

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 30 June 2022 at Woodhatch Place, Reigate, Surrey.

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

Members:

(*Present)

- *Councillor Satvinder Buttar
- *Councillor Mick Gillman
- Councillor Valerie White
- Councillor Keith Witham
- *Councillor Paul Kennedy
- *Councillor Victor Lewanski
- *Councillor John Furey
- *Councillor John Robini
- *Mr Martin Stilwell
- Mr Philip Walker
- *Councillor Barry J F Cheyne
- *Councillor Ellen Nicholson
- *Councillor Julia McShane
- Councillor Hannah Dalton

31/22 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

Two nominations had been received in advance of the meeting:

1. Councillor Satvinder Buttar was proposed by Councillor John Furey and seconded by Councillor Victor Lewanski.
2. Councillor John Robini was proposed by Councillor Paul Kennedy and seconded by Councillor Mick Gillman.

As there was more than one nomination a vote was taken by show of hands, with seven votes for Councillor John Robini and three votes for Councillor Satvinder Buttar.

RESOLVED:

The Panel agreed the appointment of Councillor John Robini as the Surrey Police and Crime Panel Chairman for the Council Year 2022/23.

32/22 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 2]

Two nominations had been received in advance of the meeting:

1. Councillor John Furey was proposed by Councillor Satvinder Buttar and seconded by Councillor Victor Lewanski.

2. Councillor Mick Gillman was proposed by Councillor John Robini and seconded by Mr Martin Stillwell at the meeting.

As there was more than one nomination a vote was taken by show of hands, with seven votes for Councillor Mick Gillman and three votes for Councillor John Furey.

RESOLVED:

The Panel agreed the appointment of Councillor Mick Gillman as the Surrey Police and Crime Panel Vice-Chairman for the Council Year 2022/23.

33/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 3]

Apologies were received from Keith Witham, Hannah Dalton, Valerie White and Philip Walker.

34/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 21 APRIL 2022 [Item 4]

1. A Member noted that it was agreed that future reports on recruitment were to include police staff and this had not been recorded as an action. This was noted by the support officers.
2. The minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2022 were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

35/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

None received.

36/22 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

None received.

37/22 POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR SURREY ANNUAL REPORT 2021-22 [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (OPCC)

Lisa Herrington, Head of Policy and Commissioning (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Panel Member noted that the previous Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC) annual report included performance measures and queried whether there had been any progress in developing performance measures. The PCC explained that it was the PCC's report, rather than a report by the Force, therefore it focused on the work of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC). The PCC added that isolated metrics did not provide a complete picture. The Head of Performance and Governance shared that the OPCC were doing a lot of work consulting with stakeholders on increasing the availability of Force performance data. Currently, a lot of the data was provided in the performance meetings with the Chief Constable, however, this needed to be opened up to a wider audience. The OPCC had plans to launch a performance portal, and by the next meeting, it was hoped that a more substantive update could be provided on this. The Head of Performance and Governance explained that performance measures required context to ensure that the data was not misleading. The Panel Member questioned whether it was just the PCC's report, as it should address the Police and Crime Plan which involved the work of the Force. The Head of Performance and Governance confirmed that the report did address the priorities and progress of the plan, just not in a quantitative sense. The PCC added that this was one part of the PCC's role and encouraged Panel Members to look at the wider work of the OPCC, beyond the reports brought to the Panel.
2. A Panel Member suggested that the Force should be more explanatory regarding the outcomes of crimes. The PCC responded that they would pass on the comment and suggested for the Panel Member to raise it with the Chief Constable at the Panel meeting in October.
3. A Panel Member queried the small proportion of the commissioning budget spent on fraud and cybercrime, considering how prevalent this form of crime was. The PCC explained that a significant amount of the Force's budget was spent on fraud, as 43% of crime in Surrey was fraud. It was, however, still important for the OPCC to support victims of fraud. Fraud victims could also access the universal support offer made available to all victims of crime in Surrey. A large amount of the budget was spent on supporting victims of domestic abuse and children and young people who had sexually assaulted, as there was a key role for the OPCC in this area. The Head of

Policy and Commissioning added that the OPCC had commissioned specialist case workers to support victims of crime. Certain crimes were more likely to require emotional support, such as rape which was traumatic for victims.

Recommendation:

The Panel will formally write to the Police and Crime Commissioner with any comments and/or recommendations regarding the Annual Report.

38/22 SURREY POLICE GROUP UNAUDITED FINANCIAL REPORT FOR 2021/22 [Item 8]

Witness:

Kelvin Menon, Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that the report covered up to the year end of March 2022.
2. A Panel Member asked whether the numbers of temporary and agency staff affected the restructuring and training, or vice versa. The Chief Finance Officer explained that there were a number of vacancies due to issues with recruitment, therefore, temporary staff were employed to cover the gaps. The training was deferred due to the pandemic and staffing issues.
3. A Panel Member queried the partially unused IT budget. The Chief Finance Officer explained that most of the money had been spent on keeping existing systems running which was charged as revenue. It had been increasingly difficult to recruit IT staff with the right skills at rates the Force could afford. As a result, IT schemes in the capital programme had not been advanced as quickly as possible. The newly hired Chief Digital and Information Officer had plans to improve the IT schemes. There had been issues with laptops due to supplies and issues with the hardware refresh due to servers.
4. A Member noted the fall in the reserve for ill-health and questioned whether the amount was adequate. The Chief Finance Officer explained that part of the reserve was used to cover pension costs for those who retired early due to ill health and this figure was hard to predict. The Chief Finance Officer

had been assured by the Force that they believed the reserve was adequate at the moment.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

39/22 POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONING STRATEGY 2022 - 2025 [Item 9]

Witness:

Lisa Herrington, Head of Policy and Commissioning (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Head of Policy and Commissioning explained that the Strategy was a public facing document and was made to be easy to understand. The cover report provided detail around the legislation and a summary of the approach. The Strategy could be revisited over time. It was noted that not every OPCC had a Commissioning Strategy and there was not a standard template. The Head of Policy and Commissioning presented slides to the Panel (Annex 1). Due to the commissioning work of the OPCC, those affected by crime and anti-social behaviour had a more positive future. The OPCC used a mixed model of both small (under £5,000) and larger (over £5,000) grants. Funding was prioritised based on the degree of harm of the type(s) of crime. The OPCC's work on supporting victims of domestic abuse was considered best practice and was included in the government toolkit.
2. A Panel Member asked how the Strategy was being communicated to residents who could not access it online. The Head of Policy and Commissioning responded that they would take this away and think about how to do it effectively.
3. A Panel Member requested whether information on the value for money of the grants and the results of commissioning work could be provided. The Head of Policy and Commissioning explained that outcome data could be provided, but it would be useful if an area could be defined so that specific information could be provided. The Panel Member suggested providing one or two examples.
4. A Panel Member queried how the process of receiving grants was fair, for example, geographically and noted the lack of

feedback included in the Strategy. The Head of Policy and Commissioning confirmed that the process was open, and anyone was able to apply. Panel Members were encouraged to promote the grants across their communities. The Head of Policy and Commissioning explained that there would be a separate document demonstrating the value of the grants. Contracts were monitored on a six- and 12-month basis and some were monitored on a quarterly basis as well.

Actions/requests for further information:

1. **R18/22** – The Head of Policy and Commissioning to provide outcome data for one of two commissioning grants.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

40/22 UPDATE ON SURREY ESTATES [Item 10]

Witnesses:

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Kelvin Menon, Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC noted that they were working closely with the Head of Estates team and that staying at Mount Browne was the right decision. The PCC noted that the site visit for Panel Members was now in the diary.
2. A Panel Member enquired as to whether District and Borough Councils would have the opportunity to acquire properties that the Force were disposing and noted the importance of the Housing Strategy, with the cost of housing in Surrey. The PCC explained that some of the properties were not fit for purpose and would not be suitable to be acquired. An important part of wider Estates Strategy was about building affordable housing for police officers to enable them to live in Surrey. This was important to both the Chief Constable and the PCC.
3. A Panel Member asked whether the new Estates Strategy had been published. The PCC confirmed that it had not been published yet. The Panel Member noted that it would be helpful for the non-commercially sensitive part of the Strategy to be published. The PCC explained that the intention was to publish

it. The Panel Member queried whether there was independent oversight of the Strategy. The PCC responded that the Joint Audit Committees looked at both the work of the PCC and the Force more widely. There was a new Oversight Board chaired by the PCC. Governance changes had been done to address concerns over estates planning.

4. In response to a question on the budgeting of the project, the PCC responded that the OPCC had been as transparent as possible with the Panel over the last year. The PCC reminded Panel Members that her role was independent of the Force. The Chief Finance Officer explained that costs were currently being finalised and planning permission was still being applied for.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

41/22 HOME OFFICE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER REVIEW AND POWERS OF COMPETENCE CONSULTATION [Item 11]

Witness:

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Panel Member asked whether the Panel needed to respond to the Fire Reform White Paper and raise any particular issues. The PCC explained that the OPCC was in the process of writing a response to government and there was nothing that the Panel needed to respond to.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

42/22 PERFORMANCE MEETINGS [Item 12]

Witness:

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC encouraged the Panel Members to watch the meetings online. In the PEEL report, Surrey was rated as outstanding at

preventing crime. The Chief Constable championed neighbourhood policing. There were areas that required further work, however, there was no area that was rated inadequate. There had been a number of months to discuss the inspection with the Chief Constable and work was already underway to address the areas that required further work.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

43/22 PCC FORWARD PLAN AND KEY DECISIONS [Item 13]

Witnesses:

Ellie Vesey-Thompson, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Alison Bolton, Chief Executive (OPCC)

Kelvin Menon, Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Panel Member asked about the resources and efficiency meeting. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) explained that there was a discussion around recruitment and staffing, and the Force were likely to meet the government's recruitment target. They also discussed the 101 service. It was noted that the Force were performing well for 999 calls which was the most important aspect. The digital 101 service was doing well. There were staffing challenges around the contact centre. There were plans to recruit staff to cover peak times and to introduce flexible working arrangements. 101 was a non-emergency number and the average wait time was three minutes, which they hoped to improve. The DPCC encouraged Panel Members to promote the digital 101 service, as it was quicker, and it allowed you to send photos.
2. A Panel Member enquired as to why recruitment to the Joint Audit Committee was restricted to existing members and whether the role was politically restricted. The Panel Member noted that the internal auditors found only limited assurance over the systems for uniformed stocks and firearms licensing and provided a large number of recommendations and asked about concerns regarding this. The Chief Executive explained that in the past the Joint Audit Committee had recruited someone to

serve as Chair, however, the current Chair felt it was sensible to elect someone from the Committee as they could provide experience and knowledge. The Chief Finance explained that there were two audit reports. The report on uniforms produced 18 recommendations which had been implemented, largely around stock control. The report on firearms produced nine recommendations, eight had been implemented and the ninth was being worked on now. They were largely due to it being a paper-based system and therefore, there was a backlog of processing licenses.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

44/22 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 14]

Witnesses:

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Alison Bolton, Chief Executive (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Panel Member noted that the College of Policing were taken to the High Court over non-crime hate incidents (NCHIs) and lost the case. The Panel Member asked whether they were going to continue to do something deemed illegal and asked about the manhours wasted on this issue. The PCC informed the Panel that it was not illegal, as it a civic case. It was a ruling in respect of the College of Policing's guidance on NCHIs and it was an operational issue. The Chief Constable was aware of the PCC's views on this. The Panel Member suggested that the PCC should be concerned in her role. The PCC explained that it was a national issue and out of her remit. The PCC suggested that the Panel Member wrote to the College of Policing.
2. A Panel Member noted that the Judicial System was failing both the Force and the public, by releasing criminals. The Panel Member asked whether the PCC raised this issue with the Chief Constable. The PCC explained that although the Judicial System was outside of her remit, she had been having discussions around this with the Justice Secretary and the Courts Minister. This was a shared frustration across policing and many PCCs. The PCC was meeting in September (2022) to discuss the Justice Strategy; however, the PCC did not hold the Crown

Prosecution Service or the Judicial System to account. There had been discussions about giving PCCs more power in this area. The Chief Executive added that Surrey led the work on out of court disposals which worked to try and tackle reoffends. The scheme was successful.

3. The PCC requested for questions to be submitted in advance of the meeting to enable more detailed responses to be provided. The Chairman agreed that Panel Members would try to do this in future meetings.
4. A Panel Member asked the PCC to comment on their questions regarding the comments from the previous set of minutes on the 101 service and unauthorised encampments. The PCC responded that there was no obvious reason for the OPCC to be working with District and Borough Councils on the 101 service. Regarding unauthorised encampments, the guidance following the Act had not been published yet, but Chief Constables had sight of the draft. The Lead PCC in this area had been dealing closely with the Policing Minister and the Home Office on the guidance more widely. The PCC would bring the guidance to the Panel to hear their comments when published.

Actions/requests for further information:

1. **R19/22** – The Police and Crime Commissioner to bring the guidance on unauthorised encampments to the Panel when published.

The Panel meeting was paused at 12:15pm and reconvened at 12:21pm.

**45/22 SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL ANNUAL REPORT 2021-2022
[Item 15]**

Witness:

Ross Pike, Scrutiny Business Manager (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Scrutiny Business Manager confirmed that the report would be amended to reflect the item missing on the DPCC in June 2021.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

46/22 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 16]

Witness:

Ross Pike, Scrutiny Business Manager (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The process of complaints handling would be resumed following the meeting once the Complaints Sub-Committee had been reconstituted.
2. A Panel Member suggested to include a section on complaints made against the DPCC in future reports. The Scrutiny Business Manager confirmed they could be recorded in future reports.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

47/22 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 17]

Witnesses:

Ross Pike, Scrutiny Business Manager (SCC)

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Scrutiny Business Manager noted that two items needed to be added to the forward work programme following the meeting: the performance portal and a deeper dive into the work of the Commissioning Strategy.
2. A Panel Member asked for RAG (red, amber, and green) ratings to be added to the recommendations tracker. The Scrutiny Business Manager confirmed that there was a template in this style which could be used.
3. A Panel Member queried when the drafted complaints protocol would be shared with the Panel Members. The Scrutiny Business Manager explained that it was awaiting legal comment

internally, it had since received this, and could be shared with the Complaints Sub-Committee Members and agreed by the Panel.

4. A Panel Member asked whether the statistics for the 101 service had been collated yet (R46/21). The Head of Performance and Governance responded that they would chase this up, as there had been recent data from a performance meeting. The Panel Member added that they would like the data on how many of the calls were relevant and for the Force.
5. A Panel Member suggested that the action on the Force's use of the CCTV (R4/22) needed to be revisited in some detail.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

48/22 RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMPLAINTS SUB-COMMITTEE 2022/23 [Item 18]

RESOLVED:

1. Appointed the following members to the Complaints Sub-Committee for the 2022/23 Council year, having filed the vacancies:
 - Councillor John Robini – Chairman
 - Councillor Mick Gillman – Vice-Chairman
 - Councillor John Furey
 - Councillor Victor Lewanski
 - Councillor Valerie White
 - Independent Member – Mr Philip Walker

49/22 RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FINANCE SUB-GROUP [Item 19]

RESOLVED:

1. Appointed the following members to the Finance Sub-Group for the 2022/23 Council year, having filed the vacancies:
 - Councillor John Robini – Chairman
 - Councillor Mick Gillman – Vice-Chairman
 - Councillor Paul Kennedy
 - Councillor Valerie White
 - Councillor Satvinder Buttar
 - Independent Member – Mr Martin Stillwell

50/22 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 20]

1. The Panel noted that its next public meeting would be held on Monday, 26 September 2022.

Meeting ended at: 12.37 pm

Chairman

Contact: Julie Armstrong
Tel: 07816 091463
E-mail: julie.armstrong@surreycc.gov.uk



Lisa Townsend
Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey
PO Box 412
Guildford
Surrey
GU3 1YJ

Surrey County Council
Woodhatch Place
11 Cockshot Hill
Reigate
Surrey
RH2 8EF

9 September 2022

Sent by email

Dear Commissioner,

Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey Annual Report 2021-22

Thank you for meeting with the Surrey Police and Crime Panel on 30 June 2022 to discuss the content of the Annual Report 2021-22.

The Panel greatly appreciated the ability to comment on the document prior to its publication.

As you are aware, there were no recommendations in relation to the Annual Report made by the Police and Crime Panel; however, I would like to take the opportunity to draw your attention to the following area of concern raised by one Panel Member, which is noted in the [minutes](#):

Information in the Annual Report should enable Panel Members to understand whether the objectives set out in the Police and Crime Plan have been met and, to this effect, quantitative performance measures should be added to a narrative to give a complete picture.

To give an example, progress made in your priority of Protecting people from harm in Surrey could be illustrated by a comparison of the solved outcome rate for high harm offences with that of the previous year. Similarly, KSI statistics would allow the Panel to see if progress had been made in relation to Ensuring safer Surrey roads.

The Panel finds it very helpful to learn what actions have been taken throughout the year towards meeting the objectives; nevertheless, the inclusion of measurable outcomes could greatly enhance its meaningfulness. One Panel Member commented, however, that overuse of data could be off-putting to residents.

If you have any questions regarding the above comments, please do not hesitate to communicate them to me via the Panel's Scrutiny Officer, Julie Armstrong.

On behalf of the Panel I would like to thank you once again for attending the meeting.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J Robini', written in a cursive style.

Councillor John Robini

Chairman of the Surrey Police and Crime Panel