

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 29 April 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

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

Members:

Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (Chairman)
Borough Councillor Terry Dicks (Vice-Chairman)
Borough Councillor John O'Reilly
Borough Councillor George Crawford QPM
Borough Councillor Richard Billington
District Councillor Margaret Cooksey
Borough Councillor Victor Broad
Borough Councillor Charlotte Morley
District Councillor Ken Harwood
Mrs Pat Frost
Borough Councillor Bryan Cross
Independent Member Anne Hoblyn MBE

Apologies:

Borough Councillor Colin Davis

12/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Borough Councillor Colin Davis.

Apologies were also received from the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner, Jeff Harris, and the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for Victims, Jane Anderson.

13/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

Members requested they receive further details on the relative cost of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to the previous Police Authority.

14/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

15/14 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

None received.

16/14 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 5]

The Commissioner outlined some key points of success including; a reduction in crime by 8% within the last year, increase in arrests by 8% across the county, almost £1million of assets seized from criminals, an increase in public satisfaction by up to 3% and the enforcement project in Reigate & Banstead having been launched.

- The Panel discussed the Her Majesties Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) report which had Sussex fairing less well than Surrey, and requested assurances that resources would not be diverted from Surrey to Sussex. The Commissioner conceded this was a concern but that collaboration was only for support functions and would not affect 999 response or neighbourhood policing. The Commissioner, however, did hope to see more cross-border work where it was appropriate.
- The Commissioner stated that he still personally believed that amalgamation was the way forward, however he was aware that it would not happen in the next few years. He also would not support an amalgamation which put Surrey at a disadvantage.
- Members queried what was being done with the assets being seized and were informed that the money was being held by courts as some had to be used for the prosecution, however the Commissioner was part of a lobby group which called for more money from seized assets to be available for frontline staffing.
- A Member raised concerns regarding the victim satisfaction survey as it was felt that a yes/no response did not allow for a full evaluation and it would be better to have a scale of one to ten. The Commissioner

stated that he intended to review this survey and requested the assistance of Panel Members in this piece of work.

- The Panel raised the concern that there was still a high level of hidden crime in Surrey. The Commissioner stated that there had been a rise in reports of domestic violence and sexual assault but felt this was due to victims feeling in a position to report the crimes when previously they felt they could not. This suggested that there was hidden crime but that confidence in Surrey Police was rising. However, to-date there had been no reports of Female Genital Mutilation in Surrey which suggested that more work needed to be done as statistically there would be victims in Surrey.
- The Commissioner informed the Panel that Local Road Accident Officers were covering two or three boroughs and districts which was not ideal but a symptom of austerity. The Police however, continued to work with partners such as Surrey County Council on the Drive Smart campaign, and continued to look at other initiatives.
- The Community Safety fund had decreased, however the Commissioner wished to encourage Community Safety Partnerships to bid for grants. These grants were evaluated on merit, however last year not enough bids were made by councils for the funding. The Chairman informed the Commissioner that the Panel would scrutinise the dispersal of the bids across Surrey at a future meeting.
- Members were concerned that detection rates had declined substantially and violence with injury had increased and queried whether there would be a change in policy to address this. The Commissioner felt that the figures were unsatisfactory, however they were three months old and that recent detection figures had shown an improvement. The Commissioner was satisfied that the work of the Deputy Chief Constable would address the issues as there was great rigor in his work, including that of individual Officers. The Commissioner agreed to provide the Panel with up-to-date detection figures in a supplementary letter.
- The Commissioner agreed to share the Oxford Economics report on the police funding formula with the Panel which had been shared with the Surrey MPs.
- The Panel queried whether the enforcement of the work of Community Speed Watch volunteers could be strengthened. The Commissioner felt that more work could be done to improve the initiative and stated that an audit was ongoing. He hoped to give the volunteers more powers and training. Members suggested that the behaviour of cyclists was also an issue and was sometimes dangerous.
- Members further raised concerns that public concerns of dangerous driving were not considered by the Police unless there was an additional witness present. The Commissioner felt that there could be a case for exploring how Police respond to public reports of dangerous driving.

- Asian Gold burglaries were raised as a concern of Members and they were informed that Surrey Police had an ongoing investigation relating to this specific crime.
- Members of the Panel requested an update on the reviews being undertaken by the Chief Constable. The Commissioner agreed to provide the Panel with a summary and would answer questions Members had relating to the reviews.
- The Commissioner stated the Police and Criminal Prosecution Service had been defining crimes differently, however he had spoken to the Chief Constable and was convinced that Surrey Police were taking the most ethical route to ensure crimes were reported correctly.
- Members queried whether anti-social behaviour interventions had increased. The Commissioner stated it was difficult to judge the number of interventions, however the 8% increase in arrests suggested that some could be due to anti-social behaviour.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report be noted.
2. The Police and Crime Commissioner provide the Police and Crime Panel with a more detailed overview of detection rates, particularly in relation to progress being made.
3. The Police and Crime Commissioner provide the Police and Crime Panel with a copy of the research conducted by Oxford Economics that looked at the national funding formula and the impact on Surrey.
4. The Police and Crime Panel consider how it can work with the Police and Crime Commissioner to improve the way in which victim satisfaction is assessed.
5. The Police and Crime Panel be provided with an update on the status of the various reviews being conducted by Surrey Police.
6. The Police and Crime Commissioner consider whether the way in which anti-social driving is reported can be improved.

