

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 22 March 2021, remotely via Microsoft Teams.

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

Members:

(*Present)

- *Councillor Andrew Povey
- *Councillor David Reeve (Chairman)
- *Councillor Victor Lewanski
- *Councillor Hazel Watson (Vice-Chairman)
- *Councillor Fiona White
- *Councillor John Furey
- *Councillor John Robini
- *Councillor Will Forster
- *Councillor Josephine Hawkins
- *Councillor Christine Elmer
- *Councillor Bernie Spoor
- Councillor Bob Milton (no longer a Panel representative as of 15 March 2021)
- *Mr Philip Walker
- *Mr Martin Stilwell

21/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [ITEM 1]

No apologies had been received.

22/21 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [ITEM 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2021 were agreed as a true record of that meeting.

23/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [ITEM 3]

There were none.

24/21 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [ITEM 4]

One question was received from Paul Kennedy (District Councillor - Mole Valley District Council). The response can be found attached to these minutes as Annex A.

A supplementary question was asked by Paul Kennedy and the response can be found below.

- *Supplementary question asked by Paul Kennedy:*

The questioner thanked the Chairman and thanked the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for his positive written response, noting that although the PCC was not yet a convert to 20 mph schemes, he welcomed the new broader approach and consultation outlined.

Regarding the PCC's meeting on 24 March with Surrey County Council and Surrey Police he asked whether the scope for establishing more county-wide default speed limits in certain situations could be explored, as opposed to the existing expensive

speed-testing, feasibility studies and requirements for serious injuries. Not just for 20 mph outside schools, but also for example 40 mph on quiet country lanes with unseen hazards as opposed to the often 60 mph speed limit. That whilst rural County Councillors such as the Vice-Chairman had worked hard, with the support of Surrey Police, to get specific roads reduced, at least to 40 mph, it was a difficult process and he asked that the PCC try to make the process less difficult in those situations.

Response:

The PCC confirmed that he had put the issue of 20 mph speed limits on the agenda for that upcoming meeting and the aim of the meeting was for it to be the start of a long process to revitalise the DriveSmart programme. He noted that change would not happen overnight and that he had doubts as to whether a blanket approach to 20 mph speed limits was correct, but welcomed a considered debate going forward.

25/21 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN 2018-2021 – PROGRESS [ITEM 5]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC highlighted that:
 - The 'Positive Outcome Rate for crimes against vulnerable people (sexual offences, domestic abuse, child abuse and hate crime)' which remained at 13% was a concern. Although not bad compared with nationally and better than Sussex Police's positive outcome rate, improvement was needed and he was optimistic that the rate would increase noting that he was satisfied with the enormous amount of work going on in Surrey Police and the extra resources going in. He added that delays in the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) had created a backlog in cases.
 - In addition to supporting the DriveSmart programme as noted in his response to the public question, he commended the Community Speed Watch scheme and noted that work was underway to start to formalise Surrey Police's support for HGV Watch - in which volunteers kept a lookout for HGV's in restricted weight limit roads - and its roll out across the county.
 - Surrey Police had received over £500,000 from the Government's Safer Streets Fund, which had been invested in housing blocks in Stanwell North, with the doubling of national funding on offer as a result of the recent Sarah Everard case.
 - The Magistrates and Crown Courts in Surrey and Sussex were hit badly by Covid-19, and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey (OPCC) had been working with the local teams, the CPS and Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunal Service to try and get back to normality. Whilst the throughput was back to normal levels, the backlog remained. His view that people were waiting too long for justice was shared by his PCC colleagues, noting dissatisfaction with the Government's slow and unimaginative reaction to addressing the delays and that no extra funding had been provided.

