



Panel date:	27/03/2025
Number of panel members in attendance:	11 Panel members including the two co-chairs and vice chair
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Steve Kerridge (SK), Caitlin Bones (CB)</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Heather Sheldon (HS), Charie Murfitt (CM), Charlotte Cramp (CC)</i>
Agenda item 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charlotte Cramp, new Communities Policy Officer for OPCC provided a brief introduction to panel members and gave an overview of her job role and reason for attending this meeting. • The minutes from the December meeting were agreed as true and accurate and signed off. • Actions from the previous meeting were completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Police Race Action Plan circulated ○ Proportionality of Use of Force fed back to officers ○ Officer commended for thorough stop search • Following the previous meeting where adultification was the theme, KP fed back to the IOPC. Thanks was received, with the IOPC commenting on the proactive work regarding adultification. • CM highlighted the value of previous scrutiny by the panel following an incident which took place recently. This involved a police car being struck whilst officers dealt with a roadside incident, with the officers narrowly avoiding serious injury. Previously, the panel had fed back to the Constabulary the importance of where officers stood whilst dealing with roadside incidents as in the BWV, the officers were positioned in a dangerous location. It is feedback like this which shows the difference the panel can make.
Agenda item 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The theme for this meeting was ‘Young Black and Asian

	<p>People who were stopped and searched where nothing was found and the outcome was no further action.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data presented for this theme showed of 168 stop searches in February 2025, 58 had an item found. A comparison was also provided on the Cambridgeshire find rate against the national find rate. • Of these, 74 were on people under 25 years of age and 15 had nothing found • Data was also provided on all searches where nothing was found.
Minutes & AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was asked if the data shared suggested Cambridgeshire performed better compared against the national average, due to the higher find rate percentage. CB: Nationally, all forces are being compared and therefore there will be varying find rates, however Cambridgeshire Constabulary were commended in the PEEL report for having one of the highest find rates. This could also be attributed to the quality of the grounds. • SK added that although the figures may seem low, they have improved significantly. Legislation has not changed however scrutiny has and so have expectations. • It was asked how many Section 60 searches (without suspicion searches) had been carried out. SK/CB: There have been no section 60 searches. If a search was to be carried out under section 60, immediate scrutiny would take place via the command chain. • A recap was also given as to what may constitute a reason for stopping and searching under section 60.
Date of next meetings	<p>Custody - Thursday 24th April Online Vehicle Stops – Thursday 8th May Online AGM - Thursday 15th May HQ Use of Force – *New Date* Thursday 5th June HQ Stop and Search - Thursday 26th June Online Stop Search Scenario Day – Wednesday 30th April Monks Wood</p>

Incident 1			
Review Date:	27/03/2025	BWV reference:	SS/4104610957/12
Incident Date:	15/02/2025	Incident time:	23:30

Grounds: Written Assessment			
Did the grounds provide sufficient evidence that a reasonable person would have concluded, on an objective basis, that the stop and search should be undertaken?			
Overview: Male stopped and searched after refusing to give name following reports of a group seen with knives and firearms in Peterborough City Centre.			
Comments:			
Comprehensive Grounds			
There was a slight discretion with the time written on the grounds, and the time on the BWV.			
It may have been helpful if the officer had written why he was suspecting the subject was in possession of a weapon.			
If there was a group of 16, why was only one person searched? CB: There were several officers at the scene and therefore others were searched, but just not seen on this BWV.			
Future theme could be where there has been an incident with multiple people and therefore multiple stop and searches. Would be interesting to see how the officers handle the situation.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
The officer put in the grounds that the subject would not give their name, however this part of the interaction cannot be heard in the BWV.
Why was this incident shown rather than the one with the argumentative subject. CB: The videos are randomly selected.
It was not clear if the officer checked the subject's hood or ankles. This was verified to have been carried out by other panel members, the hood was checked and the officer then patted down the legs.

The officer should have asked the subject to remove their jacket as it was bulky.
 The officer did not search far enough into the groin area for hidden weapons which was an issue at an incident in Bedford, where a subject had been searched and subsequently arrested, however in custody, a further search led to a firearm being found in the groin area.

A calm search explained well.

Having attended Scenario Days, sometimes student officers are apprehensive in searching the groin area.

The search would not have found a small knife, however it would have found a machete or firearm which was what was listed as suspected in the grounds.

Officer very calm and professional.

Good communication between officers.

The search seemed too quick and barely adequate.

The officer was curt with the subject so could have built more of a rapport.

