

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 9 September 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

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

Members:

Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (Chairman)
District Councillor Ken Harwood (Vice-Chairman)
Borough Councillor John O'Reilly
Borough Councillor George Crawford QPM
Borough Councillor Richard Billington
Borough Councillor Victor Broad
Borough Councillor Terry Dicks
Borough Councillor Colin Davis
Borough Councillor Charlotte Morley
Borough Councillor Beryl Hunwicks
Independent Member Bryan Cross

Apologies:

District Councillor Margaret Cooksey
Mrs Pat Frost
Independent Member Anne Hoblyn MBE

40/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from District Councillor Margaret Cooksey, Independent Member Anne Hoblyn and Mrs Pat Frost.

Apologies were also received from Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner Jeff Harris, Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner Jane Anderson and Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner Shiraz Mirza.

41/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

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

42/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received

43/14 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

None received

44/14 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 5]

The Panel were informed that the outcome of a complaint considered by the Complaints Sub Committee on 12 June 2014 could be found within the agenda pack.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report be noted.

45/14 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]

The Panel reviewed the recommendations tracker and forward work programme.

- Members requested clarification on statements made in relation to the Budget Quarterly Update on the forward work programme which stipulated that late payments from public sector bodies were 'not a cause for concern'. The Treasurer & Chief Finance Officer indicated that budget squeezes meant a number of public sector organisations who owe money to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) were having difficulty honouring their debts but that these amounts were not significant. It was stated the OPCC was confident that these debts would be recovered but that it was not necessary to actively pursue money owed. The Chairman highlighted that no amount of money was insignificant in times of austerity and advised the Treasurer to pursue these public sector bodies until the monies owed to the OPCC had been recouped. The Police and Crime

Commissioner (PCC) gave his assurances that any outstanding payments would be followed up.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED

1. The Panel will discuss outstanding monies owed to the OPCC in more detail at a future meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

46/14 INDEPENDENT MEMBER OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL AND MEMBERSHIP OF FINANCE SUB-GROUP [Item 7]

The Chairman requested the Panel's approval on the appointment of Bryan Cross to the Surrey Police and Crime Panel (PCP) as well as the PCP Finance Sub-Group as an Independent Member. The Panel unanimously indicated their agreement, by show of hands, with the appointment of Bryan Cross to both the Surrey Police and Crime Panel and the Surrey Police and Crime Panel Finance Sub-Group.

RESOLVED: That,

1. Bryan Cross be appointed as an Independent Member to the PCP and PCP Finance Sub-Group.

47/14 FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 8]

- The PCC drew the Panel's attention to the challenges Surrey Police were having in retaining and recruiting Police Officers as well as indicating that a drop in the number of Special Constables (PCSOs) operating in Surrey had been recorded which the PCC indicated was also a cause for concern. The PCC did indicate, however, that the Joint Enforcement Teams (JET) operating in Reigate and Banstead had recorded huge success in tackling crimes such as fly-tipping and parking offences. Furthermore, it was stated that Surrey Police were on budget for the financial year 2013/14 with a very slight under-spend and that the Force was in a better position than most other forces in the UK to deal with reduced budgets. It was also highlighted that one of the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) has been working closely with Police Officers to increase awareness of the cultural issues around crimes such as honour-based violence and domestic violence to ensure that the Force is better prepared to tackle crimes of this nature.
- The Panel expressed concerned with events in Rotherham and members assurances that the Police wouldn't be obstructed by political correctness. The PCC assured the Panel that all claims made to Surrey Police would be rigorously investigated regardless of who the claim was made against and that all groups participating in

ritualised grooming or sexual offences against young women would be investigated and brought to justice. It was further stipulated that discussions would be conducted with Children's Services and Police Officers working in areas with large Pakistani communities to ensure that they coordinated and engaged with the community effectively.

- The Panel also requested more information on the problems that Surrey Police were having with recruiting and retaining Police Officers. Numerous pressures but in particular the high cost of living in Surrey and the increased salaries offered by the Metropolitan Police were highlighted. The Panel queried whether it would be possible to pay a bounty to PCSOs in an attempt to attract more people to fulfil this role in Surrey. It was confirmed this had been considered but that existing legislation restricted paying PCSOs. Other potential options were, however, being considered to reward PCSOs for their work such as Council Tax rebates.
- The Panel requested some detail on how the OPCC was using its resources to mitigate the threat of terrorism from British citizens returning from fighting in Iraq and Syria. The PCC suggested that the overwhelming majority of those returning from Syria or Iraq would live peacefully and presented no risk. It was stressed, however, that every effort was being made to ensure the safety of the public and that discussions had been conducted with the Security Services to ensure that individuals who may have been radicalised were identified and that appropriate measures were taken to ensure that the public was not at risk.
- Members sought clarification on the nature collaboration between Surrey and Sussex Police forces. The PCC highlighted that Surrey Police continues to collaborate with Sussex on a number of operational matters but assured the Panel that, from the PCC's perspective, these were always conducted with an eye to how it would benefit Surrey especially given the relative financial positions of the two Forces. Crucially, it was advised that there were no Surrey-funded Police Constables working in Sussex, while the PCC indicated that Surrey Police had received substantial support from Sussex Police during last year's floods by providing Officers to assist Surrey residents.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report be noted.

48/14 DEPUTY AND ASSISTANT POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONERS' OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW [Item 9]

This item was deferred to the next meeting, as the DPCC and APCCs were not in attendance.

ACTIONS:

1. The Panel examine the DPCC's and APCCs' performance monitoring at the next meeting.

49/14 QUARTERLY POLICE AND CRIME PLAN PROGRESS UPDATE [Item 10]

- The PCC stated that arrests in Surrey were up 15% and that crime was down 8% in 2013/14 which highlighted that his strategy was working, particularly in relation to reducing anti-social behaviour. The PCC reiterated the success enjoyed by the JET teams in Reigate and Banstead which have been working to enforce local bylaws. Members commended the success of the JET initiative and highlighted that they were being rolled out in other Boroughs and Districts throughout Surrey with Spelthorne set to introduce them next year and Runnymede developing plans to start the initiative in the near future.
- The PCC mentioned that he was conducting a series of crime summits throughout Surrey to assess residents' concerns and priorities for tackling crime in the County and to help inform the strategic direction of the Police. It was advised that the PCC was also using these meetings to gauge public support for granting more powers to PCSOs as well as for raising the precept by the equivalent of £1 a week per household for a Band D property and stated that the majority of residents who had attended the Crime Summits so far were in favour of both. The PCC further mentioned that applications amounting to £108,000 had so far been received for funding Community Safety Partnership initiatives and asked the Panel to remind their colleagues on Borough and District Councils that more money is available for these Community Safety schemes.
- Members highlighted that they were aware of how easily and readily crime statistics can be skewed and requested assurances that crimes were being downgraded to give the appearance that crime was falling in Surrey. The Panel expressed some concern with the recording of crime statistics which it was intimated could often be skewed or new practices adopted in an attempt to give the appearance that crime was falling. The PCC stated that discussions with the Chief Constable had assured him that Surrey's crime recording statistics were both ethical and accurate and that crime in Surrey is in fact falling. It was further advised that the fact that arrests have increased suggests that Police are taking crimes more seriously rather than downgrading them.
- In reference to the increase in the reporting of sexual offences, Members queried the logic of the PCC to indicate that this was a good thing and whether the obvious conclusion could be that more sexual offences took place in Surrey than last year. It was advised that few victims of sexual offences come forward to report the incident and that the number of sexual offences brought to the attention of the Police is the tip of the iceberg. Thus, any rise in the reporting of sexual offences

should be viewed positively as it suggested that victims were beginning to place more trust in the Police.

- Members also requested clarification on why the detection rates for Surrey Police were so low. The PCC highlighted that detection rates are complex and involve numerous variables which must be considered. It was advised that the drop in detection rates could either be a combination of the fact that more victims are coming forward to report crimes but there has been no increase in the number of cases being solved or that the reduction could be as a result of the time it takes detection rates to be recorded due to the length of time it takes for case to go through the criminal justice system.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report be noted.

50/14 PROTOCOL BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL AND THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR SURREY [Item 11]

The Panel noted the two changes to the protocol suggested by the PCC. The Chairman, with the support of the Panel, agreed to accept one of the amendments but rejected the other.

RESOLVED: To,

1. Agree the recommended changes to the protocol as set out in Appendix 1 and summarised in Section 2 of this report.
2. Add additional points on the Commissioner's role as an Appendix, with reference to the Appendix in the relevant section.

51/14 BUDGET QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 12]

- Money paid out in Consultant fees by the OPCC were queried by Members and it was stated that these outgoings were actually the salaries paid to the two APCCs who were prevented from inclusion on the payroll due to their positions on other public bodies. The PCC was asked to clarify why the salaries of the APCCs had increased significantly from the agreed annual fee of £12k for each APCC. It was advised that both APCCs had been employed to work one day a week but were now working at the OPCC three days a week and their annual salaries had been amended accordingly.
- Members also asked about the increased spending on the PCC's Communications Staffing, it was highlighted that social media platforms were becoming an increasingly important way of engaging with the public especially among the younger parts of the community and so a new part-time member of staff had been hired to manage the PCC's online presence.
- Members were unsure why the PCC had received £38K from Surrey Police budget for Communications especially given that the

Communications budget for last year had been underspent. The PCC stated that he had been involved in a great deal of public engagement and was replacing the role of the Police in interacting with the public and understanding their priorities when it came to reducing crime. 38K had been transferred from the Chief Constable's office to ensure that the PCC had enough money to fulfil this enhanced public engagement and communications role. It was stated that a number of additional events were planned for the remainder of the year that would account for some of the budget while some could also be set aside for a potential referendum.

