

Panel date:	19/12/2024
Number of panel members in attendance:	18 including the panel chairs and vice-chair
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Caitlin Bones (CB), Steve Kerridge (SK), Dean Wiffin (DF), Jack Priestman (JP), Sean Feline (SF)</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Heather Sheldon (HS), Charlie Murfitt (CM)</i>
Agenda item 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minutes to the meeting on the 27th July were circulated prior to this meeting and agreed. N.B. During the July meeting, a schedule change was agreed resulting in a one-off, longer gap between stop and search meetings. The new schedule provides a better rotation of themes and does not impact on the regularity of each theme.
Agenda item 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop search data was presented to the panel, summarising total of stop searches in November 2024 and a breakdown of age, ethnicity, reason for search and outcome.
Agenda item 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An introduction and overview of tonight’s theme of Adultification was given Tonight’s theme was chosen following a report by the IOPC and the Co-Chair was keen to feed back to the IOPC on this meeting’s findings. Education on unconscious bias was suggested.
Minutes & AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The date for the next Stop & Search Scenario Day will be shared once this is known. SK highlighted that ethnicity was discussed in detail at this meeting. The National Director of the Police Race Action Plan carried out an inspection at Cambridgeshire Constabulary and therefore SK was keen to feedback to the panel, the value these meetings bring and the relevance and importance of discussing specific themes. Action: Police Race Action Plan to be circulated.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SK thanked the panel members for their participation and the OPCC for their support throughout 2024 and extended thanks to the OPCC Co-Chairs and Vice Chair. • HS thanked the Constabulary and the panel. HS added that there was tremendous value in looking at the age group of U18 as the future generation and by having the conversations this can bring positive change and make the difference.
Date of next meeting	Thursday 30 th January 2025 - HQ

Incident 1			
Review Date:	19/12/2024	BWV reference:	SS/0572363364/2
Incident Date:	19/11/2024	Incident time:	22:00

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?	
<p>Overview: Stop Search took place outside Serpentine Green, Peterborough following up on missing person reports of two regularly missing 13-year-old females. Missing persons were found and searched for glass which had been reported as on their person. Bladed article.</p> <p>Comments: All panel members were content with the grounds.</p>	
Grounds RAG rating:	Green 100%

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several panel members felt the situation escalated due to the other male officer raising his voice and the male officer shouting at girl and telling her to behave did not help to calm her down. • Who was the lady in suede boots?

CB: A Mental Health Nurse Practitioner who attend mental health related calls with response officers on most late shifts and a range of other shifts over the weekend. Work is underway to arrange attendance during additional shift patterns.

- The camera angle was quite high and therefore did not capture the incident and maybe missing key footage. Are the officers conscious of this?
- The officers wear gloves to protect themselves, however the material of the gloves is insufficient when searching for sharp items and possibly bladed articles.
- The incident occurred in a public place so the officer shouldn't have told the member of the public who was filming not to film, despite the subject being a minor.
- The camera wasn't that clear when focusing on the subject.
- The male police officer shouted which wasn't helpful and was disproportionate to the situation.
- It wasn't clear whether the bystander was filming the police or the subject.
- One panel member suggested if the girls were working together, the officers need to look at causality, taking into consideration county lines and other potential influences.
- One panel member observed that the girls could be scared by the male officers. A female officer should have stepped in and a sympathetic and empathetic officer should have taken the lead, with help of mental health nurse.
- One panel member suggested the female officer shouldn't have asked if the girl would like to speak to the mental health advisor as the girls understanding of what that means could be limited, they don't know what they don't know.
- Were the girls known to the police? The officer may have behaved differently if they were known.

CB: Yes they were known to police.

- Were they going home after?

CB: They would have been going back to their place of residence.

- Was the search carried out by a female officer as this wasn't clear from the video.

CB: Yes a female officer carried out the search.

- There seemed to be a lack of conversation from officers whilst the search was being carried out.

SK addressed the comments made regarding the shouting. On this occasion it wasn't felt that the officer shouting changed or exasperated the attitude of the subject in this case.

SK clarified with regards to the search, that until the officers are satisfied the subject doesn't have sharp objects on them, the mental health nurse would not be allowed near to them. In addition, the gloves give protection from blood borne infections, they do not necessarily protect sharp objects. The alternative would be leather gloves however this would possibly scare some.

SK discussed a query around adultification and stated that it is right and proper that officers are challenged and that they recognise how they talk with children, even if they are already known to officers.

Overall RAG rating:	Green 67% - Amber 33%
----------------------------	-----------------------

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:	19/12/2024	BWV reference:	SS/0936265605/3
Incident Date:	11/11/2024	Incident time:	04:20

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: 17-year-old male seen to be selling drugs on council operated CCTV in Peterborough.

Comments:

- What does J.O.G stand for – Jacket / Outer Clothing / Gloves.
- CB welcomed feedback on the quality of the grounds as these would be provided to parents if requested.
 - If the grounds are given to the parents, don't use acronyms
 - The reference to '1090 cameras' is confusing.
- One panel member commented that they believed the grounds wouldn't stand in court. A conversation followed between panel members and there was a general consensus that as members of the public, scrutiny of the grounds should not include legal considerations.

Grounds RAG rating:	Green 36% - Amber 67%
----------------------------	-----------------------

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Several members noticed that the officers are bare armed and only wearing thin gloves to search.
- The BWV isn't very clear, there was very little of the person being chased and tackled.
- The general consensus was that the use of force appeared disproportionate on the suspect. It did not seem necessary or appropriate and at the beginning, the subject protested that he was vulnerable which seemed to be ignored.
- The person in the fleece was identified as a Detective Inspector.
- The searching officer was talking through the search process but then appeared to stop talking. Talking calms people down.
- A panel member observed that was a member of public shouting at the side to say he was a child, so the search wasn't out of the view despite the grounds saying he was taken to one side.
- The situation seemed like it was escalating. It could have been made to feel more relaxed.
- Multiple officers holding the subject down however the more officers there, the safer it is potentially.

- It looked like the officer's knee was on the back/neck of the subject.
SK: the number of officers involved is a fine balance. The knee is there for support and protection but on this occasion it did appear to move too close to the subject. The hand is also interesting, it is to avoid neck injury if struggling on floor, but these were good observations.

Overall RAG rating: Green 35% - Amber 59% - Red 6%

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:

- Proportionality to be feedback to officers**

Feedback:

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

Name:

Date:

Incident 3

Review Date:	19/12/2024	BWV reference:	SS/2426978634/12
Incident Date:	08/11/2024	Incident time:	21:00

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: 15-year-old male has run away when seeing the patrol vehicle. The officer has caught up with the male and engaged with them, however the officer was suspicious of

their nervous behaviour, along with the area in which they were in which is known to be a sex worker/drug dealing area.

Comments:

- The grounds have improved a great deal since the Community Scrutiny Panel began in 2021
- The officer should be commended for the thorough and clear grounds.
- Good Grounds
- Why was this person chosen when there were so many listed in the grounds?

CB: The subject had been seen loitering in several different places.

Grounds RAG rating:	Green 100%
----------------------------	------------

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- There are too many people talking at beginning of video.
- To a 15-year-old, having that many people involved would be intimidating
- There was an error in the length of time the copy of the search is available for, it is 90 days not six months as stated by the officer.
- A minor wouldn't understand GOWISELY and it was spoken through too quick.
- One female officer was chewing gum which didn't look very professional.
- One officer stated that the subject was giving off 'dodgy vibes' which wasn't a good thing to be saying to the subject.
- One panel member noticed that the subjects bank card was flashed in front of the camera and had concerns about bank details being leaked.
- The search was well talked through, but another officer was shouting over them.
- Some panel members thought the handcuffs were on for too long after the search was finished.

JP: Although the search did not find anything, on occasions the officers are waiting for the force control room to confirm that the subject isn't wanted in connection with anything else therefore they wait to remove the cuffs until then.

- It was difficult to follow at times and overwhelming.
- The subject's face was showing in the BWV, compared to the other incidents viewed during this meeting.

CB: Footage isn't redacted for panel meetings therefore it is likely that the BWV in the other incidents was out of position which is why it might differ to this footage.