The search seemed very efficient and quick, how quickly do searches get conducted?

CB: Although this isn't recorded, it all depends on circumstances, grounds and surroundings.

The officer maintained professionalism and calmness which could have helped keep the subject calm and willing to answer questions.

The officer could have carried out a more thorough search and asked the subject to remove the jacket.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:
----------------------------	--------------------	---------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:
<i>Eg – feedback to officer as the most basic</i>	<i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i>

Name:	Date:
--------------	--------------

Incident 2			
Review Date:	27/03/2025	BWV reference:	SS/2814940576/8
Incident Date:	15/02/2025	Incident time:	23:47

Grounds: Written Assessment			
Did the grounds provide sufficient evidence that a reasonable person would have concluded, on an objective basis, that the stop and search should be undertaken?			
Overview: Female stopped and searched following reports of a group seen with knives and firearms in Peterborough City Centre.			
Comments:			
Clarification was sought on coding used in the grounds.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IC3 is code for black • 1090 is CCTV 			
Clarification was sought on the use of 'IC' coding. SK: IC Codes are not widely used any longer.			
Plain English would be preferred in the grounds as the coding is not understood by all.			
Clear grounds.			
The grounds were good and concise.			
Strong written grounds.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<p>The officer did very well.</p> <p>On incident one, the interaction was very curt however this officer was very friendly during the interaction.</p> <p>The search was easier on this occasion as the jacket was removed and the outfit was tight fitting.</p> <p>Good search.</p> <p>The camera was not aimed correctly and therefore it was difficult to see the search properly as it was pointing in the wrong direction. CB: The camera is attached to the officer's outerwear and therefore the officer cannot reposition it. Even if they could, in the</p>

heat of the moment they may not think to. However, there was another officer there to provide back-up.

How often is the camera technology reviewed? **CB:** The BWV devices are reviewed regularly and have come a long way since their initial rollout. The main barrier to upgrading the cameras is funding.

The officer made good contact and was very friendly.

There was good rapport with the subject and good professionalism.

They were calm and friendly.

It was an efficient search.

The officer provided clear answers to the subject's questions.

Good rapport and interaction.

Good rapport and friendly.

Great communication with a good sense of humour.

It was difficult to see the quality of the search due to the camera angle.

The officer had a good rapport with the person being searched and there were no concerns.

The officer was professional yet friendly.

Overall RAG rating:

Green: 100%

Amber:

Red:

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:

Eg – feedback to officer as the most basic

Feedback:

Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23

Name:

Date:

Incident 3			
Review Date:	27/03/2025	BWV reference:	SS/2110419886/4
Incident Date:	23/02/2025	Incident time:	01:45

Grounds: Written Assessment			
Did the grounds provide sufficient evidence that a reasonable person would have concluded, on an objective basis, that the stop and search should be undertaken?			
Overview: Incident related stop search. Following reports a vehicle had been stolen, officers saw a group of males jump over a fence and into another car park and appeared to have no reason to be there.			
Comments: Clear grounds. Good response time. Clear and comprehensive written grounds.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<p>One of the officers said “turn them over” which did not seem an appropriate choice of language. SK: This phrase is quite possibly one from years ago which has been passed down and down again.</p> <p>Does the younger generation have the same interpretation of the phrase as the older generation do? KP: Many of the younger generation would understand what the phrase meant and may feel intimidated by it.</p> <p>The search was a little perfunctory.</p> <p>The officer did not seem completely focussed on the subject he was searching.</p> <p>The video was not turned on until the search had started.</p> <p>The officer could have been slightly friendlier.</p> <p>Looking at the facial expression, the person looked like they could be hiding something.</p> <p>The officer did not ask the subject to take their jacket off.</p> <p>Officers in this interaction seemed more excited than the officers in the earlier incident.</p> <p>SK: A deep breath and calm down would be a reasonable expectation.</p>

The subjects had just been seen jumping over a fence where the reported stolen car had been found, which could be the reason for the excitement and so the officers did well in the circumstances.

The interaction was fine and the officer was ok.

The interaction was nice however it could have been explained slightly better to help have the subject be more on their side.

The subjects were children so why are they out at that time of night, were they missing from home? **CB:** They were returned to where they were residing following the interaction.

SK: A safeguarding viewpoint follows incidents like this, looking at the wider context. After the incident, the officer will think about what the necessary course of action is and how can they be helped.

Is there a law for teenagers to be in by a certain time in this country? **SK:** In the UK, there is no curfew however, courts can impose curfews. Adult offenders, such as burglars who predominantly commit crime at night, will have conditions imposed so as not to be able go out at night.

CB: With the justification of stopping searching individuals, does the panel agree that all four subjects should have been searched in this scenario? The panel agreed that as all four had been seen coming away from the location of the stolen vehicle, it was justified to search them all.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 64%	Amber: 36%	Red:
----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
<i>Eg – feedback to officer as the most basic</i>	<i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i>
Name:	Date:

Incident 4			
Review Date:	27/03/2025	BWV reference:	SS/2217684564/10
Incident Date:	19/03/2025	Incident time:	14:30

Grounds: Written Assessment			
Did the grounds provide sufficient evidence that a reasonable person would have concluded, on an objective basis, that the stop and search should be undertaken?			
Overview: A member of the public reported that an Audi A3 with several occupants was parked in a car park, and the occupants were smoking drugs.			
Comments: Good grounds. Strong written grounds.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<p>Was the subject given a warning? CB: The officers didn't on this occasion</p> <p>Was the subject fit to drive, did the officers do a drug swipe. CB: The officers didn't on this occasion. Not all officers are trained to carry these out.</p> <p>The subjects may have a positive reaction in future as this was a good interaction.</p> <p>SK: Had there been nothing found at all, even though they were intoxicated it was the right thing to do to stop them.</p> <p>Great rapport between the officer and subject.</p> <p>There were very good interpersonal skills displayed by the officer and excellent communication.</p> <p>Unsure if GOWISELY was heard in its entirety.</p> <p>Good friendly approach.</p> <p>The level of detail the officer gave the subject about the circumstances that led them to perform a stop and search along with how chatty the officer was may not have been viewed by the member of the public who reported the subjects very well. The member of the public may have become nervous about being confronted as they were not many people in the area at the time.</p>

The context of the stop/search was explained well.			
Overall RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
<i>Eg – feedback to officer as the most basic</i>	<i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i>
Name:	Date:

Incident 5			
Review Date:	27/03/2025	BWV reference:	SS/2827849532/4
Incident Date:	06/02/2025	Incident time:	20:15

Grounds: Written Assessment
Did the grounds provide sufficient evidence that a reasonable person would have concluded, on an objective basis, that the stop and search should be undertaken?
Overview: On Hotspot patrols, officers noticed a stationery car with two males sat inside. One male was recognised for having previously been stopped and searched with a positive result.
Comments: There were good written grounds, however the stop/search did not seem justified. SK: Some of the grounds were not justified reasons for stop search. It was the cannabis in the

vehicle that justified the search.

The grounds were not as strong as they could have been.

The grounds were clear, however it was not stated that there was a search of the vehicle.

CB: The grounds should have stated that there was a search on the subject and the vehicle. There is a discretion between the grounds and the search outcome.

Is the person searched the driver or passenger? **CB:** It appears the driver and passenger may have swapped seats during the interaction, however it is the driver being searched.

Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 82%	Amber: 18%	Red:
----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

Did the officer go through GOWISELY? The initial contact could have been done by the other officer. **SK:** If GOWISELY was not given, this will get fed back to the officer.

The officer was not relaxed initially but got better as the interaction went on.

If the subject is the driver, why haven't the officers carried out a drugs test? **SK:** The officer would have to perform grounds that they believed the subject had consumed drugs. The search at that point does not suggest there are grounds. If there had been some suggestion, they could have done a wipe.

The officer seemed to handle the evidence quite a lot rather than putting it to one side and dealing with it after.

The interaction appeared messy although the rapport improved.

The officers' interpersonal skills could have been better.

The officer did not identify themselves.

The officer handled the subject better as the interaction went on.

Good rapport.

The resolution of the stop was justified.

The car was searched but this was not stated in the grounds.

There was not a lot of detail provided as to why they were stop/searched.

The searches were cooperative.

Clear explanation given of the community remedy issued and the implication of what would happen next time.

SK: The outcome seems proportionate to the situation based on the grounds and what was found, however it would be good to delve a bit deeper into how the officer arrived at the decision.

It was suggested that feedback could be provided following the meeting so that issues that have been raised are clarified.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 55%	Amber: 45%	Red:
----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

--

Actions arising:

Feedback:

- Feedback to be provided to the panel regarding points made:*
- *GOWISELY*
 - *The explanation of the Community Remedy*
 - *Car search missing from grounds*

Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23

Name:

Date: