

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 15 September 2020, remotely via Microsoft Teams.

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

Members:

(*Present)

- *Councillor Andrew Povey
- *Councillor David Reeve (Chairman)
- *Councillor Victor Lewanski
- *Councillor Hazel Watson (Vice-Chairman)
- *Councillor Fiona White
- Councillor John Furey
- *Councillor John Robini
- *Councillor Will Forster
- *Councillor Josephine Hawkins
- *Councillor Christine Elmer
- *Councillor Bernie Spoor
- Councillor Bob Milton
- *Mr Philip Walker
- *Mr Martin Stilwell

In attendance

Steve Owen-Hughes - Director - Community Protection & Emergencies (SCC) and Chief Fire Officer for Surrey Fire & Rescue Service
Councillor Jonathan Essex - Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

39/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [ITEM 1]

Apologies were received from Councillors Bob Milton and John Furey.

Councillor Bernie Spoor joined the meeting at 11.15am (noted in item 8).

40/20 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [ITEM 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2020 were agreed as a true record of that meeting.

41/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [ITEM 3]

There were none.

42/20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [ITEM 4]

One question was received from Councillor Jonathan Essex (Reigate and Banstead Borough Council) on behalf of a member of the public. The response can be found attached to these minutes as Annex A.

A supplementary question was asked by Councillor Jonathan Essex and the response can be found below.

- *Supplementary question asked by Councillor Jonathan Essex on behalf of a resident:*

The questioner stated that since the coronavirus crisis started there had been an increase in speeding and in anti-social behaviour locally in terms of motorbike gatherings; and a drop in Community Speedwatch.

Concerning the original question, he noted that the rise in overt drug dealing in a sheltered older persons housing area - covered by CCTV - at the same time every week all with no clear on the ground police response was a concern. He queried that with an extra 150 officers budgeted by 2021/22 whether there would be a return to more on the ground community police presence in Surrey, such as neighbourhood policing especially where there was still a lower level of people movement due to the pandemic. Due to the return to higher police numbers as a result of funding replacing those officers lost due to Government cuts, he asked the PCC if areas without officers would be provided with them and if there would be a shift in approach to community policing.

Response:

The Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) replied that Surrey Police used its resources available to crack down on drugs and associated anti-social behaviour. It was a scourge in the county as it was nationally, and Surrey Police had a zero-tolerance policy; urging Panel members, residents and Surrey councillors to report incidents of drug dealing to Surrey Police via 101 - or 999 if there were security implications.

He positively commented that Surrey Police had made several good arrests of county lines drug dealers during lockdown. He provided assurance that there would be more police on the ground, noting that the force was in the first third of their recruitment programme with high grade trainee police officers slowly filtering onto the ground. Further details on recruitment was included as item 8 in the agenda.

The PCC noted that he had asked for a report from Surrey Police last year on how big the force should be, the answer was just over 500 more staff and police officers. By the end of March 2021 Surrey Police were expected to be halfway there, although future funding for the next financial year was uncertain. He replied that there would be a change of strategy as the biggest emphasis on recruiting was to allocate more officers on neighbourhood policing teams and every ward in the county would have a named police officer or an appropriate officer such as a Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) going forward. The PCC was concerned that there might not be an uplift in funding next year because of Covid-19 and strained public finances, and that Surrey Police's retention rate was only satisfactory.

43/20 APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED INDEPENDENT MEMBERS [ITEM 5]

Witnesses:

Amelia Christopher - Committee Manager, Surrey County Council (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Committee Manager welcomed the Panel's two new proposed co-opted independent members.
2. She explained that as of 7 February 2020 the Police and Crime Panel approved to run an open recruitment process to appoint two new co-opted independent members due to the vacancies. Adding that two candidates had been recommended after a robust cross-party selection panel involving a series of questions to the candidates.

