

## **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel**

Date: 27<sup>th</sup> June 2023  
Time: 18:30hrs – 20:30hrs  
Venue: HQ

### **Attendees:**

- 7 independent panel members were in attendance
- Charlie Murfitt OPCC (CM)
- Matilda Henry OPCC (MH)
- Robin Sissons Cambridgeshire Constabulary (RS)
- Ciaran Constable Cambridgeshire Constabulary (CC)
- Julie McDougall-Waters Cambridgeshire Constabulary (JMW)
- Jamie Rice Cambridgeshire Constabulary (JR)
- Matt Hart Cambridgeshire Constabulary (MHrt)
- Caitlin Bones Constabulary (CB)

### **Apologies received:**

3 independent panel members gave their apologies

### **1. Introduction and apologies**

1.1 KP welcomed all attending members to HQ for this Stop & Search (S&S) session of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's Community Scrutiny Panel. All members introduced themselves as there was a new panel member.

### **2. Minutes of Previous Panel Meeting (25 April 2023)**

2.1 The minutes of the previous S&S Scrutiny Panel meeting were discussed. The minutes had been circulated by the OPCC, to all attendees, prior to attendance at this meeting. One amendment was fed back to the OPCC and it has been made. No additional comments had been received by the Chair, or the OPCC. The minutes for the Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2023 were therefore approved.

### **3. Action Updates from Previous Meeting**

- 3.1 The action log, which is shown at the end of this document covers all agreed actions and updates.

### **4. Frequent Searchers**

- 4.1 CC presented the 4 frequent searchers data for information. The most frequent users are all from Neighbourhood teams and have a focus on drugs which is what is to be expected. The force is reassured that the most frequent user has a high standard of entries.
- 4.2 One officer had a high 'nothing found', but having looked back over the last 12 months, the force did not find any trend. The panel were reassured that the force continue to monitor this.

### **5. Body Worn Video Reviews**

- 5.1 Regarding availability of BWV, all selected incidents by the Chair had BWV available.

#### **5.2 Stop & Search Review 1 – SS/1974580564/1**

Brief Circumstances: Authority was s.36 of Psychoactive Substances, with the object being to search for relevant evidence offering to supply.

The grounds presented were considered before viewing the BWV. The consensus was that the written grounds provided sufficient evidence to justify this S&S. The only comment made regarding the grounds was by SM, and she noticed that the time was not added to the grounds. CC apologised for this and added that he would ensure it is there going forward.

Following viewing of the BWV the consensus was green. The panel felt that this was a very straight forward and calm interaction. The feeling was that the encounter was justified, proportionate, necessary and ethical. There was very little conversation on this incident. One panel member however did comment that the ratio of Police Officers to suspects was imbalanced and that it was lucky the subjects were compliant and calm.

The panel member did ask why the people were searched when the objects they were looking for were large and could be seen on the seats of the vehicle. This was put down to being a thorough search and eliminating the potential of further evidence.

RAG rating: Green.

#### **4.4 Stop & Search Review 2 – SS/2137965768/3**

Brief Circumstances: Authority for S&S was S.43 Terrorism Act. The object of the search was to find an offensive weapon.

The general feeling of the panel was that the Grounds could have been improved with some information on how the individual was known to the police, as referenced. It would be useful to give context to the extent of the search and interaction of officers.

Some of the panel members felt that the female officer in this interaction, despite being the only one of the four officers to introduce herself, was slightly aggressive and could have acted with a calmer manner. The individual was clearly in distress, and they felt that her attitude could have been more recognisant of this.

MM questioned the thoroughness of the search when the Grounds stated they were looking for an explosive, as they were very thoroughly turning out pockets and looking in a tabaco packet. RS explained to the panel that he felt the officers would have been scrutinised had they not been this thorough, because although there was no evidence of an explosive, they needed to search well to ensure no smaller evidence of anything that could cause harm to the officers was present. RS added that the length of the search also allowed the officers to liaise with the individual while they were searching him and to try and establish what help it was he was referencing wanting/needing.

The consensus of the panel was that overall, the encounter was justified, proportionate, necessary and ethical.

RAG rating: The consensus of the panel was that this S&S was assessed as amber and could have been improved with a calmer approach from the female officer. Feedback to be provided to the Constabulary for consideration and action where necessary.

Breakdown of RAG rating across panel: GREEN x 2, AMBER x 4, the Chair of the panel did not vote on this one.

#### **4.5 Stop & Search Review 3 – SS/0524828178/2**

Brief Circumstances: Authority for S&S was S.1 Weapon PACE. The object of the search was to find an offensive weapon.

A few questions were raised about the written grounds and whether they provided sufficient evidence to justify this Stop & Search. The Grounds refer to 3 males and it is not clear that two are minors. CC confirmed that this may be because they were identified from CCTV and therefore it may not have been obvious that two were minors.

RA questioned appropriateness of searching each in front of the other when two of them were minors. The force confirmed that this is an appropriate scenario when there is a chance that the suspected items could have been passed onto either of the minors. As the three people got out of a car, there was a possibility this could have happened. CC also added that in a situation such as this, the parents/guardians of the children would be informed that this has taken place.

The Chair questioned what the item found was that led to the arrest mentioned in the Grounds. JR looked into this in the submitted paperwork and confirmed that they were arrested based on the match to the registration of the car that

was picked up by CCTV and the items that were seized looked similar to the reported items.

MM noted that the officer conducting the search of the 50 year old male did not fully explain rights to the search report. This needs to be fed back for improvement. KP added that the hat of this individual was removed and that this should have been done somewhere more private.

Regarding the search of the vehicle, RL raised that the search was not as thorough as it could have been as they did not remove a pushchair from the boot or the cover or spare tyre storage.

The consensus of the panel was that overall the encounter was justified, proportionate, necessary and ethical but that there are items to be noted with how the encounter was dealt with.

RAG rating: The consensus of the panel was that this S&S was assessed as amber overall. There is feedback included above to be provided to the Constabulary for consideration and action where necessary.

Breakdown of RAG rating across panel: GREEN x 1, AMBER 6

**The panel stopped here to review custody strip search, please refer to section 5. S&S reviews will continue from 4.6 afterwards.**

#### **4.6 Stop & Search Review 4 – SS/1079160099/5**

Brief Circumstances: Authority for S&S was S.23 Misuse of Drugs Act. The object of the search was to find controlled drugs – possession.

The consensus was that the written grounds provided were sufficient for the Stop and Search having viewed the BWV.

MM questioned why the driver of the car was not searched, but the Chair brought the panel back to the question on the interaction with the individual that

was searched.

The consensus of the panel was that overall, the encounter was justified, proportionate, necessary and ethical.

RAG rating: The consensus of the panel was that this S&S was assessed as Green.

Breakdown of RAG rating across panel: GREEN x 7

**4.7 Stop & Search Review 5 – SS/1942004828/1 & SS/4019730550/1**

Time did not allow for this to be scrutinised.

**4.8 Stop & Search Review 6 – SS/4114052895/1**

Time did not allow for this to be scrutinised.

**4.9 Stop & Search Review 7 – SS/2683964839/3**

Time did not allow for this to be scrutinised.

**5 Strip Search in Custody of Juveniles**

CC introduced this item as it is an experiment with panel to explore the potential of scrutinising custody, and more specifically Strip Searches of Juveniles. As the panel have not been trained on the power for this, MHrt explained it to the panel.

Section 54 of PACE gives the custody sgt the power to make a decision on what level of search they will do. When it comes to searching juveniles, this decision is around whether to strip search or not. The expectation is that other options are considered before doing this. Internally, Cambs Constabulary review all incidents of Strip Searches of Juveniles.

