

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 18 September 2019 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)

- *Councillor Ken Harwood (Chairman)
- *Mr Bryan Cross (Vice-Chairman)
- *Councillor Andrew Povey
- *Councillor David Reeve
- *Mr David Fitzpatrick-Grimes
- *Councillor Victor Lewanski
- *Councillor Hazel Watson
- *Councillor Fiona White
- *Councillor John Furey
- *Councillor John Robini
- *Councillor Will Forster
- Councillor Josephine Hawkins
- Councillor Christine Elmer
- Councillor Richard Barratt

Councillor Andrew Povey left the room between 11.30am and 12.05pm, absent for Items 8-11 and part of Item 12.

52/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Councillors Christine Elmer and Josephine Hawkins.

53/19 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The Committee agreed that point 4 of Item 38/19 of the 27 June 2019 minutes be removed as it duplicated point 2.

54/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

55/19 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

There were none.

56/19 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN 2018-2020 – PROGRESS [Item 5]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)
Damian Markland, Head of Policy & Commissioning, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) introduced the report and highlighted the new Enterprise Resource Planning system (known as Equip) and informed Members that a detailed update on this item would be presented to Members at the next informal meeting.

In response to Member queries:

2. The PCC explained that it was positive that 9 out of 11 districts and boroughs had supported and funded the domestic abuse service and that he would continue working with the other 2. They would not be named and shamed as the Head of Policy & Commissioning (OPCC) informed the Panel that some boroughs and districts had given direct funding whilst others provided non-financial support such as accommodation.
3. The Head of Policy & Commissioning (OPCC) responded to the concern around domestic abuse by explaining that there had been changes to the way that it was commissioned. As of April 2020 there would be a formally commissioned service, contractually based providing a clear access point for borough and district councils to support.
4. The PCC agreed with Members' concerns that the figures on anti-social behaviour were not moving in the right direction. In Appendix A the '% of public from survey believing that the police deal with anti-social behaviour and crimes that matter in their area' had declined and was almost down a third. The PCC explained the period of turbulence Surrey Police had been through following the adoption of the policing in the neighbourhood system. It was in place a month after the PCC began his term and its destabilising impact had now been realised three years later. It had to be done as the previous model was not affordable. He was pleased this has now been got over and there was a sea change in Surrey Police through engagement with communities and noted positively the current good relationship with the districts and boroughs.
5. The PCC hoped that public perception and confidence would increase from around 70% - which was a high number - due to the extra 104 police officers, the doubling of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) who had a critical role in tackling anti-social behaviour, extra one youth intervention officers per borough and the ongoing work on unauthorised encampments.
6. A Member however commented the 10% drop in public confidence since 2015/16. He noted several cases in his borough of Runnymede where the police had failed to deal with anti-social behaviour including unauthorised encampments. The PCC was happy to meet with that Member on his particular problems.
7. In response the PCC, explained that Surrey Police now had the procedures and officers on the ground to deal with unauthorised encampments but there were still no transit sites in Surrey compared to Sussex and a complete section of the act dealing with unauthorised encampments was not operative in Surrey. He urged district, borough and county councillors to push for the transit sites and in response Members stated that funding must also come from Surrey Police.

8. The PCC clarified that the 'changes in powers' over unauthorised encampments sought, was in response to a drafting error where the police could move travellers on public land but not on highway verges.
9. The PCC shared the Panel's dismay that the Positive Outcome rate for high harm offences had gone down in Appendix A and noted that Surrey Police was near the bottom of the national league for this due to disclosure issues. Various other reasons were mentioned including a lack of resources and a difficulty in hiring detectives. Surrey Police was putting all focus and resources possible into resolving this issue; and more high harm investigators were being recruited as part of the 104 extra police and a problem solving unit was formed.
10. A Member raised the issue of the Surrey Road Casualty 2018 figures which showed a drop in number of those 'killed', the 'slight injured' and 'all casualties' from previous years; and whether his Community Speed Watch (CSW) scheme reduced those numbers. He also asked the PCC if he could explain the huge change on the ratio of those 'seriously injured' between 2017 and 2018.
11. In response the PCC stated that he could not explain the ratio change, but he was hoping to put some of the extra officers from the 20,000 confirmed by the government into road policing. There was a current successful campaign to warn people of the danger and criminality of using mobile phones, decreased offences. The CSW scheme was difficult to assess, but there had been a slowing down of cars and it engendered a sense of community between residents.
12. The PCC noted local communities' concerns over the lack of enforcement of speed cameras, but prioritising this would mean other areas would go down the scale. Drive SMART was also a good initiative between Surrey County Council - notably Councillor Povey and the Cabinet Member for Highways, Matt Furniss and Surrey Police - but needed to be revitalised and called for the Panel's help. New technology needed to be utilised and he was pressing for an average speed camera programme.
13. The PCC agreed to provide an appendix page in the future to clarify the terms such as Cuckooing Project, catalyst, dovetail, SHIPP and fearless worker to be accessible to the Panel and the public. The Chairman stated that proof reading of reports was also necessary due to many grammatical errors.
14. It was also pointed out to the Panel that there was an error whereby the Surrey High Intensity Partnership Programme (SHIPP) cost down from approximately £176,000 to just £116.
15. The error of the number of serious sexual offences figures from 677 to 324 in Appendix B should have been 624 to reflect the percentage change amount was also highlighted. The PCC explained that the low Positive Outcome rate on serious sexual offences was due to problems of disclosure. The inquiry on the disclosure review would be made public shortly and reported to the Panel.
16. The PCC explained that the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme (CSAS) was a legal scheme where the Chief Constable was allowed to delegate closely defined powers to others such as the Joint Enforcement Teams (JETs). Parking powers were not included and the PCC had spoken to the Home Office on this. The PCC would speak to the Member on the Guildford JET.
17. In response to a Member query, the PCC explained that Project Fearless was an initiative under Crime Stoppers encouraging young people to use anonymously online and through telephone calls to

report crimes. A case worker funded by the OPCC went round schools to promote the Project.

18. The Vice-Chairman praised the Borough Commander for Woking on the work done on Woking station with 35 people arrested with 26 linked to county lines. The PCC was at the event and commented on its success and hoped that this initiative could be reproduced elsewhere.
19. The Head of Policy & Commissioning stated that 'fraud navigators' fell within Operation Signature led by Sussex Police. Fraud navigators supported the process of compiling the details of numerous vulnerable individuals to fraud and led on preventative work and cybercrime training. They would be based in the Victim and Witness Care Unit.
20. The PCC explained that the number that Surrey Police would be allocated of the 20,000 extra police nationally 'to make our streets safer' – which would include detectives - had not been released. Based on the figures alone of 20,000 new police, it would mean a 16% uplift in police officers over 3 years nationally. That could mean approximately an additional 100 police a year for three years for Surrey. The majority of new police would go to national law enforcement agencies and the Metropolitan Police for example.
21. There would be adequate resources to train those extra police and there would not be any relaxation of the recruitment process although it needed to be rationalised as outlined by the Government's investigation into 43 forces with different recruitment processes. There was two-way movement between Surrey and Sussex Police but the lower retention rate in Surrey Police needed to be addressed.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the progress made against the Police and Crime Plan 2018-2020.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

1. **R38/19** - The PCC to provide an appendix explaining the acronyms and specialist language used in the reports in order to be accessible to the Panel and the public.
2. **R39/19** - The PCC explained that the inquiry on the disclosure review on serious sexual offences would be made public shortly and reported to the Panel.

57/19 VICTIM AND WITNESS CARE UNIT STAFFING AND GOVERNANCE [Item 6]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner
Damian Markland - Head of Policy & Commissioning, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC informed the Committee that this was a bold new venture that started 18 months ago and required a large amount of work in order to give better care to victims.
2. The Head of Policy & Commissioning (OPCC) introduced the report and explained that Surrey OPCC received £1.4 million from the Ministry of Justice a year to be used for a range of services for victims; this was a combination of third sector providers which offered specialist services and more generalist services through a safety net for victims of crime.
3. Historically, the independent charity Victim Support provided this service but as the contract had come to an end after four years, victim care was brought in-house to Guildford as the new Victim and Witness Care Unit. It was not primarily about saving money but to provide a single point of contact and support for victims and creating a better understanding of victim and witness support within Surrey Police.
4. There would be a six month post-implementation review on the successes and challenges of the Unit through the joint Surrey/Sussex Police Change Delivery Team; which would be shared shortly to the Panel. The Unit was working well with the largest challenge being the duplication of cases on the IT system, and an accessibility issue by volunteers to the police IT system.
5. In response to a Member query, the Head of Policy & Commissioning (OPCC) stated that there was currently no skewing along geographical lines posing difficulty for victims on the eastern side of Surrey County. Initial support would be offered from the Unit's base in Guildford through text messaging, calls and online help; and long-term support offered through the mobile base of volunteers and paid staff spread across the county.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the report and it was noted that for further information members of the Police and Crime Panel could visit:
victimandwitnesscare.org.uk

Actions/Further information to be provided:

R40/19 - The results of the six month post-implementation review on the successes and challenges of the Unit would be shared shortly to the Panel.

58/19 RURAL CRIME STRATEGY [Item 7]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. In response to the Chairman's query on the meaning of 'Niche flags', the PCC responded that it was a statistically useful police IT system which categorised crime more accurately including rural crime.
2. A Member queried whether the rural crime system had an effect to reduce rural crime and whether residents in rural areas felt supported. The PCC responded that an update on the strategy's results would be provided and that anecdotally people felt re-assured and welcomed greater Surrey Police engagement in rural areas.
3. Members were concerned with the issue of mounted police and the training costs of the horses and their insurance. The PCC explained that they were fully insured and being privately owned the training costs of the horses were significantly reduced.

Councillor Andrew Povey left at 11.30am

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the report.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

R41/19 - The PCC to provide an update on the strategy's results.

59/19 INDEPENDENT CUSTODY VISITING SCHEME [Item 8]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC paid tribute to the volunteers who ran the Independent Custody Visiting Scheme.
2. The Chairman highlighted that there was feedback from the Independent Custody Visitors but no feedback had been reported from 'detained persons'. In response, the PCC stated that there was feedback available reported by the ICVs and was largely positive.
3. The Vice-Chairman queried more visits were held on Wednesday rather than the assumption of Friday/Saturday evening of more people in custody. The PCC explained that generally the distribution of visits was good with monitoring done suite by suite and that he wanted the volunteers to do more visits out of hours if possible.
4. In response to the Chairman's question over the recruitment of ICVs, the PCC informed the Panel that there was regular and successful recruitment campaigns primarily online based and the majority of

recruitment was by word of mouth. It was reported that the retention rate was also good.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the report.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None.

60/19 PCC PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT [Item 9]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC introduced the report and remarked that the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), himself and the Chief Constable of Surrey Police held a series of successful community engagement sessions in all 11 boroughs and districts in the summer. He hoped to repeat these in January around the time of consultation on the precept. The PCC reported that these events were very useful with a good turnout and interesting questions asked by members of the public.
2. In response to the Chairman's query, the PCC recalled anecdotal comments from when he went out on shift with Neighbourhood Policing Teams and Street Angel teams. It was noted that there was an enthusiasm and a depth of commitment by those teams to the task and a frustration on not being able to help even more due to a lack of resources.
3. The PCC responded to a Member question, that a wider and more formal survey on public opinion would be useful rather than the sole focus on precept consultation. The PCC would look into it, but stated that it would be costly and time intensive, there was however constant daily engagement between the police and residents. There was also a large amount of free-standing views at 4,000 on general opinions not just around the precept.
4. In response to the Vice-Chairman's query on the groups the PCC consulted with, he stated that he went round as many groups as possible – not just through the police text messaging service 'In the Know' - such as this Panel, stakeholders, borough and district councils and he had a close link to the Chambers of Commerce and Federation of Small Businesses.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the report.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

R42/19 - The PCC would look into a possible wider survey of topics to gather greater public opinion on the police.

61/19 CCTV [Item 10]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC introduced the report and expressed frustration that CCTV in Surrey was not a rationalised process unlike in Sussex with a more consistent service through good partnerships between Sussex Police and borough and district councils.
2. Despite the budgetary pressures, the PCC pledged not to reduce funding for CCTV whilst he was in office.
3. In response to Members' concerns over Surrey Police's long-term financial commitment on CCTV enabling future financial planning by eastern borough and district councils, the PCC noted the need for a future joint CCTV strategy. He also reported that he had not picked up specific issues with east Surrey, CCTV was being monitored at Reigate police station for the foreseeable.
4. In response to a Member question, the PCC stated that CCTV as an evidence gathering tool had decreased in its importance of live recording as mobile phones and dash cams had filled this role but it was still useful as a reassurance tool.
5. A Member recalled that Surrey Highways used the live feed from the CCTV network and whether Surrey County Council was aware of Surrey Police's plans over the change of CCTV strategy. The PCC commented that the council were fully involved in this and he would check the specific point on the live feed being used in road side cameras.
6. A Member thanked the PCC for putting money back into CCTV but questioned the low funding offered by Surrey Police. Runnymede received £30,000 a year for CCTV access from Surrey Police, but it had cost Runnymede Borough Council over £1.8 million to establish which meant the borough had to recover the costs elsewhere.
7. A Member stated that mobile phones were not always the best placed item to capture crime and queried whether Surrey Police could collaborate more greatly with Sussex Police to ensure best practice. In response the PCC remarked that there was currently good collaboration between both forces.
8. The PCC recalled that Surrey Police had no powers to require district and borough councils to give ownership of CCTV up, Woking for example chose to keep ownership. This resulted in fragmented funding on CCTV, with Surrey Police proposing a county wide procurement programme over many obsolete CCTV systems. The PCC suggested that borough and district councillors on the Panel should take this matter back to their respective councils.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the report.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

1. **R43/19** - The PCC would check the specific point on the live feed being used in road side cameras.
2. **R44/19** - The PCC suggested that borough and district councillors on the Panel should take the matter of CCTV ownership back to their respective councils.

62/19 FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 11]

Witnesses:

Lisa Herrington, Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Ian Perkin, Treasurer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Member questioned how the reduction in the Levels of Victim Contact compliance was compatible with the new Victim and Witness Care Unit. The Chief Executive (OPCC) explained that the Victim Contact compliance was done by investigating officers separately to the Victim and Witness Care Unit which was a mandatory requirement as part of the Victims' Code.
2. In response to a Member question concerning the lessened role of the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) in Surrey the PCC stated that the CPS was very under resourced. There was however a good relationship between Surrey Police and the local CPS in Kent, Surrey and Sussex as a result of 'embedded officers' which were police who sat with the local CPS for joint collaboration over cases.
3. The Vice-Chairman queried the amount of the 50% of all cash forfeitures recovered from the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) 2002 that went to Surrey Police and highlighted the error on page 68: that 18/75% should be 18.75 % of confiscation orders fulfilled by Surrey Police. The PCC stated that POCA was a success which brought in a large amount of money to the police with a recent successful bitcoin fraud crackdown.
4. In response to the Vice-Chairman's query, the PCC would report at a later date with more detail on the issue of Surrey Fire and Rescue receiving hate crime reports.
5. In response to a Member's concern over the lack of long-term success on Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) representation with the target of 9% being missed by half, the PCC remarked that Surrey Police had stepped up its positive action programme. This ensured that all candidates regardless of their background received the same access to training and mentoring through the selection process. Surrey Police needed to work with the BAME community to remove cultural disadvantages and it was also important to recruit more women and LGBT individuals.

6. In response to the Chairman's query on stalking and harassment, the PCC explained it was a severely underreported crime now with its own 'Niche flag'. That 'compliance in crime data integrity' meant that volumes were recorded, ensured through better categorisation and encouragement for victims to report it.
7. The Chairman raised the issue of the Capital Programme and why Surrey Police only 'appear' to be getting this under control and whether the new finance tool called Host Analytics would resolve this. In response, the Treasurer (OPCC) stated that there was a caution of underspending within Surrey Police as past schemes did not take into consideration the additional costs from planning difficulties for example. Greater encouragement to use the funds available was necessary rather than a constant rolling over into the next year.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the update on the PCC's Performance Meetings.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

R45/19 - The PCC would report back to the Panel on the issue of Surrey Fire and Rescue receiving hate crime reports at a later date.

