

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 1 December 2016 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

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

**Members:**

Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (Chairman)  
Ken Harwood (Vice-Chairman)  
David Reeve  
Graham Ellwood  
Chris Sadler  
Margaret Cooksey  
Peter Waddell  
Anthony Mitchell  
Charlotte Morley  
Pat Frost  
Beryl Hunwicks  
Bryan Cross

**59/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from David Fitzpatrick-Grimes.

**60/16 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

A Member made reference to a discussion on rural crime where the PCC visited Mole Valley District Council and advised that this was not reflected in the 10 October 2016 minutes, the Panel noted this.

The minutes from the meeting held on Monday 10 October 2016 were agreed by the Panel as a true record of the meeting.

**61/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

**62/16 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

None received.

**63/16 VERBAL UPDATE FROM THE COMMISSIONER [Item 5]**

The PCC advised that the key issues arising from policing matters would be covered in today's agenda, therefore a verbal update at this time would not be necessary as matters would be raised in the reports.

**64/16 PROGRESS AGAINST THE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN [Item 6]****Key points raised during discussion:**

1. The PCC introduced the item and informed Members that although the report was written two weeks ago, there had been various updates. The Panel was pleased to note that the PCC has agreed to fund the Police Cadets uniform. The Panel was further advised that Waverley Borough Council has informally agreed to develop a JET team and to support this plan the PCC was providing £50k in funding.
2. The PCC advised the Panel that he recently met with the Director for Public Prosecutions, Alison Saunders to improve victims' cases going through the criminal justice system. The PCC recognised the delays in cases and assured the Panel Alison Saunders was looking to expand the number of prosecutors to remedy the concern and ensure progress was made. The Panel also noted that a Police Officer was being embedded into the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to administer support and to improve delays in the CPS reaching a charging decision.
3. The PCC was queried whether he was aware that certain files held by the CPS, relevant to Guildford Crown Court were being processed in Canterbury. The PCC acknowledged this and assured that work was underway in pressing the matter in recruiting more lawyers to be based in Guildford. However as the CPS was a regional service there was good reason why lawyers were based in Canterbury.

4. The Vice-Chairman sought clarification on the funding behind the initiative to support victim's cases in the criminal justice system, with regards to the costs involved with embedding a Surrey police officer into the offices of the CPS. The PCC advised that there was funding to support this role.
5. A Member mentioned that the Policing in your neighbourhood (PIYN) review had been completed, however findings had not been circulated. The PCC explained that the report was a public document and would be available shortly after final checks were carried out. A press release regarding the review had been released on 30 November 2016.
6. The PCC was also questioned as to whether information about the victims' fund and community safety fund had been circulated to the Boroughs. The PCC informed the Members that the information in fact had been circulated as widely as possible, including a press release. The Panel were advised the best way to access all the information was to visit the Surrey Police Funding Hub online.
7. There was a discussion around tackling rural crime and a Member wanted more information with regards to the time scales in delivering the new Rural Crime Strategy, in particular the new rural crime community engagement volunteers' scheme. The PCC notified Members that the implementation was a working progress and a colleague in the OPCC was actively working on this with police colleagues. The PCC encouraged the Panel to notify his office if anyone would like to come forward as a volunteer.
8. A Member drew the PCC's attention to Reigate and Banstead's problem with dangerous parking and obstructions, in particular around schools and appealed for support. The PCC had assured the Panel that he had recently visited the Borough Inspector and was aware of the problems and the Police service was working to the best of their ability in cutting crime and building safer communities.
9. The PCC touched upon the problem with dangerous parking and proposed joint action with John Furey, the Surrey County Council Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding and requested Members to inform him of any parking hotspots in their local areas. The Chairman stated that it was not a matter of additional resources, but that existing Officers should be visible to Residents.
10. The PCC was pleased to announce the mobile data terminals which have been rolled out have been saving Officers' time and as technology advances so will procedures.
11. The PCC was asked to update the Panel on the progress of the body worn cameras as it was mentioned in the last meeting that there were delays. Members were advised that the body worn cameras would be rolled out this month from 1 December 2016 in Guildford and that, in due course, all front line officers would be equipped with these.
12. There was a discussion around making town centres safe and the absence of Mental Health Practitioners, Members wanted assurance from the PCC that this was being addressed. The PCC informed the

Panel that he was working with the Health and Wellbeing Board to promote better cooperation so that Mental Health Practitioners are based at the appropriate places.

13. A Member of the Panel queried the progress around the work with youth organisations and developing partnerships between police, businesses and community safety agencies to tackle crime. The PCC reported that work around youth organisations were underway and that he recently attended the Surrey Youth Focus seminar last week, establishing what issues face young people. It was stated that cyber-bullying was identified as a key concern. The Panel was also asked to note that the PCC's office was providing substantial amounts of funding to support youth organisations in preventing crime.
14. In relation to businesses the PCC reported that it was difficult to engage with businesses and commended his predecessor for setting up a comprehensive cybercrime network, which addresses key concerns within this sector. The Panel also noted the PCC was in contact with the federation for small businesses which he addresses with the Sussex PCC and engages regularly with the Chamber of commerce.

**RESOLVED:**

The Police and Crime Panel noted the early progress made against the Police and Crime Plan 2016-2020.

**65/16 BUDGET QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 7]**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Chief Finance Officer introduced the report and informed the Panel the following updates were a representation of the financial performance and position up to month 6 for 2016/17 financial year.
2. The Officer highlighted that the OPCC was forecasted to achieve an under spend of £455k at year end, as a result of the changes made by the PCC since his appointment. The PCC would decide what happened with this underspend in advance of setting his budget for 2017/18.
3. The Panel also noted that Surrey Police was also going to reach an under spend of £1.5M. The Officer advised that the main reason for this under spend was the turnover of Police Officers leaving the force at a faster rate than officers were being recruited.
4. Members were briefed upon the strategic saving programme, noting that there would be a shortfall for this financial year. The Officer informed the Panel that the remaining 19% of budgeted savings that were not achieved will have to be included into the next financial year.
5. A Member referred to the under spend figures and recommended that more needed to be done to increase recruitment and training opportunities. The PCC explained the problem was with retention and losing Officers to neighbouring authorities or out of the police service

altogether. The PCC and Chief Constable's main focus was on alleviating this problem and focusing on making Surrey a more attractive employer although it was recognised that retention would always be a problem, particularly with the high cost of living in Surrey.

6. There was a discussion around the new joint finance service between Surrey and Sussex Police Forces and Members requested further information on this merger. The Officer advised that the merger involved two finance functions which would deal with a significant combined annual budget. The Officer stated that as this was a recent merger teething problems existed, although he was confident the actual spend figures to month 6 provided to Members in the reports was correct, he felt that the year-end forecasts provided in the report were not so reliable. In the future staff would require retraining on one computer system.
7. A Member proposed whether some of the under spend could be put towards housing for Officers, making it more attractive for them to stay in the police service. The PCC noted this suggestion and assured Members that there were a number of measures the Police force were considering in tackling recruitment and retention issues.
8. Members were concerned with the references made of Police Officers leaving the force and requested Officers to provide exact figures of recruitment and turnover for better understanding.

A Member referred to Annex A and noted the spend on Memberships was very high and sought more information regarding this. Officers explained that the funds that were spent in this area were for National Association membership costs. These associations were non-profit and allowed officers to do research and put forward joint responses to consultations. Going forward the Panel asked that under membership costs, each association along with the annual cost of this association was listed.

**RESOLVED:**

The Police and Crime Panel noted the financial performance of the Surrey Police Group and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

R15/16- For the PCC to provide the Panel with details of the number of Police officers recruited from 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017 (including the numbers that subsequently left during this period).

**66/16 SURREY OPCC COMMISSIONING STRATEGY UPDATE [Item 8]**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Officers introduced the report by providing the Panel with a presentation. This covered the main themes of the Commissioning Strategy, the progress made to date and the key areas going forward.

2. The Chairman proposed within the list of themes to have Child Sexual Exploitation and Rape at the top of this list so it was seen to be given a higher priority. Officers advised that the list was not in any particular order of priority and noted the Member's suggestion.
3. A Member queried the local principles in which the commissioning strategy is guided and driven by and requested for further information around these. The Officer explained that these local principles were developed through Commissioners' work around the county, focusing on the resident as well as the victim and offender who are at the heart of this service.
4. In achieving the outcomes set out in the strategy, Officers outlined specific areas of focus as building good practice, developing services that work in hand with Surrey Police and partners, working with partners to ensure best use of resources and providing strong management.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the update report.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None.

**67/16 UPDATE ON THE WORK OF THE ASSISTANT POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER (VICTIMS) [Item 9]**

**Keys points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Assistant PCC for Victims introduced the report and informed Members that her role ensured the voice of the victim was at the heart of the service. The APCC emphasised a considerable amount of her time was spent speaking to victims, in particular vulnerable victims of domestic abuse, rape and sexual assault.
2. The APCC explained that her contribution in this area involved putting the victim's experiences on record, then using this knowledge to influence decision making.
3. The PCC commended the work of the Assistant PCC for Victims, informing the Panel that in the community Jane Anderson was held in very high regard and was pleased to have her as part of the team in Surrey Police.
4. The APCC was asked to provide the Panel with details on her biggest achievement for 2016. Members were informed that the Assistant PCC's biggest achievement was her work around Child Sexual Exploitation and the time that was spent with victims of this crime which led to more funding for this area.
5. The Panel also noted that the Assistant PCC's contribution towards rape victims provided better understanding and training back into the

police service. The APCC was also one of the only people to have access to speak with victims of rape. The APCC also explained that she would be meeting with women from BME backgrounds in Woking to speak about domestic violence and the support available.

6. A Member queried the APCC on what improvements had been identified as a result of her work. The Panel were informed that victims were pleased with the response they received when reporting crimes such as rape and domestic violence. The Assistant PCC reported that this was an improvement from previous years with improved feedback.
7. There was a discussion around the drop in victim satisfaction from 81% to 79% for the year and what the Assistant PCC for victims can do to ensure this is improved. Members were advised that the APCC ensured that the voices of victims was heard by the Police service. The feedback from victims is directly targeted at police training. Any gaps that need attention are raised with the PCC and CEX to ensure resources are targeted appropriately.
8. The Panel noted that Surrey Police undergo mandatory victim surveying which is contracted and conducted by an external, independent service. Officers indicated it was difficult to assess these results as there was a time lapse between the results and reporting, however the force has a programme in place to improve this.
9. A Member of the Panel stated her involvement with the Woking People of Faith Forum and how there has been no reference to the work Assistant PCC for Victims in that context. The Officer explained that faith groups was a difficult territory to gain access to, taking years to build a strong relationship. The Assistant PCC for victims welcomed any contacts in this area.
10. The Vice - Chairman raised a concern with the distinction made between high level crime and low level crime and wanted assurance from the APCC that any type of crime would be treated equally from a victim's point of view.
11. The APCC was requested to provide the Panel with details of any training she has organised for police officers. The APCC explained that she did not organise training but contributed material towards training sessions.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the update report.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None.

**68/16 FEEDBACK ON PERFORMANCE MEETINGS WITH THE CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 10]**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. A Member queried the PCC on crime statistics, which were absent in the report and questioned whether crime statistics were mentioned in discussions with the Chief Constable. The PCC assured the Panel that crime statistics were touched upon frequently in discussions, not only on figures of crime committed but crime that was solved.
2. The Panel requested that the PCC could provide quarterly updates on crime statistics for Surrey. The PCC informed Members that these were publicly available and would be happy to provide the link to access these.
3. There was a discussion around the employee survey results and the Panel noted that the Sussex Deputy Chief Constable was overseeing this analysis and it was on the agenda for the next performance meeting with the Chief Constable. Officers assured the Panel results would be presented as soon as they were available.
4. The Chairman asked how Surrey Police were responding to new legislation regarding Modern Slavery and whether training was being organised for Officers around this. The PCC informed Members that a series of training courses were being provided to Officers to raise awareness around Modern Slavery.

**RESOLVED:**

The Police and Crime Panel noted the update on performance meetings.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

R16/16- For the PCC to provide the Panel with details of crime statistics for Surrey.

R17/16- For the PCC to share with the Panel the Surrey Police employee survey results once these become available.

**69/16 HATE CRIME IN SURREY [Item 11]**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. A Member raised a concern that although hate crime figures had declined, there was no indication whether these hate crimes were solved. The PCC advised the Panel that these figures were not currently available, however could provide them at a later date.
2. The Panel noted that the PCC was familiar with Tell Mama (Measuring Anti Muslim Attacks) and recognised the importance of tackling hate crime and the organisations involved in representing the voices of minority groups.
3. A Member referred to the 'hate crime coordinator' mentioned in the report and asked for more details regarding what this involved. The PCC assured the Panel the role would be undertaken by a Police Staff Officer and not a uniformed Officer and further details could be provided into the responsibilities of the position.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None.