2. A Panel member highlighted:

- The appalling positive outcome rate for high harm offences highlighting Appendix A: Police and Crime Plan Performance Measures in which the 'Positive Outcome Rate for crimes against vulnerable people (sexual offences, domestic abuse, child abuse and hate crime)' had dropped throughout the PCC's tenure from 26.5% from the 2015/16 baseline to 13% 2020/21; he further asked how women in Surrey could feel confident in Surrey Police.
- Appendix B: Crime Measures Requested by the Panel - Latest Data in which the 'Positive Outcomes' for Serious Sexual offences was 7.1% in 2020/21. He noted that the PCC throughout his tenure had done nothing to persuade the Chief Constable and Surrey Police to improve upon those rates.
 - In response, the PCC recognised that the rates were not good enough but disagreed with the use of 'appalling' as he noted that regarding the actual numbers of offences that had been solved, the numbers were not dissimilar year on year. What had changed however, was the increase in the number of reported offences particularly Serious Sexual offences.
 - He noted that during his tenure as PCC he had:
 - firstly, provided Surrey Police with as much money as possible through the precept increase which he scrutinised the spending of. He was satisfied that Surrey Police had put in an enormous number of measures to improve the positive outcome rate for high harm offences and had confidence in the force to concentrate more on that area.
 - secondly, he noted that over the last five years of his tenure as PCC and indeed five years prior to that, Surrey Police as with all other forces had been underfunded by the Government and through no fault of its own it had moved from a proactive to a reactive force due to the lack of resources. He welcomed the increase in new recruits and was confident that over time the positive outcome rates would improve.
 - He noted that women in Surrey could feel very confident in Surrey Police which treated serious sexual offences against both women and men with the utmost seriousness. Nationally, more women had the courage to report Serious Sexual offences which affected the positive outcome rate due to resourcing, however the increase in the precept and the PCC Commissioning Budget – Community Safety Grants and Victim Services of over £600,000 to support victims through the Victim and Witness Care Unit, would increase resourcing and lead to improvement.

3. A Panel member referred back to the 'Positive Outcome Rate for crimes against vulnerable people (sexual offences, domestic abuse, child abuse and hate crime)' in Appendix A which remained at 13%. He noted that of the four offences, domestic abuse usually has a high positive outcome rate as often the perpetrator is known to the victim; that meant that the other three offences must have a very poor positive outcome rates and so he asked for a breakdown of the figures relating to all four offences.

- In response, the PCC explained that it was not as simple concerning domestic violence as often such offences are hidden and it is extremely difficult to get evidence.
- Following the clarification by the Chairman on the question due to poor audio, the PCC was happy to provide the breakdown of the four grouped offences and the Chief Constable's plans to address those.

4. A Panel member noted that:
 - He grew tired of the Government being blamed for everything as it did not run Surrey Police, he noted that it was the PCC's responsibility to hold the Chief Constable to account and to make the best use out of his budget.
 - The PCC had not addressed the rising levels of crime nor the positive outcome rates particularly for high harm crime. Rising levels of crime were the barometers that the PCC should have responded to, if they were getting lower because the crime detection rate was lower, then the PCC needed to understand the reasons why and act on it.
 - Although not responsible for Surrey Police's operational activities, the PCC was elected to represent the needs of Surrey's communities.
 - In response, the PCC reiterated the decade of underfunding and resourcing of the police by the Government and so it had been a reactive force.
 - The PCC however welcomed the recent reversal by Government through Operation Uplift and commended the Minister for Policing who was an excellent advocate of police to Her Majesty's Treasury.
 - The PCC noted that he did represent the needs of Surrey's communities, highlighting that he was not satisfied with the level of the positive outcome rates, but welcomed that extra resources coming in and Surrey Police's plans to improve the solve rates across all crimes. Recruitment would take time as indicated in a later report and he was confident that Surrey Police was up for the challenge to address the solve rates and he would continue to scrutinise progress made.
 - The PCC noted that through the precept increases he had provided as much funding to Surrey Police as he could which was a burden on Surrey taxpayers. Whilst actual resources in real terms were back to 2010 levels, funding from the Government through central taxation had decreased by 30% in real terms over the last ten years.
5. The Vice-Chairman referred to page 34 welcoming the reinvigoration of the DriveSmart programme and the new HGV Watch scheme which should make Surrey's roads safer.
 - In response, the PCC gave credit to the Surrey County Council, particularly to the Deputy Leader, who he noted that with support from the Leader he had been working jointly to reinvigorate Councillor Povey's DriveSmart programme.
6. The Vice-Chairman referred to page 32 regarding Victim Navigators in relation to fraud and cybercrime and asked for more detail on their role.
 - In response, the PCC explained that the Victim Navigators would provide support to victims by helping them along their journey by explaining the procedures.
 - He noted that specific to that role, Victim Navigators would be trained officers in relation to fraud and cybercrime so would be able to offer their professional expertise to help victims.
 - He commented that he had grave doubts on whether the national model to support victims of cybercrime and fraud was the right one as criminals were operating nationally and internationally so there should be a stronger focus by the Government on the matter.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the progress made against the Police and Crime Plan 2018-2021.

Actions/further information to be provided:

R4/21 - The PCC will liaise with Surrey Police to provide the breakdown of the 'Positive Outcome Rate for crimes against vulnerable people (sexual offences, domestic abuse, child abuse and hate crime)' and the Chief Constable's plans to address those.

26/21 TACKLING RURAL CRIME STRATEGY UPDATE [ITEM 6]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Panel member asked whether there was a breakdown of the different types of rural crime and their prevalence as that was not specified in the report. In response, the PCC was happy to provide the information requested, noting the complexity of defining a rural crime as opposed to a crime that took place in a rural setting.
2. A Panel member congratulated the PCC in providing the important update highlighting the issue of rural crime. However, he sought a clear definition of rural crime in order to understand how it was flagged on Surrey Police's crime recording system.
 - In response, the PCC noted that he would pass on that thanks and noted that the precept increase was being used to fund a rural crime squad. He noted that although there was a rural crime flag on the NICHE reporting system, rural crime was a complex area and so he would look into providing a more detailed explanation.
3. The Vice-Chairman praised the Strategy and welcomed the Rural Report newsletter provided which highlighted Surrey Police's successes in the rural areas and hoped that it would encourage residents to report crimes in rural areas. She welcomed the inclusion of the contact details for the rural crime officers across Surrey and asked how the newsletter was distributed.
 - In response, the PCC explained that the newsletter was distributed through as many channels as possible particularly via social media. He explained that rural crime officers would normally be out on patrol meeting many residents which was not possible during the pandemic; and welcomed feedback on whether residents viewed the newsletter as useful.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the progress report on tackling rural crime from Surrey Police.

Actions/further information to be provided:

R5/21 - The PCC will provide a breakdown of the different types of rural crime and their prevalence, and will provide a more detailed explanation of how rural crime was flagged on the NICHE reporting system.

27/21 OPCC COMPLAINTS HANDLING UPDATE [ITEM 7]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC highlighted that the OPCC had been responsible for the review of complaints for over a year regarding decisions on complaints made by Surrey Police's Professional Standards Department.
2. The PCC noted that the OPCC was expecting around fifty requests for reviews per year, which was an underestimate as there was one hundred and seventeen in 2020. Although he delegated the review process to the Complaints Review Manager (OPCC), he looked at every review decision which both highlighted the day-to-day operations of Surrey Police officers and that most complaints were handled fairly and thoroughly.
3. The PCC concluded that the review process had highlighted areas of unsafe practice, however it was a concern that a lot of resources were spent on the review process and he had increased his budget as a result. A further review on the process was needed by Government to ensure that full justice was granted to those raising a complaint.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the progress report on complaint handling from the OPCC.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

28/21 SURREY POLICE RECRUITMENT AND WORKFORCE UPDATE [ITEM 8]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC noted that recruitment numbers were slowly returning to previous levels, recognising pleas from residents who had asked where their Council Tax money was being spent noting that they had not seen police officers on the beat; and explained that the recruitment process took time which the report detailed.
2. A Panel member asked how recruitment numbers could be increased from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities, the numbers were low and as a public service it was important that Surrey Police reflected the population it served.
 - In response, the PCC agreed with the Panel member's comments and recognised her concern.
 - The PCC noted that in the national league table Surrey Police was doing well in terms of diversity but noted the need to improve further. He welcomed the national focus and Government's prioritisation of increasing diversity across the nine protected characteristics - under the Equality Act 2010 - including BAME and women.

- The PCC was confident in Surrey Police's desire to increase diversity, noting the actions undertaken by the Chief Constable downwards including a special diversity department to try to increase diversity from a multitude of communities who would not normally consider a police career.
- The PCC was pleased that recruitment was widening but recognised the worry over the narrowing of diversity higher up the ranks. It was vital to both increase recruitment and to ensure that those from BAME communities had equal chance with white peers to get to the highest ranks, with preparing people for final interview panel for example.
- The PCC noted that the statistics on ethnicity from the 2011 Census were out of date and so hoped for an increase in diversity characteristics nationally and as a county in the 2021 Census.

In response, the Panel member added that it was vital to recruit people from those nine protected characteristics now, to ensure more diversity across the future experienced officers up to highest rank of the Chief Constable.

3. A Panel member noted that rather than the standard route of advertising to join Surrey Police through social media or the newspapers, there was a need for more lateral thinking to increase recruitment from diverse backgrounds. He asked whether BAME communities were being utilised by Surrey Police to work with them to provide the path for career development and further asked whether the breakdown of applications by ethnicity could be provided; so by encouraging greater applications from BAME communities that would be translated into more recruits.
 - In response, the PCC agreed with the need to think laterally by working more closely with people from those communities who would not normally think of joining the police. Once lockdown restrictions eased, face-to-face engagement and recruitment could resume.
 - The PCC responded that a more detailed breakdown of applications by ethnicity could be provided and welcomed ideas to further diversify recruitment.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the Surrey Police plans for recruitment and workforce planning.

Actions/further information to be provided:

R6/21 - The PCC will provide a more detailed breakdown of applications to Surrey Police by ethnicity.

29/21 VICTIM AND WITNESS CARE UNIT UPDATE [ITEM 9]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC noted the success of the Unit which was a bold in-house venture replacing the Victim Support external contractor two years ago. the unit gives an extremely good service.
2. The PCC highlighted the issue of delays in the CPS due to the pandemic, noting that the usual caseload held by the Unit which was approximately seven hundred people being supported at any one time had nearly doubled.

As a result, staffing in the Unit had increased and he noted the need to get back to normality in order for the CPS to clear the backlog as people were waiting too long for justice.

3. The Vice-Chairman asked whether there were any surveys carried out to gauge feedback from victims and witnesses who had received support from the Unit and if there were, she queried what type of responses had been provided.
 - In response, the PCC confirmed that there were regular surveys as feedback was invaluable. The responses had largely been positive and it was vital to understand that often victims had gone through a deeply traumatic time. He would look to provide the feedback from the surveys and include them in future reports.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

R7/21 - The PCC will provide the feedback from the surveys carried out by the Victim and Witness Care Unit and will look to include that in future reports.

30/21 HATE CRIME [ITEM 10]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC introduced the report and in response to a Panel member's question he noted that he supported the recent announcement by the Government to record misogyny as a hate crime following the recent Sarah Everard case and provided assurance that Surrey Police was responding to the matter.
2. A Panel member highlighted the recent shootings in Georgia against Asian Americans and denounced former president Trump's terming Covid-19 the 'Chinese virus' which had encouraged hate crime against Asian-Americans; he asked whether there was a rise in hate crime against British Asians.
 - In response, the PCC stated that he had not been briefed on any recent specific attacks against the Asian population in Surrey, however he noted the rise in hate crimes a few years ago in response to the rise in attacks by Islamist terrorists.
3. A Panel member sought clarification regarding paragraph 3.4 on page 78 on whether the 'third of offenders' that had mental health issues referred to offenders in hate crime, or whether it referred to offenders more generally.
 - In response, the PCC noted that the third related specifically to hate crime offenders.
 - The PCC recognised the need to address the prevalence of mental health issues noting a recent meeting with the Chief Constable and the Chief Executive of the Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust in which a new task group was agreed to ensure that people with mental health issues who came to Surrey Police's attention were to be treated in a more medical way.
4. A Panel member welcomed the collaboration between Surrey Police and Stop Hate UK but noted that it had taken a low number of calls on the issue of hate

crime. She queried whether it might be possible to persuade local authorities to link in with Stop Hate Crime UK to encourage reporting, such as through training staff on front desks so residents could walk in and easily report hate crime.

- In response, the PCC would take that point away especially as lockdown restrictions began to ease, adding that Surrey Fire and Rescue Services' joint initiative which began two years ago in which residents could walk in to designated fire stations to report hate crimes and he noted that he would follow up on the outcomes of that initiative which could be extended to Borough and District Councils which he worked closely with.
5. The Vice-Chairman commented that it was important that the Stop Hate Line was well publicised to encourage more people to come forward particularly for those reluctant to go to the police to report hate crime incidents. She welcomed any ideas for the PCC to promote the service.
- In response, the PCC thanked the Panel member for that suggestion.
6. The Chairman referred to paragraph 4.8 'Police Officers joining Surrey Police from 01/01/2020 to 31/12/2020 (includes probationers and transferees)' which listed the headcount and percentage for White and BAME officers, querying the inclusion of the 'Not Stated' and 'Not Recorded' categories which if added to the BAME category, the headcount would be tripled which would mean that Surrey Police would be doing exceptionally well in terms of BAME recruitment.
- In response, the PCC noted that it would be good if there was 100% recording for White and BAME recruits but stressed that the reporting was voluntary. He noted the drive to increase reporting by Surrey Police as two years ago the National Black Police Association highlighted that Surrey's record was poor. Out of the total numbers, the headcount for the 'Not Stated' and 'Not Recorded' categories was not a matter for concern.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

R8/21 - The PCC will look into the results of Surrey Fire and Rescue Services' joint initiative in which residents could walk into designated fire stations to report hate crimes and look at extending that initiative to Borough and District Councils who he worked closely with.

31/21 PCC DECISIONS AND FORWARD PLAN [ITEM 11]

Witnesses:

None

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chairman thanked the OPCC for providing the report with the decisions tabulated and welcomed it as a standing item.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

32/21 FEEDBACK ON PERFORMANCE MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [ITEM 12]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC highlighted the next PCC Performance Meeting with the Chief Constable on 30 March 2021 which was the last before the upcoming elections.
2. In response to the Chairman, the PCC confirmed that the meeting was public and so was streamed online.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the update on the PCC's Performance Meetings.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

33/21 BUILDING THE FUTURE - UPDATE [ITEM 13]

Witnesses:

Alison Bolton - Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer (OPCC) provided a verbal update on the Building the Future project following a key meeting held last Friday which marked the end of Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Stage 2 - Concept Design - with Stage 3 commencing.
2. The Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer (OPCC) noted that recent consultation events on the project had been well-attended, in which residents and local councillors were provided with the design of the new Surrey Police headquarters in Leatherhead which would be operational in the next three to four years. Further information on the disposal strategy for some of the existing police estates was becoming available.
3. The PCC stated that he was pleased with the way the project was progressing and the Building the Future Board was working well. He added that it was a large and complex project over the next three years and that the appointed contractors were looking at the details of the construction.
4. The PCC highlighted the series of community engagement events in Leatherhead for local residents which were positive, noting some concerns raised including parking and road congestion. The planning application would be submitted to Mole Valley District Council later in the year.

5. A Panel member asked for further information as to whether there was a timeline available regarding the future closure of Reigate Police Station. In response, the PCC noted that the non-local functions would move into the new headquarters and the local functions including the front counters and the police officers and staff would be re-provided for within the Reigate and Banstead borough. The current police station would not be vacated until a new building was found and the headquarters were operational.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

34/21 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [ITEM 14]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

See Annex B - Submitted Questions and Responses

1. Councillor Will Forster (Woking Borough Council):

Thanked the PCC for his positive answer noting that he was pleased that he had taken on board the suggestion for Surrey Police to review its position on Surrey County Council's part-night lighting policy and welcomed the OPCC's application for further Safer Streets funding; and asked whether he had a timescale for the review and application.

In response, the PCC recognised residents' concern on the part-night lighting policy which he noted was Surrey County Council's policy. Regarding a timescale for the application to the expanded Safer Streets Fund, he noted that the OPCC was in a position to act swiftly.

A Panel member sought clarity on whose responsibility it was to turn on or off street lights as when the question around the part-night lighting policy was raised at March's Surrey County Council meeting, the response was that it was down to Surrey Police to recommend if they felt that lights ought to be turned back on in a particular area which was contrary to the PCC's last comment that it was up to Surrey County Council.

In response, the PCC explained that the lights and part-night lighting policy were under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council.

A Panel member clarified that the part-night lighting policy was Surrey County Council's, Surrey Police were regarded as consultees which meant that if it provided strong reasons to turn streets lights on in terms of safety or crime then it could influence the outcome that had been requested. He stated that overall there had not been a large number of residents or Borough and District Councils asking for street lights to be turned on, he noted that any Borough or District Council could

ask for the streets lights to be turned on and pay for it themselves, which is what Spelthorne Borough Council had done.

A Panel member commented that in her experience Surrey County Council had reacted positively to questions on street lights, noting a successful example of getting the street lights turned back on in a local road.

The PCC echoed Panel members' clarifications and noted Surrey Police's supporting role regarding the policy.

RESOLVED:

The Panel raised issues and queries concerning Crime and Policing in Surrey with the Commissioner.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

35/21 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [ITEM 15]

Witnesses:

Amelia Christopher - Committee Manager, Surrey County Council (SCC)
David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Committee Manager (SCC) explained that regarding Appendix A page 95, the complainant and PCC had been informed of the outcome on 16 March 2021.
2. The PCC confirmed that as recommended by the Complaints Sub-Committee, he wrote an explanatory letter to the complainant which was circulated to the members of the Complaints Sub-Committee for reference.
3. The Chairman thanked the Complaints Sub-Committee members for their work and the Committee Manager's (SCC) presentation of the complaint information.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report and that the Complaints Sub-Committee had received one complaint since the last Panel meeting.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

36/21 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [ITEM 16]

Witnesses:

Amelia Christopher - Committee Manager, Surrey County Council (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Committee Manager (SCC) noted that regarding an update on the EQUIP project, action R7/20, that had been completed as an action and had been added to the Forward Work Programme 2021 as a standing Part 2 item when an update was available.
2. The Chairman thanked the OPCC and Committee Manager (SCC) for keeping the Actions and Recommendations Tracker updated with detailed responses.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the Actions and Recommendations Tracker and the Forward Work Programme.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

37/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [ITEM 17]

The Panel noted that its next public meeting would be held on 30 June 2021 - Annual General Meeting - the location was to be confirmed.

The Chairman thanked the Panel members for their participation and the work of the OPCC and Committee Manager (SCC) to ensure meetings ran smoothly. He wished those standing for re-election the best of luck, thanking Panel members for their service as critical friends to the PCC.

The PCC noted that it may be his last meeting pending the upcoming elections and thanked the Chairman, past chairmen and Panel members for their contributions over the years which he hoped had added to good policing in the county over the last five years.

The Chairman reciprocated thanks to the PCC for his service over the last five years which included the extra year due to the delayed PCC elections. He wished all a good spring and a safe easing out of the Covid-19 restrictions.

Meeting ended at: 11.48 am

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL – 22 MARCH 2021

PROCEDURAL MATTERS – PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

1. Question submitted by Paul Kennedy

A growing number of communities across Surrey are showing interest in introducing wider 20mph speed limit areas, which rely on alternatives to expensive traffic calming, and which aim to promote wider objectives beyond road safety such as promoting active travel and increased community engagement and wellbeing. However, such schemes may not fully meet the enforcement-led criteria for police support set out in Surrey County Council's guidance on Setting Local Speed Limits (2014 - [Setting Local Speed Limits \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](http://surreycc.gov.uk)).

What is your approach to such schemes, and do you agree with me that this guidance needs updating?

Response:

Thank you for this question, which is very timely. For some time now I have been pressing for a review of the countywide DriveSmart programme, so that it can build on the successes of the past and further improve the safety and environment of our county. I am pleased to say that, as a first step, we have a meeting arranged on 24 March with Surrey County Council, Surrey Police and myself, to scope out informally what we want to achieve and to give a clearer direction to officers on aims, priorities, timetables and finances. The outcome I hope will be a consultation document which will allow all residents to contribute fully to how we tackle issues such as road safety, community cohesion, adoption of latest technology, climate change and many others. I will bring the subject of 20 mph limits to that discussion.

I have mixed feelings on whether there should be a general increase of these limits. On the one hand there is clear evidence that road traffic accidents at lower speeds have fewer devastating consequences, contribute to a healthier environment, and that there is a significant number of residents who are passionate to see them introduced. On the other hand, there is also evidence that just introducing these limits by themselves has little effect in practice - motorists tend to ignore them - and so can waste money, bring the law into disrepute and contribute adversely to the street scene.

What should the balance be? It is surely time that there is a proper debate on the issue, and I hope the re-launch of DriveSmart will give impetus to that.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL – 22 MARCH 2021**PROCEDURAL MATTERS – PANEL MEMBER QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES****1. Question submitted by Councillor Will Forster (Woking Borough Council)**

Last week, the Government announced it would double the size of the Safer Streets Fund - which provides local measures such as better lighting and CCTV - to £45 million.

On the same day as the expanded Safer Street Fund was announced, the Leader of Surrey County Council, Tim Oliver confirmed that if Surrey Police asked for street lights to be turned back on throughout the night, it would do so.

Please will the Commissioner agree to review the Police's view on the County Council's part-time lighting policy as soon as possible following recent events to enable the Council to apply to the Safer Streets Fund to switch on Surrey's street lights?

Response:

Yes I am fully supportive of Surrey Police and Surrey County Council discussing street lighting and I will ask Surrey Police to contact the Council.

My office (OPCC) are waiting for the criteria for the additional Safer Streets funding and will apply for that funding once we are able to and if Surrey meets the criteria, in partnership with the Council and Borough and District councils.

This page is intentionally left blank