63/19 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 12]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Member remarked that earlier this year there was a report by the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Knife Crime which linked the reduction in the amount of activities available for young people- through cuts in grant provisions - with knife crime. In response the PCC noted that knife crime in Surrey was low, however the fear of being stabbed by young people in Surrey was second on their anxiety rating behind mental health. He reported that there was not a major correlation between knife crime and closing youth services, but education in schools was important.
2. The PCC also pointed out that preventative work was essential as although knife crime was more prevalent in London, it travelled out of the capital to counties such as Surrey. He also informed the Panel that he had pushed for a portion of the Governments' £100 million of 'Surge' funding - of which the majority went to urban areas, London and the West Midlands for example- to tackle knife crime to be allocated to Surrey.
3. Members were also informed that Surrey Police was running a knife amnesty campaign that week where anyone carrying a knife could surrender it anonymously to police stations. This included: Woking, Guildford and Reigate, to which Members were concerned as it was a long way to travel for those on the outskirts of Surrey. The campaign recognised that there was a higher correlation between knife carrying

and being stabbed, the PCC commented that he had made a video the day before the Panel to widely publicise it.

4. A Member raised the issue of the decreasing positive outcome rate of 'high harm' crimes and asked what the category consisted of. The PCC stated that it included a number of categories. In response, a Member stated that those categories should be included in an updated Appendix B: Crime Measures Requested by the Panel, on both the Levels of Crime and Positives Outcomes. The PCC recalled that he had six-weekly performance meetings with the Chief Constable where 'high harm' crime was taken seriously and he would look into expanding Appendix B in a future report to the Panel.
5. Concerning the average time to answer 101 calls, a Member noted that many in his borough of Runnymede felt it worthless without any follow up. In response, PCC confirmed that there were statistics available on the nature of the calls; these would be reported by borough if available at the next informal meeting. The PCC extended an invitation to the whole Panel to visit the Surrey Police Contact Centre, he also informed the Member that all 101 calls were recorded and he would follow-up specific calls and cases he may have.
6. The PCC commented that half of all calls to 101 were not police matters. There had been an improvement of 101 use and handling over the last three years- made a priority by the Chief Constable and the PCC- with a shorter waiting time and there was information given to callers on their number in the queue for greater clarity. Other forces often visited Surrey Police to find out its strategy on 101 handling.

Councillor Andrew Povey returned at 12.05pm

7. In response to a Member question, the PCC explained that every individual post was vetted to a varying degree which included employees within partnership agreements and due to a high volume vetting took a long time.
8. A Member raised the issue of parking controls in Reigate that in his councillor surgeries he had been approached by two wheelchair users who had to go onto main roads to get round parked cars. In response the PCC recommended the recent parliamentary Transport Select Committee report on pavement parking which called for a revision of parking laws. The PCC urged the Member to refer to him on specific issues concerning parking. The PCC would shortly be having a meeting next week at Reigate and Banstead Borough Council with parking officers as a pilot concerning the revision of parking laws.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

1. **R46/19** - The PCC would include the other categories concerning 'high harm' crimes in an updated Appendix B: Crime Measures Requested by the Panel, on both the Levels of Crime and Positives Outcomes in a later report.
2. **R47/19** - Statistics on 101 calls would be reported at the next informal meeting and by borough if possible.

3. **R48/19** - Democratic Services will liaise with the OPCC for the whole Panel to visit the Surrey Police Contact Centre.

64/19 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 13]

There were none.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None.

65/19 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 14]

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. **R35/19:** The Chairman reiterated that the matter of Transit Sites was an ongoing matter with District and Borough Councils to feedback.
2. **R34/19:** This item was completed with a document on Collaboration Agreements provided in the agenda. Members questioned the large amount of national agreements detailed and the PCC commented that he signed the first-ever Surrey-wide formal concordat with the Leader of Surrey County Council Tim Oliver and the Chief Constable.
3. Members were informed that there were still two vacancies on the Complaints sub-committee.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the Recommendations Tracker and Forward Work Programme.

66/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 15]

The next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel will be on 27 November 2019, at County Hall.

Subsequent to the meeting, the informal meeting will take place on 31 October 2019.

Meeting ended at: 12:27pm

Chairman