

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 28 June 2018 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

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

Members:

(*Present)

- * Ken Harwood (Chairman)
- * Ms Charlotte Morley (Vice-Chairman)
- * Cllr Victor Broad
- * Borough Councillor Andrew Burley
- * David Reeve
- * Borough Councillor Beryl Hunwicks
- * Bryan Cross
- * David Fitzpatrick-Grimes
- Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- Cllr Graham Ellwood
- Cllr Margaret Cooksey
- Cllr Peter Waddell
- Cllr Nick Gething

1/18 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

Councillor Ken Harwood was proposed by Councillor David Reeve and seconded by Councillor Bryan Cross.

RESOLVED:

The Panel agreed the appointment of Councillor Ken Harwood as Police and Crime Panel Chairman for the Council year 2018/19.

2/18 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN [Item 2]

Councillor Charlotte Morley was proposed by Councillor Beryl Hunswicks and seconded by Councillor Ken Harwood.

RESOLVED:

The Panel agreed the appointment of Councillor Charlotte Morley as Police and Crime Panel Vice Chairman for the Council year 2018/19.

3/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 3]

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Graham Ellwood, Nick Gething, Margaret Cooksey, Josephine Hawkins and Peter Waddell.

An apology for lateness was received from Councillor Andrew Burley who arrived at 10.35am.

4/18 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - 12 APRIL 2018 [Item 4]

Key Points raised during discussion:

The Commissioner pointed out errors in minute 82/17 as given below.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2018 were approved as a correct record subject to the following amendment of minute 82/17:

That the second and third bullet points of paragraph 2 should read:

- *Depending on where the new HQ was located, there could be another station located in the east of the county as the current Reigate station was not fit for purpose. If the new HQ was in the Eastern division, this would also be the divisional base and there won't be another station.*
- *Woking police station would not be retained but there would still be full operational coverage for the Woking area.*

That in paragraph 3 Reigate Street should read *Reigate station*.

5/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

None received.

6/18 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

None received.

7/18 POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S ANNUAL REPORT [Item 7]

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. Disappointment was expressed by one Member who thought that there was little information regarding tackling particular types of crime in the monthly update of the report. The Commissioner stated that tackling crime was a high priority and that the Chief Constable would be happy to respond to specific queries at the informal meeting in October.
2. There was a general discussion around performance indicators. The Commissioner reported that the dip in figures two years ago was due to disruption whilst police changes were taking place. Whilst the number of crimes solved remained static the number of crimes reported had risen which meant that the performance indicator had dropped. He also pointed out that Surrey's figures were better than most.
3. A Member stated that he was supportive of the additional policy officer post in order to reduce re-offending. The Commissioner explained that he was looking for evidence that work was succeeding in reducing crime and re-offending but it was hard to get the data. He reported that there was a new scheme called Checkpoint which was being worked on for Surrey and would look at offending as well as deferred prosecutions. The Commissioner also stated that he was happy with the Justice Minister's decision not to build a further five women's prisons because locking them up was not good for them or for the community.

There were several queries and comments regarding the 101 service:

4. A couple of Members had visited the 101 call centre and were very impressed with the set up and how the calls were dealt with. The Commissioner responded that the demand for 101 had increased alongside improvement and he believed it would continue to improve.
5. It was stated that when a caller when dials 101 the last option given is to report a crime and asked if this should be the first option and that it had taken 90 seconds listening to all the options to get to the most important one. The Commissioner reminded the Panel that 101 is a non-emergency number and if a crime was in progress that 999 should be dialled.
6. The Panel asked what further public communication could be done. The Commissioner informed the Panel that the Force had just started re-running an advertising campaign that asked the public to ask themselves if the call they were about to make was a police matter. Fifty percent of calls were not police related matters.
7. It was stated that the 101 number goes down at 5pm on a Friday afternoon and callers are told to contact the local authority which is also closed from Friday evening. The Commissioner stated that the 101 number was a 24-hour service, but he would look into this particular case. He also pointed out that council's do have some out of hours services.
8. It was asked if the rise in 101 callers was due to police front desks closing and that this would need to be considered in line with the proposed estates strategy especially with regards to resources for 101. The Commissioner would check on this.