There have been 2 in June 2023 and these two were scrutinised as a trial and to prompt discussion on the kind of thing the panel would want to ask, and for the force to check themselves against. MHrt added that there is currently no requirement for BWV to be used, but that there is potential that further down the line this will change.

### **5.1 Entry 1: 35NT/1724/23**

Basic circumstances: section 54 pace, arrested for criminal damage and expected to have an item that may cause injury. Self-harm threat. Known to police.

For this incident there is no BWV audio to be scrutinised, so the panel were only able to view the Grounds. Additional information was given on the individual and the context as the subject is well known to the police and there are a lot of concerns for her well-being due to high risk of and previous incidents of self-harm. The panel noted that in this situation additional information is needed in the Grounds to explain that they are known to the police in order to be satisfied that the search was justified. The panel were also all in agreement that the Grounds don't address the mental health concerns the force have and that this should be included.

SM raised the concern that the Grounds suggest a potential breakdown, and therefore she questioned whether medical intervention may have avoided the need for S&S. CC explained that there had been criminal damage, as explained in the Grounds, but that once the subject was in custody there would have been medical intervention.

CC asked the panel to consider questions they have and send them in, MH offered to collate over email once panel members had the opportunity to give it some thought.

The general consensus of the panel was that in order to be able to fully scrutinise the interaction, audio was required so that you could hear the communication of the officers involved to decide whether the encounter was justified, proportionate, necessary and ethical.

### **5.2 Entry 2: 35NT/1733/23**

Basic circumstances: Section 54 PACE, items that may cause injury, cash drugs. BWV available.

CC handed out a form to see how the panel felt this could be used and whether the right questions are asked or not and what they would propose.

The first footage was CCTV from the custody cell. The panel felt this was necessary as this enabled them to confirm that an Appropriate Adult had been formally introduced to the DP prior to being strip searched. It was discussed whether or not this was necessary and whether confirmation could be included in the Grounds that an Appropriate Adult was present, but the general feeling was that CCTV was preferable.

The second piece of footage was BWV recorded in the room in which the strip search took place. Again, it was noted that audio was needed to be able to scrutinise the footage fairly.

CC confirmed that an individual removes their own clothes and the sgt searches the garments not body. MHrt confirmed that Cambs Constabulary policy is quite restrictive intentionally, as PACE guidance is quite vague.

MM raised the potential health issue of the subject as he admitted swallowing drugs. MHrt reassured that the subject physical demeanour and symptoms would be monitored throughout the strip search and then medical needs would be addressed following this. If the strip search was not carried out initially, there is potential for the subject to ingest more drugs that could be upon his person.

MM queried whether social services should be informed prior to the parents of the subject being informed. MHrt clarified it was standard procedure to inform parents first unless there was a clear care plan in place highlighting that there could be a risk to the child if the parents are informed first.

CC wrapped up by asking if the second entry was a good example of having everything you need to be able to scrutinise the incident. He also welcomed any additional questions that panel would have to raise them. MHart added that if the panel required more grounds as to why they were carrying out the strip search or the events leading up to this, it would not be a problem to give more detail.



**6 Any other Business.**

**Date of next Scrutiny Panel meetings are currently scheduled for:**

Use of Force – 25<sup>th</sup> July 2023 and will hopefully be online via MS Teams.

**Action and Decision Log: Stop & Search Community Scrutiny Panel**

Action/Decision	Date	Information	Owner	Update
<b>ACTION:</b> 23/04/25/4.6b	25/04/23	Provide feedback to the Chair to ensure that on the selection of the BWV, where possible a search is undertaken. Ref <b>SS/1384126838/1</b>	OPCC	OPCC have discussed with acting Chair – When selecting BWV consideration needs to be given to whether a search actually took place. No further action required.
<b>ACTION:</b> 23/04/25/4.7	25/04/23	Constabulary to review findings for <b>SS/1310262714/1</b> and update the panel on any subsequent action taken.	JR	24/5/23 – Feedback provided to officer and their supervisor. No further action required in relation to this S&S.
<b>ACTION:</b> 23/01/24/8.6.1	24/01/23	The Constabulary to speak to officers involved in <b>SS/3749100736/84</b> regarding the interaction being controlled temporarily by the subject (through provocation) rather than the officers.	JR	
<b>ACTION:</b> 23/01/24/8.5.2	24/01/23	The Constabulary to review the findings of the Panel for <b>SS/3379797349/4</b> and update the panel on any subsequent action taken.	JR	

ACTION: 23/01/24/8.5.1	24/01/23	The Constabulary to verify if corresponding UoF report completed for <b>SS/3379797349/4</b> with feedback to officer if not completed.	JR	
ACTION: 23/01/24/8.4	24/01/23	The Constabulary to review the findings of the Panel for <b>SS/3379797349/1</b> & <b>SS/3379797349/3</b> and update the panel on any subsequent action taken.	JR	
ACTION: 23/01/24/3.3	24/01/23	Explore options for increased scrutiny, covering other aspects of policing such as Sect 136 Mental Health, Domestic Abuse incidents and taser use.	JH & RS	
ACTION:22/10/25/5.1	25/10/22	Explore benefits of having a CSP presentation to be used during training of new recruits.  RS has approached the training team and they are more than happy for this to be incorporated into their training. They suggest that a video would be good as it provides more flexibility on when they show it and will have less impact on the panel / gives consistency in delivery and	RS	Action ongoing - 24/01/23

		is a contingency for times the panel can't make it.		
ACTION:22/10/25/3.2	25/10/22	Look at alternative for under-16's to get involved with scrutiny – possibly through Youth Panels.	JH	Action ongoing - 24/01/23 MH still exploring this option.
ACTION: 22/08/23/2.1	23/08/22	Minutes of S&S Scrutiny Panel to be published on the Police & Crime Commissioners Website. A conversation took place around whether members would be willing to have names and faces appear on the website. General consensus was yes. JH will send consent form around to all panel members, via AG.	OPCC	Constabulary happy to have presentation on website.  Consent form has been signed by all members who have attended meetings since 23/08/22.
ACTION:22/10/25/7.6.2	25/10/22	Explore why BWV is not started when entering premises during Section 8 warrant to pre-empt any possible S&S incidents.	RS	Action closed – 24/01/23
ACTION:22/10/25/7.6.1	25/10/22	The Constabulary to review the findings of the Panel for SS/3702843619/1 and update the panel on any subsequent action taken.	JR	Action closed – 24/01/23

ACTION:22/10/25/7.4	25/10/22	The Constabulary to review the findings of the Panel for SS/0128078458/10 and update the panel on any subsequent action taken.	JR	Action closed – 24/01/23
ACTION:22/10/25/7.3	25/10/22	The Constabulary to review the findings of the Panel for SS/1966200011/45 and update the panel on any subsequent action taken.	JR	Action closed – 24/01/23
DECISION:22/10/25/6.5	25/10/22	AG suggested that calling notices include; Minutes of previous meeting (including Action & Decisions Log); Constabulary data; Summary of monthly statistics; Frequent Searcher report.	OPCC	Action closed – 24/01/23
ACTION:22/10/25/4.1	25/10/22	Explore ways of wider sharing 'Good Practice' using positively rated BWV.	RS	Action closed – 24/01/23
ACTION:22/08/23/10.1	23/08/22	Grounds Assessment Criteria to be printed and made available at all panel meetings.	AG OPCC	Action closed – 24/01/23
DECISION: 22/08/23/6.0	23/08/22	Data will be shared in advance of the meeting and only questions raised in advance will be addressed in the panel.	AG	Action closed – 24/01/23

		Looking to share data quarterly?		
ACTION: 22/08/23/1.3	23/08/22	Chair to speak to the Constabulary to consider the scope of their requirements in relation to the Use of Force in Custody. Update from AI needed.	AG	Action closed – 24/01/23