

## **CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY**

**Date:** 07 September 2012  
**Time:** 10.30am  
**Location:** Conference Rooms 1 & 2, Police Headquarters, Huntingdon

**Members** Ruth Rogers, (Chair)  
Victor Lucas, (Vice Chair)  
Ansar Ali,  
John Batchelor,  
John Clark,  
Shona Johnstone,  
Ruth Joyce,  
Nazim Khan,  
Matthew Lee,  
Olive Main,  
Viv McGuire,  
John Reynolds,  
Kevin Wilkins,  
Nic Williams,  
Jayne Wright

**Executive Team** Dorothy Gregson, Chief Executive  
John Hummersone, Treasurer  
Katie Russell, Policy Officer

**Constabulary** Simon Parr, Chief Constable  
John Feavour, Deputy Chief Constable  
Niki Howard, Director of Finance and Resources  
Simon Megicks, Detective Superintendent

Deputy Chief Constable John Feavour asked members to defer the Injury on Duty Awards (IODAs) agenda item. He stated that he had been reviewing the policy for some time and had kept IODA holders involved in the process. However, the report presented at the meeting had not been the same draft version that had been sent to IODA holders for comment, as he had updated the policy informed by the inputs he had received. He added that this had caused significant concern and that it would therefore be inappropriate to ask members to consider the report. He informed members that he would share with IODA holders the new version of the policy. The Authority agreed that the proposed policy would be brought back for consideration at the next meeting.

## **1. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Benjamyn Damazer and John Pye.

## **2. Declarations of Interest**

Ansar Ali and Shona Johnstone declared their interest as potential candidates for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Ansar Ali also declared an interest as a member of Unison.

## **3. Questions and statements from members of the public**

The Chair welcomed members of the public and thanked them for taking an interest in the work of the Authority. She announced that 15 minutes would be allocated for questions in line with Standing Orders. It was noted that the Authority had received a significant number of questions and a request to make a statement from members of the public. Ruth Rogers informed members of the public that hard copies of all of the questions for consideration at the meeting (Appendix 1 of minutes), with the Police Authority's responses, had been placed on chairs and would also be published on the Police Authority website.

She noted that a number of questions had been received on organisational support. Those who had posed the questions indicated that they did not wish to speak and were content to receive the written response. Ruth Rogers explained that concerns would be considered in the full business case. She reminded members of the public that the organisational support decision would be taken by the three Police and Crime Commissioners.

Mr Chamberlain read his question to the Authority regarding the timing of the meeting and further to the written response provided; Ruth Rogers added that Police Authority Standing Orders allowed members of the public to ask questions and receive a response whether they were able to attend the meeting or not.

Mr Beckett introduced himself to the Authority and informed them that he had been injured in police service, and as a result had been forced to retire. He stated that he had attended the last People and Professional Standards Committee meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2012 and had advised members then not to follow ACPO advice and raised concerns that crimes may have been committed in the handling of the policy. At that meeting, DCC John Feavour had requested for the relevant information to be provided to himself. Mr Beckett informed the Authority that he had recently submitted the letter to DCC John Feavour and asked that members take full note of the letter. In response, DCC John Feavour stated that he would give the letter careful consideration.

## **4. Items proposed as matters of urgent business**

None.

## **5. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2012 were accepted as a correct record, subject to an amendment to page 6 to include Kevin Wilkins to have voted against the amended resolution, and it was noted these would be signed by the Chairman once the amendment had been made.

## **6. Roads Policing Unit Business Case**

The Chair reminded the Authority that the Road Policing Business Case had been taken through the Finance & Resources Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012 and members recommended approval to the Full Authority with finalisation of the Section 23 agreement delegated to the Authority Chairman and the Chief Executive. DCC John Feavoyour informed the Authority that the business case proposed to bring together Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire into a collaborated Roads Policing Unit; the functions of the unit would remain the same and the savings would be achieved by the consolidation of resources and locations and staff efficiencies.

He informed members that there would be a reduction of 28 constables and 8 sergeants and the Cambridgeshire base would be at Huntingdon Police HQ not St Ives as indicated in the report. Members questioned whether the reduction in officers would affect operational performance. DCC John Feavoyour stated that he was confident in the demand data analysis which allowed for the core remit of the service to be delivered 80% of the time, with additional input from cross board support or other Cambridgeshire Officers at other times.

It was noted that it was common practice to support other surrounding forces in critical incidents and that the collaboration would not exclude that practice.

The committee agreed the business case and instructed Cambridgeshire Constabulary to work with Hertfordshire Constabulary and Bedfordshire Police to bring about a joint unit. The Authority agreed for a formal s.23 agreement to be delegated for signing to the Chief executive and Chair prior to the commencement of formal operations.

### ***Resolved:***

- (i) That the Authority instructs Bedfordshire Police, Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Hertfordshire Constabulary to work to bring about a Joint Roads Policing Unit as set out in the outline business case presented.*
- (ii) That members delegate the approval of a Roads Policing Unit Section 23 agreement to their Police Authority Chief Executive and Chairman.*

## **7. Injury on Duty Awards**

This item was deferred until the next meeting in October 2012.

### ***Resolved:***

- (i) DCC John Feavyour to collate the concerns and comments of pensioners and present them alongside the proposed policy at the next Full Authority meeting.*

## **8. Performance Update**

Chief Constable Simon Parr introduced the performance update report which put in context the data within the performance report, to help understand the progress against the local policing plan priorities. He noted that the Constabulary had faced a very busy time over the summer period with events such as the Jubilee and Olympics, resulting in some members of staff not being in their correct post since the implementation of OpRedesign. CC Simon Parr stated that he was happy with the figures which showed a continued trend of crime numbers going down even against such a demanding backdrop.

He informed the Authority that despite a reduction in funding, public satisfaction had increased slightly compared to last year to 70.9%. He added that work continued to build even stronger relationships with communities to promote public confidence.

The Constabulary continued to look at drivers of what makes victims satisfied to ensure a greater level of understanding in order to improve performance. He recognised that the Victim and Offender Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (V&ONA) would aid the development of Police and Crime Plan and bring out key areas that needed improvement.

The Authority was told that Special Constable numbers were set at 300 and two further intakes in September and January would achieve that level. It was noted that the high level of interest in the role showed that the public wanted to be involved in policing and that it was helping recruitment to maintain Constable numbers.

CC Simon Parr informed the Authority that Local Area Commanders had been tasked to focus on the issues which were on the radar of communities, including driving down the prevalence of Anti-Social Behaviour.

He stated that the Constabulary continued to bring down the overall level of crime and reduce the crimes with a victim even though spending continued to fall. He added that they would continue with a threat, risk and harm approach to victims in order to protect the public.

There had been signs of improvement in performance for the detection of domestic violence and hate crime since the Domestic Abuse Investigations and Safeguarding Unit went live in April 2012.

Finally, the performance of call handling was discussed. CC Simon Parr made the Authority aware that last year performance had been affected and there had been a reduction in

service due to a £2m budget cut. Members were reassured that the Constabulary continued to prioritise emergency calls and the performance in emergency call handling had improved to 92% from last year. The initial handling of non-emergency call handling had improved to 89% of calls being answered within the target time, compared to 86% last year. Also, subsequent waiting times after the initial answer had reduced. It was noted that the Constabulary continue to look at innovative and cost-effective ways to improve the service further.

Members questioned why voice recognition software was not performing as well as expected. CC Simon Parr stated that the system had so far failed to deliver the expected reduction in the volume of non-emergency calls handled in the Police Service Centre (PSC). He informed members that work was currently being undertaken to improve the effectiveness of the technology and it was being monitored closely.

The report also provided data and information on how the implementation of taser was being used across the three collaborated forces.

Olive Main stated that the issue of diesel theft had been highlighted at a Neighbourhood meetings as a key issue for rural areas. In response, CC Simon Parr stated that rural policing teams had been refocused to prioritise the issue and discussions were also taking place with landowners to gather intelligence.

The issue of officers and staff on long-term sickness was discussed. The Authority were told that Cambridgeshire compared well to other forces and had been working with the federation and medical practitioners to take a more vigorous approach to the matter. They were informed that 44 officers were currently on long term sickness and a rigorous assessment would take place to see if they were able to return to work, if not the appropriate steps would be taken.

Victor Lucas raised the issue that Huntingdonshire were changing their current neighbourhood panel arrangements and the scheme would result in no traditional neighbourhood forums taking place. CC Simon Parr reassured members he was confident the Local Area Commanders engagement strategy went beyond the forums, with additional engagement in areas such as leisure centres and cafes. He added that they were continuing to communicate with Huntingdonshire District Council to ensure they continued to work together.

The benefits and key points of restorative justice were discussed. The Authority was informed that some of the benefits are that offenders are dealt with very quickly and the victims were able to decide if the remedy given was appropriate. It was recognised that if the officer's judgement, that the offender was not a long term risk, was being made correctly than this could prevent the criminalising of a generation of young people. An early indication of the rate of re-offending was good. DCC John Feavoyour offered to provide the Police Authority Executive Office with information that they had currently obtained.