RESOLVED:

1. That Mr Philip Walker was appointed to the vacant role of co-opted independent member on the Surrey Police and Crime Panel for a four year term.
2. That Mr Martin Stilwell was appointed to the vacant role of co-opted independent member on the Surrey Police and Crime Panel for a four year term.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

The Chairman welcomed the newly appointed co-opted independent members.

**44/20 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (MTFP) UPDATE 2020/21 TO 2024/25
[ITEM 6]**

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Kelvin Menon - Chief Finance Officer & Treasurer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC noted that at present Surrey Police was at a reasonably healthy financial position. Going forward, it was a worry that the collection rate of Council Tax would decrease as a result of Covid-19 and people being on furlough or unemployed unable to pay that tax. He added that future funding from Government was uncertain, but they were still committed to have a fundamental review of police funding and the formula, which was positive as Surrey Police's share was unfair.
2. A Panel member queried the assumptions made about increasing costs because of salary increments and if the figure in the report was a net figure, as the increasing cost annually suggested that the overall workforce was going up salary scale and rather than keeping a balance between junior and senior staff. The Chief Finance Officer & Treasurer responded that the increments were the net costs as the workforce was ageing.
3. A Panel member queried the shortage of capital reserves which was unusual as the force had a lot of property assets to sell off and it would be a shame to use its limited revenue for capital. The Chief Finance Officer & Treasurer responded

that the level of capital grant received was small at approximately £400,000 a year so capital receipts made up the rest of capital funding. The force had ambitious capital programmes which included investment in vehicles and ICT as well as the new Surrey Police headquarters in Leatherhead.

4. Responding to a Panel member's query on where the savings would come from in response to the deficit over the next four years, the Chief Finance Officer & Treasurer noted that the levels of savings noted were only predictions based on assumptions. Increasing efficiency through greater utilisation of remote working and ICT as well as the rationalisation of estates would lead to some savings but delivering those levels of savings in line with previous years would be a challenge.
 - The PCC added that he hoped that he would not have to take many savings out of the budget and that national finances going forward would be strained.
5. A Panel member queried the report which stated that 3.5% of Council Tax might not be collected due to Covid-19 which equated to approximately £5 million and whether the lack of house building contributed to that. The Chief Finance Officer & Treasurer responded that Surrey had a growth in the tax base every single year but this year there was no predicted increase in the tax base as building was slow due to Covid-19.
6. Regarding the predicted deficit in Council Tax the Panel member noted that the PCC had written to Government and to Surrey MPs on the Council Tax deficit and asked whether it would be appropriate for the Panel to write to them as well asking them for support to meet that cost of Covid-19 - the Panel agreed to add that point to the recommendations. The Chief Finance Officer & Treasurer explained that he had been working closely with treasurers in the other Surrey districts and borough as well as Surrey County Council to assess what they thought the shortfall would be on Council Tax collection this year. The latest assessment was 3.5% and Government had said that the deficit could be spread over the next three years, they had not however indicated whether they would make the shortfall up - he welcomed the Panel's support in writing to the Government and Surrey MPs.
 - The PCC responded that yes it would be helpful if the Panel reported their concerns to the Government and Surrey MPs and that PCCs had noted their collective concerns through the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC).
7. The Chairman queried that if 1% of the Home Office grant equated to approximately £0.7million were the force anticipating an approximately 10% percent rise in Home Office Grant funding from £69.5 million at present to £76.7 million for 2021/22. In response the Chief Finance Officer & Treasurer believed that the figure was the overall Home Office grant including the uplift and would provide a fuller response in due course.

RESOLVED:

The Panel:

1. Noted the initial outcome of the forecast, the likely need for additional savings and the challenge that this will present.
2. Noted the current assumptions being employed in the scenarios and the risks therein.

3. Commented as appropriate.
4. Agreed to write to Surrey MPs and the Government raising its concerns on the predicted 3.5% deficit in Council Tax collection.

Actions/further information to be requested:

1. **R26/20** - The Panel will write to Surrey MPs and the Government raising its concerns on the predicted 3.5% deficit in Council Tax collection.
2. **R27/20** - The Chief Finance Officer & Treasurer would clarify the apparent 10% rise in the Home Office Grant funding from £69.5 million at present to £76.7 million for 2021/22; and whether it was the overall Home Office grant including the uplift.

45/20 CORONAVIRUS [ITEM 7]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Alison Bolton - Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

Steve Owen-Hughes - Director - Community Protection & Emergencies (SCC) and Chief Fire Officer for Surrey Fire & Rescue

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC introduced the report and hoped that it showed how the OPCC and Chief Constable had been active in supporting a variety of people and organisations to cope with coronavirus. He thanked the OPCC staff and Surrey Police for quickly identifying key areas of need during the pandemic and doing their best to provide support.
2. He highlighted that the report had been written a week ago and there had been changes since including the 'rule of six'. He had spoken to the Chief Constable on the new restrictions and noted that Surrey Police would still maintain the four Es: encourage, educate, explain and enforce. Policing was done by consent, with enforcement as a last resort.
3. A Panel member queried the new enforcement arrangements for the 'rule of six' which included the provision of Covid-19 secure marshals organised through councils - with a register of environmental health officers compiled to offer support - and if Surrey Police had enough resources required should greater enforcement be necessary. In response, the PCC noted that yes there were enough police officers to provide enforcement particularly if the majority of residents obeyed the rules.
4. The PCC noted that the introduction of Covid-19 secure marshals was a surprise and no further details had been provided from Government on the matter. He had spoken to the Chief Constable and there were no plans for the Surrey Police to actively recruit such marshals as that was down to local councils. At present, Surrey Police and the JETs were the only body with enforcement powers. The PCC added that he was happy to consider a small amount of initial funding to councils to establish such marshals.
5. A Panel member was grateful that Surrey Mediation had been supported by the OPCC and asked approximately how much funding had been given to the partner.

The PCC responded that he was a firm supporter of Surrey Mediation and details would be provided on the funding in due course.

6. The Vice-Chairman asked what action or additional resources Surrey Police would deploy to enforce the 'rule of six' so that residents had confidence that they will be kept safe; particularly concerning beauty spots with large crowd gathering to enjoy the good weather. In response, the PCC provided reassurance that there was an ongoing police presence at the beauty spots including Box Hill and Frensham Ponds - he asked residents not to go to busy beauty spots as Covid-19 remained a threat.
7. Panel members were concerned that the Government's announcement of Covid-19 secure marshals had raised the public's expectation on enforcement and asked if the Panel could be kept informed on the implications on enforcement and any involvement of Surrey Police. The Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer noted that the Chief Constable would be present at the Panel's October informal meeting and could provide an update on Covid-19 secure marshals.
8. A Panel member asked if it would have been helpful to have received a briefing from the Government on the Covid-19 secure marshals. The PCC responded that yes all forces preferred more timely and detailed communications from the Government. He added that the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) made regular requests for early and thorough briefings, but in fairness he noted the fast-moving situation.
9. A Panel member noted that the Panel should express its thanks to Surrey Police and the OPCC for their work during Covid-19, going beyond their usual duty. The PCC responded that he had a virtual meeting with four hundred police officers yesterday, thanking them for their work.
10. The Director - Community Protection & Emergencies (SCC) and Chief Fire Officer for Surrey Fire & Rescue noted that he was also the director of the Surrey Community Protection Group and was the chair of Surrey's Local Resilience Forum (LRF). He provided clarity on Covid-19 secure marshals, noting that:
 - Currently, two boroughs and districts in Surrey had marshals. He was liaising with the Director of Public Health (SCC) on the provision of marshals and the LRF's Strategic Co-ordinating Group (SCG) - co-chaired by the Chief Constable - would be meeting on Wednesday to discuss the matter and what their role would be.
 - Regarding enforcement although it was primarily Surrey Police's role, public health, trading standards and local authority safety advisory groups had a role in joint enforcement.
 - Over the summer the beauty spots were monitored by borough and district council emergency planning teams, rangers, Surrey Police and Surrey Fire & Rescue Service; and would continue to be monitored.
 - As chair of the LRF, he offered thanks to Surrey Police for its outstanding work over the last six months. In response the PCC returned the compliment, praising the collective effort of all the emergency services, district and borough councils and Surrey County Council.
11. The Chairman queried why only two Citizens Advice groups had received the Ministry of Justice funding. In response, the PCC noted that the reason why was because those two groups were at the forefront in providing domestic abuse services in the county. All the groups were aware of the funding and the OPCC would continue to look at their bids.

12. An independent member queried whether the Surrey LRF and Surrey Local Outbreak Engagement Board were the same. In response the PCC clarified that they were separate bodies.
13. Referencing the co-commissioning of enhanced substance misuse support, the independent member asked if there was any intention to liaise with both Alcoholics, and Narcotics Anonymous which could offer support and were self-funded. The PCC responded that he did not have the detail of which organisations were being liaised with regarding that co-commissioning and he would provide a follow-up.

RESOLVED:

The Police and Crime Panel noted the report and their appreciation to Surrey Police, and Surrey Fire & Rescue Service for all their efforts during the pandemic.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. **R28/20** - The PCC will clarify how much funding is given to Surrey Mediation, in providing anti-social behaviour support.
2. **R29/20** - The Panel is to be kept updated on the provision of Covid-19 secure marshals and any enforcement involvement of Surrey Police.
 - The Chief Constable to provide an update at the Panel's October informal.
3. **R30/20** - The PCC will look into the organisations being liaised with regarding the co-commissioning of enhanced substance misuse support and to consider both Alcoholics, and Narcotics Anonymous.

46/20 SURREY POLICE RECRUITMENT AND WORKFORCE PLANNING [ITEM 8]

Councillor Bernie Spoor joined the meeting at 11.15am

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Panel member asked how Surrey Police's unplanned leaver rate of 5.8% compared to other forces. In response, the PCC noted that the force was in the top half of other forces regarding the leavers rate. He feared that it was at an artificially low number as people did not want to change jobs due to Covid-19.
2. A Panel member queried the summary of the distribution of new staff and officers across various strategies and how that correlated to the overall Police and Crime Plan. The PCC responded that there was a more detailed breakdown on the distribution of new staff and officers by 2021/22 and he would look into whether that could be shared with the Panel as Part 2 confidential information.
3. A Panel member welcomed the plans to recruit and attract more candidates from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) and other under-represented groups but was surprised that there were no statistics included on the percentage of BAME staff and officers currently in the force. The PCC responded that diversity included all the protected characteristics and not just race. According to the 2011 Census Surrey had a BAME population of 9.6%, Surrey Police had a % BAME workforce

of 5.0% overall, with 4.6% for police officers and 5.4% for police staff. The target for police officers was 5% and he thought that figure was out of date as Surrey had become more diverse.

4. The PCC stressed that he took diversity seriously and had special engagement teams to attract a greater diversity of candidates.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the Surrey Police plans for recruitment and workforce planning.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. **R31/20** - The PCC will look into whether the more detailed breakdown on the distribution of the newly recruited staff and officers by 2021/22 could be shared with the Panel as Part 2 confidential information.

47/20 BUILDING THE FUTURE – UPDATE [ITEM 9]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC introduced the report and noted that the project was going well including the building design which would incorporate the greater use of remote and agile working as a result of Covid-19.
2. He explained that he would have liked to have announced the chosen architects publicly but there were final legal matters to resolve.
3. A Panel member queried whether there was a timeline for the disposal of the six sites and whether there would continue to be some form of police presence on those sites in the interim. The PCC responded that there was no specific timeline as the disposal of the sites could happen at end of project, in at least four to five years.
4. A Panel member noted the concerns of his constituents regarding the closure of Reigate police station earmarked for disposal and whether that would be replaced by a small neighbourhood office. In response, the PCC pledged that there would be a physical building with standard police presence in every single borough and district in county. The PCC added that Reigate police station was outdated, and expensive and non-local functions would move into the new headquarters at Leatherhead. He reassured the Panel member that the Reigate local policing effort would remain in Reigate.
5. Referring to the disposal of existing estate, a Panel member asked whether the Panel could receive the report on the sensitivity analysis on capital receipts of the six sites carried out in June 2020 to reflect changes to the residential housing market, which was considered by the PCC at the August Building the Future Board. The PCC responded that he would need to consider this request, as it included sensitive information concerning the amount resulting from Mount Browne's disposal.
6. A Panel member asked whether the PCC was able to inform the Panel on who the other partners would be as a result of the possible co-location in the new

Leatherhead headquarters. The PCC responded that he could not give the specific names of the partners as discussions were at an early stage. He emphasised that the new headquarters would serve the primary needs of Surrey Police and would not be compromised by other partners' needs.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the contents of the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. **R32/20** - The PCC to consider whether he is able to share with the Panel the sensitivity analysis on capital receipts of the six sites earmarked for disposal, reported to August's Building the Future Board.

48/20 POLICE COMPLAINTS REFORM [ITEM 10]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner
 Alison Bolton - Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC explained that the Government had decreed that PCCs should be responsible for the appellate function, with changes to legislation coming into effect on 1 February 2020 in the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2020. He explained that like the majority of PCCs, he chose Model 1 in which most elements of handling police complaints remained with the police themselves, but an appeals function provided by the PCC's office was available to complainants once their complaints had gone through the Professional Standards Department (PSD) and Local Resolution had been exhausted.
2. He noted two fears as a result of the change to the complaints system, firstly that there would be a spike in the number of complaints as people saw another avenue to complain about - which had been realised so that meant more work and money. He hoped that it was a spike and not a plateau. Secondly, that any changes to the wider complaints process would take away the responsibility of individual police offices in dealing with incidents and complaints directly where they occur. That was not an issue for Surrey where Model 1 had been adopted.
3. The PCC praised the work of the Complaints Review Manager, Nick Wainwright, who had complete delegated power under the regulations to deal with appeals.
4. A Panel member referred to the process of complaint resolution, particularly the three different types of categories of complaint and that the OPCC only had responsibility in the Schedule 3 - Otherwise by Investigation category. He queried whether that would be the case under Models 2 and 3. In response, the PCC noted that he was unsure of the member's point and noted that he did not see any benefit to the OPCC or the complainant for Models 2 and 3.
 - The Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer added that it was her understanding that the appeal function would be the same for whichever Model was chosen as the Models chosen dictated how much of the overall complaints process would be taken on rather than any difference in the appeal function - she would check that point.
5. The Chairman thanked the OPCC for the comprehensive report.

RESOLVED:

The Police and Crime Panel noted the update to the management of the new complaints regulations within the OPCC.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. **R33/20** - The Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer will look into whether the responsibility of the OPCC for the three different types of categories of complaint would be different across the three Models.

49/20 FEEDBACK ON PERFORMANCE MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [ITEM 11]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chairman queried the rollout of the new body worn video system as he thought that every officer had such a system by default. In response, the PCC noted that relating to officers tackling domestic abuse there was a minority who did not have that system yet but would get one with the continuing rollout. Officers who requested one or that were in a high public contact role had that system already.

RESOLVED:

The Police and Crime Panel noted the update on the PCC's Performance Meetings.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

50/20 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [ITEM 12]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. Councillor John Robini:

Highlighted the news article - BBC - the day before which reported that the computer system for the Surrey, Sussex and Thames Valley police forces could be scrapped. He noted concern as there had been several failures of computer systems across the forces and Surrey Police over the years, spending a lot of money starting projects but not finishing them. In response, the PCC explained that he was happy to give a Part 2 briefing after the meeting on that computer system, EQUIP, to Panel members and stressed that no decision had been made on the status of the project by the three forces.