There were several queries and comments regarding traveller encampments:

9. Concern was expressed that illegal traveller encampments appeared to be not of great concern to the police who were slow to respond.
10. The Commissioner explained that encampments were a societal problem and not always a police problem. More transit sites were needed. There was nowhere for police to move travellers to. Sussex had three sites but Surrey had none. The police, whilst not touchy-feely, were conscious that all people had rights.
11. The Commissioner also reported on the consultation regarding the legislation and it was believed by the police to be fit for purpose with a few tweaks.
12. The Commissioner also reported on the current government review of the law and powers available to deal with unauthorised site. Police broadly felt that the powers available to them were fit for purpose with a few tweaks required.

RESOLVED:

The Panel accepted the Annual Report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That formal notification of the Panels acceptance of the Annual Report would be sent to the Commissioner.

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. It was noted that IT was overspent for the last five to six years and a query about reserves was put to the Commissioner. The Chief Finance Officer (CFO) responded that general reserves should be maintained at 3%, however the actual figure at this point was just under the 3% and he would continue to monitor this.
2. In response to a question regarding the gap between February and March over/under spend, the CFO explained some of the reasons for the large jump between underspend and overspend between these months. He explained that following the merger of finance functions between Sussex and Surrey, both used different IT systems so there were a few difficulties around forecasting. Additional software was due to be purchased to resolve this issue. He went on to say that when the IT was in place and working, the financial forecasting would even out. It was admitted that forecasting was a challenge at the moment but something that the CFO was working on to improve.
3. The CFO explained that there was a joint audit committee and that papers were public. A link to this would be sent to the Panel.
4. The Commissioner responded by stating that a year ago he could not trust the figures he was given but the CFO was now on top of the problem to the point where he could now trust the figures.
5. The Commissioner also pointed out that Surrey had the lowest reserves in the country.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That a link to the online papers for the joint audit committee be sent to the Panel.

9/18 OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER 2017/18 END OF YEAR FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 9]

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. In response to a query about whether Sussex contributed to the internal audit costs of the special audit commissioned for the joint Surrey/Sussex finance function, the CFO explained that it was Surrey that was unhappy with the service provision, so bore this cost. Further information would be provided to the Panel after the meeting.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That further information on the additional audit costs taken on by Surrey be forwarded to the Panel.

10/18 VICTIM SATISFACTION [Item 10]

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. The Commissioner introduced his report and explained that there would hopefully be improved services from next year when the current provider contract ended. The services were being brought back in-house in conjunction with the police. Users would have one point of contact via the new Victim Care Unit. The Panel welcomed this news.
2. There were a couple of queries that the Commissioner did not have the answers to and would respond later – these are listed below as further actions.
3. The Commissioner explained that the take up of victim care services was lower than he would like but that under the new arrangements, this would hopefully be redressed.
4. An example of good work of police was cited by a Panel Member in respect of a burglary which had been witnessed. It was suggested that the public needed to consider updating their house alarm systems. The Commissioner would speak with crime reduction officers about this.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That the Commissioner would provide information on the following unanswered queries:

- What percentage choose not be contacted again by the VARC (paragraph 2.3 of the report)?
- What does enhanced and non-enhanced mean (paragraph 2.6 of the report)?
- What are grades 1, 3 and 4 callers?

11/18 DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERNAL VICTIM CARE UNIT [Item 11]**Key Points raised during discussion:**

1. The Chairman advised the Commissioner that Panel members had received a letter from a current service provider but no response had been made, pending this meeting. The Commissioner explained that the decision for the change of provider was taken after careful consideration.
2. In response to Member questions the Commissioner reported that funding for any new victim care unit would be through the PCC's Victim Fund so the Commissioner would be involved and provide support although day to day operations would be by Surrey Police. He also reported that most of the staff in the new unit would not police. He would report back later on what 'priority crime' meant which was referred to in paragraph 3.1.7 of the submitted report.

RESOLVED:

To note the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

Report back on what 'priority crime' referred to in paragraph 3.1.7 of the submitted report.

12/18 FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 12]

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. There was some misunderstanding on the meaning of the third paragraph on the fourth page of the report. On the fourth line the word 'released' should read 'detained'.
2. There was discussion around burglary figures and the Commissioner stated that burglary figures, the number of arrests and solving of crime were higher, but accepted that these figures were still too low.
3. One Member stated that drug use figures were 'off the chart'. The Commissioner explained that whilst the figures were high, the police were on top of the situation in the short term but were more pessimistic about the longer term. He explained that many drug users thought that it was alright to take drugs which shouldn't be a crime. He also stated that where there is demand you will find a supplier.
4. In response to a Member query about quality of police files and subsequent disclosure of those files, the Commissioner explained that the Chief Constable had received national acclaim for work he had done on disclosure. He also stated that file quality related to files for the Crown Prosecution Service; especially for rape and sex offence files.

RESOLVED:

To note the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That the Panel be sent details of the following:

- a. The new scorecard
- b. Update of number of people still wanted for burglary following the HMIPC report

13/18 FRAUD UPDATE [Item 13]

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. In response to questions from the Panel the Commissioner explained that:
 - (a) Whilst 440 crime referrals had been made to Surrey Police only 84 had gone to trial. That there was a national effort to tackle fraud as it was a growing area for the police.
 - (b) That Operations Signature was a cross-border initiative to help those too embarrassed to report that they were a victim of fraud. Further details would be sent to Panel Members.
 - (c) That whilst engagement with business did take place it was difficult to get them to report fraud. It was also recognised that there was little meaningful contact made with businesses, especially amongst the smaller businesses.

- (d) The police do not have the resources or expertise to deal with banking fraud and therefore these were referred to banks. The police have to concentrate on serious fraud. He also explained that individual Forces were responsible for the cost of serious fraud investigations and he believed it should be paid for nationally.
- (e) With regard to the proposed staff changes within the Economic Crime Unit, the Commissioner stated that considerable effort had been made to multi-skill staff and he was confident that the Chief Constable would give this the priority it deserved.
- (f) The Commissioner confirmed that there was an obligation on banks to report credit card scams but not all did.

RESOLVED:

To note the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That details of Operation Signature be provided to Panel Members.

14/18 GOVERNANCE OF FIRE AND RESCUE IN SURREY [Item 14]

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. The Commissioner introduced his report and explained that he was waiting for two crucial pieces of information before making a final decision on whether to take on fire governance in the Autumn of 2018. These were:
 - The results of the current inspection of the fire service, and
 - The outcome of Hertfordshire's decision to take on fire governance.
2. In response to questions, the Commissioner stated that if he were to take on fire governance, this would come out of existing budgets. He would need to provide a business case and include independent financial viability details. The KPMG report had not identified any significant savings to be made by the Commissioner taking on fire governance.

RESOLVED:

To note the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That an update be provided to the Panel in November 2018.

15/18 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 15]

Key Points raised during discussion:

A Panel Member asked the Commissioner about future planning and provision of accommodation for key service workers. The Commissioner accepted that relocation of staff would be difficult and that he had looked at this potential problem a few months ago but would take another look at it.

16/18 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 16]

Key Points raised during discussion:

The Chairman introduced the report for noting.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the outcome of Complaint PCP031.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

17/18 PCP BUDGET 2017/18 [Item 17]

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. The Chairman introduced the report and confirmed the fact that no Panel Members received an allowance.
2. It was noted that Surrey County Council had abolished the Special Responsibility Allowance for scrutiny of the Police and Crime Commissioner, and the concept of a 'Lead Member' abandoned and replaced by the designation of an 'SCC Representative'.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

18/18 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 18]

Key Points raised during discussion:

1. The Chairman introduced the Tracker and Forward plan. There were several items that had previously been suggested by Members but had no details of what was being asked for. These items were discussed and how they would be handled.
2. The Commissioner pointed out that requesting so many formal reports had an effect on his office and staff. Panel Members suggested that not all items required formal reports and some items only required a paragraph of explanation.

RESOLVED:

1. To request a short briefing note containing the following items listed in the Forward Plan (Tracker R15/18):
 - Use of drones – a Strategic overview. Is there funding?
 - Coercion – What are 'coercive crimes'?
 - Neighbourhood Watch – A summary on its current position.

- CCTV Review update – details of where and how this will be provided especially as part of the Estates Strategy.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That an short briefing note on the above items be provided by the OPCC.

19/18 RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMPLAINTS SUB COMMITTEE [Item 19]

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Panel discussed whether to increase the numbers of Members on the Complaints Sub-Committee as there had been occasions during the previous year when it had been difficult to reach a quorum.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Complaints Sub Committee membership be increased to seven members.
2. The Panel agreed the terms of reference for the Complaints Sub-Committee attached at Annex A.
3. The Panel appointed the following members to the Complaints Sub-Committee for the remainder of the 2018/19 Council year,
 - Cllr Victor Broad
 - Cllr Margaret Cooksey
 - Cllr Ken Harwood
 - Cllr Charlotte Morley
 - Cllr David Reeve
 - Independent Member David Fitzpatrick-Grimes
 - Independent Member Bryan Cross
4. The Panel agreed the Complaints Protocol, attached at Annex B.

ACTION/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

20/18 RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FINANCE SUB GROUP [Item 20]

RESOLVED:

The Panel agreed the terms of reference for the Finance Sub-Group attached at Annex C,

The Panel appointed the following members to the Finance Sub-Group for the remainder of the 2018/19 Council year,

- Independent Member Bryan Cross
- Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- Cllr Victor Broad

- Chairman
- Vice-Chairman

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

21/18 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 21]

The next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel meeting will be held on Wednesday 19 September 2018 at 10.30am in the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

Meeting ended at: 12.26 pm

Chairman



Surrey Police and Crime Panel

Complaints Protocol

1 Background

- 1.1 The Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 make Surrey's Police and Crime Panel (hereby referred to as "PCP") responsible for overseeing complaints made about the conduct of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) and the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC), where appointed.
- 1.2 The PCP also has a responsibility to informally resolve noncriminal complaints about the conduct of the PCC and DPCC, as well as criminal complaints or conduct matters that are referred back to it by the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). Issues raised about local crime or neighbourhood concerns rather than about the conduct of the PCC or DPCC will be dealt with by the police force through normal channels of feedback rather than under the Regulations.
- 1.3 This document sets out how the PCP will manage the complaints process.

2 Initial Complaint Handling

- 2.1 In accordance with Regulation 7, the PCP has agreed to delegate initial receipt of complaints to the Chief Executive of the PCC's Office (hereby referred to as "Chief Executive").
- 2.2 Where a complaint is sent directly to the PCP, the PCP's Support Officer will refer the matter to the Chief Executive for initial consideration within 5 working days.
- 2.3 Upon receipt of a complaint, the Chief Executive will record the complaint, except in cases where he/she is satisfied that the subject-matter of the complaint is being/has been dealt with by means of criminal proceedings against the PCC/DPCC, or the complaint has subsequently been withdrawn in accordance with the Regulations.
 - 2.3.1 Where the Chief Executive decides not to take action to notify the appropriate panel or record all or any part of the complaint, he/she will notify the complainant of this decision and the grounds on which it was made.
- 2.4 Once recorded, the Chief Executive will determine whether the PCP is the appropriate body to deal with the complaint. If it is not, the Chief Executive will notify the appropriate body. If it is, he/she will refer the matter in the manner outlined in Section 3.
 - 2.4.1 The Chief Executive will refer non-criminal Complaints that are 'out-of-scope' of the PCP on to the most appropriate body.
- 2.5 Where the Chief Executive becomes aware of a Conduct Matter, except where the matter has been recorded as a Complaint or is being/has been dealt with by means of

criminal proceedings, he/she will determine whether the PCP is the appropriate body to deal with it. If it is not, the Chief Executive will notify the appropriate body. If it is, he/she will record the Conduct Matter.

2.6 In the event that it becomes clear to the Chief Executive that a complaint or Conduct Matter involves any degree of criminality, he/she will refer (in such manner as the IPCC specifies) a Serious Complaint or Conduct Matter to the IPCC. This referral will occur no later than the end of the day when it first became clear that the matter constitutes a Serious Complaint or Conduct Matter.

2.6.1 Where the IPCC notifies the Chief Executive that it requires a Complaint or Conduct Matter to be referred to it, the Chief Executive will comply as soon as possible and in any event no later than the end of the day after such notification was made.

2.6.2 The Chief Executive of the PCC will notify the complainant (where applicable), and the person to whose conduct the matter relates (unless a decision has been taken that it might prejudice a possible future investigation) of the referral.

2.6.3 Where the IPCC refers a criminal or conduct complaint back to the PCP, the Chief Executive will refer the matter in the manner outlined in Section 3.

3 Disapplication of the Regulations

3.1 Having decided that a complaint does not need to be referred to the IPCC or having referred a complaint to the IPCC and had it referred back, the PCP Complaints Sub-Committee may decide that a complaint should not be subjected to resolution in accordance with Part 4 of the regulations or that no action should be taken in relation to it at all. The Complaints Sub-Committee must notify the complainant and the person being complained about if they decide to handle the complaint in this manner. The Complaints Sub-Committee may only do this if the complaint falls into any one of the following specified categories:

3.1.1 A complaint by a member of the relevant office holder's staff, arising from the staff member's work;

3.1.2 A complaint that is more than 12 months old, where there is no good reason for the delay or the delay would be likely to cause injustice;

3.1.3 A complaint about conduct that is already the subject of another complaint;

3.1.4 An anonymous complaint that discloses neither the name nor address of the complainant;

3.1.5 A complaint which is vexatious, oppressive or otherwise an abuse of process for dealing with complaints;

3.1.6 A complaint that is repetitious.

3.2 If the Chief Executive of the PCC considers that either there is an actual, or there could be a perceived, conflict of interest in respect of them taking any of the decisions detailed in Section 2, he/she shall refer the matter to the PCP's Complaints Sub-

Committee for it to take the decision. Such referral will be made no later than **2 working days** after identifying the actual or perceived conflict of interest.

4 Referral of Complaint to the PCP

4.1 When the decision has been made to record a complaint that does not need to be referred to the IPCC, or a Serious Complaint or Conduct Matter that has been referred back by the IPCC, and falls under the responsibility of the PCP, the Chief Executive will:

4.1.1 Send a record of the complaint to the complainant and to the person complained about. In the latter case, the Chief Executive may decide to provide the complaint in a form which protects the identity of the complainant. The Chief Executive will also provide the complainant and the person complained about the contact details of the Panel's Support Officer;

4.1.2 Refer the record, and copies of all the associated paperwork, to the Panel's Support Officer within **5 working days** of the complaint being recorded.

4.2 On receipt of the complaint, the Panel's Support Officer will:

4.2.1 Assess the complaint to ensure that it clearly identifies the alleged conduct matter.

4.2.2 Refer unclear complaints back to the Chief Executive of the Office of the PCC seeking further information.

4.2.3 Consider whether the complaint has been satisfactorily dealt with and if so, consult with the complainant to treat the complaint as withdrawn.

4.2.4 In appropriate cases, consider in consultation with the Chair of the Panel the suitability of the complaint for disapplication of part 4 of the regulations (see section 3).

4.2.5 In the event that a matter is considered suitable for a disapplication of Part 4 of the Regulations, to consult the complainant and the PCC, before determining whether a disapplication is appropriate, whereupon the complaint will be recorded as complete.

4.2.6 Share details of the complaint with the membership of the Complaints Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee is a working group made of six members of the Police and Crime Panel. Three members of the Sub-Committee must be present to consider a complaint.

4.2.7 Convene a meeting of the Complaints Sub-Committee, normally to be held within **4 weeks** of the referral of the complaint.

4.2.8 Write to the complainant, setting out timescales and providing details about the informal resolution procedure, and giving the complainant **2 weeks** to make further comments in support of his/her complaint. Where the Panel's Support Officer believes that the circumstances of the case are such that the Complaints Sub-Committee may decide to treat the complaint as having been

resolved, he/she will ask the complainant to provide his/her representations in this regard for the Complaints Sub-Committee to take into account; and

- 4.2.9 Write to the person complained about, setting out timescales and providing details about the informal resolution procedure; and giving him/her **2 weeks** to make comments in response to the complaint.

5 Considering the Complaint

- 5.1 The Panel's Support Officer will compile a brief report for the Complaints Sub-Committee, setting out the pertinent details of the complaint, recording any failure by the person complained about to comment on the complaint and making suggestions for the next steps.
- 5.2 Upon meeting, the Complaints Sub-Committee will first consider whether the complaint has been satisfactorily dealt with and, subject to any representations by the complainant, may decide to treat the complaint as having been resolved. In such a case, the Complaints Sub-Committee's reasons will be recorded and notified to the parties.
- 5.3 The complaints Sub-Committee shall have regard to:
- 5.3.1 The Code of Conduct of the Police and Crime Commissioner;
 - 5.3.2 Whether the complaint discloses a specific conduct failure identifiable within the Code of Conduct of the Police and Crime Commissioner;
 - 5.3.3 Whether the complaint related to operational policing matters which the Police and Crime Commissioner has no authority over;
 - 5.3.4 The remedies available to it.
- 5.4 If the Complaints Sub-Committee believes that the matter has not yet been satisfactorily dealt with, it will determine the most suitable course of action to assist informal resolution. The Panel will take into account any applicable guidance issued by the Secretary of State and may also consider any guidance issued by the IPCC pursuant to section 22 of the Police Reform Act 2002 on local resolution. Any such action plan will include an indicative timeframe. Any action plan may include the following:
- 5.4.1 Asking the Panel's Support Officer to write an explanatory letter to the complainant on behalf of the Complaints Sub-Committee;
 - 5.4.2 Requesting that an officer of the PCC's Office write an explanatory letter to the complainant;
 - 5.4.3 Suggesting a change to the Office of the PCC policy;
 - 5.4.4 Requesting that an apology be tendered by the person complained about (no apology may be tendered on behalf of the person complained against unless that person has admitted the alleged conduct and agreed to the apology).

- 5.5 In accordance with Regulations, the Complaints Sub-Committee will not conduct an investigation¹. The Complaints Sub-Committee may exercise its delegated powers to require the person complained against to provide information or documents or attend before it to answer questions or give evidence, as this will not be regarded as an investigation. However, any other step intended to gather information about the complaint, other than inviting the comments of the complainant and the person complained against, will not be permitted.
- 5.6 If, at any stage, the IPCC informs the PCP that it requires the complaint to be referred to it, or if the Complaints Sub-Committee decides that the matter has a criminal element and therefore needs to be referred to the IPCC, the informal resolution process will be discontinued.
- 5.7 The Panel's Support Officer will make a record of any informal resolution and will, usually within **5 working days**, provide copies to the complainant and the person complained about.
- 5.8 The PCP shall not publish any part of any such record unless the Panel:
- 5.8.1 has given the complainant and the person complained against the opportunity to make representations in relation to the proposed publication; and
 - 5.8.2 having considered any such representations, is of the opinion that publication is in the public interest.
- 5.9 As a working group of the PCP, the Complaints Sub-Committee will meet in private and will report to each quarterly scheduled meeting of the PCP summarising any complaints that have been considered since the last meeting, including the outcome.
- 5.10 If agreed by the full membership of the Sub-Committee, the informal resolution of a complaint can be considered through 'electronic' means, including email and teleconferencing, depending upon the evidence provided and complexity of the complaint.


6 Complaints about the PCP

- 6.1 A complainant who is not satisfied with the outcomes of the Complaints Sub-Committee may make a complaint to the LGO (Local Government Ombudsman) who will consider the case- <http://www.lgo.org.uk/make-a-complaint>.
- 6.2 Any complaints about the Surrey Police and Crime Panel or a Panel Member will need to be directed to the Monitoring Officer of the host authority.

¹ The Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex B - SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL COMPLAINT HANDLING FLOWCHART



Glossary

PCC- Police and Crime Commissioner

DPCC- Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner

IOPC- Independent Office for Police Conduct

This page is intentionally left blank

ANNEX C

SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL FINANCE SUB-GROUP

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Purpose

To monitor and review the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner's budget proposals (including the proposed precept) and make recommendations to the Panel as appropriate.

Membership of the Group

3-6 members of the Surrey Police and Crime Panel.

Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Panel will be ex-officio members of the sub-group.

Roles/Functions

- To develop a good understanding of the Surrey Police budget.
- To question/challenge the Commissioner about the financial information provided in support of the precept and identify any further information which might be required, so that any issues can be addressed at an early stage.
- To carry out detailed scrutiny of specific budget issues as necessary.
- To provide a steer to the Commissioner and/or the Surrey Police and Crime Panel on action to be taken to address any budget issues identified.
- To lead the discussion when budget issues are discussed by the full Panel, ensuring that other members of the Panel have a good understanding and can make informed decisions.

This page is intentionally left blank