

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 12 December 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting.

**Members:**

Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (Chairman)  
District Councillor Ken Harwood (Vice-Chairman)  
Borough Councillor John O'Reilly  
Borough Councillor George Crawford QPM  
Borough Councillor Richard Billington  
District Councillor Margaret Cooksey  
Borough Councillor Charlotte Morley  
Mrs Pat Frost  
Borough Councillor Beryl Hunwicks  
Independent Member Anne Hoblyn MBE

**Apologies:**

Borough Councillor Victor Broad  
Borough Councillor Terry Dicks  
Borough Councillor Colin Davis  
Independent Member Bryan Cross

**57/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Borough Councillor Victor Broad, Borough Councillor Colin Davis, Borough Councillor Terry Dicks, Independent Member Bryan Cross and Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner Shiraz Mirza,

**58/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

It was noted by the Panel that there was an error on page 5, paragraph 3 of the minutes. Pending this correction, the minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

**59/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received

**60/14 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

None received

**61/14 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 5]**

The Panel were informed that the outcome of a complaint considered by the Complaints Sub-Committee on 28 October 2014 could be found within the agenda pack.

**RESOLVED:** That,

1. The report be noted.

**61/14 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]**

The Panel noted its Forward Work Programme and Recommendations Tracker. There were no further comments.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

None

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None

**PANEL NEXT STEPS:**

None

## 62/14 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 7]

- The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) briefly highlighted some of the key points from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner's (OPCC) performance against the Police and Crime Plan. In particular, the Panel were advised that the numbers of theft and burglaries had fallen in the past quarter while a rise in the detection rates had also been recorded. The Panel's attention was drawn to the finalisation of a contract signed in conjunction with Sussex and Thames Valley police forces for the provision of £1.8 million worth of support for victims; the implementation of the Joint Enforcement Team (JET) initiative in Spelthorne which launched in December 2014; as well as updating the Panel on discussions with the District and Borough Councils for the implementation of the Community Trigger programme for reviewing anti-social behaviour complaints.
- The Panel requested information on how much money was still available from the Community Safety Fund allocation. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) indicated that £240k of the Community Safety Fund has not yet been allocated.
- Panel members drew attention to crimes such as violence with injury which have risen over the past quarter and asked the Commissioner to explain why serious crimes of this nature have increased. Reference was also made to the HMIC PEEL Report which highlighted inefficiencies in the way that Surrey Police record crime. The PCC advised the Panel that the PEEL report was not up to date but rather was based on crime statistics from the past. Since these samples were taken by HMIC, it was indicated that efforts had been made to improve the way in which Surrey Police record crime. The DPCC responded to the query about violence with injury and stated that additional funding received from the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 had been distributed to each of the divisions to combat violent crime.
- The Panel requested information on the policing of the M25 and whether there is a specific strategy for dealing with travel disruption such as car crashes. The PCC confirmed that Surrey Police have a strategy for dealing with crashes which derives from the strategy developed by the British Transport Police and includes targets to get the M25 running normally again as soon as possible after a crash while also having access to the latest equipment in order to do this. The Panel was advised, however, that Surrey Police work in conjunction with the Highways Agency (HA) who have oversight of the condition of roads before they are re-opened. Subject to the same financial pressures that the rest of the public sector is currently experiencing, the PCC indicated that it sometimes takes longer than planned for the HA to assess the condition of the M25 following a

crash. It was highlighted that both Surrey Police and the HA are acutely aware of the importance of the M25.

- Panel members also drew attention to travel disruption caused by crashes on smaller roads in Surrey and suggested that it can often take the Police a long time to reopen roads wherever an accident takes place. The PCC advised that the British Transport Police are not always able to respond to these crashes and so indicated that the possibility of briefing all Surrey Police officers on responding to crashes and getting traffic moving after crashes is something that could be looked into to reduce travel disruption.
- The Panel asked whether there were plans for a public consultation on strategies to tackle anti-social behaviour. Panel members were advised that a consultation had already taken place with the public and community safety partners to discuss strategies and that the results of these consultations were in the process of being collated. The PCC further highlighted that the OPCC is continuing to work with local councils in Surrey to tackle anti-social behaviour
- Panel members made reference to conclusions from the HMIC PEEL report which suggested that Hampshire Police are one of the best performing forces and asked the PCC why Surrey had therefore chosen to collaborate with Sussex Police. The PCC advised that Surrey Police works closely and collaborates in certain areas of policing with all forces in the region and have worked with Hampshire Police on issues such as organised crime and counter-terrorism. The Panel were advised that Surrey Police carefully consider which forces they collaborate with to ensure they work together effectively and get the best deal for Surrey.
- The Panel inquired about the prospect of amalgamation between Surrey and Sussex police forces and indicated that the PCC's public comments appeared to suggest that this is on the table. The PCC clarified that no merger between the two forces is possible in the short to medium term due to the large discrepancy in the amount of money that the people of Surrey pay directly to the Police through the precept in contrast to the amount paid by Sussex residents which is significantly less. The Treasurer and Chief Finance Officer (TCFO) of the OPCC indicated that the gap in funding being faced by Sussex Police was considerably larger than that of Surrey Police and there was a danger that Surrey Police could end up subsidising Sussex, which also made closer collaboration between the two forces less attractive.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. To note the report.