17/14 BUDGET QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 6]

The Commissioner informed the Panel that the budget for Surrey Police was on track for the financial year end with a potential underspend of around £180,000. The Chairman confirmed with the Commissioner that he was willing to work with Members of the Finance Sub-Group on the formation of the budget for 2015/16, ahead of the precept deadlines. Member of the Finance Sub-Group were invited to ask questions relating to the reports submitted.

- Members felt the summary report did not contain enough explanation to the figures within the annexes. There was also some concern that it appeared the reserves had risen by £1.5million during the financial year despite the norm being to evaluate reserves contributions at the

end of the financial year. The Chief Finance Officer stated that the Commissioner had a policy to put aside 3% to reserves, and during the last year had been able to put more into reserves due to an underspend in budgets.

- The Commissioner informed the Panel that Operation Franklin, the flood response operation, had cost in the region £600,000 which the Police were hoping to reclaim from the government. At the time they were developing their claim with all the figures related to the Operation.
- The figures provided to the Panel were for up to the end of January 2014 and had been updated in March 2014.
- Members queried the £1million savings from the Learning and Development budget due to the Commissioners commitment to development. The Commissioner stated that he would look at this budget saving.
- The Chief Finance Officer explained that the costs associated with the cancellation of Project Siren was capital, however the costs discussed within the report were revenue expenditure as they were for the maintenance costs related to the maintenance the system.
- Members queried why the budget for the Officer of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) had three budget headings for audit – internal, external and independent. The Chief Finance Officer explained that the external audit fee was a contractual fee which was agreed by the Audit Commission which they were required to pay. In addition, the external auditors had been contracted to audit Project Siren. The internal audit was a joint audit committee with the Chief Constable, while the independent audit fee was for the expenses of members on the independent audit committee. The Panel were informed that one member of the independent committee had previously sat on the Police Authority.
- The Commissioner informed the Panel that it had been a year since he had cancelled Project Siren and that there was a draft report out to consultation. He hoped the final report with lessons learnt within the next two months, and he would circulate the report as soon as he was able.
- Members queried the £1.3 million underspend on specialist crime and were informed that due to the reconfiguration of the Force to a more regional focus some budgets and staff were still being recoded. It was hoped the recoding would be completed with variances being balanced by the year end. The Chief Finance Officer stated that he would look at the specialist crime budget in particular.
- Members were concerned that the Police had £280,000 of accounts payable which were over 90 days overdue. The Chief Finance Officer stated that these were generally from low risk bodies, such as other public sector bodies and that the Police had a relatively low level of

write-off monies. Members felt that the Police should chase public sector bodies for monies due as much as they did the private sector.

- The Panel raised concerns that there was an overall underspend for overtime, despite the overtime put in during the flooding. They were informed that the overtime for the flooding response had been separately recorded for the reimbursement claim for the Project Franklin costs.
- Members questioned the £15,520 expenditure on an internet cafe and were informed this was a staff facility by the staff canteen, but that the Commissioner would look into the spending of this budget.
- The Panel thanked all the agencies involved for their work during the flooding.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The Police and Crime Commissioner re-examine in-year revised savings for Learning and Development.
2. The Police and Crime Commissioner provide more information regarding the variance for Specialist Crime.
3. The Police and Crime Commissioner examine actions that can be taken to reduce late payments from other public sector bodies.

18/14 REPORT ON COMMISSIONING VICTIMS' SERVICES IN SURREY [Item 7]

The Chairman informed the Police and Crime Commissioner that the Panel had made the decision to defer this item until a meeting to which the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for Victims would be able to attend. The Commissioner accepted this proposal, but stated that the Assistant Commissioner was not involved in the commissioning project as two officers were leading on this work.

The Panel further expressed their concern that the Assistant Commissioners contracts would automatically be renewed, and requested they were consulted before this took place.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report on the Commissioning of Victims' Services in Surrey be deferred to a future meeting to which the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for Victims is able to attend.

19/14 FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 8]

The Commissioner informed the Panel that there had been two management meetings with the Chief Constable which were reported on within the agenda pack.

- Panel Members queried the work on the Blue Light Collaboration project and the aims and objectives of this work. The Commissioner informed the Panel that the Police were looking to improve emergency services response alongside the ambulance and fire services. They were looking to having a joint system which would enable information to be shared quickly and effectively, along with services which could be shared such as having defibrillators on police vehicles.
- The Commissioner stated that there was an intention to have neighbourhood PCSOs working within local schools on projects such as drug dealing in schools. This was not a government target currently but was still an area which needed consideration.
- Members queried what was discussed under the item of 'Treasury Management' and were informed that the Commissioner particularly concentrated on whether the budget balanced, the condition of the reserves, and budget plans. The Chief Finance Officer stated that there were twice annual reports on the reserves and that the reserves were managed by Surrey County Council through a service level agreement. This report included the risks associated with the investments.
- The Commissioner raised concerns regarding the Officer turnover as the attrition rate was the highest in the country due to Surrey being one of the most expensive places to live . However due to pay rates being nationally set they did not reflect the cost of living. The Metropolitan Police offered Officers free travel on South West Trains in addition to £6,000 more in pay, and with the Winsor report it was felt that cuts in wages were causing people to leave the Force.
- Members were concerned that there was a link between the attrition rate and the detection rate in the county, as there was a loss of knowledge within the Force which the Commissioner conceded was a concern.
- The Commissioner informed the Panel that he would raise concerns regarding attrition rates in Surrey with the Policing Minister, Damian Green MP, as there was a need to sort out the issue particularly as Surrey was training Officers which were moving elsewhere.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report be noted.

20/14 CHIEF CONSTABLE'S APPRAISAL PROCESS [Item 9]

The Commissioner informed the Panel that he felt that the Chief Constables appraisal had gone well as she and her team were working towards delivering the six People's Priorities. Furthermore, the Commissioner stated that the Chief Constable was dealing with various challenges with historic cases, staying in budget and the restructuring of the Force with senior officers in the localities.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report be noted.

21/14 DEPUTY AND ASSISTANT POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONERS' OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW [Item 10]

The Panel felt that it was not appropriate for neither the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) or Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for Victims (APCC) to not be in attendance, particularly when items which related to their work were being considered.

- Members questioned the work of the APCC for Equality and Diversity as they felt that the work was very generic and could relate to all the residents rather than just minority groups, and queried whether there had been a rise in the recruitment of BME. The Commissioner informed the Panel that his role was very different from that of the Police Authority and he would not be able to engage with all residents on his own. Due to the work of the APCC for Equality and Diversity the Commissioner stated there was now better communication between the Police and minority groups, with these groups now feeling as though they can raise their concerns. This work had been well received and the APCC was now working at Crawley Mosque to improve relations with Sussex Police.
- The Commissioner informed the Panel that he was looking to encourage taxi drivers as a mobile Neighbourhood Watch as they were out at all hours of the day and across the county.
- Members raised concerns that while the APCC for Equalities and Diversity was visible within the community, the APCC for Victims was not. The Commissioner felt that the APCC for Victims was visible in the courts and victims services units across the county, which was where her work was focussed.
- The Commissioner informed the Panel that the DPCC was scrutinising the business cases for amalgamation of services with Sussex Police to ensure the process was effective. Additionally, the DPCC's involvement in the review of the disposal of assets would cause an estimated additional £1million of revenue, by thinking more strategically about what buildings need to be kept.
- The Junior Citizens Scheme was being developed with six boroughs and districts involved. However for the other five there was an issue of cost, however the DPCC had been able to agree Epsom Racecourse as a venue and was looking into funding to enable the other boroughs and districts to be involved in the scheme.
- Members suggested that the Outcomes section of the reports should contain examples of the DPCC and APCCs work to better explain what they had done so as to enable the Panel to better evaluate their work.
- The Commissioner stated that he had seen the APCC for Victims in action and found her to be very competent at raising concerns and

questioning the organisations. He further stressed that he would look into having her attend a future Panel meeting.

- The APCC for Equalities and Diversity informed the Panel that he was working to assure Officers that minority groups were on their side and wanted a proactive force.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report be noted.
2. The Police and Crime Commissioner consider the level of detail provided in the Outcome section of the performance monitoring tables, to help improve the Police and Crime Panel's understanding of the Deputy and Assistant Police and Crime Commissioners' work.

22/14 WEBCASTING OF POLICE AND CRIME PANEL MEETINGS [Item 11]

The Chairman stated that though some Members of the Panel were unsure whether to webcast meetings at the start, they now believed that webcasting the meetings was right way forward. The Panel had received praise for being open and transparent and the viewing figures were very encouraging.

- Members of the Panel stated that the viewing figures showed that residents were interested in the work of the Panel and though there were concerns regarding the costs, it was felt that they were relatively low considering it enabled residents to engage with the process.
- Borough Councillor Margaret Cooksey proposed a vote to continue to webcast the Panel meetings which Borough Councillor Terry Dicks seconded. The Panel voted unanimously to continue webcasting Police and Crime Panel meetings.

RESOLVED: That,

1. Meetings of the Police and Crime Panel continue to be webcast.

23/14 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 12]

The Scrutiny Officer informed the Panel that two complaints had been received since the last meeting. Details of the first complaint could be found in the agenda, while the second complaint was considered by the Complaints Sub-Committee on 24 April 2014 and would be reported on at the next meeting of the Panel.

RESOLVED: That,

1. That the report be noted.

24/14 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 13]

The Panel reviewed the recommendations tracker and forward work programme.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The recommendations tracker and forward work programme be noted.

25/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 14]

It was noted that the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel would be on 10 June 2014 at 10.30 am.

Meeting ended at: 1.00 pm

Chairman