- Members expressed concern with the lack of control that Police forces have over the ACPO's agenda. The PCC indicated that ACPO had begun to lose many of its functions over areas such as Police Officer training and that the money paid from the PCC's budget was to pay for the role they play in setting national protocols and best practice procedures in policing. The Association of Police Commissioners had already conducted a study into ACPO and its role in policing and highlighting that it was an organisation under close scrutiny.

RESOLVED: To,

1. Note and comment on the financial performance of the OPCC at Month 4 for the Financial Year 2014/15.
2. Note and comment on the Surrey Police Group Financial Report for Month 3 2014/15.

52/14 END OF YEAR FINANCE REPORT [Item 13]

- The Panel requested a timeline on the auditing accounts for the Financial Year 2014/15 and inquired as to when these would be available for the Panel to consider. The Treasurer indicated that there were still a few final elements of the audit to finalise but that sign off was required by the end of September 2014 and so the audit report should be available for the Panel in the coming weeks.
- Members probed the PCC on how Surrey and Sussex Police Forces divide the cost of joint operations to which the PCC responded stating that Surrey pays 45% of the cost. The Chairman expressed concern with this division given the size of Sussex Police Force in relation to Surrey and questioned whether it was fair that Surrey shouldered so much of the cost. The PCC highlighted that the division was made according to the respective budgets of each of the forces and Sussex Police's annual budget is roughly 10% larger than Surrey's meaning that the 45%-55% split was in fact a fair division.
- The Panel asked the PCC for more information on why none of the allocated annual training budget had been spent for the year. The PCC advised that both he and the DPCC had been long-serving to Police Officers prior to taking on their positions and, as such, the PCC

felt that they both had a very strong and well-rounded understanding of the demands of modern day policing and that there were few areas where training would be money well-spent. It was stated, however, that both the PCC and DPCC would be very willing to attend training courses if they encountered areas where they felt training or further experience was required or would help them carry out their respective positions more effectively.

RESOLVED: To,

1. Note and comment on the financial performance of the OPCC for the Financial Year 2013/14.
2. Note and comment on the Surrey Police Group Financial Report for the Financial Year 2013/14.
3. That the OPCC send copies of the final audited reports when available.

53/14 VICTIM SERVICES COMMISSIONING [Item 14]

- The Senior Policy Officer provided a brief overview of the OPCC's new role in commissioning Victims' Services and the plans in place to assume this new responsibility. It was highlighted that Surrey's bid for additional funding made available by central government to commission victims' services attracted £450k of funding from a pot of £12 million made available for PCCs. The funding is earmarked for a variety of services for victims of crime ranging from specialist services for victims of sexual offences or domestic abuse as well as more general services for victims of crimes such as burglary and will lead to a significant reduction in the time that victims of crimes such as rape or sexual assault will have to wait for specialist services. Decisions will be made on contracts for providing these services and details of these contracts will be made available to the Panel at the next meeting.
- The Senior Policy Officer advised that running a contact service for victims in Surrey alone would not be sustainable and so they had agreed with Sussex and Thames Valley Police Forces to collaborate on creating one contact centre covering the three Force areas. The contract for providing this centre is currently out for tender and they are on schedule to award this contract by the end of October. It was noted that this collaboration would be beneficial for all three Forces as well as for victims who would receive a better service from a combined contact centre and had led to the creation of a framework agreement that was open for all PCCs.
- The Panel asked whether the £450k of additional funding provided by the government was a single payment or whether there were indications that this additional funding would be provided annually to cover the costs of this additional responsibility. The Senior Policy Officer advised that this was understood to be a one-off payment and

that funding was not guaranteed for the future. As a result the OPCC had sought to commission services which were sustainable where possible although an indication was given that some services might have to be ended if Central Government didn't continue this funding.

- The Members requested more information on the provision of services to victims of domestic abuse in Surrey, specifically, how the OPCC is working with specialist organisations who already deliver a great service to victims of domestic abuse such as yoursanctuary which was not listed as a partner organisation in the report provided. The Senior Policy Officer advised that the OPCC was working with a number of providers of domestic abuse services including yourSanctuary and that funding is being made to existing providers of services to domestic abuse victims through a block grant arrangement to rather than the usual contract tender process to ensure the provision of services which already exists in Surrey isn't undermined. The Senior Policy Officer stated that a full breakdown of the beneficiaries of the victims' services funds would be made available to the Panel once these had been finalised.
- The Panel felt that 6-8 weeks was still quite a long time to wait for victims to receive support services and stated that they felt support was needed much sooner and preferably as soon as the crime had happened. The PCC stated that the 6-8 week timeframe was specifically in reference to the specialist services for victims of sexual offences which are less readily available than more general support services. It was further highlighted that victims of sexual offences receive a chaperone officer with specialist training in supporting victims of crimes of this nature and who will continue to provide support and advice handing them over to a specialist counsellor so there would be no gap in the support available to the victim.
- Members also wanted to know more about the services available for victims of anti-social behaviour especially those who are older or more vulnerable and can often live close to the perpetrator. The PCC advised that when crimes are reported Victims' Support Services are informed and will contact the victim within hours of the complaint being made. Following this, a discussion will take place and involving the victim to determine what services they require. In some cases a volunteer caseworker will be assigned to the victim to ensure that they have full access to the services and support required.
- The Panel also requested more information on how many cases of domestic abuse are reported to Surrey Police and how this impacts on caseloads. The PCC suggested that probably just 10% of domestic abuse incidents are actually reported to Surrey Police. Despite this, domestic abuse cases accounted had a significant impact on Police caseloads as complaints are often retracted before the case goes to court. The OPCC is taking steps to better understand why victims of domestic violence don't come forward particularly in some ethnic minority communities where offences such as domestic abuse and

marital rape are more common. It was advised that, as a result of these efforts, more victims were stating that they felt well supported by Surrey Police, something that was being seen in real terms with more victims taking their cases through to trial.

RESOLVED: That;

1. The report be noted.
2. The OPCC share the results of the bidding process for specialist services, including a breakdown of services and partners, with the Panel.

54/14 PROJECT SIREN UPDATE [Item 15]

- The PCC gave a brief update on Project Siren and the steps taken to hold someone to account for the failings and financial losses stemming from the project. It was highlighted that a letter had been sent to the Mayor of London detailing the accusations against the former Chief Constable of Surrey Police who is now the Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police. A response has been received from the Mayor's Office which indicated that he was unwilling to consider action against the Assistant Commissioner. Members agreed to support the PCC and discussed the possibility of following up the PCC's letter to the Mayor of London highlighting their own concerns. The PCC indicated that he felt a letter from the Panel would be valuable and indicated that he would make the letter and accompanying documents which he sent to the Mayor available to the Panel.
- Members asked whether civil litigation had been considered against Surrey Police's former Chief Constable. The PCC confirmed that this had been considered but it appeared that no specific laws had been infringed which would make legal action a viable option.
- The Panel also requested more detail on where the failings with Project Siren occurred, specifically whether the problems with the project were endemic throughout the design and creation of Siren or whether the issues had come towards the conclusion of the Project. The PCC advised that there appeared to be culture of bad scrutiny and a failure to look at Project Siren objectively which meant they failed to realise that important requirements for the system weren't being met. Furthermore, the PCC indicated that he didn't feel the right individuals were in place to execute and implement the project which was ultimately why Siren failed.
- Members also asked whether the PCC had sought the backing of MPs in attempting to hold the Ex-Chief Constable to account for his part in the failings of Project Siren. It was highlighted that MPs had been made aware of the Ex-Chief Constable's new position in the Metropolitan Police but that it was ultimately the role of the Mayor of London to take action against members of the Metropolitan Police force.

55/14 VERBAL UPDATE ON ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INCLUDING DEEPCUT [Item 16]

- The PCC advised the Panel that he had assigned £1.3 million to Operation Heather to facilitate the transfer of new research and existing documentation from Surrey Police to the Coroner responsible for the new inquest into the deaths at Deepcut Barracks. The Vice-Chairman made the panel aware that the case was sub judice and so questions asked to the PCC about the Coroner's inquest would have to be kept very general.
- The Members asked why Surrey Police has been asked to be involved in another investigation on the deaths at Deepcut following their failures in previous investigations and asked whether it would have been better to have the inquest without Surrey Police's involvement. The PCC advised that Surrey Police were not conducting the investigation but were only working in tandem with independent legal counsel to ensure that all documents and evidence relevant to the Deepcut cases were made available as and when required by the Coroner.
- Assurance was sought from the Panel that the Officers and members of staff from Surrey Police who were aiding in the investigation did not have any previous involvement with any of the investigations previously conducted on the deaths at Deepcut to ensure that Surrey Police's part in the inquest would be conducted entirely correctly. The PCC confirmed that he would indeed ensure that no one who had previously been involved in the investigations or could be perceived as having a vested interest in the outcome would be part of the team aiding the Coroner with the new inquest.

RESOLVED: That,

1. The report be noted.

56/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]

It was noted that the date of the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel would be on 12 December 2014.

Meeting ended at: 12.35 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank