

## **CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY**

**Date:** 01 October 2012  
**Time:** 3.00pm  
**Location:** Conference Rooms 3 & 4, Police Headquarters, Huntingdon

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

**Executive Team**  
Dorothy Gregson, Chief Executive  
John Hummersone, Treasurer  
Cristina Strood, Policy and Performance Manager  
Katie Russell, Policy Officer

**Constabulary**  
Simon Parr, Chief Constable  
John Feavoyour, Deputy Chief Constable  
Niki Howard, Director of Finance and Resources  
Kate Tonge, Head of Corporate Comms

**Members of the Public**  
Members of the public were present at the meeting.

### **1. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Matthew Lee and Nic Williams.

## **2. Declarations of Interest**

Ansar Ali declared an interest as a potential candidate for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Benjamyn Damazer declared an interest with agenda item 8 with regards to the organisational support business case.

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

The Chair welcomed members of the public and 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. Ruth Rogers informed those present 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 asked if anyone present wished to read their questions out or ask a supplementary question.

A member of public requested to ask a further question regarding the response they had received. The Chair agreed and the member of public asked why the Police Authority had not wound down its numbers of staff in the Executive Office for the transfer over to the Police and Crime Commissioner. The Chair replied that it was in statute that the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner would require a Chief Executive and a Chief Finance Officer and that the Police Authority had a legal responsibility to keep the business running until midnight on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2012.

An additional question was put to members, the member of public asked the Authority's views on what had been happening pending the elections regarding the focus on organisational support. He questioned what the Authority had done to ensure Cambridgeshire were receiving fair funding and stated that it was important to ensure the work of the Commissioner was challenged and scrutinised and displayed more transparently in public. In response, the Chair informed the member of public that at the time of the spending cuts, Police Authority members had arranged meetings with MPs along with the Deputy Chief Constable and they had made a strong case for Cambridgeshire, she stated that MPs had been receptive to their views but it had made no difference. The Chair went on to state that the Authority had improved openness and transparency in recent years and hoped that the Police and Crime Panel, who would be taking on the scrutiny role of the Commissioner, would continue to do the same.

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

None.

## **5. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2012**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2012 were accepted as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## **6. Report of the Committees and Other Activities**

The Chief Executive asked the Authority to note that the report displayed the three weeks of business since the last Full Authority. She added that further information on what had been discussed at the Interim Audit Committee on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2012 could be requested from the office. It was highlighted that the Ethical Standards Committee had given support to maintain an Integrity sub-committee.

Victor Lucas emphasised that the Police & Crime Commissioner will have a statutory duty to have due regard to the Strategic Policing Requirement (SPR) and that it should be taken to candidates at every opportunity. In response, the Chief Executive stated that she would draw down the presentation that was given by the Home Office at the SPR event and share with candidates.

### ***Resolved:***

- (i) Dorothy Gregson to share the Home Office SPR event presentation with P&CC candidates.*

## **7. Overview of Progress**

The Chair introduced the Overview of Progress report as a legacy document displaying the work the Police Authority and Constabulary had achieved. It was recognised that the change from Police Authorities to Police and Crime Commissioners was one of the biggest changes in Policing for decades and that the Home Office reasons for such change were that they wished to increase democratic accountability and they had found Police Authorities to be invisible and ineffective. The Chair asked the Authority to note the evidence in the report which showed the amount of effort the Police Authority had given in supporting and challenging the Chief Constable and his team to make sure sizeable proportions of savings in the budget were found. She added that Cambridgeshire Police Authority had also looked at business cases for collaboration with fresh eyes. The Chair expressed that she hoped the foundations that the Authority had created will form a firm basis for the Commissioner and she wished them the best.

The Chief Executive stated that the report was structured around aspects of the Police and Crime Plan and also provided an overview of collaboration work, which highlighted that collaborated functions had maintained resilience and protected the public. She added that the report brought out the partnership work that had been ongoing and also highlighted how far custody had improved compared to the past. It was noted that there were issues remaining such as call handling.

Chief Constable Simon Parr asked the Authority to note that although substantive amounts of money had come out of the budget, crime numbers had continued to go down, which was a tribute to the efforts of Police officers, PCSOs and Police staff that had experienced great upheaval in their roles. He stated that it was necessary to continue to look at different ways of working to be able to bring the most productive operational hours out of staff as possible.

The Chief Constable informed the Authority that they would continue to drive hard and work with partners to continue to improve effectiveness and efficiency.

The Chief Constable provided further information on Restorative Justice, stating that the percentage of cases dealt with by restorative justice was small but that the re-offending rate of young people dealt with by restorative justice was approximately half compared to when it was not used. It was recognised that further benefits were the time it frees up for courts and police officers, a positive outcome for victims, benefits to the community and most of all it prevents young people receiving criminal convictions for minor offences that can be dealt with more appropriately. The Chair shared that there was increasing evidence from America regarding the important part that community interventions played in reducing the number of people who needed to go to prison, reducing overall costs and increasing efficiency. She agreed to provide members with links to the relevant information.

The Authority discussed the issue of call handling and it was noted that emergency call handling was on target however issues still remained with the handling of non emergency calls. The Chief Constable asked the Authority to note that it was a balance between answering calls quickly and making sure that they spend time on the phone with someone to ensure that they have all the information they need.

The abandonment rate of calls was highlighted and the Authority questioned how confident the Constabulary were that crime had actually fallen and it was not a case that crime was not being reported due to difficulties getting through to 101. In response, the Chief Constable encouraged people to not give up on the call and stated that he did not believe that that was the reason crime figures had gone down. Deputy Chief Constable John Feavour reassured the Authority that analysis had taken place of the crimes that had been reduced and that there was no evidence to suggest it correlated with call handling issues.

Members questioned what effect call handling had had on public confidence. The Chief Constable stated that it was always difficult to pin down what influences public opinion, and they always try to deliver a good service to improve confidence. He added that a performance report would be going to the Interim Audit Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> November which would provide an update on call handling performance.

It was suggested that it would be helpful to have an update on the Victim and Offender Needs Assessment in the report.

Olive Main asked the Authority to note the marvellous job Police Officers did in the Olympics.

DCC John Feavour highlighted that procurement and stores needed to be added to the section on collaboration. He also suggested that it was worth noting Cambridgeshire's significant input into all of the collaborated units and the involvement of senior managers.

***Resolved:***

- i. To note the report*

## **8. Decisions Required by the Police and Crime Commissioner**

The Chief Executive introduced the Decisions required by the Police and Crime Commissioner report which placed important information into the public domain and allowed feedback from members regarding its content. It was recognised that the Commissioner needed to be able to hit the ground running but in the direction they wanted to go. The Chief Executive took the Authority through the key statutory decisions needed; the proposed precept, the Police and Crime Plan and collaboration agreements. She highlighted the need to understand and recreate governance processes and the need to agree a mechanism that allows information to flow between the Commissioner, Constabulary and Police and Crime Panel. She informed the Authority of the Commissioner's role to add value to partnerships and vice versa but to be careful not to duplicate work. The report highlighted the importance of having the appropriate number of staff to support the Commissioner and move issues forward.

It was noted that work was being carried out by members of the Executive Office staff to find out how the Panel plan to work with the Commissioner.

Members questioned whether there had been any further update as to the Commissioners involvement with the Criminal Justice Board (CJB). The Chief Executive informed members that the Commissioner would be invited to attend the CJB.

### ***Resolved:***

- (i) To note the report.*

Olive Main left the meeting for agenda item 9.

## **9. Injury on Duty Awards**

The Chief Constable introduced the draft Injury on Duty Awards Policy. He stated the Deputy Chief Constable John Feavyour had worked hard on the policy to ensure it was fair, lawful and open. It was recognised that poorly drafted Home Office guidance, elements of which had since been discredited as unlawful, had made the piece of work difficult for both the DCC and pensioners.

DCC John Feavyour took the Authority and members of the public through the draft policy, providing the background detail and a clear explanation of what an injury on duty award was. He asked the Authority to note, as demonstrated in the report and draft policy, that budgetary availability had not had any historical or current bearing on the process. The DCC informed the Authority that there had been considerable correspondence between the Constabulary, pensioners and the Authority and that many concerns from the pensioners had been reflected in the draft policy. He had also conducted research with stakeholders nationally, consulted with HR leads from other forces and had feedback from the Federation. It was noted that the draft policy applied to Cambridgeshire only.

DCC John Feavoyour highlighted some of the substantive issues that had been raised. Firstly there had been a concern that medical confidentiality had not been strong enough; the DCC assured the Authority that there would be no access to medical files by staff outside occupational health. Secondly, he drew attention to Regulation 37(1) at paragraph 3.8.1 of the policy, which made it clear that the Police Authority had a duty, at intervals as may be suitable, to consider whether the pensioner's degree of disablement had altered and that if it had substantially altered, the pension should be revised. It was noted that the policy sought to frame the meaning of suitable intervals and also what would amount to substantial change. He went on to update the Authority that he had made one minor change to 8.6 to include 'and regulations' to the end of the sentence.

The DCC concluded by stating that he had tried his best dealing with a complex area of policy; he also reiterated his apologies to all of the pensioners that had been affected for the obvious anxiety which they have felt despite the best efforts of the force. He recommended to the Authority that they agree the draft policy and transitional arrangements.

A representative from the Federation informed the Authority that they were supportive of the draft policy and would look forward to it being implemented.

Benjamyn Damazer thanked the DCC and all of those that had been affected and suggested that the Authority joined in with the apology given by the DCC to all pensioners. He reassured members of the public that he had never seen any financial figures in relation to the impact of injury on duty awards on overall budgets.

Following discussion the Chair apologised for the anxiety that had been caused and wanted to assure pensioners that that was never the intention. She thanked DCC John Feavoyour for the amount of effort he had put into trying to resolve difficulties and she also thanked the members of the public for attending and contributing to meetings.

It was noted that final minor changes would be delegated to the Chief Constable for the finalisation of the policy.

**Resolved:**

- i) *That the Authority note this report and in particular the background to the administration of the scheme and the review.*
- ii) *That the Authority notes the formal consultations in respect of the policy and transitional arrangements have now taken place with existing pensioners.*
- iii) *That the Authority support the draft policy and the transitional arrangements and delegates its finalisation to the Chief Constable.*
- iv) *That the Authority notes the apology that the DCC has given to our pensioners and adds its own apology to this.*
- v) *That the Authority agrees with the proposal to expedite resolution of outstanding ombudsman cases consistent with the policy.*

- vi) *That the Authority instructs the Constabulary to expedite personal updates to all of our pensioners and to resolve any grievances in line with both the detail and spirit of the policy.*

Olive Main rejoined the meeting.

## **10. Dog Unit Business Case**

Chief Constable Simon Parr introduced the Dog Unit Business Case stating that it had been through Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire's Police Authority and had been approved, however he was not happy that it created significant coverage for Cambridgeshire. The Authority was presented with a revised version of the business case which would mean that the business case would not be implemented in full, although the level of GPD and Specialist Dog capability could be reduced. It was also recommended that the Specialist Dog capability is retained in-house.

It was noted that the staged implementation would need to be captured in the collaboration agreement. It was also recognised that the second stage of implementation would go to the three Police & Crime Commissioners to decide.

DCC John Feavyour stated that an alternate location was available, the current site being at Alconbury, although a move would increase the set up costs. It was questioned whether the reduced number of dogs would be able to work on the same shift pattern as current. In response, DCC John Feavyour informed members that the reduction would reduce inactivity in the pack and surplus dogs would go to the handler or be re-homed. The Authority requested clarification on how many dogs would be reduced, to which the DCC stated that there was currently a large amount of duplication in the Specialist Dogs so they would be reduced from 28 to 5.

The Authority was happy to take the proposal forward.

### ***Resolved:***

- (i) *To note the report.*
- (ii) *To instruct Cambridgeshire Constabulary to work jointly with Bedfordshire Police and Hertfordshire Constabulary to bring about a joint unit.*
- (iii) *The approval of a formal Section 23 agreement to be delegated to the Chief Executive and Chair prior to the commencement of operations.*

## **11. Joint Engagement Strategy Update**

Kate Tonge, Head of Corporate Communications, introduced the update report on the Police Authority and Force joint engagement strategy. She stated that a single line of engagement was of underlying importance to strengthen the response to the public. The delivery of activity in the first quarter had been effective and tangible and the use of social media would

continue to be used. The Police Authority led activity had primarily focused on the transition to the Commissioner.

It was noted that the proportion of those who agree the Police are dealing with the things that matter has improved compared to last year. The satisfaction rate of victims of crime has marginally decreased compared to last year.

A lot of activity had taken place in the second quarter and the performance is being collated and evaluated.

The issue of Huntingdonshire neighbourhood panel forums no longer going ahead was raised. CC Simon Parr stated that he hoped the Commissioner would encourage interaction and that the Constabulary were currently finding other ways to engage with Huntingdonshire.

The Chair thanked Kate Tonge and Anna Horne for the work they had done to engage with potential Commissioner candidates and helping to make the public aware of the elections, she also thanked the local media for raising the awareness.

***Resolved:***

- (i) To note the report.*

**12. Date of the next meeting**

There will be no further meetings of the Full Authority.

-----  
**CHAIRMAN**

## Appendix 1

### Full Police Authority meeting, 1 October 2012 Questions and statements from members of the public

Q1. The authority's chair Ruth Rogers told Cambridgeshire County Council's Safer and Stronger Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 13th of September 2012 that the law requires the Police Authority to keep all its staff on and transfer them to a newly elected commissioner with the authority's Chief Executive automatically becoming the Commissioner's Chief of Staff. The scrutiny committee were sceptical and requested written clarification of the position, including citing the relevant legislation and providing copies of any guidance the authority has received. Could the requested clarification please be released in response to this question?

**Police Authority response:** As you have previously been advised the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 will automatically transfer staff employed by police authorities, on their existing terms and conditions, to the employment of the Commissioner on the day they take office. The relevant section of the Act is Schedule 15, Part 2. This was also outlined in the letter from the Minister of State for Policing and Criminal Justice dated 12 September 2012 and available on the Police and Crime Commissioner section of our website. I believe you have also been referred previously to the dedicated Home Office Police and Crime Commissioners website, which publishes the 'guidance' that police authorities are working to. The relevant advice is in the Home Office briefing for prospective candidates: "Have you got what it takes? Delivering through your chief executive and monitoring officer." This information has also been passed on to Cambridgeshire County Council.

Q2. Could a summary of authority's current staff numbers, costs of employment, and notice/contract periods, be provided so that it is clear to what extent the outgoing authority have tied the hands of the incoming commissioner and what staff related spending the authority has committed the commissioner to?

**Police Authority response:** The Police Authority conducts its business transparently in public. The costs of the Police Authority, including Executive Office Staffing costs, are published in the Authority's Statement of Accounts along with details of senior employee remuneration (Chief Executive and Treasurer). The table below sets out the information we are required to provide.

Post	No. of Posts (Full time equivalents)	Annual Salary/ Salary Band	Notice/Contract Period
Chief Executive	0.9	£89,300	6 months
Treasurer and Deputy Chief Executive	0.8	See below	4 months
Policy and Performance Manager	0.9	£45,537 to £50,214 (full time)	
Policy Officers	3.0	£21,099 to £23,046	
Heads of Engagement and Partnerships	1.6	£34,965 to £39,711 (full time)	
Business Support Manager	1.0	£23,799 to £25,449	
Administration	1.7	£16,938 to £18,093	
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.9</b>		

**Q3.** Could the status of the authority's treasurer in relation to the transfer of staff to the commissioner be clarified?

**Police Authority response:** The Authority's Treasurer and Deputy Chief Executive is employed on a consultancy contract. He works four days a week on average (0.8fte) and contract payments in 2011/12 were £74,825. The contract was renewed in April 2012 and will novate to the Police and Crime Commissioner who could terminate the contract. If that course of action was followed, the Commissioner would need to appoint another Chief Finance Officer as this is a statutory post.

**Statement 4:** I note the public questions from the last authority meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> of September are not yet available online on the meeting's webpage.

**Police Authority response:** The questions and answers are now available on the Police Authority website.

**Q5:** As one recommendation of the Deputy Chief Constable to the Police Authority (Agenda Item 9 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 – Draft Policy para 8.5) is “that the Authority notes the apology that I have given our pensioners”, are all members of the Authority aware of the extent and content of that apology and will the Authority make comment? For clarity, the apology contained in the circular letter to pensioners dated 20<sup>th</sup> January 2012 stated: “I know that many former colleagues have been affected with anxiety as a result of the situation, and if that includes you I send my personal and sincere apologies for any distress caused by the circumstances.” A letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> April 2012 reported this meeting with pensioners stating, “I reminded delegates that I had in my earlier letter apologised for any angst and anxiety caused through the administration of the IODA policy and I repeated that apology.”

**Police Authority response:** All Members of the Authority are aware of the detail of the apology given by the Deputy Chief Constable and the publication of your question as part of this meeting serves to further ensure that is the case. Members will of course have the opportunity to comment further when the item is discussed in the agenda.

Q6: Will members of the Authority acknowledge that in delegating matters concerning the Police (Injury Benefit) Regulations 2004 and the Cambridgeshire Police Pension Scheme to the Chief Constable it approved and maintained until today an unlawful policy relating to the injury awards of pensioners over 65 years of age?

**Police Authority response:** The Authority does not accept that it has maintained an unlawful policy up until today. Paragraph 2.7 of the Chief Constable's report to the Authority today on injury awards makes clear that the policy for pensioners over 65 "was suspended". The review which has since been undertaken has that suspension as its starting point and through the review we have come to understand the unlawfulness of certain elements of the Home Office guidance.

Q7: Will members of the Authority acknowledge that action it agreed and taken on its behalf since January 2008, in relation to injury on duty awards to pensioners at 65 year of age, resulted in significant increase in expenditure of public money caused by need for additional legal advice, additional medical opinion, additional administration by Human Resources staff, additional medical appeals and need for chief officers to deal with Pensions Ombudsman complaints and report on consultation for a new policy?

**Police Authority response:** It is a matter of fact that there has been expenditure both in cash terms as well as staff time to properly respond to issues arising out of concerns about the suspended policy. The Authority and the Constabulary have at all times applied their best efforts to administer the injury on duty award regulations and it is accepted that some pensioners do not agree with this statement.

Q8: The business case for Collisions, Tickets department (CTC) has fundamentally changed from the original business case in that there is now to be only one site in Stevenage. Has this fundamental change been put before the Police Authority or are the collaboration team acting unilaterally to introduce major changes to business cases without the authority of the Police Authority? Are the Authority aware that this would mean loss of jobs for Cambridgeshire Police Staff due to the journeys involved and the upheaval to their Work Life Balance. If Luton is not available then why cannot the second site be in Cambridgeshire? Many staff are viewing this as a Hertfordshire takeover of Cambridgeshire and Bedfordshire.

**Police Authority response:** The Police Authority Executive has been updated on these recent proposed changes to Collisions, Tickets department. Collaboration is within the agenda of the Police Authority meeting today during which the Constabulary will update the Authority on the proposed changes. Additionally they have provided the following background in response to your question.

The business case was designed to provide a level of service to the public which will be entirely unaltered by the proposed change and there will be greater savings for the strategic alliance by having one site instead of two. Indeed, the earlier thinking on number of sites suggested that one site would be the best operational solution but that a staged approach, initially using two sites would be taken. It was not thought for example that we had to find two sites to make the changes viable and in particular, sites in Bedfordshire or Hertfordshire were preferred because of the maturity of the business processes already operating in those sites. From a travelling perspective, Stevenage is closer to Cambridgeshire than Luton and has better rail links. For all of these reasons, the change is considered to be far from fundamental. The view expressed as to this being a takeover is understandable given the uncertainty faced by staff but the business case reflects important savings and improved resilience which have to be delivered to maximise funding available to front line policing.

In reviewing these changes the Police Authority is aware of the need to make savings and improve resilience. We acknowledge the adverse impact of such changes being experienced by many staff within the public sector in response to unprecedented economic times. If implemented, processes are in place to ensure the concerns are considered of all individuals affected by the changes.