

## **Minutes from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel**

### **4<sup>th</sup> Use of Force Community Scrutiny Panel Meeting**

**Date:** 28<sup>th</sup> June 2022

**Time:** 18:30 – 20:30

**Venue:** Parkside Police Station, Cambridge

#### **Attendees:**

- 7 independent panel members
- Superintendent Robin Sissons - Cambridgeshire Constabulary via Teams (RS)
- Inspector Jamie Rice – Cambridgeshire Constabulary via Teams (JR)
- Sergeant Ciaran Constable – Cambridgeshire Constabulary (CC)
- PC Julie McDougall-Waters - Cambridgeshire Constabulary (JM-W)
- Jack Hudson – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (JH)
- Charmaine Christie – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (CCh)

#### **Welcome and Introduction**

AG welcomed members of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel (the “Panel”) to the scrutiny meeting of Cambridgeshire Constabulary’s (the “Constabulary”) Use of Force (UoF) powers.

Panel members, and attendees from the Constabulary and Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), introduced themselves.

#### **Minutes of the previous Use of Force meeting**

The Panel agreed the minutes from the previous UoF meeting. The minutes were signed off by AG.

The Panel discussed Actions from the previous meeting and agreed that, going forward, a response from the Constabulary after initial Panel feedback is not required, unless specifically requested.

## **Use of Force Presentation**

JW-D provided a PowerPoint presentation to the Panel, detailing the meeting agenda, Body Worn Video (BWV) footage availability, UoF ratings, and BWV grounds.

***ACTION: There is a column missing on the UoF BWV footage table. Can this be rectified? (For Constabulary)***

***(Chair's Note Post Meeting: Feedback has since been received from the Constabulary on 30th June 2022 informing the Panel of changes underway to include a single check box for BWV captured against each UoF record rather than the individual UoF per record. Above Action Closed)***

## **Use of Force Scrutiny**

All Panel members had a scrutiny pack including information to aid their scrutiny of the BWVs. These included:

- Code of Ethics summary (from the College of Policing's website)
- UoF Assessment and Rating sheet (one for each BWV shown), including the 'PLANTER' assessment ('PLANTER' being the mnemonic used to assess the interaction between the police force and the person subject to the use of force)
- UoF legal powers
- Grounds for use of force (one for each BWV shown)

Multiple BWVs were shown for some of the incidents scrutinised. Following the viewing of each incident, EW asked Panel members for their views on the UoF encounter, using the assessment sheet as a guide.

## **Incident 1**

JM-W provided background information to the relating incident. One BWV was viewed – Entry 70 UD/1933479576/8 03/05/2022.

Brief description of incident: Adult, Asian male was seen in an area known for drug dealing and officer could smell cannabis. Male was in possession of drugs. Male was subject to stop and search. Handcuffs used.

The Panel agreed that the overall rating was: **Green 2**.

Panel and Chair comments and feedback can be seen in Appendix 1.

***ACTION: The Panel would like to know why the officer deemed it necessary to handcuff the male, as he appeared compliant? Feedback requested. (For Constabulary)***

***FEEDBACK: The BWV could have started earlier. (For Constabulary)***

The Constabulary explained that officers are encouraged to use handcuffs when conducting a search in order to protect themselves, especially in circumstances such as this, where they will be crouched down in order to conduct a search and are therefore left vulnerable. Panel agreed the logic but sought further clarity from the individual officer.

### **Incident 2**

JM-W provided background information to the relating incident. Two BWVs were viewed – Entry 456 UF/3402262539/4 20/05/2022 and Entry 454 UF/3379797349/11 20/05/2022.

Brief description of incident: Child, Black female was arrested for Actual Bodily Harm against another. Possible mental health issues. Handcuffs and unarmed skills used.

The Panel agreed that the overall rating was **Amber 5**.

Panel and Chair comments and feedback can be seen in Appendix 2.

### **Incident 3**

JM-W provided background information to the relating incident. Two BWVs were viewed – Entry 596 UF/1180389196/30 and Entry 597 UF/1093067072/3 26/05/2022.

Brief description of incident: Report made to police of a group of males arguing. One male reported to have a knife and to be making threats to another. Males run from officers on their attendance. Officer red dots child, Black male matching description of male in possession of a knife. Male searched and knife and drugs found. Taser red dot and handcuffs used.

The Panel agreed that the overall rating was **Green 1**.

Panel and Chair comments and feedback can be seen in Appendix 3.

#### **Incident 4**

JM-W provided background information to the relating incident. One BWV viewed - Entry 236 UF/0241441404/7 11/05/2022.

Brief description of incident: Report of high-risk missing child making threats to overdose and threats towards another. Possible mental health issues. Child, White female located by officers. Unarmed skills used.

The Panel agreed that the overall rating was **Green 3**.

Panel and Chair comments and feedback can be seen in Appendix 4.

***ACTION: The Panel would like to know why the Sergeant present took the approach that he did? Feedback requested. (For Constabulary)***

***FEEDBACK: The Panel would like to commend the female officer present for their approach in dealing with the subject. (For Constabulary)***

Appendices 1, 2, 3 and 4 are attached.

**(Chairs Note Post Meeting: Following review of last UoF minutes dated 28<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and reflecting against observations in this meeting, Panel notes a tendency for officers to opt for UoF rather than explore further de-escalation when dealing with minors. On several occasions, it has been noted that the application of UoF has provoked an aggravated response. Panel would like to understand the initial and ongoing training that is provided for officers when dealing with minors, particularly in consideration of de-escalation techniques.)**

***ACTION: From Chair Post Meeting - Constabulary is to comment on training in de-escalation techniques when dealing with minors. (For Constabulary)***

### **Any Other Business**

The Panel discussed the current structure of the UoF scrutiny sessions and agreed they are suitable. No changes required at this time.

RS and JR thanked the Panel for their input. From this meeting they have deduced that there is a need for the Constabulary to look at the way in which incidents are managed when there is more than one officer in attendance, i.e., the need for one officer to take the lead.

***ACTION: Constabulary to feedback to Panel thoughts surrounding the application of a pre-brief and formalising a teamed approach to arrests and interactions. (For Constabulary)***

AG advised the Panel that there is now a Community Scrutiny Panel presence on the OPCC website.

***ACTION: Chair to provide written feedback to OPCC on website page. (For Chair)***

**End of meeting.**