



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
ON 1 FEBRUARY 2023**

**Members Present:** Edward Leigh (Chair), Claire George (Vice-Chair), Councillors A Bradnam, C Hogg, A Sharp, D Jones, M Beuttell, S Ferguson, SA Hart, S Warren, and Count

**Officers Present:**

Jane Webb	Senior Democratic Services Officer, Police and Crime, Peterborough City Council
Rochelle Tapping	Monitoring Officer, Peterborough City Council
Charlotte Cameron	Democratic Services Officer, Peterborough City Council

**Others Present:**

Darryl Preston	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner
Jim Haylett	Chief Executive OPCC
Matthew Warren	Chief Finance Officer OPCC
Nick Dean	Chief Constable, Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Jon Lee	Chief Finance Officer, Cambridgeshire Constabulary

**40. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Gilderdale and Tierney.

**41. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were declared.

**42. Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 November 2022**

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2022 were agreed as an accurate record subject to the following amendments:

Paragraph 25, first line – deletion of the words “that it was”

Paragraph 31, section (d), lines 4 and 5 - the word “depravation” to be amended to “deprivation”.

**43. Review Actions and Recommendations from the previous meeting**

The Commissioner addressed points/questions raised at the previous meeting:

*Solar energy at Milton Park & Ride Site/New Police Build* – This was actively being looked at with local partners.

*Safer Streets Funding regarding cameras and domestic burglaries* – Too early for any statistics but cameras were preventative and domestic burglary within Cambridgeshire had reduced significantly.

*Video doorbells* – The Commissioner met with Councillor Tierney and provided an update.

*Community Members* – Community concerns were now able to be reported via a link which should have been circulated to all Members

*Wet Film Processing in Speed Cameras* – As of three years ago, cameras were now digital.

*Community Safety Partnerships* – Local Authorities hold CSPs (Community Safety Partnerships) to account and there was some great work being done by some of the CSPs to keep communities safe.

#### 44. **Public Questions/Statements**

There had been one late submission received but the author did not finalise the process in time for the statement to be submitted. The author did not attend the meeting.

#### 45. **Precept Report 2023/24**

The Panel received a report on the proposed policing precept element of the Council Tax precept for 2023/24. The Panel were recommended to review and make a report or recommendation on the proposed precept.

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

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

1. Edward Leigh thanked the Commissioner and his staff for the pre-brief, presentation, and detailed, comprehensive report for the panel.
2. Councillor Ferguson stated there had been a 60% decrease in survey responses this year; what had gone wrong? The Commissioner stated that the survey did not go wrong but that everyone had struggled with surveys this year. The survey had changed, it had asked for feedback, and this may have put residents off from completing the survey.
3. Councillor Bradnam asked what the consequences would be if the Commissioner did not receive the proposed precept and asked how many officers were currently in the force and what the Commissioner was doing to retain these officers. The Commissioner reiterated that Police officers would not be lost therefore it would be support staff who were integral to the frontline service delivery of the police. The Chief Constable stated the force was currently 33 short of the target of 1732 officers. Investment had been made into the retention of new officers by the development and implementation of two Continuous Professional Development Units (CPDUs), one in Parkside and another in Thorpe Wood. These units were led by experienced staff (Inspector, two Sergeants, coaches, and HR (Human Resources) professionals), who worked alongside the officers' shifts. The CPDUs also had Detective Sergeants and Detective Constables who mentored the detective officer input. Considerable investment had gone into developing the Positive Action Team and a

technological onboarding app to attract officers and maintain their interest with the force as they moved through the selection process.

4. Councillor Bradnam stated that the new recruits were of an average age of 25/26 and faced situations that could have an effect on their mental health; what was the Chief Constable doing to ensure the recruits were sufficiently supported. The Chief Constable stated that the CPDUs contained a Wellbeing connection; the app and link on each officers' desktop allowed access to advice from financial to emotional support. There were also Wellbeing Champions available, a People and Professional Department, a number of employment-assisted schemes, a chaplaincy support network. The Chief Constable also stated that every officer that was assaulted, which unfortunately was every day, the Chief Constable personally contacted and spoke to.
5. Councillor Hogg asked the Commissioner if his current Deputy gave value for money and had the Commissioner passed on any elements of his role onto the Deputy. The Commissioner stated the Deputy was a part time role and assured the Panel that the Deputy did what was asked of him. The Commissioner stated he had made it clear from the beginning that he would not be giving specific legislative designated responsibilities to his deputy. The current Deputy stood in and contributed to a number of strategic meetings, including the Combined Authority and was active in local community groups within Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. The Commissioner stated he was happy to bring back more information in the future.
6. Councillor Sharp thanked the Commissioner's office for the comprehensive report and asked the Commissioner if he was satisfied that officers had appropriate accommodation in the northern part of the county. Councillor Sharp also asked that with the future pressures on the budget, how confident was the Commissioner that he could achieve a balanced budget. Jon Lee responded stating that since Covid, Copse Court had been purchased, modernised, and served the northern area alongside Thorpe Wood and Huntingdon. Jon Lee explained that after the operational costs of the current schemes had been incurred and each project realised then the capital spending needed to be kept under review.
7. Councillor Jones questioned the perception of policing. The Chief Constable explained that the Estates Strategy had been refreshed, alongside a new Agile Strategy and the Engagement Strategy. The force was at the forefront of the Serious and Organised Crime Strategy around the Clear Hold and Build Strategy which was implemented in Peterborough. Policing was unique in that call taking was still held within the county but there was some necessary upgraded technology that was needed before 2024.
8. Edward Leigh asked for clarification on which calls would be routed out of the county. The Chief Constable explained that overflow 999 calls from other counties were routed into the Cambridgeshire control room, which added pressure. The Chief Constable could not recall when a 999 call had been routed out of Cambridgeshire into another county. 101 were held within the county and not routed therefore everything remained within the county.
9. Councillor Hart thanked the Commissioner for his comprehensive report and asked what areas of need would prove difficult to respond to even if the precept was agreed. The Commissioner stated that Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) was a national priority. The Chief Constable explained there was a Deputy Chief Constable responsible for the national strategy of VAWG, Cambridgeshire force was well engaged with the national scene and the HMIC Inspection rated this particular strand as good. Cambridgeshire also had a sound multi agency safeguarding hub and worked well with partners around the safeguarding of individuals. The OPCC had brought in a considerable amount of money under the Safer Streets scheme, which aligned to VAWG.
10. Councillor Hart asked about the mental health needs across the county and how police responded when called to those types of incidents. The Chief Constable stated that a national piece of work had been carried out on the demand placed on police, and this had

shown that the number of incidents with a reference to mental health, had not increased, but the time taken to respond to these incidents had increased, as it was the handover time to the health service that had taken up police time. The police work well with the health service, there was now a mental health car, which consisted of a police officer and a mental health professional, which toured the county and responded to incidents of mental health which reduced the time that police officers spent on these incidents. The Chief Constable stated there would be consequences on both the police and health services, if the local authorities split both children's services and adult services, presently there was a coordinated single approach but going forward there would be further pressures and discussions needed to happen as a statutory partner across children's services.

11. Councillor Hogg asked the Commissioner if the Charity Embrace still had the lease on Copse Court. The Commissioner explained that Embrace leased rooms at Copse Court, which was ideal as it meant they worked closely with the child protection team and victims' hub.
12. Councillor Hogg stated that the recent change to home working had decreased sickness, increased productivity, and asked if the police had investigated this regarding call handling to maximise work output. The Commissioner explained that how the Demand Hub was operational and therefore a responsibility of the Chief Constable and added that call handlers for the police did more than just 'handle' calls, they undertook significant training and had as much knowledge as a police officer. The Chief Constable explained that the role of the call handlers covered many disciplines, and he had a duty of care to them; he also explained that the current technology did not allow for the role to be undertaken remotely but the new telephony system due to be introduced, included an agile stream that would allow for home working. The Chief Constable thanked those that worked in the Demand Hub, as they had consistently gone into the office throughout the pandemic, dealing with some stressful situations.
13. Councillor Bradnam asked whether the single online home was a website or the demand hub. The Chief Constable explained that it was a website that gave a single point of entry to your own police force which had produced some savings, was effective and was a very good system.
14. Councillor Bradnam asked the Commissioner if he had an update on the central government funding of Domestic Homicide Reviews. The Commissioner stated the national review was still ongoing, but he would find out when it was due to end.
15. Councillor Count stated that it would cost Cambridgeshire County Council an extra £8.5m to separate adult and children's services from Peterborough City Council and asked the Chief Constable if discussions had taken place about how this would impact the police. Councillor Count added that at Cambridgeshire County Council, the mental health service was understaffed due to the inability to fill vacancies and in the new budget a £150,000 block had been put on these vacancies, therefore they would remain understaffed, he asked if these discussions/impacts had taken place with the constabulary. The Commissioner stated that no one had approached him directly about the issue although he was aware of it. He added, previously when the service had been split between the county and unitary authority, the same meeting was attended twice; for partners (police, probation, and fire) this had a significant impact. The Commissioner explained that it was statutory responsibility for all partners to consider crime and disorder in their decision making. The Chief Constable added he had been informed of the split, not consulted, the police had raised their concerns, but the inevitable split was to happen anyway. He was concerned the police were a statutory partner with one safeguarding board, one MASH (Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub) with single point of contact, now splitting into two.
16. Councillor Hogg added that Peterborough councillors had received an email from their Chief Executive, on Monday 30 January, outlining that this was going out to consultation, and he

was happy to discuss with the Chief Executive if this consultation was to include the constabulary.

17. Councillor Count referred to the report regarding 80% of police work was not crime related and asked therefore what areas they related to. The Chief Constable stated these were concerns for safety that did not reach the threshold of crime. Edward Leigh stated the Panel needed to have a clearer understanding of the proportion of calls that should fall to other agencies to show the areas where the police were 'stepping' in to fill the gaps.
18. Councillor Count also queried the full time equivalent and part time figures. The Chief Constable assured the panel that the police had policies around flexible and agile working, parental and dependency leave. The influx of new recruits would have swayed the percentage towards full time, as they would all be full time officers, but he would look into the numbers of full time equivalent to head count.
19. Councillor Jones asked the Commissioner about his thoughts around the report stating that officer pay, and allowances would not increase by much given the rate of inflation. The Commissioner stated the pay assumption was not realistic, but this was within the government's spending review which dictated the grants allocated to the constabulary. The Panel should be assured that the Chief Constable was aware of future spending and would ensure that provision was allocated but this was a worry and a concern on the budget.
20. Councillor Hogg asked that if the loss of £300,000 from council collections was improving or increasing. The Commissioner stated he presumed, with the cost-of-living crisis, that this was a situation that would get worse. Jon Lee explained £200,000 surplus had been forecasted but this had swung to a £300,000 deficit, the funding section of the report showed additional local council tax support grant received on the back of covid, which underpinned the deficit whilst it recovered. The economic climate did elevate the risk for future years around ongoing deficits.
21. Edward Leigh stated it would be useful for the Panel to understand what further collaborations the police envisaged in the next financial year as this could potentially be a source of future savings.
22. Edward Leigh stated that in a high inflation environment where the value of money was decreased and the interest rate was below the rate of inflation, money lost its value whilst sat in an account, therefore it was better to borrow and spend now rather than save and spend later, particular with construction inflation.
23. Edward Leigh stated that the central government grant and the formula used was repeatedly under discussion and the constabulary were clearly seeking a fairer formula for the region. There were many aspects of Cambridgeshire that were unique, particularly Cambridge with the biomedical campus, the high employment led growth which drove a demand for housing. There was a large homelessness problem and a large student population which created different demands. Edward Leigh asked if there was anything the Panel could do to reinforce the Commissioner's appeal to government for a fairer funding formula.
24. Edward Leigh concluded that as the precept increase could not be deferred and the medium term forecast for the budget showed a large deficit, even for the next year and growing in subsequent years meant the challenges faced in balancing the budget in future years was already severe enough for it to be impossible for the Panel to do anything other than to support the Commissioner's request for the full precept this year in order that the situation did not worsen in the future.

The Panel unanimously **AGREED** to **NOT** exercise its veto power over the precept increase proposed by the Commissioner.

*The Panel made a recommendation for the Commissioner to report back to the Panel on the discussions and consultation the Commissioner had been involved in regarding the future of adult and children’s social care services and the impact any changes may have on policing.*

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

**46. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan**

<b>DATES</b>	<b>ITEMS</b>
<b>15 MARCH 2023</b> <b>1:30pm</b> <b>Bourges/Viersen Rooms</b> <b>Town Hall</b> <b>Peterborough</b>	<b>Public Questions</b> <b>Approach to Comms &amp; Engagement</b> <b>Putting Communities First (Ensuring local concerns are addressed)</b> <b>Trust in Policing – Culture Statement</b> <b>OPCC – Forward Plan (Final Year)</b> <b>Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan</b>
<b>19 JULY 2023 - AGM</b> <b>1:30pm</b> <b>Bourges/Viersen Rooms</b> <b>Town Hall</b> <b>Peterborough</b>	<b>Public Questions</b>  <b>Review of Complaints</b>  <b>Police and Crime Commissioner’s Annual Report</b>  <b>Integrity in Policing</b>  <b>Rules of Procedure/Panel Arrangements</b>  <b>Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Annual Report</b> <b>Administration Costs &amp; Member Expenses</b>  <b>Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan</b>
<b>13 SEPTEMBER 2023</b> <b>1:30pm</b> <b>Civic Suite</b> <b>Huntingdonshire District Council</b>  <b>Huntingdon</b>	<b>Public Questions</b>  <b>Serious Violence Strategy</b>  <b>Harm to Hope Drug Strategy</b>  <b>High Harms Board</b>  <b>Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan</b>
<b>29 NOVEMBER 2023</b> <b>1:30pm</b>  <b>Civic Suite</b>	<b>Public Questions</b>  <b>Commissioning and Grants</b>  <b>OPCC – Forward Plan</b>

Huntingdonshire District Council  Huntingdon	Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan
31 JANUARY 2024  1:30pm  Civic Suite Huntingdonshire District Council  Huntingdon	Public Questions  Precept Report 2024/2025 (full meeting – given importance) OPCC – Forward Plan  Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan
14 FEBRUARY 2024  1:30pm  TBC	If needed (Veto)
13 MARCH 2024  1:30pm  TBC	Public Questions  Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan

The meeting began at 1:30pm and ended at 3:50pm  
CHAIRPERSON

ITEM	ACTION
1. Precept Report 2023/24	The Panel unanimously <b>AGREED</b> to <b>NOT</b> exercise its veto power over the precept increase proposed by the Commissioner.  <i>The Panel made a recommendation for the Commissioner to report back to the Panel on the discussions and consultation the Commissioner had been involved in regarding the future of adult and children's social care services and the impact any changes may have on policing.</i>
2. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan	The Panel <b>NOTED</b> the forthcoming meeting dates and added <b>Trust in Policing – Culture Statement</b> to the March agenda.