**RESOLVED:**

1. To note the report.

**ACTIONS/ FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None

**PANEL NEXT STEPS:**

None

**63/14 BUDGET QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 8]**

- The Panel asked whether a virement was possible for any excess funds from the PCC budget to the Surrey Police budget. The PCC stipulated that it wasn't possible to transfer funds between the PCC and Surrey Police budgets but indicated that the PCC provides a much better service for Surrey Police than the Police Authority had previously done. PCC staff are required to execute policy and fulfil various functions to assist the Police. The PCC stated that he would circulate a staff diagram to the Panel for their reference.
- Members drew attention to the training budget and asked the PCC why much of the training budget had still not been used. The PCC indicated that no training opportunities had arisen which he thought would be beneficial for either him or the DPCC to attend but highlighted that this money would be put back into the OPCC and would be allocated towards training for staff. The Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for victims (APCC) advised the Panel that many of the events and conferences attended by members of the OPCC were in fact training of sorts for the PCC and his staff but that the money paid to attend these events was not listed as such in the budget.
- The Panel expressed reservations about the manner in which the PCC has been pushing for a referendum on raising the precept in Surrey and stated that people should not be scared into voting for a raise in the precept, especially given the PEEL report which suggests Surrey Police is well placed to deal with the pressures of austerity in comparison to other forces. The PCC advised the Panel that a decision on whether or not to move forward with a referendum on raising the precept still hadn't been made but reiterated that Surrey Police will face a significant funding gap over the next few years and that, without additional funding, frontline services would need to be cut

in order to balance the budget. The PCC advised the Panel that, as an elected official, he feels it is his duty to inform the public of the issues and their options for maintaining frontline services although the PCC agreed to look at the language used when discussing the precept with the public.

- Members asked why the costs of insuring Surrey Police had increased so significantly. The TCFO advised that Surrey Police is an insurance collective with a number of other forces in the region to share costs but unfortunately, insurance claims against the Police means that insurance premiums have been steadily increasing. The Panel were advised that a breakdown of the insurance costs paid by Surrey Police would be circulated to Members for their reference.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. To note and comment on the financial performance of the OPCC at Month 7 for the Financial Year 2014/15.
2. To note and comment on the Surrey Police Group Financial Report for Month 7 (October) 2014/15.

**RESOLVED:** That the Panel,

1. Note and comment on the financial performance of the OPCC at Month 7 for the Financial Year 2014/15
2. Note and comment on the Surrey Police Group Financial Report for Month 7 (October) 2014/15.

**ACTIONS/ FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

1. The OPCC to circulate information on the amount of money paid on public liability and motor claims insurance.

**PANEL NEXT STEPS:**

None

**64/14 VICTIM SERVICES COMMISSIONING UPDATE [Item 9]**

- The APCC provided a broad overview of the background to the change in the commissioning of victims' services and highlighted the approach taken by the OPCC to develop services for victims that work for the County. The Panel were advised that generalist victims' services have been commissioned in concert with other police forces in the region to provide economies of scale and which had allowed for the allocation of greater funding to put towards commissioning specialist victims' services. It was highlighted that Central Government

had caused some problems due to the fact that they had held onto the commissioning of services for witnesses as well as funding the creation of a centre for victims of sexual offences in Surrey and Sussex at Croydon, which has undercut some of the work already done by the OPCC.

