

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 21 November 2022 at Woodhatch Place, Reigate, Surrey.

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

**Members:**

(\*Present)

- \* Councillor Satvinder Buttar
- \* Keith Witham
- \* District Councillor Mick Gillman (Vice-Chairman)
- \* District Councillor Paul Kennedy
- \* Borough Councillor Victor Lewanski
- \* Borough Councillor Valerie White
- \* John Furey
- \* John Robini (Chairman)
- \* Mr Martin Stilwell
- \* Borough Councillor Barry J F Cheyne
- \* Borough Councillor Hannah Dalton
- Councillor Ellen Nicholson
- Councillor Julia McShane

**68/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Cllr Ellen Nicholson and Cllr Julia McShane.

**69/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]**

None received.

**70/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 26 SEPTEMBER 2022 [Item 3]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2022 were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

**71/22 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

None received.

**72/22 CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS [Item 5]**

**Witness:**

Councillor John Robini, Chairman of Surrey Police and Crime Panel

1. The Chairman thanked the current Chief Constable for his work with Surrey Police and looked forward to working with the newly appointed Chief Constable in 2023. The Chairman noted the

importance of the Force having policies in place to protect the vulnerable during the current economic climate, where crime was likely to rise as a result.

**73/22 APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED INDEPENDENT MEMBER [Item 6]**

1. The item was deferred due to unforeseen procedural issues.

**74/22 SURREY POLICE GROUP UNAUDITED FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD TO 31 AUGUST 2022 [Item 7]**

**Witness:**

Kelvin Menon, Chief Finance Officer (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Chief Finance Officer (CFO) clarified typographical errors in the report, explaining that there was an underspend of £2.2 million at the end of August which was largely related to staffing. There were a large number of vacancies with police staff and the timing of recruitment of uplift police officers. The Force were unable to attract candidates in specialist areas, such as IT, due to being unable to compete with private sector salaries. A number of capital schemes had been delayed, such as IT schemes, which contributed to the projected underspend. In the recent budget announcement the Government confirmed that the spending review, which was announced in 2021, would be honoured, however, any additional funding would go to fund police officer uplift. No new funding was announced to cover inflation and the referendum limit of £10 for the precept was not increased. Surrey had approximately £20 million of reserves, and it was likely to remain around that figure by the end of 22/23 financial year. The level of reserves was towards the lower end when compared with other Forces.
2. A Panel Member enquired if the value of the Leatherhead site was included in the capital figures. The CFO explained that the table in paragraph five showed the capital expenditure for the year and the Leatherhead site was purchased a few years ago and so was on the balance sheet as an asset. The Panel Member asked about the increase in expected funding gap for 2023/4 compared to 2022/23 and 2024/25. The CFO explained that it included an assessment of inflation and wage increases. It had been assumed that inflation would fall back and a wage

cap would be established in later years although this may have to be revised.

3. A Panel Member questioned whether the CFO was comfortable with the level of reserves. The CFO explained that he would like to have more reserves, however, this was not possible in the current financial envelope as there was not enough surplus resources. There was a balance to be struck between a having a good level of reserves whilst not needing to making cuts to services to maintain or increase them.
4. A Panel Member asked whether the Force was likely to be in the same situation next year in terms of struggling to recruit staff and therefore have an underspend. The CFO explained that the savings at the moment through vacancies were unplanned rather than being part of a strategic plan these savings were not sufficient to cover the funding gap and the Force would need to reduce staff numbers with a targeted approach. The Panel Member queried whether the Panel could expect to see a detailed analysis of staffing reductions in the budget paper. The CFO shared that it was a legal requirement to present a balanced budget and any reductions in staff would be included in the report.
5. In response to a question on expected borrowing for the redevelopment of Mount Browne Police Headquarters, the CFO explained that the original financial assessment included £40 million from capital receipts and £35 million from borrowing. The financial model was being reviewed. The focus would remain on affordability and this could mean a smaller scheme and hence less borrowing or a different phasing.
6. A Panel Member asked how many more recruitments were needed to reach the police officer uplift target for the current year and how many reclaims were expected. The CFO would find out the number following the meeting but assured the Panel that the Force tracked the uplift recruitment carefully. As a result no grant reclaims were anticipated although these could be quite substantial. Missing the target by 1 officer would result in the loss of £175k. Missing the target by 25% of the requirement (26 Officers) would see all of the funding (£1.75m) forfeited.
7. A Panel Member questioned whether the borrowing in respect of the Leatherhead site would be repaid or put into reserves. The CFO responded that the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) loan was entered into for 25 years; it would be retained as part of the

Mount Browne funding. A Panel Member asked whether the Force was subject to the same restrictions as Local Authorities in respect of borrowing for investment and had led to some Government enquiries. The CFO explained that PWLB rules were recently changed to make it more difficult to borrow solely for commercial investment. However, the borrowing for Mount Brown would be for operational investment and so would not be caught by this restriction.

**Actions/requests for further information:**

1. **R22/22** – The Chief Finance Officer to provide the number of recruitments required for the end of the financial year to meet the uplift target.
2. **R23/22** – The Chief Finance Officer to provide the original budget for the redevelopment for Mount Browne and the amount spent so far.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report.

**75/22 CALL IT OUT SURVEY [Item 8]**

**Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner  
Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Head of Performance and Governance introduced the report, explaining that the survey was launched in the period following the murder of Sarah Everard when women were sharing their experiences online. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) and the Force had other sources of data to track residents' perception of safety as well, but the survey was useful in providing a snapshot for that current point of time.
2. The Chairman asked about the number of detectives in the rape investigation team, the percentage of posts filled in the sexual offences team, and how many more rape cases were making it to court since the increase in detectives. The Head of Performance and Governance would provide those figures following the meeting. In terms of the team, vacancy rates were quite high as it was a competitive recruitment market. The Force had utilised agency staff to fill capacity, but this was not a sustainable position

and was monitored closely. The OPCC supported people through the criminal justice process, ensuring they had access to high quality victim and witness care. The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) added that it was known that victims of rape, sexual assault and domestic abuse often withdrew support for prosecution and that supporting people whilst they awaited their case to be heard was essential, especially with current court delays. However, the position in Surrey was better compared to some neighbouring areas.

3. A Panel Member asked about the use of the StreetSafe tool in Surrey. The Head of Performance and Governance shared that the tool provided granular insight into where issues took place. Initially there was a large uptake and it had decreased since. The OPCC was working with the Force to try to re-advertise the tool again. They had used the data for work with victims and to support bids to government for additional commissioning funding.
4. In response to a question on who had responsibility for streetlighting, the PCC confirmed it was Surrey County Council. The PCC stated that there was often a misconception that the decision rested with the Police, but they had no direct control over lighting, though may be consulted. A Panel Member added that the Council introduced a policy to turn off some streetlights in residential roads and residents could request for decisions to be reconsidered. If the Force supported residents' requests, then the lights would be turned back on. The Panel Member would raise the issue again with the Leader of the Council from a county-wide perspective. The PCC shared that the Force would not disagree with residents if they wanted the lights turned on and said that any police consultation should not cause delay.

*Cllr Satvinder Buttar jointed the meeting at 11:10am.*

5. Responding to a question on plans to repeat the survey and comparable figures from other Forces, the Head of Performance and Governance explained that not all other Forces ran the survey and those which did had slightly different questions, which made it difficult to make comparisons. The Force were interested in running the survey again, however, it was unlikely they would receive the same level engagement again and the benefit of the first survey had been it had helped capture the views of harder to reach groups, including young people that didn't always engage with traditional surveys. The Panel Member also asked about measures to demonstrate whether men's behaviour is changing. The Head of Performance and Governance shared that the

OPCC had invested heavily in perpetrator schemes, related to stalking, harassment, and domestic abuse. These had created positive change; however, it was the start of the journey and a whole societal shift was required.

6. A Panel Member asked how the OPCC were helping to improve reporting rates for rape, harassment and sexual assault cases. The Head of Performance and Governance explained that there had been work with schools on the PSHE curriculum about what behaviour was acceptable and what was not. It was with the responsibility of all partners to ensure that residents feel empowered to call out inappropriate behaviour. The Force took this seriously, however, sometimes there were more appropriate routes for people to report such behaviour, such as through GPs, teachers or social workers. The PCC added she wanted to see an increase in reporting and highlighted the opportunities of partners such as the fire service, who entered residents' homes.
7. A Panel Member noted that the number of respondents seemed low. The Head of Performance and Governance explained that if the survey was unique in that it prompted a very organic response and more specific targeting would likely have skewed the sample. The survey was also pushed out quickly due to the societal context at the time.
8. A Panel Member shared an experience of young men waiting around a train station late at night and queried whether a greater police presence would help. The PCC explained that the Force could not police for uneasiness, and it would not be the best use of their resources. It was about educating men on their behaviour so that women did not feel intimidated in these circumstances.

**Actions/requests for further information:**

1. **R24/22** – The Head of Performance and Governance to provide the quantitative information requested by the Chairman regarding detective numbers, percentage of sexual offence posts filled, and number of rape cases making it to court.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel recommends:

1. That the PCC makes an application to round 5 of the Home Office's Safer Streets Fund, and any other potential funding sources, using the StreetSafe tool and Call it Out survey findings as evidence.
2. That the OPCC reviews specific areas perceived as unsafe by users of the StreetSafe tool and Call it Out survey respondents

and the Commissioner recommends to Surrey County Council that night-time LED streetlighting is reinstated in these locations as a priority, as the College of Policing finds violent and property crime reduced on average by 21% in areas where street lighting was improved relative to areas where it was not.

3. That the findings of Call it Out and Streetsafe are shared in full with Panel Members so their respective local authorities can lobby Surrey County Council in relation to areas perceived as unsafe.

## **76/22 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN PROGRESS [Item9]**

### **Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Alison Bolton, Chief Executive (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

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

1. The Head of Performance and Governance shared the performance hub to the Panel, noting that it was due to be launched in early December 2022. An early access version could be circulated to the Panel.
2. A Panel Member asked about the recruitment of a Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Policy and Commissioning Officer and how this would differ from the DPCC's role. The Chief Executive explained that the PCC and DPCC were supported by a team of staff in the Office to deliver against their statutory responsibilities. The Office has brought in over £1 million of funding for VAWG and consequently, this produced more work, including implementation of services, contract management and reviewing delivery. This post would complete that work.
3. A Panel Member asked whether the average speed camera scheme in Pirbright Bends had succeeded in reducing drivers' speed. The Panel Member representative for Surrey County Council explained that the average speed cameras were not yet operational. Surrey Highways first needed to make a legal order and there were some technical issues to navigate.

4. In response to a question on 101 waiting times, the PCC stated she was applying pressure for these to improve. The Head of Performance and Governance explained that the Home Office data demonstrated that the Force's 999 response times were among the best in the country and as a result, the focus on emergency calls came at the expense of 101 response times. The Force were attempting to channel shift callers to digital contact methods which led to an increase in abandonment rates. The OPCC was working closely with the Force to gauge public perception and understanding of the 101 service. The Panel Member raised that some residents view the live chat as a less legitimate contact method. The Head of Performance and Governance recognised that it was important to change the mindset around live chat and digital contact methods.
5. A Panel Member asked whether the performance hub measured against the same objectives as included the Police and Crime Plan. The Head of Performance and Governance explained there was qualitative information as well as quantitative and that data was based around the Plan's priorities, with a selection of policing measures used to demonstrate progress. There was still scope for refinement and feedback was welcomed.

**RESOLVED:**

1. In the Commissioner's progress reports on the Police and Crime Plan, the Panel recommends that for each objective, relevant KPIs are included to evidence what progress has been delivered.

**77/22 CCTV IN SURREY [Item 10]**

**Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Ellie Vesey-Thompson, Surrey Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. A Panel Member asked about the PCC's view on the effectiveness of CCTV in crime reduction, prosecutions and locating missing persons. The PCC explained that in some cases, the evidence did not back up the usefulness of CCTV.



Ring doorbell footage was often more useful for a recent missing person case. It was noted that in areas with a night-time economy, CCTV was still seen as beneficial. However, it was made challenging as District and Borough Councils took different views on CCTV and its provision.

2. In response to a question on the new CCTV Strategy, the PCC explained that this was a decision for each of the District and Borough Council Leaders. The Force would not take a lead on this work going forward and encouraged the Panel Member to ask the Chief Constable about it. A Panel Member added that the District and Borough Councils needed a policy from the Force. The PCC emphasised that CCTV had been devolved to District and Borough Councils and whilst the Force would work with local councils, it was not appropriate for them to lead on CCTV.
3. A Panel Member asked about the responsibility of CCTV on highways and the use of personal CCTV in rural areas. The DPCC explained that Automatic Number Plate Recognition was used actively by the Force. They had also been trialling mobile CCTV units. The Force had a good relationship with farmers and landowners in rural parts of the county.

**Actions/requests for further information:**

1. **R25/22** – The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to reshare the funding formula for financial support from Surrey Police for CCTV.

**RESOLVED:**

1. The Panel recommends the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey takes a lead on renewing the county's CCTV strategy, in partnership with local authorities, and publishes the renewed strategy within the next three months.

**78/22 SURREY PCP BUDGET MID-YEAR CLAIM 2022 [Item 11]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. None.

**79/22 PERFORMANCE MEETINGS [Item 12]**

**Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Head of Performance and Governance noted that there had not been a private meeting between the Chief Constable and PCC prior to when the report was written.
2. A Panel Member asked whether the public accountability meeting should have assessed the Force's performance against other police and crime objectives beyond the national policing priorities. The PCC explained that the national priorities were set by the Home Office. Some were more relevant to Surrey than others. For example, there was a focus on homicide, however, Surrey was the second safest county for homicides. Every part of the national strategy would have a place in the local strategy. The Panel Member asked about the main conclusions from the Private Resources and Efficiency meeting. The PCC shared that the conversation focused on finances.

**80/22 PCC FORWARD PLAN AND KEY DECISIONS [Item 13]**

**Witnesses:**

Alison Bolton, Chief Executive (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

Kelvin Menon, Chief Finance Officer (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. A Panel Member noted that some of the links were not working and asked what decisions 34/2022 and 25/2022 related to and why they had not been published yet. The Chief Executive explained that there were still some teething issues with the new website which should be resolved shortly. The decisions were linked to two funding decisions. The officer had not yet finalised the decision with the PCC and therefore they were not yet published. The Panel Member also asked about the internal audit progress report. The Chief Executive explained that the management actions were minor issues, such as publishing the PCC and DPCC's gift and hospitality register on a monthly basis, rather than bi-monthly. The Chief Finance Officer added that the IT action related to the ERP system; the system was fine, but quite old and currently out for tender to upgrade it. Virtualisation

related to putting servers onto the cloud and the decision-making related to a review of the forward plan on a regular basis.

## **81/22 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 14]**

### **Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Ellie Vesey-Thompson, Surrey Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (Office of Police and Crime Commissioner)

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

1. One question was received from Cllr John Furey and no supplementary questions were asked.
2. One question was received from Cllr Keith Witham. The Panel Member clarified that his question was in reference to local roads and explained that he would be grateful for any further support. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) assured the Panel that she was against road racing. The DPCC was not aware of those specific cases, however, offered to look at them outside of the meeting.
3. One question was received from Cllr Mick Gillman. The Panel Member noted that residents would disagree that the Force did act quickly and appropriately. The PCC explained that the Force had to ensure that the police officers were kept safe when getting protestors down from the gantry. Sometimes the protestors would play dead which made it more difficult to remove them at pace. Road closures were an issue for National Highways. The PCC emphasised that she fully supported Surrey Police's approach to the protests and felt that they had dealt with the issue well.
4. Two questions were received from Cllr Paul Kennedy. A Panel Member queried when the response inspection to the inspection results would be published. The Head of Performance and Governance shared that there was a formal 56-day return which was likely to be available in late December. The response to the Casey report was expected in two weeks. A Panel Member asked whether there were any remaining backlogs of the service level agreements. The PCC responded she would check with the Force.

**Actions/requests for further information:**

1. **R26/22** – The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to confirm whether there are any remaining backlogs of the service level agreements.

**82/22 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 15]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

None.

**83/22 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 16]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

None.

**84/22 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]**

The Panel noted that its next public meeting would be held on Friday, 3 February 2023.

Meeting ended at: 12.39 pm

---

**Chairman**



This page is intentionally left blank

## Questions to Surrey Police and Crime Panel – 21 November 2022

The recent HMICFRS report on vetting, misconduct, and misogyny in the police service contained shocking findings about police forces across the country. Those findings included cases where new and transferred officers and staff had not been properly vetted, where cases of misconduct had not been properly dealt with, and where a culture of misogyny, sexism and predatory behaviour towards female officers and staff, and members of the public, still exists and is even prevalent in many forces. In light of this report:

1. How confident is the PCC that Surrey Police is addressing the concerns raised in the report so as to provide assurance to the public that the officers and staff they deal with meet the high standards expected of Surrey Police; and to female officers and staff that they will not be subjected to misogyny, sexism and predatory behaviour by their male colleagues?
2. In relation to vetting, is the PCC satisfied with Surrey Police's
  - a) performance against agreed service levels for vetting officers and staff;
  - b) progress in tackling backlogs in vetting officers and staff;
  - c) programme for re-vetting officers and staff?

*Cllr Paul Kennedy, Mole Valley District Council*

### Response:

As noted, HMICFRS has published the results of its inspection looking at vetting, misconduct and misogyny in the police service – delivering a total of 43 recommendations and noting that “it is too easy for the wrong people both to join and to stay in the police”.

Prior to this, on 17 October 2022, Baroness Casey published an interim report as part of her review of standards and internal culture at the Metropolitan Police - commissioned as part of the Force's response to public outrage following the kidnap, rape and murder of Sarah Everard.

Naturally, at a time when all forces are under extraordinary pressure to meet their officer uplift targets, the suitability of our vetting and disciplinary processes are paramount.

As such, I met formally with the Chief Constable and Deputy Chief Constable in November to discuss the above findings, and to seek high level assurances around the issues identified by HMICFRS. Based on these discussions I am confident that Surrey Police are well-placed to address the recommendations and have historically been proactive in doing so.

The Force and my office will be preparing a formal, detailed response to HMICFRS setting out work being undertaken to address their findings, and this will be published on the OPCC website, as is the case with all HMICFRS inspections concerning Surrey.

I have also requested a written response from the Chief Constable on the findings of the interim Casey report, and what we can learn from the issues identified in the Met. I am happy to share these with the Panel once the response has been received.

**Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner**

Many residents of Tandridge know I am a member of the Police and Crime Panel and as a result I have been asked by several why more action is not being taken by the police with the protesters that block the M25? The disruption at J6 on the M25 has a significant impact over the whole of the Tandridge district. I have found it impossible to provide them with a satisfactory answer to explain when laws are being broken the police are not acting. I have been quoted laws by residents that make it clear it is an offence to block the public highway but no action has been taken and there have even been pictures of the police handing water to those blocking the road instead of moving them on and arresting them. Residents expect the police to apply the law without fear or favour and there is strong feeling that lack of decisive action by police when the protests started have only encouraged more protests as those involved feel they can get away with this. Can I have an assurance that you will be using all your influence with the police to insist they now apply a zero-tolerance approach to any protesters who block or disrupt the highway?

*Cllr Mick Gillman, Tandridge District Council*

**Response:**

What we have seen in Surrey and elsewhere over recent weeks goes way beyond peaceful protest. What we are dealing with here is co-ordinated criminality by determined activists. The actions of this group are becoming more and more reckless, and I have publicly called on them to halt these dangerous protests immediately.

I fully share the anger and frustration of those who have been caught up in this activity. We have seen stories of people missing vital medical appointments and family funerals and NHS nurses unable to get into work – it is completely unacceptable.

However, I would strongly disagree with the assertion that Surrey Police are ‘not acting’.

I have been out and witnessed the operation myself, and our police teams have been working extremely hard and I fully support their efforts to combat these protests. We have had teams patrolling the M25 from the early hours to try and disrupt the activities of this group, detain those responsible and ensure that the motorway can be reopened as soon as possible.

Having dealt with similar behaviour earlier this year, Surrey Police and Sussex Police's joint Operations Command team confidently led the policing response which required support from multiple teams across both forces. Ahead of the operation, a significant number of officers and staff were stood up, drawing in specialisms including the Roads Policing Unit, Protester Removal Teams, Public Order officers, Evidence Gathering Teams and the Media team. Surrey worked with neighbouring forces too, and pre-emptive arrests were made on those planning activity.

However, despite a positive operational response, this is nevertheless diverting our resources and putting an unnecessary strain on our officers and staff at a time when resources are already stretched. I will therefore continue to do everything in my power to resolve the situation.

**Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner**



Runnymede's full Council meeting on 20 October 2022 debated a motion about tackling discrimination against women, girls, men and boys and considering acts of misogyny and misandry a hate crime.

1. As the Police & Crime Commissioner has identified this Committee as the most appropriate forum to discuss the matter, could full details be provided about Surrey Police's current action plan to tackle discrimination against women, girls, men and boys, what further steps can be taken and how Runnymede can support these steps at a local level.

*Cllr John Furey, Runnymede Borough Council*

**Response:**

In 2021 Surrey Police became one of the first forces in the UK to launch a Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy, helping to harmonise and develop a consistent approach across multiple areas including domestic abuse, sexual offences, peer-on-peer abuse in schools and Harmful Traditional Practices.

The strategy was formally recognised by HMICFRS as good practice, with Surrey Police working closely with partners to disrupt and proactively target those using abusive and violent behaviours. The Force has also invested heavily in its dedicated Rape Investigation Team, doubling the number of Detectives. Work is also underway to address serial domestic abuse perpetrators, including the creation of problem profiles to better target activity.

As detailed in my update report to the Police & Crime Panel, in October 2022 Surrey Police won the annual Tilley Award, set up by the Home Office in 1999 to celebrate problem-oriented projects that have achieved success in resolving issues faced by the police, partners and/or the community. The award was in recognition of work undertaken to ensure the safety of women and girls using the Basingstoke Canal in Woking, following a number of indecent exposures and suspicious incidents since 2019.

The above is a good example of how my office continues to be proactive in seeking out additional funding for projects and initiatives, working with local partners to ensure successful delivery. Naturally, my office and I are always happy to hear from our Borough & District colleagues about potential initiatives.

**Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner**

1. Would the Police and Crime Commissioner set out her views regarding the issues of organised “road racing” at locations across the County and the response re any discussions she has had with Surrey Police regarding this ongoing problem that greatly concerns residents in the roads affected.

*Cllr Keith Witham, Surrey County Council*

**Response:**

Surrey is home to some of the busiest stretches of motorway in the UK with significant numbers of vehicles using the county’s road network every day. Road safety is understandably a significant concern for Surrey residents, and a key focus of my Police and Crime Plan. It is also an issue that has been raised during public meetings between myself and the Chief Constable.

Since becoming Police and Crime Commissioner I have spent a considerable amount of time out on patrol with our Roads Policing Unit (RPU) to understand the challenges faced by officers. Surrey police have established a new policing team dedicated to cutting the driving offences that lead to the most death on Surrey roads. Known as “the fatal five offences”, the new team focusses on combatting careless driving, drink and drug driving, not wearing a seatbelt, using a mobile phone and speeding.

As detailed in my Deputy’s letter to you on 19<sup>th</sup> September, during 2021/22 Surrey Police issued 556 Section 59 warnings in relation to the anti-social use of vehicles, with 32 vehicles subsequently seized through the Force’s vehicle recovery service.

I would strongly encourage residents to report incidents of illegal racing to help the Police build intelligence and ultimately take appropriate action.

**Lisa Townsend, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner**