

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 12 September 2017 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Panel at its next meeting on Wednesday 15 November 2017.

**Members:**

Ken Harwood (Chairman)  
Charlotte Morley (Vice-Chairman)  
Chris Sadler  
Josephine Hawkins  
David Reeve  
Graham Ellwood  
Margaret Cooksey  
Peter Waddell  
Dorothy Ross-Tomlin  
Bryan Cross  
David Fitzpatrick-Grimes  
Beryl Hunwicks  
Nick Gething  
Pat Frost

### **32/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Pat Frost and Beryl Hunwicks. The Chairman advised that Cllr Dorothy Ross-Tomlin would be arriving late to the meeting.

### **33/17 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

#### **Key points raised during discussion:**

1. It was noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) was in the process of meeting with local district and borough representatives to determine the CCTV strategy going forward.
2. The Panel were informed that the PCC had recently met with the Cabinet Member for Highways, Colin Kemp to discuss parking enforcement in the County and ways of promoting better working relations between Surrey Police, SCC and districts and boroughs. It was further added that the PCC and Cabinet Member discussed ways of reinvigorating the Drive Smart Programme which is expected to relaunch later this year.
3. Members noted that a report on parking enforcement could be provided at the next Panel meeting.
4. The PCC acknowledged concerns regarding the service around keeping victims informed after a crime was reported and agreed work in this area required improvement.
5. Councillor Margaret Cooksey requested a revision to Item 25/17, paragraph one, for the last sentence to be reworded to report that Mole Valley endorsed the 'In the Know' community messaging system and were actively promoting information to reach residents.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The minutes from the previous meeting held on 13 July 2017 were agreed by the Panel as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

#### **ACTIONS/FUTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

Make revision to Item 25/17 as per Councillor Margaret Cooksey's request.

### **34/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None were received.

### **35/17 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

No public questions have been received.

## **36/17 BUDGET QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 5]**

### **Key points raised during discussion:**

1. The Chief Finance Officer advised the Panel that the Surrey Police Group financial report for month 4, 2017/18 indicated an under spend of £4.93m with forecasts anticipating this figure to reduce to an under spend of £887k.
2. It was noted the reasons for any significant variances in the budget would follow from increasing establishment figures, costs for supplying information to the coroner service, restructuring the Management and Information department and IT expenditure.
3. It was further reported that the Central budget showed a saving of £3.724m which was primarily due to the reduced costs of hiring new recruits.
4. The Chief Finance Officer explained that the financial position based on the information provided showed no particular areas of concerns and careful monitoring would continue as the year progresses.
5. It was stated a report on the Sussex/Surrey Joint Finance Team would be available later on in the year as work was still in progress to develop the information required.
6. Members raised concerns with the over spend in relation to IT and on victim services opposed to investigating and preventing crime. It was explained an investigation was currently taking place to establish the reason for the large overspend in IT to determine what caused this and to initiate remedial action.
7. It was further added that the funds spent in victim services were provided by the Government. In the papers this figure is reported as an overspend but only because the funding has not been reimbursed as of yet.
8. The Chief Finance Officer explained that Operation Heather was not an investigation. The operation was as a result of the Coroner's Service opening inquests resulting in Surrey Police having to respond to the Coroner's Office with information.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted and commented on the budget updates.

### **ACTIONS/FUTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None

## **37/17 PROGRESS AGAINST THE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN [Item 6]**

### **Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The PCC reported that the new Joint Enforcement Team (JET) in Guildford was making progress and was keen to pursue discussions with other districts and boroughs in developing JET teams in the county.
2. It was noted that there had been an increase in traveller incursions across the county putting strain on district and boroughs. The PCC expressed the view that a better intelligence network was needed for tracking these incursions and making sure the Police used their powers within the law when responding in these circumstances.
3. The PCC further added that it was difficult to remove travellers from unauthorised encampments as there was a lack of transit camps in Surrey and was looking into the matter to reach long term solutions. Members supported the view that the provision of transit camps should be made available in the County and were advised the obligation fell on district and boroughs to coordinate this.
4. Members expressed the view that Surrey Police should show more visible presence with traveller unauthorised encampments however the PCC explained it was the council's responsibility to attend to these incursions and Surrey Police would respond if a serious incident occurred.
5. It was noted that Runnymede Borough Council had obtained an injunction that protects public spaces in the Borough, allowing them to bypass the process in having to obtain a court order to remove travellers from unauthorised encampments on council owned land which had been successful.
6. The PCC informed the Panel as the Chairman of the Emergency Services Collaboration Programme he would like to ensure that progress continues in promoting blue light collaborations despite there being a lack of commitment from the police in Surrey and Sussex towards the future funding of the Programme Team that has supported this area of work.
7. Members raised concerns that the report showed a decline in performance in some areas. The PCC noted that there were areas for improvement, but overall he felt that Surrey Police was performing well. Certain increases could be deemed positive as it showed a confidence to report issues, and the Surrey picture needed to be set against the national context.
8. It was further noted that Surrey Police were diverting resources from other areas to deal with crimes in particular the increase in burglaries that was being managed under operation 'Spearhead'.
9. There was a discussion around victim satisfaction levels and members were informed that Assistant Chief Constable Nev Kemp would be leading in this area.

10. The PCC gave assurances that publicity would be provided in preparation for the new service to support victims of Anti-Social Behaviour launching on 26 October 2017 to help people tackle difficult situations.
11. Members raised concerns with recent performance on 101 calls and expressed the view crimes were not being reported due to people not being able to get through. The PCC noted this concern and assured the Panel that the 101 service would be monitored carefully to ensure better outcomes however commended the service for improving greatly from the previous year.
12. The PCC informed the Panel that there was a high turnover of operators however training was providing continuity to ensure services was maintained to an efficient standard.
13. Members sought more information around average response times and targets set for non-emergency 101 calls and the PCC agreed to circulate the details to the Panel in due course.
14. The PCC acknowledged concerns regarding residents not feeling safe after dark due to switching off street lights however explained that this was a County issue and not a matter for Surrey Police. He said that there was no evidence to suggest a correlation between the switch off of lights and any increase in crime or fear of crime.
15. The PCC further added that Surrey Police gave the professional view that switching off street lights did not contribute to an increase in crimes. Members stated that they would like to see supporting evidence in this matter despite the PCC indicating no data or statistics existed.
16. The PCC advised members that the budget for the Community Safety Fund had increased this year to £750k and key partners were being identified to work with over a long term basis.
17. There was a discussion around Restorative Justice in Surrey and the PCC indicated that there were aspirations to create a Surrey wide strategy around Adult Restorative Justice between the Police and other agencies including the Community Rehabilitation Company.
18. The PCC explained that modern slavery was a national problem and the Chief Constable was working towards an action plan to combat this in Surrey however the issue was hugely under reported and obtaining evidence was difficult as victims in these circumstances would not come forward.
19. The PCC indicated that in an event of a terrorist act in the UK, plans were in place for assistance to be provided from other Police forces when necessary. The PCC reported that Surrey detectives had been dispatched to Manchester to assist with the terrorist incident that had occurred and three Police Constables had also joined a team to provide emergency assistance in the British Virgin Islands.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the progress made against the Police and Crime Plan 2016-2020.

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

R8/17 – For the PCC to provide the Panel with performance targets set for the 101 number (including targets for the response times).

**38/17 GOVERNANCE OF FIRE AND RESCUE IN SURREY [Item 7]**

**Key points raised during discussion:**

1. The PCC informed the Panel that KPMG had been commissioned to carry out an options analysis on behalf of the PCC and a report with findings would be available in October.
2. The Chairman suggested a report be provided to the Panel once KPMG completed their analysis.
3. The PCC explained that the Panel had no influence over the final decision regarding fire governance although they could scrutinise the decision. Only the Home Secretary could accept or refuse the business case put forward for the future of the fire service.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report.

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

R9/17 – For the PCC to provide the Panel with results of the options analysis carried out by KPMG once completed.

**39/17 FEEDBACK ON PERFORMANCE MEETINGS [Item 8]**

**Key points raised during discussion:**

1. Members queried the PCC on the powers available to JET teams on parking and proposed an update report.
2. The PCC agreed to provide a report on highways enforcement (parking) for the next Police and Crime Panel meeting to address members questions.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the update on the PCC's performance meeting.

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

R11/17 For the PCC to provide the Panel with a report on highways enforcement for the next meeting on 15 November 2017.

**40/17 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 9]**

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report and Appendix A.

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

None

**41/17 ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER & FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 10]**

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the Forward Work Programme and Recommendations Tracker.

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

None.

**42/17 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 11]**

**Key points raised during discussion:**

1. It was noted that a project implementation review was underway to look at the vetting process for new police officers. The PCC advised this was a collaborative service between Surrey and Sussex and results were expected at the end of the month.
2. Members raised concerns with health care services provided at Police stations for victims and offenders and how this was undertaken by the PCC as part of his responsibilities. The Chief Executive explained that all contracts were managed on a day to day basis on behalf of the PCC by Surrey Police.
3. It was further added that despite retendering for the provision of health care for people in custody the duty remained with Surrey Police and details could be provided on the current arrangements in place. Members insisted that the PCC review 24/7 coverage of these services as it was reported that Surrey did not have this cover in place.
4. Members asked the PCC to comment on the recent news publication about the Sussex Chief Constable and specifically his attitude to victims. The PCC stated that he did not feel it was his place to comment on this news story and stated that Panel could raise this with

the Surrey Chief Constable at the next Police and Crime Panel informal meeting.

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

R10/17 – For the PCC to provide the Panel with details regarding the current contract in place for the provision of healthcare in custody. To also include an update on the effectiveness of the current contract.

**43/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 15 NOVEMBER 2017 [Item 12]**

The next meeting of the Panel will be held on 15 November 2017.

This will be an informal meeting with the Chief Constable of Surrey police and the PCC.

Meeting ended at: 11.47 am

---

**Chairman**