- Members asked how this would impact the Rape and Sexual Abuse Support Centre in Guildford. The APCC indicated that the centre in Croydon would not be adequate to cover all of Surrey and Sussex and that it would work in tandem with other services available in the County.
- The Policy Officer (Victims) (PO) highlighted that Surrey has emerged as one of the leaders in the commissioning of victims' services through informed discussions with partners and a focus on outcomes. The OPCC has successfully provided grants for the provision of victims' services across a broad range of areas. The Panel were advised that the OPCC had focused on using services that already existed in Surrey while also ensuring that the application process was not overly-bureaucratic so as not to discourage applications for funding. The PO further highlighted that Surrey OPCC had been called on to give evidence to an all-party parliamentary group enquiry on methods for commissioning victims' services and were now passing on advice and best practice to OPCCs across the country.
- The PO also indicated that the OPCC would ensure that services are being provided effectively and would work to identify emerging areas where victims' services will be required in the future. Providing support for victims of child sexual exploitation was flagged as an area that is currently being researched which will then be pulled together into a needs assessment. Discussions were also taking place to bring together services for victims of sexual violence in Surrey.
- The Panel asked how it was decided to prioritise victims and ensure that support is given to those most in need first. The PO advised that there is a lot of literature available on informing how to prioritise the provision of services to victims which exists in conjunction with the Victims' Code. It was further highlighted that, in conjunction with a number of other forces, a needs assessment had been commissioned from the University of Portsmouth which would also provide insights into which victims are most in need of support services.
- Panel members also asked what protocols were in place to measure successful outcomes in supporting victims of crime. The PO highlighted that since many of the funding had been granted to existing organisations, methods were already in place to measure outcomes. It was further indicated that the OPCC is working with the

Council to look at the measures support services already have in place to ensure that the right outcomes are being achieved for victims of crime.

- The Panel asked for more information on the number of people from outside Surrey who were using Surrey's victims' support services network and whether this was having an impact on people from Surrey getting access to these services. The APCC stated that support was only being given to individuals from outside Surrey that are in refuges within the county and that this was an arrangement that also benefitted victims in Surrey who had to be moved to another county. The APCC indicated that she would send details on how many people from outside Surrey were using victim support services and how many Surrey residents were receiving these services in another county.
- Members drew attention to an HMIC report which highlighted failings in the way that Surrey Police deal with victims of domestic violence. The APCC highlighted that efforts were being undertaken to improve the performance of Surrey Police in this area and that police officers were being given training to help them deal more effectively with victims of domestic violence while a multi-agency hub was being developed to join up services for victims of domestic violence. The PCC further highlighted that the officers were also being given training on recognising and tackling honour-based violence.
- The Panel requested information on steps that the PCC and Surrey Police have been taking to tackle the practice of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) in the county. The APCC stated that funding had been given to tackle this and that instances of FGM were recognised and dealt with correctly but indicated that it doesn't appear to be as much of an issue in Surrey in contrast to other counties.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

None

**RESOLVED:**

None

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

1. The OPCC to circulate information to the Panel on the number of Surrey residents that receive victim support services outside of Surrey.

**PANEL NEXT STEPS:**

None

**65/14 DEPUTY AND ASSISTANT POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONERS' OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW [Item 10]**

- The DPCC drew Panel members' attention to the Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) funding and stated that there was still money available for this fund. Members were asked to make their colleagues in the District and Borough Councils aware that there was still funding available and to put applications in for the CSP if they were aware of a project that could be funded through this scheme.
- Discussions also took place around the Junior Citizens initiative which has been successful in a number of Districts and Boroughs. It was agreed that further discussions will take place at another time to discuss introducing the Junior Citizens programme to the Districts and Boroughs which have not yet adopted the initiative.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. To note the report

**RESOLVED:**

1. To note the report

**ACTIONS/ FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

1. A meeting to be arranged between the representative on the Panel from Mole Valley District Council and the DPCC to discuss the Junior Citizens initiative.

**PANEL NEXT STEPS:**

None

**65/14 FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 11]**

- Panel members reiterated their concerns with the poor performance of the 101 service and asked if the PCC had discussed this with the Chief Constable. The PCC confirmed that he has brought this up with the Chief Constable on numerous occasions to make the case for improving the 101 service and that he would send some information through to the Panel on this. The DPCC advised the Panel vacancies in the 101 service were being filled and training being provided to staff which should improve the service.
- The Panel asked whether Surrey Police are losing staff to Sussex Police. The PCC indicated that Surrey Police lose staff to all forces in

the region due to the prohibitively high cost of living in Surrey and this includes loss of staff to Sussex Police. It was further advised that recruitment and training is a huge drain on the resources of the force due to the number of police staff that are lost to other forces or which leave the Police force entirely.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. To note the report.

**RESOLVED:**

1. To note the report.

**ACTIONS/ FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

1. The OPCC to circulate further information on discussions between the PCC and Chief Constable in respect to the improvement of the 101 service.

**PANEL NEXT STEPS:**

None

**66/14 VERBAL UPDATE ON ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INCLUDING DEEPCUT [Item 12]**

The PCC indicated that there was nothing significant to report to the Panel at this stage.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

None

**RESOLVED:**

None

**ACTIONS/ FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None

**PANEL NEXT STEPS:**

None

**67/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]**

It was noted that the date of the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel would be on 5 February 2015.

Meeting ended at: 1.00 pm

---

**Chairman**