Detective Superintendent Simon Megicks informed the Authority that work was on-going nationally to understand what the repeat rate for domestic abuse cases meant, whether it was a good or bad indicator. He explained that the increase in the detection of repeat

offending could mean that the victim had gained confidence in reporting to the police. He added that domestic violence was a multi-agency approach which provided the maximum opportunity for intervention.

**Resolved:**

- (i) *To note the report.*

**9. Thematic Review of Performance against Local Policing Plan – Keeping People Safe**

Ruth Rogers stated she was pleased to introduce the report and Det. Supt Simon Megicks highlighted the on-going work to “keep people safe”. He advised the Authority that the new Multi-Agency Referral Unit (MARU) based at Chord Park gave the opportunity to align referral pathways across agencies and also enable information to be accessed in a timely manner in order to take action quickly. He informed members that they were working with the County Council and Peterborough City Council to discuss how to further develop safeguarding processes. They also had support from probation and the NHS, who all recognised that effective criminal justice intervention was often the best way to safeguard.

He asked members to note that as part of the change in process there had been an increase in recording of incidents. The detections in domestic abuse crimes had risen from 433 last year to 603. The MARU was looking to have independent domestic violence advocates housed with Officers at Chord Park. He advised the Authority that the rape investigation team had been consolidated which enabled crimes to be responded to quickly and special teams had been formed to support victims.

Members questioned whether Peterborough would be joining the MARU. In response, Simon Megicks stated that the unit being based in Cambridgeshire proved to be a challenge for Peterborough, although work would continue with them and they were in negotiations regarding child protection and domestic abuse. He assured members that protocols existed with other cross border agencies and domestic abuse was being prioritised by the emerging Health and Wellbeing Boards. It was noted that ensuring efficient and effective information sharing with other agencies was still a challenge; process mapping was being carried out to look at parallel work streams and remove redundant processes.

The Authority discussed a new ‘Stop the Hurt’ programme which had been part funded by the Constabulary. Its aim was to support perpetrators of domestic violence identified either through the criminal justice system or other ways and to try to intervene in the cycle of abuse. Simon Megicks also made members aware that a consultation was out to change the definition of domestic abuse to include those 16 year olds plus.

**Resolved:**

- (i) *To note the report.*

## **10. Review of All Stops Proportionality**

The Authority received a report that had been commissioned by the Constabulary to understand the ways stop and search activity is undertaken. It provided an independent review of this important issue. It was noted that the conclusion of the data collected stated that, "...It is important to emphasise that the differences do not reach even moderate levels and based on the methodological approach taken herein, they do not suggest signs of an institutional bias."

CC Simon Parr reassured members that they would continue to reflect on and revise tactics appropriately. DCC John Feavoyour added that the data would continue to be analysed and the assessment was designed to illustrate that the analysis is a matter of routine.

***Resolved:***

- (i) *To note the report.*

## **11. Report of the Committees and Panels**

Dorothy Gregson introduced the report which updated the Authority on the business of the various committee and panel meetings that had taken place since the last Full Authority meeting.

Ansar Ali added to the summary of the Custody Visitors Panel held on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2012 that ICV panels had welcomed the proposal to continue post November 2012 and it hoped to continue to enjoy the same relationship with the Commissioner.

It was recognised that it was important to have transparency of the BCH Strategic Alliance Joint Working Group, hence the inclusion of its work in the report, although it was emphasised that the group was not a decision making body.

Ruth Rogers informed members that the Home Office had announced that the Commissioner would now have until 31<sup>st</sup> January to notify the proposed precept to the Police and Crime Panel. She added that the Finance & Resources agenda had ensured a lot of information was now available for potential candidates.

***Resolved:***

- (i) *To note the report.*

## **12. Transition Progress Update**

The Transition to Police and Crime Commissioner Update report informed the Authority of the approach taken to engage with potential candidates and progress on implementation of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.

Dorothy Gregson informed members that the Police Authority was strategically moving forward well and the Finance & Resources Committee had brought out the element of work for the Police and Crime Plan so it was now clearly and transparently in the public domain. It was recognised that the Victim and Offender Needs Assessment had given a different perspective to add to previous strategic assessment work.

The Authority was informed that work was on-going to promote knowledge of the election as public understanding remained low. It was noted that the linkage with candidates was increasing and that any information given to one candidate would be shared with all candidates. Candidates were also able to request one to one meetings with the Chief Executive.

Matthew Lee notified the Authority that it was his last meeting and thanked the Police Authority members and executive for all of their support. He highlighted that the minutes of all Committee meetings would need to be archived, he suggested the Peterborough County Hall facilities should be used. Dorothy Gregson stated that she was linking with the British Library but asked Matthew Lee to provide contact details for the County Hall so that the potential of local archiving could also be archived locally.

***Resolved:***

- (i) Matthew Lee to provide Dorothy Gregson with contact details for the County Hall archive.*

**Date of the next meeting**

Confirmed as Monday 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 at 3.00pm, Conference Rooms 3 & 4

-----  
**CHAIRMAN**

## Appendix A

### Cambridgeshire Police Authority meeting 7<sup>th</sup> September 2012

#### Questions: Organisational Support

**Q1./Q16.** Are the members of the PA aware of the answer G4S gave in relation to the Lincs OJEU notice/bid application under the heading 'Has the company been investigated at any time for HR abuse?'

**Q8.** Members of the public highlighted ethical problems with G4S both at home and abroad at the last meeting, what have the Police Authority done to investigate these problems?

**Q19.** Members of the Public and the media highlighted ethical problems with G4S both at home and abroad at the last meeting, what have the Police Authority done to investigate these problems in the context of the OJEU notice for the Lincolnshire Framework Agreement/Outsourcing and due diligence with the business case being worked up?

*Answer:- In reply to ethical questions about the contractor the Authority's response is that:- The Strategic Policing Alliance will review the standing of any company before any decision to sign a contract. This would include HR aspects and a contract would not be signed unless sufficient assurance as to the standing of the company had been received.*

---

**Q2.** What is Plan 'B'?

**Q3/Q22.** Is it true that the proposed budget for 2013/14 has been balanced? If so, why are the Police Authority still working up the 5a option?

*Answer:- In reply to questions about Plan B and the budget already being balanced the Authority's response is that:-*

*The report to the Finance and Resources Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012 on the Medium Term Financial Plan 2013/17 presented broad options (a 'Plan B') for delivery of savings to balance the budget for 2013/14. The areas to be considered are police overtime; police staff; training; supplies and services (ICT); air support; collaboration; and capital financing. These options will need to be fleshed out with the incoming Police and Crime Commissioner. Whilst the report to the Committee presented these broad options for the delivery of savings ('Plan B') to balance the 2013/14 budget (if the Organisational Support work was delayed or abandoned), the structural deficit remains to be addressed. Significant additional savings are still to be found.*

**Q4. Will the Chief/Police Authority confirm that in regards to the final option, the decision will be made by the incoming Police Crime Commissioner?**

*Answer: - The Full Business Case will be developed for final decision by the Police and Crime Commissioner after 22 November 2012.*

---

**Q5. What are the assurances G4S have given in relation to the joint Chief's concerns post June 28<sup>th</sup>?**

**Q9. In the light of the recent decision by the Chief Constables of Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire to suspend work on the Outsourcing Business Plan to seek assurances around G4S's ability to deliver support services against the background of the Olympics, is it morally correct that the Joint Working Group have recommended that work to complete a full business case will continue without sending that recommendation back to a full Police Authority Meeting?**

**Q10. UNISON are often told that the JWG is not a decision making body, so is it right that the JWG made this decision without referring back to the Full Police Authority?**

**Q12. Are the Police Authority Members satisfied with the assurances given by G4S (which were discussed at the recent JWG) which they have not yet seen as far as UNISON are aware? If not, are the Police Authority Members going to challenge these assurances on behalf to the citizens of Cambridgeshire**

**Q13. What assurances have G4S given in relation to the concerns raised by the three Chief Constables post June 28<sup>th</sup>? G4S are not going to tell the Chief Constables they are unable to adequately meet the requirements of the contract, in the same way they gave assurances to LOCOG and then failed to meet the requirements to LOCOG.**

**Q18. What are the assurances G4S have given in relation to the Joint Chief Constables concerns as widely reported and what were the joint Chief Constables concerns post-June 28<sup>th</sup> 2012?**

*Answer:- In reply to questions about the Chief Constables' concerns, the responses from G4S, and the consideration of these matters by the Joint Working Group, the Authority's response is as follows:-*

*The three Chief Constables raised concerns with G4S regarding the ability of the Lincolnshire/G4S contract to meet the specific organisational support needs of the BCH strategic alliance, as opposed to those of Lincolnshire. Following further work between the constabularies and G4S the three Chief Constables gained satisfactory assurances that there could be enough flexibility and scope within the contract to continue negotiations, e.g. locating any shared services centre within the BCH boundaries.*

*The Authority appoints Members to various working groups. One of these is the Alliance Joint Working Group which scrutinises proposals for, and the development of, collaboration across three Forces. The Joint Working Group is not a decision making body and for Cambridgeshire*

*the appointed members are the Chairman, Ruth Rogers, Vice-Chairman Victor Lucas and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Finance and Resources Committee, Shona Johnstone and Matthew Lee.*

*At the Working Group's August meeting it heard the result of the Chief Constables' further work with G4S and agreed that there should not be a recommendation to the three Authorities to reverse the June decision to develop the Full Business Case. The areas of concern will be covered in the Full Business Case which will inform the final decision made by the Police and Crime Commissioner.*

---

**Q6. Will any shared services be contractually run from the 3 counties with no option to move outside the 3 counties in the future?**

**Q14. Can you confirm that any and all outsourced services will be run from offices (complete with senior outsource provider managers working at them) within one of the 3 Counties and that any outsource provider will be contractually bound to maintain such arrangements for the entire length of the contract?**

*Answer:- In reply to questions about the location of a shared service centre the Authority's response is that:-*

*G4S has provided assurances that any shared service centre set up in due course for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire would be based within the three counties. The detail of this will form part of any contract developed following approval of the Full Business Case.*

---

**Q7. Why has there not yet been any Public Consultation as stated at the June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting?**

*Answer:- Cambridgeshire Police Authority will seek to undertake public engagement to ensure that when the Full Business Case is presented to the Police and Crime Commissioner, the views of the public and other stakeholders are presented at the same time. Staff engagement continues together with updates to the Authority in public.*

---

**Q11. With the adverse reaction to the Olympics, would the decision made by the Full Police Authority on June 28th 2012 have been the same had the members been aware of the problems faced by G4S, which, according to media reports were known but not publicised until early July?**

*Answer:- The Olympics issues did not change the content of the outline business case. It has however emphasised that a robust and Full Business Case must be produced, underpinned by appropriate contractual safeguards, for a decision to be taken to move forward with any contract of this magnitude.*

---

**Q17. A recent decision has been made to include fewer work streams into the full business case for potential outsource so that they can be leveraged into the Lincolnshire**

**framework contract with the known failings of G4S. If this is approved we have a piece meal solution with potential multiple, conflicting and damaging contracts in other work streams going forward into the future. How can this be in the interests of the people of Cambridgeshire? If the decision is to nevertheless pursue a potential outsource why are the Police Authority not investigating the option of a bespoke contract to meet the needs of the 3 counties? Is this a race to the bottom for short term savings regardless of the quality of the outcome?"**

***Answer:- These issues will have to be considered within the Full Business Case.***

---

**Cambridgeshire Police Authority meeting  
7<sup>th</sup> September, 2012**

**Questions: Other**

**Although I am employed by Cambridgeshire Constabulary I am still a resident of Cambridgeshire, I am fully aware that the Public may attend Police Authority Meetings and table any questions that they might have. With regards to the police authority meeting why are we having these at 10.30 in the morning and not at a more reasonable time say 19.30 allowing members of the public to attend as most people work and 15 minutes should also be extended and the meeting advertised more.**

**Answer:** The Police Authority welcomes involvement from members of the public and members of staff. Our meetings are advertised both on our website and on Twitter.

Our meetings allow business to be undertaken in public. They are not public meetings. Police Authority members regularly attend and present at neighbourhood meetings which are held in the evening to allow a wider group of people to attend.

We also want to ensure that if people wish to comment, in person, on how our business is undertaken they have the opportunity to do so. Our Standing Orders make provision for this and at Authority meetings 'any member of the public may ask questions of or make a statement to the Police Authority relevant to its business'.

Members of the public are asked to submit questions or statements in advance wherever possible to ensure accurate and meaningful response.

As in any business meeting there is much official and formal business on the agenda to discuss in a managed timeframe. As stated in Standing Order 6 (2) 'if the agenda permits, questions received on the day may be permitted at the Chairman's discretion. However, members of the public are advised that it may not be possible to provide a meaningful response on the day without further research, in which case a written response will be provided within three working days.'

It is recognised that it is not always possible for people to attend in order to ask a question or make a statement, because of their personal circumstances. Provision is therefore made in our Standing Orders that 'if a person putting a question is not present the answer as reported to the Authority shall be sent to such persons following the meeting'.

Comments and questions can be sent to us via our website, by email or letter. We aim to respond in a timely way.