**70/16 CCTV IN SURREY [Item 12]****Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The PCC introduced the report and informed the Panel that Surrey Police was commissioning a CCTV review to address the long term issues with resourcing and funding of CCTV..
2. A Member queried when the Panel could expect the final CCTV review. The PCC advised that no date was in the diary at the moment, however the matter was being pressed as urgent and would require a high level of demand.
3. There was a discussion around the funding in relation to CCTV and a Member sought assurance that the strategy coming forward would not undermine the system currently in place. The PCC advised that substantial amounts of funding would be required and evidence would be sought to justify the means.
4. A Member expressed concern with the capacity of monitoring more cameras and requested for further information on how the PCC would meet that demand. The PCC noted this concern and assured he would take it away to reflect on when reviewing the matter.
5. A Member highlighted how the Woking Street Angels rely heavily on CCTV to ensure safety and sought assurance from the PCC the new strategy would not raise unattended consequences for other systems in play. The PCC explained that the strategy was still in the making and would raise more questions than answers.
6. The PCC noted the recommendation that industry standards should be applied to the various provisions already in effect around the County to establish an accurate picture of the delivery capacity.
7. The PCC further noted the concern around the Clacketts Services in Tandridge which is known as an area where illegal Migrants unload from Lorries and assured the Panel this would be looked into in more detail going forward.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None.

**71/16 NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN POLICING [Item 13]****Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The PCC began the item with thanking the Panel for their support in adding weight to the representations made for Surrey in the new policing funding formula.
2. The Panel noted the PCC's support in relation to the Policing vision 2025, in particular with the principles set out in the vision which had now been accepted by the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC).
3. The PCC informed Members that there was a big debate surrounding specialist capabilities, in particular with how much control should be retained in the County forces like Surrey and how much should be coordinated by national/regional services to deal with crime.
4. There was a discussion around the public consultation in relation to the new policing funding formula and the PCC assured Members that the public would be consulted in due course. The consultation on a new funding formula would not be ready until 2018/19.
5. The Chairman expressed concern with the growing problem of cyber crime amongst the elderly and requested the PCC address this going forward, the PCC noted this concern and stated that every Surrey Resident was of key concern.
6. A Member sought clarification around the time scales for when Surrey could expect the implementation of the new policing funding formula. The PCC advised that the new formula would most likely come into effect for financial year 2018/19 and the preliminary proposals would be circulated on 1 April 2017.
7. A Member queried whether specialist capabilities would effect the collaboration between Surrey and Sussex Police. The PCC explained that specialist capabilities promoted services working together and it would be highly unlikely that the collaboration would be affected but rather collaboration would be extended to the whole South East region.
8. Following on from the above, a Member asked whether Surrey Police would exist in 2025 as a result of the increasing collaboration. The PCC expressed the opinion that Surrey Police should exist and that Surrey Residents were entitled to their own police force. However the PCC explained the overriding criteria in retaining the identity would not matter if collaboration fights crime better.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the updated report.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None.

Graham Ellwood and Anthony Mitchell left the meeting at 12.40pm

The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 12.40pm

The meeting reconvened at 1.05pm

## **72/16 GOVERNANCE OF FIRE AND RESCUE IN SURREY [Item 14]**

### **Declarations of Interest:**

Margaret Cooksey – Visited Surrey Fire and Rescue HQ in Reigate (non-pecuniary)

Ken Harwood - Visited Surrey Fire and Rescue HQ in Reigate (non-pecuniary)

Dorothy Ross- Tomlin – Husband employed by Respirex UK Ltd (based in Redhill) and Respirex France – manufacturers of specialist protective clothing and equipment (pecuniary interest)

### **Key points raised during the discussions:**

1. The PCC introduced the report and commended the front line collaborative work undertaken between the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and Surrey Police. The PCC informed the Panel that the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Constable are keen that this grows and continues.
2. The PCC expressed support for the provisions around fire governance set out in the Policing and Crime Bill, however remains cautious. The Panel noted that Sussex Police would be developing a business case for change with closer working with the Fire Service. The PCC stated he would like to observe their experience before putting forward a business case.
3. A member commented whether the Panel should be anxious that delays are being made with putting forward a business case and the subsequent financial implications. The PCC stated that if things were to change, a consultant could be paid to hurry a business case. However the PCC was keen to learn lessons from other authorities before putting forward a business case for changes to governance of the fire service. Members appreciated the PCC's approach to gather all the facts first.
4. A Member queried what the implications would be if Sussex's early adoption of the change proves successful. The PCC advised that in that instance he would look into hiring additional resource to see whether Surrey and Sussex's timelines could be brought together.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None

**73/16 SCRUTINY OF REMEMBRANCE DAY PARADE POLICIES [Item 15]****Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The PCC introduced the report by advising Members that no adverse feedback was received in relation to Remembrance Day parades 2016.
2. The Chairman expressed the view that Remembrance Day parades were a good opportunity for Police Officers to attend and show support for the community.
3. The Vice-Chairman sought the PCC's assurance that the attendance of Officers at parades would grow and continue for the following years. Members were advised that that this was an operational matter and the PCC could not comment on future officer attendance, however comments would be relayed to the Chief Constable on this matter.
4. A Member informed the Panel that ahead of the parade in Walton the Police force advised that they would be attending in limited numbers, however on the day they exceeded the support which was offered and commended the service for this.
5. A Member informed the Panel that in some local areas road closures were organised by council Officers. The Member further advised that these events attract big crowds and was an opportunity for something untoward to happen. The PCC assured the Panel that the Police force had plans in place in the event something untoward was to happen and expressed confidence that these plans would be delivered successfully.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None.

**74/16 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 16]**

No complaints have been received since the last meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report and Appendix A.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED.**

None.

**75/16 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [Item 17]**

1. Parking, a Member suggested it would be appropriate for a report on Police responsibility regarding highway/ parking enforcement to be included on the forward work programme so that Members are clear on Police responsibilities.
2. The PCC proposed a joint report to be produced with the support of the highway authority. The Chairman indicated that a report from Surrey police would be appropriate in any case but would speak to the relevant Cabinet Member regarding this.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the Forward Work Programme and Recommendations Tracker.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

R18/16- For an item to be added to the forward work programme on Police responsibility regarding highways enforcement (parking).

**76/16 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 18]**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Chairman explained that the Panel had a liaison meeting with the Sussex Police and Crime Panel Chairman and Vice - Chairmen who gave details of an item on their agenda called Commissioners Question Time. It was as an opportunity for Members to expand and discuss matters that were not on the agenda with the PCC.
2. A written question was given in advance of the meeting to the PCC by a Member of the Panel which read the following, 'Judge Peter Moss in a recent case at Guildford Crown Court criticised Surrey Police for not prosecuting an Albanian man for having six wraps of cocaine when he was arrested for having improper identity documents,'. What is Surrey's current policy on possession and whether there has been any change in this policy in the last three years whether the PCC was confident Surrey Police was acting in accordance with this policy'?
3. The PCC thanked the Member for advance notice on this question and responded with giving the Panel assurance that there is no policy; rather that Surrey Police act in accordance with the law and that there has been no change in the last three years. Surrey Police are there to uphold the law which may involve making difficult decisions.

4. The Vice Chairman asked the PCC how often he had met with leaders of Faith groups in Surrey. The PCC informed the Panel that his visit to the Shah Jehan Mosque in Woking was cancelled but another meeting had been scheduled. He assured the Panel that he intends to visit the mosque and other major mosques as he is keen to engage with faith groups. The PCC also explained that he had met with Surrey Minority Ethnic Forum (SMEF) and other various BME groups.
5. The Chairman indicated that the previous PCC used to hold 'Crime Summits' to engage with residents on policing matters, however it was brought to the Panel's attention the PCC's intention was to visit overview and scrutiny committees instead. The PCC explained that he does not intend to exclusively attend overview and scrutiny committees, however attends such meetings where his diary permits him. The PCC informed the Panel his visits have stretched over neighbourhood watch meetings, parish council meetings and community safety meetings.
6. The PCC indicated he is open minded towards crime summits and there are three more years of his term to serve.
7. The Chairman advised attending overview and scrutiny committees was not an appropriate use of the PCC's time and a duplication as Members of the Panel were also there too and could feedback the work of the PCC to those in attendance at these meetings. The PCC emphasised he will attend meetings where he is requested and where his diary commitments permit him.
8. A Member expressed the cost implications of holding crime summits and suggested that attending Joint Committees would be more beneficial as these meetings have a high attendance level from the public.
9. It was brought to the Panel's attention that the PCC's predecessor would notify Boroughs and Districts before attending meetings in their area and asked that this information could be provided again by the current PCC.
10. A Member of the Panel asked the PCC to consider a commissioner's forum event which would give the PCC an opportunity to talk about specific policing issues. The PCC welcomed this suggestion and informed the board he organised a similar event at Elmbridge Borough Council which ran successfully.
11. A Member raised a concern with the seating plan and suggested that this be reviewed for the next meeting. The Chairman noted this point.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel agreed to include Commissioners Question Time as 'standing item' to each Panel meeting agenda.

**ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:**

None

**77/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 19]**

The next meeting will be held on Monday 6 February 2017 at 10:30am, in the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

Meeting ended at: 1.43 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank