

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 4 February 2016 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 David Reeve
District Councillor Margaret Cooksey
Borough Councillor Victor Broad
Borough Councillor Peter Waddell
Borough Councillor Charlotte Morley
Mrs Pat Frost
Borough Councillor Beryl Hunwicks
Independent Member Bryan Cross
Independent Member Anne Hoblyn MBE

Apologies:

Mr Graham Ellwood
Borough Councillor Anthony Mitchell

1/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Graham Ellwood and Anthony Mitchell.

2/16 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 01 DECEMBER 2015 [Item 2]

- A Panel member asked why the date of a meeting had been changed without notifying Panel members who planned to attend (page 4, point 2). The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) noted the Panel member's comments and explained that he would inform the Panel of the new date of the meeting in due course.
- A Panel member also observed a grammatical error on page five, point five regarding raising awareness of cyber crime on social media. It was agreed this would be amended.
- The Panel agreed that the minutes were a true record of the meeting.

3/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest to declare.

4/16 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

The Panel received one public question, the question and response was tabled at the meeting.

**5/16 SURREY POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONERS PRECEPT SETTING
PROPOSAL FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2016/2017 [Item 5]**

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) informed the Panel that he was required to set a budget for the next financial year and proposed to increase the council tax precept element by 1.99 per cent. The PCC noted that they had followed advice from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's financial statement in Autumn 2015 which advocated PCCs raising precept levels to ensure police funding remained stable. The PCC noted that he had used his media profile to lobby for better resources for the Police and that he was pleased with the announcement from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.
2. The PCC noted that during his time as the PCC there have been difficult challenges with diminishing resources and that the PCC proposed to the Panel to increase the council tax precept. The PCC also emphasised that Surrey Police were the only force in the country that had increased its police officer numbers. The PCC opened the discussion for questions.
3. A Panel member noted that there was no problem with an increase in the precept, however the member queried how Surrey Police were going to spend this money and stated that savings should not be spent on paying the pensions deficit.
4. The PCC agreed and noted that there had been an underspend this year due to ceasing recruitment and reducing back-office functions and that Surrey Police had taken the step to use some of this underspend to reduce the pension deficit. There was no plan in the budget to pay off pension deficit. The PCC noted that in the year ahead, Surrey Police were planning to spend money on more police officers as well as financing mobile data terminals. The PCC also noted that they had signed a contract to introduce body-worn video cameras that will benefit police officers and the public by reducing paperwork, more visibility and to keep the police officers and the public accountable through recorded video.
5. The Chairman still challenged the PCC on the amount of money being spent on pensions with the PCC reiterating that there was no budgetary provision to pay off the deficit. Additional monies raised through the precept would be for frontline policing including an additional £2 million for improving public protection. The PCC noted however, that paying of the pension deficit would enable the force to recruit more officers in the long term.
6. A Panel member noted that there was still too much money being spent on pensions and that money should be left aside for emergency purposes as well as investing money into the 101 call service as it needed investment.
7. The PCC emphasised that there was no plan to put any money into the pension fund however Surrey Police will continue to reduce the debt as well as reduce the long-term funding. The PCC informed the

Panel that Surrey Police have a reserve minimum of £6 million as well as an operational reserve of £1 million and £1.5 million of reserves to be spent on training.

8. The PCC noted the Panel member's concern regarding the 101 service and emphasised that 101 was important for the public however the force had faced issues with retaining staff at the contact centre and the PCC had asked repeatedly for a special Surrey allowance to alleviate this problem. The PCC would continue to lobby government for additional allowances.
9. A Panel member asked for more information around the public consultation on the precept. The PCC responded, stating that the public had not changed their view since 2015 with 66 per cent of the public supporting the proposal to increase the precept.
10. Further to this the Treasurer informed the Panel that the precept was collected per authority; the tax base was notified by each individual district and borough council who also advised Surrey OPCC of how many band D properties there were. The Treasurer noted that the districts and boroughs informed Surrey Police how much they would receive in the collection fund. This stood at £1.8 million.
11. A Panel member informed the Panel that she had visited (along with other Panel members) the Police Contact Centre and was very impressed and confident that the 101 service was getting better. The Panel member also asked whether it was possible for the media to report accurately regarding Surrey Police's finances.
12. The PCC thanked the Panel member for the positive feedback of the 101 contact centre however the PCC noted that Surrey received the smallest proportion of government grant funding. Some Members stated that the working environment of the 101 contact centre could be improved for staff.
13. A Panel member queried the collection fund from Runnymede. The PCC explained that this information had been submitted to the Treasurer from the finance team in Runnymede.
14. A Panel member emphasised the point that there was a concern that frontline services may be sacrificed to pay off the pension deficit but that the Panel member fully supported the introduction of technology to frontline officers. The Panel member was also concerned with the salary of the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner especially as victims of child exploitation had been failed.
15. The PCC emphasised the point that there was no budgetary plan to pay off the pension's deficit. The PCC noted that the Assistant PCC was a full paid employee and civil servant and hence was entitled to a pension. The PCC's Consultant Advisor on equalities and diversity did not receive a pension. The PCC noted that £1.8 million was funded to support the domestic abuse victims, to fund domestic violence centres and refurbishments for refuges.

16. It was explained that the Assistant PCC was a trouble-shooter and unlocks the issues faced by victims. In terms of failing victims of child exploitation this was not the role of the Assistant PCC. The PCC emphasised the work done by the APCC merited the salary she received.
17. The Chairman asked if the Assistant PCC looks in to the elderly and vulnerable people being dealt with harshly by the police. The PCC responded that there were 44 thousand crimes, some were minor cases and some involved violence. The Panel asked for details around how many victims Surrey Police supported every year. The PCC stated that he would provide the Panel with these figures.
18. The PCC also emphasised that Surrey Police oversee the victim support scheme with Thames Valley Police and Sussex Police. The PCC informed the Panel that the Victim Support budget came from Government and was separate to the overall budget.
19. A Panel questioned the lack of transparency of the reserves regarding the total amount of reserves and how much money was left over. The Panel member also noted that two employees had been transferred over to the Victim Support budget over the precept.
20. The PCC noted that there was a forecasted underspend of £250,000. He went onto further explain that three per cent of the annual budget was put aside as part of an emergency reserve.
21. Further to this, the Treasurer noted that it was cheaper to insure the police vehicles themselves. The PCC explained that he had made a policy statement to leave three per cent in the reserves in case of emergency. Additional money from the reserves had gone to the Chief Constable, £1.4M had been set aside for the Deepcut investigation and £1M for the operational training reserve
22. The Panel member asked regarding a reduction of £153,000 of the budget for the next financial year in which the Treasurer responded that the budget had not changed, the budget was re-categorised into the appropriate categories, which is why two employees were moved and re-categorised in the budget.
23. The Vice Chairman queried the update to the fingerprint machines in police vehicles as he believed this would happen in May 2016 as part of the joint commissioning with Sussex Police. The PCC informed the Panel that the fingerprint machines were being explored and that the PCC was supportive in introducing the fingerprint machines into the force.
24. A Panel member noted that he was pleased with the budget and was happy that the service was being delivered however was concerned with the Policing in Your Neighbourhood scheme (PiYN). The PCC noted that the PiYN was significant in tackling sexual-related crime and that the force needed more people trained to solve those types of crimes. The PCC noted that some of the money saved will be invested into helping victims of these crimes.

25. The Chairman took a vote on the recommendation. The Panel unanimously agreed the proposed precept for 2016/17.
26. Furthermore ten Members of the Panel agreed the precept without qualification or comment, whilst two members abstained as they wanted to make comments and recommendations regarding the precept.
27. The Panel noted and agreed the budget for the OPCC (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Police & Crime Panel agreed the proposed Surrey Police Council Tax Precept of £220.19p for a Band D Property for the financial year 2016/17.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

- For the PCC to provide the Panel with details around how many victims are supported by Surrey Police every year.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

6/16 POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER MONTH 9 2015/16 FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 5a]

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. A member of the Panel asked for more clarification around the ACPO budget. The PCC stated that this budget included the budget for the Joint Emergency Services Improvement Programme (JESIP) and budget for Operation Heather. The PCC stated that this budget was given to Chief Officers in Surrey to control themselves. The PCC stated that he would find a better title to use for this budget and would provide the Panel with more details around what this budget contains.
2. A Panel member expressed concern that the Junior Citizen Scheme had been pushed back because of the purdah period in advance of the upcoming PCC elections. The Panel member went onto ask for details around the funding and finances for the election process.
3. The PCC confirmed that he would still be in the position up until one week after the election results were announced (if the current PCC was unsuccessful in re-election).
4. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner reassured the Member that all Junior Citizen Schemes would continue to be funded and progressed in spite of purdah. The Deputy PCC stated that grants were paid before the PCC election process began. The Deputy PCC stated that between £6-9k had been put into each of the schemes.

5. The PCC reaffirmed that the PCC's election campaign would be funded through his own personal investment and nothing is taken from the OPCC budget.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

- For the PCC to provide members of the Panel with more details around the ACPO budget and what this budget contains.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

7/16 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 6]

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. A Panel member noted that there was emphasis on more visible policing and wanted clarification around the PCSOs (Police Community Support Officers) current powers and if there were any plans to increase these powers. The powers available to PCSOs were limited and the PCC was working with the Chief Constable to grant further powers to PCSOs. The PCC stated that he would provide the Panel with a list of current powers of PCSOs and details of where he believed these powers could be increased.
2. The PCC explained that there had been a reduction in the number of PCSOs as when savings were needed to be made these were the roles to be cut first as these officers did not hold as many powers as warranted officers. Additionally, some PCSOs had become Police Officers. Further to this, the PCC commented that the PCSOs did extremely good work and their work was valuable.
3. A Panel member expressed concern that anti-social behaviour had increased in the Panel member's ward due to the cut to funding in youth services. The PCC noted that Surrey Youth services do a great job and would go back and check if there has been increased reporting of this.
4. The Treasurer noted that £2 million had been invested into local projects and services around the county through community safety funding. This funding is available to all but some district and boroughs had not taken advantage of this.
5. A Panel member noted the great success of implementing the JET in Reigate and Banstead. The PCC stated that he would like to see parking enforcement designated to PCSOs and had been liaising with the County Council's portfolio holder for transport who would be checking the legality of this.

6. A Panel member asked whether the new JETs will receive funding. The PCC stated that he was committed to fund any authorities looking to join the JET programme. He was aware that Tandridge and Runnymede were looking to join the programme.
7. The Panel member also noted that the performance scorecard still needed improvement with regards to crime victim satisfaction rates. The PCC informed the Board that the treatment to vulnerable victims' satisfaction rates was something the OPCC were looking into. The Positive outcomes were something that needed to be improved on however there had been a significant increase in the outcomes for victims of sexual violence and domestic violence crimes because more people were coming forward. The PCC noted that the positive outcomes for burglary and that there had been a massive reduction to burglary over the last 3 years which is greatly due to the work of the temporary Chief Constable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

- For the PCC to provide the Panel with a list of current powers of PCSOs and details of where he believes these powers could be increased.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

8/16 FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 7]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

9/16 RECRUITMENT OF CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 8]

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The PCC informed the Panel that it was important to have a Chief Constable installed into position as soon as possible. The PCC praised the interim Chief Constable for the work he had done.

2. The PCC emphasised that he has taken the decision that whoever is elected as PCC in May should decide who is recruited as new Chief Constable. The Panel respected the fairness of the decision to elect a new Chief Constable after the PCC election.
3. A Panel member raised the concern of the lack of time between the short listing and the interview process.
4. The PCC noted that after the interview stage, the PCC's preferred appointment for Chief Constable would be made public and the Panel would have the opportunity to scrutinise the decision/appointment at a confirmation hearing.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

10/16 HMIC INSPECTION ON CHILD PROTECTION [Item 9]

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The Chairman asked for clarification around the wording of a table within the report on page 45. The PCC noted that the comparison should be made against last year and this would be corrected. The PCC emphasised that improvements had been made across the board.
2. The Chairman queried what was being done to ensure greater clarity around the delivery of child protection strategies and action plans. The PCC stated that they had discussions to enhance the training of detectives and increase recruitment. An additional £4.9M had been put into public protection and continued scrutiny of the plans would continue.
3. A Panel member asked whether the PCC was happy with the support from HMIC. The PCC noted that he was not confident with the support from HMIC. The PCC also informed the Panel that resources had been moved to support public protection. The Senior Officer Team were aware of the concerns and this was the main effort of Surrey Police. The PCC stated that there were lots of dedicated people working for Surrey Police who had done good work.
4. The PCC stated that when a new Chief Constable was appointed they could come and speak to the Panel about how they are supporting public protection.

5. A Panel member informed that there were some grammatical errors in the report as well as missing dates. The Panel member also asked who produced the Public Protection improvement Plan. The PCC informed the Panel that the plan was produced by a member of staff for the Chief Constable.
6. Further to this, the Panel member asked whether a short-term uplift to SIU detective numbers was sufficient, page 64 of the agenda. The PCC replied that as it was an operational question, the PCC could not answer that.
7. A Panel member inquired who the public protection strategy team were. The PCC responded that they had acquired outside contractors to improve the skills gap and mentor existing staff/officers within the public protection teams. The PCC noted these were previously police officers with experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

11/16 REPORT ON INDEPENDENT MEMBERS OF THE POLICE & CRIME PANEL [Item 10]

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The Chairman notified the Panel that Independent Panel Member Anne Hoblyn was not intending to re-stand for another term on the Panel.
2. The Chairman and the Panel thanked Independent Panel Member Anne Hoblyn for her commitment and service to the Panel. The Independent Panel Member Anne Hoblyn thanked the Panel.
3. The Chairman notified the Panel that there was a recommendation in the report for Independent Panel Member Bryan Cross to stay on the Panel for a second term. Victor Broad proposed that the Panel extend the terms of office for Bryan Cross, this was seconded by Charlotte Morley.
4. The Panel agreed for the Independent member to proceed with a second term on the Panel. The Independent Member was happy to stay on the Panel for another term.
5. It was explained that the recruitment process for one new independent member would begin.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Panel agreed to reappoint and extend the term of office for the current independent co-opted member for a further four years.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

12/16 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 11]

Key points raised during the discussions:

- 1. The Chairman informed the Panel that there was a Complaints Sub-Committee meeting on 11 December 2015 and there will be a Complaints Sub-Committee meeting on the 17 February 2016.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

13/16 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 12]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a) The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

14/16 VERBAL UPDATE ON ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS [Item 13]

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The PCC informed the Panel that the Coroners Case into the Deepcut investigation was still ongoing and would be supported as necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

None.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

PANEL NEXT STEPS:

None.

15/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 18 MAY 2016 [Item 14]

The next public meeting will be held on Wednesday 18 May 2016 at 10.30am.

- The Chairman invited the PCC to describe his achievements as the Police Crime Commissioner for Surrey.
- The PCC listed his achievements as well as the achievements of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Surrey Police as a whole. The PCC thanked the OPCC and Surrey Police for all their hard work.
- The PCC thanked the Chairman and the Police and Crime Panel for their cooperation and partnership.
- The Chairman and the Panel thanked the PCC for the work he had done during his term as the PCC.

Meeting ended at: 12.55 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Police and Crime Panel: 4 February 2016

Item 4: Public Questions

From: Gabriel Webber

Received: 21/01/16

The Commissioner stated in a Freedom of Information Act response dated 23 September 2015 that Shiraz Mirza was not an 'Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner' and would not, henceforth, be referred to as such. The Commissioner's audit committee was given the same assurance at two of their meetings (31 March 2015 and 22 June 2015).

Given this pledge, would the Commissioner consider explaining why Cllr Mirza is still being referred to as an Assistant PCC e.g. In the Police and Crime Panel's report pack dated 1 December 2015, pages 3, 23 and 101; and on Cllr Mirza's official biography on the website of the Kingston Borough Liberal Democrats.

Will he also provide details of the practical steps he will be taking to prevent further misrepresentation of Cllr Mirza as an Assistant PCC.

Response from PCC:

Dear Mr Webber,

With regard to the Police and Crime Panel Agenda dated 1 December 2015, on page 3 Mr Mirza is referred to as 'the PCC's consultant advisor on equality and diversity' and not as Assistant PCC. The title of the paper is headed 'Deputy and Assistant Police and Crime Commissioners Objectives and Performance Review' but the report and detail within it makes clear Mr Mirza's role.

One pages 23 and 101, there are administrative errors whereby Mr Mirza is not referred to by his correct title. The support officers will make sure the necessary steps are taken to ensure these errors do not happen again.

The Kingston Liberal Democrat website has been changed.

Regards

Kevin Hurley, PCC

This page is intentionally left blank