RESOLVED:

The Police and Crime Panel raised any issues or queries concerning Crime and Policing in Surrey with the Commissioner.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. The PCC will provide an update in Part 2 after the meeting on EQUIP, relating to **R7/20** on the recommendations tracker.

51/20 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [ITEM 13]**Witnesses:**

Amelia Christopher - Committee Manager, Surrey County Council (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Committee Manager noted that one complaint had been received since the last Panel meeting in June 2020.
2. The Committee Manager commented that in line with the Panel's Complaints Protocol, the Complaints Sub-Committee reviewed the complaint in August and concluded that the PCC had not breached his code of conduct and acted appropriately, recommending no further action.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the content of the report and that the Complaints Sub-Committee had received one complaint since the last Panel meeting.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

52/20 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE, FIRE AND CRIME PANELS (NAPFCP) [ITEM 14]**Witnesses:**

Amelia Christopher - Committee Manager, Surrey County Council (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Committee Manager introduced the report noting that last November the Chairman of the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels (NAPFCP) had asked the Panel whether it wished to express an interest in joining the National Association.
2. The Committee Manager summarised that the NAPFCP was a collaborative forum of other Police (Fire) and Crime Panels to share best practice.
3. She explained that a previous barrier to joining in the past was the annual £500 subscription fee which could not have been funded through the Home Office grant. In November 2019, NAPFCP agreed at its AGM to waive that fee and so it was an opportune time for the Panel to join.

- The Vice-Chairman proposed that the Panel should join the NAPFCP as it would provide a useful forum to share best practice with other panels nationally and as it was free of charge - the Panel agreed.

RESOLVED:

The Police and Crime Panel considered the proposal and agreed to become a member of the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels.

Actions/further information to be provided:

- R34/20** - The Committee Manager will write to the Chairman of the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels (NAPFCP) noting the Panel's decision to become a member.

53/20 SURREY PCP BUDGET 2019-20 [ITEM 15]

Witnesses:

Amelia Christopher - Committee Manager, Surrey County Council (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

- The Committee Manager explained that as a result of Panel member feedback on last year's budget report, the report for 2019-20 was more detailed. It included an explanation as to where the underspend went, clarified the Employee Costs breakdown based on the percentages of salary costs and provided more detail on the webcasting, members' expenses, printing and postage costs as well as refreshments.
- She highlighted that the ongoing Home Office grant funding section had been added, which explained that a mid-year claim between April-September 2020 for half of the grant would be submitted by end of October and that report could be brought back to November's Panel.

RESOLVED:

The Police and Crime Panel noted the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

- R35/20** - The summary of the Panel's mid-year claim between April-September 2020 will be provided to the Panel at its next meeting so ongoing expenditure in relation to the Home Office grant can be kept track of.

54/20 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [ITEM 16]

Witnesses:

Amelia Christopher, Committee Manager, Surrey County Council (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Committee Manager and Chairman thanked the OPCC for their comprehensive responses in completing the majority of actions on the recommendations tracker. The Committee Manager noted that the remaining few would be completed by end of the year or early 2021.
2. The Committee Manager noted that in relation to recommendation R14/20, a report had been annexed to the tracker noting the work of the Problem Solving Occurrence Team.
3. The Vice-Chairman thanked the OPCC for their response to recommendation R23/20, but asked the PCC whether the provision of two off-road motorbikes would be sufficient to respond to crimes across the large rural areas in Surrey. The PCC responded that he would like to have the funding to deploy more off-road vehicles with trained officers to tackle rural crime and anti-social behaviour. There would potentially be more opportunities for provision and deployment once the force was at full capacity.
4. The Chairman encouraged Panel members to email in any items to be added to the forward work programme.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the Actions & Recommendations Tracker and provided input into the Forward Work Programme.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

55/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [ITEM 17]

The next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel will be on 24 November 2020 (most likely via Teams).

The private informal meeting for Panel Members with the Chief Constable will take place on 27 October 2020.

Meeting ended at: 11.51 am

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank