

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 29 June 2023 at Woodhatch Place, Reigate, Surrey.

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

Members:

(*Present)

- *Borough Councillor Harry Boparai
- *Borough Councillor Alex Coley
- *District Councillor Richard Smith
- *Borough Councillor Danielle Newson
- *Borough Councillor Richard Wilson
- *Keith Witham
- *District Councillor Paul Kennedy
- *Borough Councillor Victor Lewanski
- *Borough Councillor John Robini
- *Borough Councillor Barry J F Cheyne
- *Borough Councillor Ellen Nicholson

Apologies:

Mr Martin Stilwell

36/21 ELECTION OF A CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

One nomination had been received in advance of the meeting:

1. Councillor John Robini was proposed by Councillor Paul Kennedy and seconded by Councillor Danielle Newson.

As there were no further nominations no vote was necessary. Councillor John Robini was duly elected as Chair.

RESOLVED:

The Panel agreed the appointment of Councillor John Robini as the Surrey Police and Crime Panel Chairman for the Council Year 2023/24.

The Chairman welcomed The Police and Crime Commissioner, Lisa Townsend and her team from the OPCC including Alison Bolton, the Chief Executive, Damian Markland Head of Performance and Governance and Kelvin Menon, Chief Finance Officer.

The Chairman welcomed new members to the Panel. Thanks were recorded for former Panel members (Cllr Hannah Dalton, Cllr Richard Morris, Cllr Satvinder Buttar, Cllr Valerie White, Cllr John Furey) and special thanks for the previous Vice Chairman, Cllr Mick Gillman Tandridge District Council.

37/21 ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 2]

Two nominations had been received in advance of the meeting:

1. Martin Stillwell was proposed by John Robini and seconded by Councillor Ellen Nicholson.
2. Councillor Alex Coley was proposed by Councillor Richard Smith and seconded by Councillor Barry Cheyne.

As there was more than one nomination a vote was taken by show of hands, with six votes for Cllr Coley and six votes for Mr Martin Stillwell. The Chairman held the casting vote. Mr Stillwell was duly appointed.

RESOLVED:

The Panel agreed the appointment of Mr Martin Stilwell as the Surrey Police and Crime Panel Vice-Chairman for the Council Year 2023/24.

38/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 3]

Apologies were received from Mr Martin Stillwell.

39/21 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 18 APRIL 2023 [Item 4]

1. The minutes of the meeting held on 18 April 2023 were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

40/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

None were declared.

41/21 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

None were received.

42/21 POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR SURREY ANNUAL REPORT [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

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

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (OPCC)

Alison Bolton, Chief Executive (OPCC)

Kelvin Menon, Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) gave an overview of the year highlighting areas of success for the OPCC including £9million of funding for commissioning through competitive bids to government; a new Chief Constable recruited and more police officers in Surrey than ever before, exceeding the government uplift target by 136 officers. The PCC highlighted challenges around staff retention plus those arising from her national roles on Mental Health and Roads and Transport.
2. A Panel Member asked what could be done to address the staff retention issue and to stop officers from leaving. The PCC explained that an extra 395 officers had been recruited as part of Operation Uplift. This included a deliberate over recruitment by 136 to address a backlog in retirements post-covid. The planned number of recruits for FY2023-34 was 228. The PCC outlined various steps to help retention including a move away from the degree-only route into policing; work around mental health and the Right Care Right Person strategy aimed at ensuring officers are not attending incidents where a mental health professional would be more appropriate; plus access to affordable housing. The OPCC were working to ensure a hub of affordable housing stock was available in each division for officers. A Panel Member (AC) asked if the number of officers who had left the force since the uplift began in 2019 could be provided in writing. **[Action i:**

OPCC to provide data on the number of officers who have left the force since the uplift began in 2019]

3. A panel member noted that Victim Satisfaction rates continue to fall and remain worse than last year and queried the reason behind this decline. The PCC emphasised that this was a wider criminal justice challenge and that the satisfaction rates reflected public dissatisfaction with the overall criminal justice system. Work by the Deputy PCC to enhance public satisfaction through improved communications between the public and the police was outlined. The PCC noted that if the public feel well communicated with by the police it makes a real difference. The PCC explained that some of the statistics underpinning overall satisfaction rates were actually very positive, for example around domestic abuse where many of the victim satisfaction metrics were high. The Head of Performance and Governance explained that victim support which had previously been delivered by an external contract was now 'in house' and properly embedded within the Force. This had improved the service provided to victims and raised the profile and understanding of victim support internally.
4. A Panel Member expressed sympathy with the PCC's concerns over policing and mental health and queried whether commissioning efforts could be focused in this area. The 'No Time To Wait' campaign was flagged. The PCC emphasised the police's continuing commitment to attend calls under section 26 where there was a threat to life, but that officers should not be attending every call relating to mental health. Concern was expressed that the crisis in mental health provision was taking officers away from the front line. The PCC reported that in February 2023 alone, officers spent 515 hours on incidents relating to mental health. This was the highest number of hours ever recorded. The PCC emphasised her support for the 'Right Care Right person' model due for national roll-out later this year. On commissioning the PCC explained that the areas for funding are dictated by government according to central priorities.
5. A Panel Member asked about the findings from the resident's survey into anti-social behaviour (ASB) and issues around the time it takes to report ASB via 101. The PCC acknowledged the challenge around reporting anti-social behaviour, especially when issues reported are not always policing issues. Key concerns for local residents

included antisocial driving and speeding, littering, antisocial and inconsiderate parking, drugs, vandalism and criminal damage. The PCC anticipated a renewed focus from the new Chief Constable on antisocial behaviour and on how the police correctly record and address these issues where they are crimes.

6. Responding to a query about Transit Sites the PCC expressed frustration at the lack of a transit site in Surrey which remains a real challenge for the Police. The PCC explained that the new legislation was helpful but only if you had a transit site for the police to move people onto. On the issue of car meets the PCC outlined a change in approach by Surrey Police: rather than attempting dispersal the police were now taking records of attendees and sending warning letters to the owners of cars involved, often to parents. These advised where participation fell into illegal behaviour. The PCC said there was work to be done working with districts and boroughs to make it harder for people to engage in this sort of antisocial activity.

7. A Panel Member noted that there was no mention of rural crime in the report and asked for an update on progress against the objective to keep rural communities safe. The Commissioner accepted that this was an omission and agreed to take the recommendation away. The Deputy PCC updated the Panel on work to engage rural communities, specific changes in Mole Valley and work across the county and nationally to address rural crime and build cross border partnerships.

[Action ii: OPCC to include progress on rural crime objectives in the draft Annual Report]

8. A Panel Member expressed concern that the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC) Annual report was more activity than outcome focused and did not truly assess performance and progress towards meeting objectives. The Head of Performance and Governance explained that the annual report needed to be accessible and digestible to the public as well as meeting the needs of those more interested in data and performance. This was a challenge. OPCC agreed to take the comments away and to look at whether a greater sense of trajectory could be provided.

[Action iii: OPCC to review Annual report in light of the comments by Cllr Kennedy with a view to giving a greater sense of progress towards meeting objectives]

9. The Chairman requested an update on the promise of a rural crime officer per borough, confusion over what constituted a rural crime and difficulties with reporting and logging these. The deputy PCC assured the Chairman that there was a dedicated PCSO per borough and three officers across the county. The system for reporting rural crimes remains problematic however national work is underway to try to address and improve this across the country. The DPCC noted issues relating to the validity of reports and data arising from assurance scams.
10. A Panel Member followed up on the issue of the provision of a transit site to clarify that this was not the responsibility of Surrey County Council but of the Borough and District Councils. Surrey had offered land for a transit site in Surrey, but the overall project was not a Surrey County Council responsibility. Background and correspondence on this project had been forwarded to the Commissioner separately. The PCC responded that Surrey had appeared to be the lead on the project and had approached OPCC for the money, nevertheless, her main concern was achieving the right outcome regardless of responsibilities. In order for the police to make use of the powers granted by government through new legislation a transit site was needed. The Chairman highlighted the need to work together to make progress on this issue and to find a solution sooner rather than later.
11. A Panel Member queried whether engagement with residents through community visits, surveys and surgeries had identified any necessary changes to the plan or new priorities. The PCC responded that the priorities remained the right ones and expressed confidence that there were plenty of avenues for the public to get involved and have their say.
12. A Panel Member asked what the PCC had done to build relationships and improve engagement within minorities. The PCC outlined engagement with a range of groups including Surrey Minority Ethnic Forum, Ahmadiyya Muslim Community as well as Disability Groups; and emphasised the importance of prioritising groups who may find it challenging to contact the Police. The force had received training on this. A new Equality Diversity and Inclusion statement had been published and was available on the PCC website. Work by the DPCC to

engage youth groups including the Youth Commission and the Children and Young Persons fund was also outlined. The OPCC was working hard to improve accessibility and make it easier for the public to engage via the website.

13. On complaints, the PCC noted that comments made in the past that have given rise to these were around the issue of self-identification and women's rights, particularly the issue of men self-identifying as women in women's safe-spaces (for example the domestic abuse refuge). The PCC reiterated her commitment to stand up for the rights of women to have their own safe spaces and highlighted the conflict of rights between self-identification and the rights for women in this area. The PCC welcomed further debate on the matter.
14. A panel member questioned the PCC's ambition as stated in the Annual report to pursue greater penalties for those who endanger lives while operating vehicles. The PCC explained that Surrey police recorded more than 700 collisions which resulted in serious injury in 2022 (an increase on 2021). A number of initiatives were underway and focused on addressing this including the Stay Safe Stay Alive campaign. The PCC highlighted her role on the National Strategy Group on road Safety looking at all aspects of road safety including penalties and whether these require review. The PCC noted that public appetite for higher penalties for drivers who speed or drive dangerously is clear and that a new government strategy was being developed. The PCC invited suggestions from the Panel on what should be represented locally to the police and to the national boards on these issues. The issue of drug driving and nitrous oxide canisters was also discussed.
15. Following up on road safety, a panel member drew attention to a fatal incident on Smarts Heath road which might have been averted had preventative measures been in place. The PCC flagged that speed camera and street furniture installation was the responsibility of Surrey County Council.
16. There was a discussion on projects and services commissioning and future expectations. The Head of Performance and Governance explained that funding opportunities were dependent on government priorities and spending aims. The OPCC was proud of its success

in this area which had been achieved through pre-emptive identification of gaps and building an evidence base. This meant OPCC was well placed to respond quickly to calls-for-bids as they arose. A panel member asked how achievement against objectives was monitored and whether there was any objective confirmation of success in this area. The Head of Performance and Governance explained that all services had reporting requirements relating to outcomes and service provision. OPCC had a high degree of confidence in the scrutiny of service delivery and monitoring and of the processes in place. The Head of Performance and Governance assured the Panel that Surrey was batting above its weight in terms of commissioning funding success.

17. A Panel Member raised questions relating to the forecast underspend (of £2.5M rising to £7.9M), use of surplus funds and the staff pension deficit. The Chief Finance Officer noted that the underspend in question (£2.5M) was only 1% of the budget and that this was the force's month-8 projection of outturn. This had turned out to be overly optimistic in terms of speed of recruitment for the uplift and delays with capital projects and IT. The Chief Finance Officer agreed that less optimism and more realism in projections was necessary. In terms of use of surplus funds these were a one off benefit, not year on year, therefore the approach was to put them in reserve for use on one-off projects such as money for solar panels or new lighting as part of Net Zero. Some of the money went into the PCCs reserve, the Cost of Change reserve and the Inflationary Contingency reserve. The risks associated with the outcomes of the pay review body were noted. An extra 4% in pay would mean an additional pay pressure of around £9 million and so money was being put aside for that. A Member suggested using some of the surplus to make an advance payment against the staff pension deficit. The Chief Finance Officer explained that the fund was currently in surplus but that the historical deficit was being paid off in instalments. With current interest rates it did not make financial sense to pay this off with underspend. The Panel Member requested further detail on the historical deficit including the actual amount and what discount would be offered if it was paid off sooner.

[Action iv: OPCC to provide a written response setting out the historical civil staff pension deficit amount and what interest rate is being paid on it.]

18. A Panel Member noted that the previous Commissioner had Value for Money (VFM) as an objective in the Police and Crime Plan and queried its omission. The PCC stated that VFM ran through the entire plan and everything that the police and OPCC did and was therefore not a standalone priority. The Chief Finance Officer concurred that VFM was more important than ever in the current financial environment where there was not enough income to provide services. Significant efficiencies would be needed just to maintain current provision. He also said that it was something the External Auditors reported on.

RESOLVED

The Panel agreed to write formally to the PCC with any comments and recommendations regarding the Annual report.

[Action v. Panel to write to the Police and Crime Commissioner on the draft Annual Report.]

43/21 PERFORMANCE MEETINGS [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC explained that regular meetings took place with the Chief Constable to look at policing activity and progress against the police and crime plan. Every other meeting was public. The PCC encouraged the Panel Members to watch the most recent meeting with the Chief Constable online.
2. A Panel Member asked about retention and staff morale. The PCC noted that morale amongst officers was a challenge especially when other public sector groups were going on strike and seeking pay increases. 'Stay interviews' were being introduced and would be an important element of the retention strategy. These conversations took place with officers who were considering leaving and were aimed at identifying what could be done to encourage them to stay.

3. A Panel Member asked about 101 performance and improvements. The Head of Performance and Governance noted that historically Surrey police was good at answering 999 calls with 90% of calls answered within a 10 second target. However, performance had dropped down to 53% due to difficulties with the contact centre. This was now almost back up to 90% as of May 2023 which was a huge achievement. No national or regional targets existed for 101 non-emergency call answering times, however this had also improved with wait times more than halved since March: another good turnaround.
4. A Panel Member asked about the impact of recent Just Stop Oil protests. The PCC gave credit to the Deputy Chief Constable for the excellent work of the force on this and for setting the commendable tone and attitude by which the force undertook the action and arrests. The force's work in relation to the Queen's funeral and the Epsom Derby were also highlighted as examples of excellent policing.
5. A Panel Member asked about the Data Hub. A discussion followed on data standards, datasets, analytics support and future plans for developing the hub. The Head of Performance and Governance reassured the Panel that data was extracted directly from the force's own systems and that the force Registrar was fully involved. He emphasised that the Hub was not intended as a professional analytical product, but a transparency tool for residents. Plans to expand the hub would be focused on its usefulness to residents.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

44/21 PCC FORWARD PLAN AND KEY DECISIONS [Item 9]

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Damian Markland, Head of Performance and Governance (OPCC)

Alison Bolton, Chief Executive (OPCC)

Kelvin Menon, Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Panel Member noted that the annual financial report 2022-23 would normally be presented to this meeting. The OPCC agreed that this item should be added to the Forward Work Plan. The member drew attention to a number of internal audit reports which gave limited assurance in a range of areas and sought reassurance. The Chief Finance Officer gave explanations and noted that all the audit recommendations had been implemented.

[Action vi: OPCC and Panel Support Officer to add Unaudited Financial Report for 202/23 to respective Forward Plans.

2. A Panel Member (NC) raised the issue of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service governance and the Home Office white paper. The PCC explained that the Fire Team within the Home Office had specifically asked her to look into it. The PCC explained that for this reason and in order to fulfil her duties under the white paper it was necessary to initiate a review.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

45/21 SURREY POLICE & CRIME PANEL ANNUAL REPORT 2022-23 [Item 10]

RESOLVED:

The Panel approved the report.

46/21 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 11]

Witnesses:

Lisa Townsend, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

Alison Bolton, Chief Executive (OPCC)

Seven Panel Member questions had been received. A summary of Questions and written responses was at the Annex. The Chairman invited supplementary questions or remarks.

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. On questions 2 - A Panel Member highlighted remaining concerns pertaining to unlawfully captured personal data on the suspicious activity portal and concerns raised by the Information Commissioners Office in April including

that data may not be being stored in the correct way. The PCC committed to revert with a fuller answer.

[Action vii: OPCC to follow up in writing with a further response and clarification to Cllr Nicholson]

2. On question 1 – Future of Surrey Fire & Rescue Service Governance. A Panel member accepted that the Commissioner was looking into the matter because she had been asked to but noted for the record that the Chief Fire officer was already a member of the senior leadership team at Surrey County Council and that Surrey saw no need for any change.
3. Question 5 – There was discussion around the distinction between establishment and strength figures and the impact on the numbers of PCSOs following concerns about their potential reduction. The PCC emphasized that there has been no overall reduction in numbers as PCSOs had been replaced by warranted officers.

47/21 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 12]

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

48/21 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 13]

RESOLVED:

The Panel endorsed the proposal to review and refresh these documents in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and OPCC.

49/21 RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMPLAINTS SUB-COMMITTEE 2023/24 [Item 14]

RESOLVED:

1. Appointed the following members to the Complaints Sub-Committee for the 2023/24 Council year, having filed the vacancies:
 - Councillor John Robini – Chairman
 - Councillor Martin Sitwell – Vice-Chairman
 - Councillor Ellen Nicholson
 - Councillor Victor Lewanski

- Councillor Barry Cheyne
- Independent Member – tbc

A panel member asked for a response on the procedural issue relating to the independent member which had been raised prior to the meeting. The Scrutiny manager noted that advice had not yet been received but would be forthcoming. A second independent member would be recruited.

[Action viii: Scrutiny Manager to revert to Cllr Coley once advice received.]

Action viii: Panel Secretariat to progress independent member recruitment]

50/21 RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FINANCE SUB-GROUP 2023/24 [Item 15]

RESOLVED:

1. Appointed the following members to the Finance Sub-Group for the 2023/24 Council year, having filed the vacancies:
 - Councillor John Robini – Chairman
 - Councillor Martin Sitwell – Vice-Chairman
 - Councillor Paul Kennedy
 - Councillor Barry Cheyne
 - Councillor Nick Prescott
 - Independent Member

51/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 28 SEPTEMBER 2023 [Item 16]

The Panel noted that its next public meeting would be held on Monday, 28 September 2023.

Meeting ended at: Time Not Specified

Chairman

COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME**SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS****Question 1** **Cllr Witham**

With regard to a possible expansion of the PCCs remit to include control of the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, would the Police Commissioner please indicate:

- **What is your motivation for initiating a review?**
- **How much will this cost, and how can the cost and time involved be justified?**
- **Is the Commissioner aware of just how much has been achieved by SF&R in the last 5 years and how would this performance demonstrate that a change in governance could benefit Surrey Fire and Rescue Service in any way at all?**

PCC RESPONSE:

Members may recall the discussion at the February Panel meeting concerning my review of fire, which was prompted by the publication of my decision notice on the subject. By way of context, the Home Office published a White Paper consultation document in May 2022, which sets out a number of proposed reforms to fire and rescue services, making clear the Government view that oversight of fire needs to change. Its preferred governance model is one where there is an individual (ideally directly-elected) who is accountable for the fire service, rather than governance by committee. The consultation highlighted the benefits of such a change, including improved accountability, more transparency, faster decision-making and a clear mandate for those charged with fire governance. Having seen first-hand the benefits to policing of a truly accountable individual who can provide strong, robust governance and oversight and drive improvements on behalf of the public, I wish to explore whether these principles may also hold true for fire and rescue, hence my initiating this review.

Since 2017, Police & Crime Commissioners have been able to take on governance of fire and rescue services in their area where a business case can be made for improved efficiency, effectiveness, governance or public safety. Four PCCs have gone on to become Police, Fire & Crime Commissioners and more have explored this possibility. My predecessor in Surrey was among them, and an options analysis report was commissioned to examine the case for change in 2017. This independent report for Surrey, prepared by KPMG, is now over five years old and my review seeks to establish whether there have been any significant changes since then.

As matters currently stand, any proposal to take on responsibility for the governance of Surrey Fire & Rescue Service would require the preparation of a full business case that would need to be subject to extensive consultation prior to being submitted to the Home Office for approval. To embark on such a piece of work at this juncture would, of course, be premature. But I would respectfully suggest a review to allow me (as the only directly-elected individual to whom fire governance could transfer under the White Paper proposals) an up-to-date understanding of the picture in Surrey is entirely prudent. This is particularly so given that one of the options mooted by the Home Office is to mandate the transfer of fire to Police & Crime Commissioners. Many of my PCC colleagues have lobbied the Policing & Fire Minister for this option, given it would negate the need for protracted and costly local negotiations where there are differences of opinion.

My review will provide me with an independent and evidence-based appraisal to help me establish whether the policy steer set out by Government may hold benefits for Surrey. In the absence of the outcome of the White Paper consultation (with there being 'no timescale' for its publication at present) and with the last significant piece of work on this issue now out-of-date, this work is to my mind, a worthwhile investment. The exact cost of the work has yet to be determined, but I have allocated £12,000 for this purpose from within my existing consultancy budget.

I am aware of the progress made by Surrey Fire & Rescue, as demonstrated in its latest HMICFRS report (2021/22) where HMI Matt Parr describes the service as being in 'much better shape' than at the time of the previous inspection of 2018/19. Without wishing to detract from this progress, it should also be noted that the service received scores of 'requires improvement' across the board for 'Efficiency', 'Effectiveness' and 'People'. Simplifying and strengthening governance for fire services is, in my view - and that of the Government - critical to unlocking the wider reforms and benefits required.

I have written to the Leader of Surrey County Council to advise him of this work, however the County Council wish to play no active part in it. I have also written to all Surrey MPs.

Question 2 **Cllr Nicholson**

I applaud the intent of Surrey Police, to reduce the instance of burglaries across Surrey, I wonder however if the PCC shares my concerns about the data protection implications of Surrey Police's initiative asking residents to submit any personal video footage, such as CCTV, dashcam or smart doorbell footage are to be commended in their initiatives and action to reduce burglaries across Surrey.

My concerns relate to data protection in line within the Data Protection Act 2018. The DPA itself outlines there is stronger legal protection for biometrics data, which arguably this video data can be considered part of. No obvious information on the portal of how long the video data may be held, how and when it will be disposed of with no obvious link to the forces data protection policies and date impact assessments.

There is no reference to how people identified in footage, may be informed that they have been identified. No obvious recourse for complaints procedure on the portal.

Could I therefore ask the Police and Crime Commissioner how they intend to hold the Chief Constable and therefore the Surrey Police, accountable to ensure that this initiative does not wrongly place suspicion on residents who may be visiting a property, delivering a parcel, free post etc, unsure of where a front door may be? Will they set a defined time frame with clear reporting metrics to be presented by the Chief Constable to the PCC and subsequently a report to the PCC Panel?

PCC RESPONSE:

In January 2023, Surrey Police ran a pilot - initially in Elmbridge before being extended to Spelthorne and Runnymede - enabling members of the public to send us their video footage from home security cameras and smart doorbells that had captured suspicious activity.

We know that in this digital era many Surrey residents have private CCTV and smart doorbells, so Surrey Police wanted to create an easy way for them to send any private CCTV that may have captured suspicious activity relating to burglary and wider serious

acquisitive crime (SAC). Panel members will be aware that quite often this sort of footage is uploaded onto social media without ever coming to police attention. Burglary and SAC are national priorities, and this type of offending has a significant impact on the public. The force is therefore looking at innovative ways of targeting these crime types, to help provide reassurance and protection to Surrey residents, and to maximise positive outcomes for victims of crime.

All footage received via the Portal is reviewed daily by divisional Proactive Investigation Teams (PITs). Once the relevant footage has been reviewed, the relevant PIT will action it as appropriate. This may include transferring footage relating to an existing crime into the correct casefile, tasking SNT/NPT for a substantive offence that needs to be created and investigated, or creating a suspicious activity occurrence.

Any data captured via the Suspicious Activity Portal is stored and processed in the same manner as any other data obtained by Surrey Police as part of evidential collection processes. A complete summary of how Surrey Police processes personal data, including subject access rights, can be found on the Surrey Police website:

<https://www.surrey.police.uk/about-us/your-right-to-information/information-about-us/privacy/>

It's worth flagging that since taking office I have increased my office's oversight of our professional standards functions, and we now hold regular meetings with the Head of Professional Standards and the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) to better monitor emerging complaint and misconduct data. My team also now have direct access to complaint management databases, allowing us to conduct regular dip checks on cases and monitor developing trends. If the Suspicious Activity Portal was generating concern amongst residents, I believe we are in a good position to recognise these issues.

I will also as part of my ongoing performance monitoring meetings with the Force have the opportunity to receive regular updates on the impact of the new portal and I am happy to provide the Panel with a fuller update in due course.

Question 3 **Cllr Nicholson**

Within Woking there have been a number of changes of Borough commander over recent years. The latest has left after less than one year in post to be replaced by an interim replacement for a number of months and a further interim replacement in the Autumn.

There have been an increasing number of ASB incidences in Woking of late, can the PCC assure Woking residents that in her discussions with the Chief Constable, she will prioritise continuity and stability of Borough Commanders to ensure that safe and effective policing continues across the Borough of Woking

PCC RESPONSE:

I have a Resource and Efficiency meeting scheduled with the Chief Constable and Deputy Chief Constable on 3 July, and I will relay these concerns. However, whilst recognising the desire for stability, it is important to recognise that Surrey Police maintain operational independence, and it would therefore not be appropriate for me dictate posting decisions.

I understand Inspector Paul Edwards is due to take over the role in September and, with a strong background in neighbourhood policing, I have no doubt that he will be well-placed to tackle any emerging issues.

It's also worth flagging that In March I launched a county-wide survey in Surrey to better understand the impact and experiences of anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the county. The survey is an essential component of our Anti-Social Behaviour Plan, which prioritises the views of residents and uses their feedback to improve services. The initial data is being used to support resident focus groups and to identify areas of focus for policing.

Question 4 **Cllr Nicholson**

Following the recent accident earlier in June between a motorcycle and a van on Smarts Heath Rd, Woking, where sadly the motorcyclist lost his life, can I ask the PCC to raise the Woking residents' requests with the Chief Constable to reconsider the need for enforceable speed limits in both the 40mph and 30mph sections and/or a speed camera on this stretch of road, or other traffic calming measures that may need to be considered.

I am sure the PCC will wish to also join me in sending condolences to the bereaved family and friends of the motorcyclist.

PCC RESPONSE:

Any death on our roads is of course a great tragedy, and my thoughts are very much with the friends and family of the deceased.

The Panel will understand that as there remains an open investigation into this specific incident it would not, at this point, be appropriate for me to comment any further.

However, Surrey Police work closely with Surrey County Council to develop local speed management plans for each of Surrey's eleven Districts or Boroughs, with officers periodically meeting with the County Council's road safety specialists to discuss and agree which sites need the most attention, and to identify the most appropriate intervention. I understand that Surrey County Council intends to wait for the outcome of the Police's investigation and then consult accordingly.

Question 5 **Cllr Kennedy**

The attachment to the minutes of the last meeting indicates that as at 31 March 2023 Surrey Police has an FTE establishment of 131 staff working in People Services, 106 staff working in Corporate Development and 113 staff working in Finance, as well as over 20 non-establishment staff working in the Commissioner's own office.

But Surrey Police's FTE establishment for Mole Valley includes just 4 PCSOs which if implemented would mean losing a further 2 PCSOs.

Given the Commissioner's responsibility for securing an efficient and effective police force, will the Commissioner please work with the Chief Constable to ensure that Surrey Police's staff establishment prioritises frontline policing and in particular that there are sufficient PCSOs to support the community in addressing local concerns like antisocial behaviour, both in Mole Valley and across Surrey?

PCC RESPONSE:

I was overjoyed that we were able to announce that Surrey Police managed to exceed its target for extra police officers under the Government's three-year uplift programme to recruit 20,000 officers across the country.

This means that since 2019 an extra 395 officers have been added to its ranks - 136 more than the target the government had set for Surrey. This makes Surrey Police the biggest it's ever been which is fantastic news for residents and puts us in a much stronger position to address resident concerns.

Whilst a lot of focus has quite rightly been on the recruitment of Police Officers, Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) remain a key part of our policing teams, working closely with the local community and helping to tackle the issues affecting them.

Surrey Police is in fact currently hiring new PCSOs to fill vacancies in the following boroughs:

- North Division - Spelthorne and Elmbridge
- West Division - Guildford, Surrey Heath, Woking and Waverley

However, whilst recognising the immense value of our officers and PCSOs, it's important that we don't lose sight of the huge contribution our so-called 'back-office' staff make to policing. These individuals form the backbone of the organisation and provide services such as forensics, investigative support, and victim contact – all of which greatly supports frontline officers in their work. Likewise, whilst careful balancing and ongoing review is naturally required, an organisation of the size of Surrey Police requires a well-functioning administrative back-office, which our colleagues in Finance, People Services and Corporate Development provide, ensuring that our workforce is properly supported and remunerated.

It's also important to note that high-level department names often hide a wide range of roles and functions. The table below demonstrates the breadth of work undertaken by the teams referenced in the question:

Corporate Development	People Services	Finance
Information Managements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Bureau and DBS • FOI and Subject Access • Data Protection • Force Crime and Incident Registrar • Information Governance 	Shared Business Services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance Operations: • Accounts and Purchasing • Careers • HR Desk • Payroll • Pensions • Attraction & Recruitment Team 	Joint Finance Service Team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic finance • Medium term financial planning • High level budget setting • Corporate reporting Business Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local budget setting, • budget control management and forecasting, • year end • project support, investment appraisal, • business development, internal consulting, advice and guidance
Service Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Intelligence • Insights 	HR Service Delivery: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Partners • Equality, Diversity, Inclusion Team 	Joint Corporate Finance Team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory reporting

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Governance • Risk Governance • Evidence Based Policing & Innovation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultants • Employee Relations • Unison • Federation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory financial returns • Financial risk and governance framework • Capital programme • Treasury Management • Financial systems - management • Pension funds - oversee the accounting, budgeting and reporting arrangements
<p>Surrey Performance Portal Maintenance</p>	<p>L&PD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Delivery • Transformation • PEQF implementation 	<p>Joint Insurance Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated insurance manager and team provides support and advice • Manage insurance renewals • Manage insurance claims, to ensure claims are minimised and claimant are managed in a respectful way • To support the development of insurance best practices across 10 Forces (SEERPIC) • Motor insurance lead for SEERPIC
	<p>Strategy Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reward & Recognition • Workforce Development • Consultants • Awards & Ceremonies 	<p>Joint Procurement Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement policy and procedures • Support contract and tendering activity • Strategic analysis of Force spend • Work with national and regional Forces, including Blue Light Commercial, to help develop best practices
	<p>Occupational Health & Wellbeing</p>	

Furthermore, some of the above are collaborated teams, where staff are responsible for servicing both Surrey and Sussex Police, with total costs shared.

Nonetheless, with the recent appointment of a new Chief Constable, Surrey's staffing model will continue to be reviewed in order to ensure

Question 6 **Cllr Kennedy**

(Note question 6 & 7 were tabled in April but omitted from inclusion at last Panel meeting due to administrative error)

Rule 163 of the Highway Code requires drivers to give extra space when passing pedestrians, cyclists and horseriders. Given your objective of ensuring safer Surrey roads, how satisfied are you with Surrey Police's performance in monitoring and enforcing this rule, and in responding appropriately to evidence of breaches from members of the public?

Safety on Surrey's roads remains a Force priority. Policing activity includes preventative work through the multi-agency "Safe Drive Stay Alive" campaign, the introduction of a new specialist team dedicated to road safety, and speed limit enforcement through the Surrey Camera Partnership. The Force continues to welcome information from residents in the form of dash cam recordings.

Public footage is valuable and the Force has invested in a digital platform to receive it. It come with challenges and the volume of material is ever expanding, and that requires Surrey Police to take difficult decisions depending on the nature of the offence and the evidence available. However, prosecutions have resulted from these submissions.

Question 7 **Cllr Kennedy**

The previous Commissioner and Chief Constable committed to making Surrey Police (including the OPCC) carbon neutral by 2030. Can you provide a quantitative update on progress in reducing the carbon footprint since then, are you satisfied that this objective is still on track, and how much resource is being committed to achieving this objective?

Surrey Police's Carbon neutral pledge has been embedded within a multitude of different policies, such as the Estates Strategy, Driver and Vehicle Management Strategy and more general directives for teams. At present the PCC generally oversees delivery of these specific strands via different conduits. For example, embedded within the Estates Strategy is the strategic objective to deliver through every project. This includes requirements to ensure projects:

- Deliver an estate which achieves (at minimum), the British Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Model (BREEAM) grading of 'Very Good' for refurbishment projects and 'Excellent' for new build facilities.

- Ensure that the estate, its design, construction, and its long-term use, delivers against the declared climate emergency agenda, reducing the current estate running and maintenance costs, with the ability to flex to accommodate changing business needs at minimal cost.

The PCC receives regular updates on work being undertaken as part of the Estates Strategy, and recent examples of fulfilment of the above requirements include:

- Numerous site visits with engineers to establish a capital costed plan which will include various innovations.
- Ongoing work to look at sites across Surrey and Sussex for a universal EV solution. This is helping the force understand the feasibility for longer term plans around the fleet itself.