notice being sent to all Members, and the item will be included in the agenda at the next available Panel meeting.

The Reporting of Future Decision

The Panel AGREED that it would like to receive advance notification of important areas of decision making (particularly in transformation) and asked that the OPCC (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioners) bring a new recommendation on this back to the next Panel meeting.

38. Frontline's 10th National Conference - Police (Fire) Crime Panels - Verbal Update

Councillors Bradnam, Daunton, Collis and Hogg updated the Panel Members on the recent Frontline's National Conference for Police (fire) Crime Panels held at Scarman House in Warwick they recently attended.

39. Agenda Plan and Meeting Dates

Forthcoming Meeting Dates:

21st January 2022 – Budget Briefing Session - OPCC

2nd February 2022 - Precept

16th February 2022 – if needed

23rd March 2022

	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<p>Police and Crime Commissioner's Draft Police and Crime Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough</p>	<p>The Panel AGREED to APPROVE the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan.</p> <p>The Panel recommended clarification of the wording of the following points in the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P15 "I will always support the police when they act lawfully." This perhaps needs nuance to acknowledge there is a grey area in the interpretation of the law and discretion in its application, in particular with respect to the proportionality of police actions and the public's perception of those actions (e.g. stop & search, management of protests and out-of-court disposals). • "When standards fall short of expectations" on page 15 of the Plan should also include that the Commissioner would oversee changes that would assure that standards would not fall below expectations <i>in the future</i>. • P34 "The capital budget is usually for spending in relation to the purchase, construction or improvement of assets such as buildings. It is a legal requirement to set a balanced budget, so that spending cannot be more than income." The two parts of the paragraph appear contradictory, since capital spending does not have to balance within a financial year, unlike revenue spending. <p><i>The Commissioner agreed to provide the Panel with the following information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Current court times</i>

2.	Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach to Commissioning and Grants	<p>The Panel NOTED the item</p> <p>The Panel made the following recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the Commissioner consults with partners on how best to fund (DHRs) Domestic Homicide Reviews in the future.
3.	Decisions by the Police and Crime Commissioner	<p>The Panel AGREED to NOTE the decision.</p> <p><u>The Reporting of Past Decisions</u></p> <p>The Panel AGREED that decision notices would not automatically be included on Panel meeting agendas. However, if a Panel Member wishes a specific decision to be reviewed at a public meeting, s/he may notify the Secretariat within 10 working days of the decision notice being sent to all Members, and the item will be included in the agenda at the next available Panel meeting.</p> <p><u>The Reporting of Future Decision</u></p> <p>The Panel AGREED that it would like to receive advance notification of important areas of decision making (particularly in transformation) and asked that the OPCC (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioners) bring a new recommendation on this back to the next Panel meeting.</p>

The meeting began at 1:30pm and ended at 4:00 pm

CHAIRPERSON

This page is intentionally left blank