

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel

Custody Detention Capture Document



Panel date:	29/01/2026
Number of panel members in attendance:	11
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Caitlin Bones, Inclusion & Legitimacy Co-ordinator, Inspector Nick Stubbs</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Matilda Pearson, Senior Policy Officer & Charlie Murfitt, Office Manager</i>
Previous Minutes and Actions	Previous minutes had been circulated in advance and no queries raised to these have been taken as approved.
	Action 1 Constabulary to feedback to local authority re the need for secure accommodation. This has been highlighted to the Youth Justice Board, as a finding from the Community Scrutiny Panel, that there is a need for a secure PACE bed locally. For context, there is a national shortage of secure PACE bed provision. The latest update given at panel 29/01/26 is that this remains a topic at YJB as that is the appropriate multiagency network to be discussing this. Keep this action live and update where possible.
	ACTION 2 From 25/07/25 meeting entry 2290. The Constabulary were asked to look into to look why this was not recorded as a late review and/or if the review was not late why did it take an hour for the juvenile to be booked in. Update for 23/10/25: None provided. Update for 29/01/26: Update requested and will be shared once provided. Update for 26/05/2026: From Inspector GORE: It was not a late review, it did take a considerable amount of

	time to book the juvenile in as they were not prioritised. Comms did go out after this to remind custody staff that a quick RA should be conducted of everyone that enters the custody suite, this will allow them to understand if they are juvenile or have additional needs and if that is the case they should be prioritised to the front of the queue.
	ACTION 4 From 25/07/25 meeting entry 2290. The Constabulary were asked to take advice from PSD as to next steps as this written record did not reflect the interaction. Update for 23/10/25: This was reported to PSD by Insp Gore in line with processes for Red reviews. Officer was spoken to and was able to show that this was a mistake and they had recorded the wrong review against the wrong detainee by accident. PSD have not taken any further action. ACTION CLOSED
Introductory meeting notes	Theme: Time taken to be booked into Custody The meeting started with Insp Stubbs giving an introduction into what the theme was. Anything before arriving onto the threshold of the police station does not count towards the 24-hour PACE clock. He explained that there is currently no requirement to record the wait time. This has never been done; there is no benefit to the force in increasing wait times as this eats into interview time. Custody is the most scrutinised area of policing. All data is presented to leadership monthly. Wait times is in this data pack and it is used for internal monitoring to ensure effective use of staffing. Examples of the data available was presented to the panel for Thorpe Wood and Parkside. Generally, Parkside has lower wait times as the demand is less.

	It was questioned whether there is a system in place to show the wait time to be checked in or where in the process detainees are, there isn't an official one. A white board is used at each station that shows how many people are queuing and where in the process they are. Questions were asked on how priorities are managed for checking in and this was explained to all. The difference between necessity to arrest and necessity to detain was explained which accounts for why some people do not end up being 'booked in'. For this theme, there is now CCTV or BWV. Custody records are being used.
Scrutiny Feedback	In body of minutes
Additional notes	When someone is taken to hospital as part of this process, how many officers must be there? Minimum of two. The higher risk the more officers. The Chair gave a recap of themes scrutinised in custody so far: UoF in custody, juvenile detention, Section 40 inspector reviews, booking in procedure, and now time take to be booked in. He called for members to have a think about potential themes for future meetings.
Date of next meeting	26th February 2026 – Use of Force

Record 1: 35NT/3922/25

This record is the longest wait time for the time period in question (the previous quarter) at Thorpewood. The wait time recorded was 12 hours. This raised alarm bells but on investigation this was a recording error. The Officer later in the record goes back to correct the error and update the record. Even though the officer has recorded there to be an error, this is not able to be changed on Athena, so the system considers it a long wait but it actually was not.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

One panel member stated they did not feel the need to see this one as it was clearly an error, however others disagreed and felt it was useful for understanding of the broader system.

Agreement from all was that anomalies such as this should be put to the Chair for them to decide whether they should be included or not. Chair confirmed that he is happy that this was brought.

No conversation needed on this as it was an error.

All panel members were pleased to hear that records cannot be changed retrospectively on the system.

RAG rating:

Green – 11
Amber – 0
Red – 0

Chairs Comments:

None provided.

OPCC Summary:

This felt like a good example to start with as panel members were able to see the form and have it explained to them what they were looking for.

Actions arising:

N/A

Feedback:

N/A

Record 2: 35NT/4852/25

This record is the second longest wait time for the time period in question at Thorpewood. The wait time recorded was 7 hours. The detainee was taken to hospital after arriving. It is recorded that the PACE clock was stopped. An explanation was given on how the PACE clock works in situations such as this. The increments of PACE time that have been used when the clock has been started and stopped are all recorded.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

No comments or questions were raised.
All panel members were in agreement that this was a good and clear example of how records should accurately reflect what has happened.

RAG rating:

Green – 11
Amber – 0
Red – 0

Chairs Comments:

None provided.

OPCC Summary:

All very straight forward and satisfactory – clear record of stops and starts to PACE clock.

Actions arising:**Feedback:**

Feedback to be shared with the department that this was a great example of a record for where PACE starts and stops. It was very clear to see timings and amount of PACE time used.

CAN THIS BE ADDED TO CUSTODY SHAREPOINT OR BE CIRCULATED

Record 3: 35NT/4356/25

A medical emergency occurred in the car park which meant that records were not able to be started until after medical care had been sought at PCH, so the record was started retrospectively.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

One panel member questioned whether this record is as comprehensive as it should be. There is more information needed to explain what happened and what PACE had been

used before a hospital visit and afterwards. The breakdown is not as clear and reading this you cannot see for certain what happened where.	
RAG rating:	Green – 9 Amber – 2 Red – 0
Chairs Comments:	None provided.
OPCC Summary:	The RAG rating was varied due to mixed opinions on the quality of the record. Some members requiring more information and more accurate time keeping.
Actions arising:	Feedback:
Feedback to be shared with the officer that more specific detail and timings would make for a more thorough record. The previous case was a good example of what would like to be seen.	Feedback provided to Sergeant Farrington.

Record 4: 35NT/5108/25	
Arrival 2pm. Detention authorised 7pm. This wait appears to be genuine with no recording issues.	
Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:	
Why would this be 5 hours? Middle of the afternoon? Too long a period of time with no information on why?	
RAG rating:	Green – 0 Amber – 9 Red – 2
Chairs Comments:	It would be helpful for panel members to have an A4 sheet of the RAG rating criteria to refer to when RAG rating.
OPCC Summary:	The panel were in agreement that no more can be discussed on this as there is a lack of information as to why it took so long. Constabulary are going to take this away to research. Given the complexities this individual has recorded against them, this feels important to get to the bottom of.

Actions arising:	Feedback:
Research to be done into why the wait time was so long for this case is missing from the record so it is not clear. Earlier example of a good record should be shown. Missing information needs to be provided for this instance.	<i>This was purely down to overwhelming demand. Parkside had reached capacity and everything came to Thorpewood overwhelming the 2 Sergeants on. New process to record long delays.</i>

Record 5: 35NT/4340/25

The time taken on this case was 4 hours 38 minutes. It appears that something has happened in the holding cell which has caused a delay potentially, but this is not clear as an explanation is missing.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

CCTV needs to be checked to account for the delay in this.

There are records that ligature has been attempted in the holding cell, but no one is sure how this would be possible, so more needs to be explained here.

The time appears to be accurate but with no explanation as to why.

RAG rating:

Green – 0
Amber – 11
Red – 0

Chairs Comments:

None provided.

OPCC Summary:

It appears that something has happened in the holding cell which may have added to the time in this process, but there isn't enough information.

Actions arising:	Feedback:
More information is needed on where the delay occurred and why to establish whether this was reasonable and proportionate.	<i>Although something did happen in the holding cells, this was fairly minor and is not the cause for the delay. The delay is simply overwhelming demand. An operation had brought multiple detainees at the same time and the 2 Sergeants on, simply couldn't keep up.</i>

Record 6: 35NT/3327/25

The time taken here is roughly 3 hours 30 minutes.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

If it's a long time between arrival and presentation at the desk is there an expectation for officers to record why? No, it is not something in legislation that is required to record so they do not.

There was speculation about the fact that there is a record of self-harm so the delay could be a result of medical care? There is no record of medical help so this is unlikely. But the record is lacking an explanation as to why.

The quickest the booking in process could be done is 15 minutes.

If an interpreter is needed it could take an hour, but this would be considered extreme.

The panel discussed whether it is appropriate to put a time on what is appropriate for delays, the general feeling is that the time is not the issue, and it is more the lack of reasoning for why there is a delay.

RAG rating:

Green – 0
Amber – 11
Red – 0

Chairs Comments:

None provided.

OPCC Summary:

I am in support of the action suggested by the panel. It seems an appropriate note to add to the system to be able to get a quick sense check on the appropriateness of the time taken.

Actions arising:

Recommendation from the panel: for the Constabulary to investigate whether it is possible to have a check point added to the booking in system to see that if the wait time feeling longer than usual, a brief summary as to why is needed. To be actioned if possible.

Feedback:

Completed - Custody Sergeant's booking in 'Cut and Paste' section of Q&As now includes a wait time section. Therefore, any wait over 45 minutes in holding should have a brief explanation as to what caused the delay.

Record 7: 35NT/3651/25

3 hours 20 wait.

Lacking information to explain why the wait is as long.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

No discussion needed regarding wait time here as there was a lack of information.

It was explained to the panel that being intoxicated would not stall the booking in process, but it would delay being told your rights. Rights would be given once sober enough to understand.

Is there a national police standard that sets the goal time to get people booked in? No. Resources cannot be set to deal with the extreme so setting such a standard would just not be achievable.

RAG rating:

Green – 0
Amber – 11
Red – 0

Chairs Comments:

None provided.

OPCC Summary:

No discussion needed on this as it was not clear what the reason behind the delay was.

Actions arising:

More information is needed on where the delay occurred and why to establish whether this was reasonable and proportionate.

Feedback:

FOR NICK STUBBS

Record 8: 35NT/3326/25

3 hours 20 minutes roughly

The circumstance of this seems to suggest that there were a lot of arrests at the same time.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

Conversation took place around street bail and what this means.

RAG rating:	Green – 11 Amber – 0 Red – 0	
Chairs Comments:	None provided.	
OPCC Summary:	This appeared to be quite a straightforward case with little conversation around wait times and more around other details.	
Actions arising:		Feedback:
N/A		N/A