

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 15 September 2021, at Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

*Due to the protest activity on the M25 the start time was delayed until 10.48 am*

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

**Members:**

(\*Present)

- \*Councillor David Reeve (Chairman)
- \*Councillor Bruce McDonald (Vice-Chairman)
- \*Councillor Paul Kennedy
- \*Councillor Victor Lewanski
- Councillor John Furey
- Councillor Fiona White
- \*Councillor John Robini
- \*Councillor Valerie White
- \*Councillor Will Forster
- Councillor Bernie Spoor
- Councillor Keith Witham
- \*Councillor Mick Gillman
- \*Mr Philip Walker
- \*Mr Martin Stilwell

**62/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Councillor Keith Witham and Councillor Fiona White in advance of the meeting. Councillor John Furey and Councillor Bernie Spoor were unable to attend due to the protest activity on the M25 and sent their apologies.

**63/21 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 30 JUNE 2021 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2021 were agreed as a true record of that meeting.

**64/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**65/21 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

None received.

**66/21 BUILDING THE FUTURE UPDATE [Item 5]**

**Witnesses:**

- Lisa Townsend - Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey
- Nev Kemp - Deputy Chief Constable (Senior Responsible Officer for the Building the Future Programme), Surrey Police
- Maureen Cherry - Building the Future Programme Director, Surrey Police

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

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey (PCC) explained that she had taken office as the Building the Future Programme review by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Administration concluded and that the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey (OPCC) and Surrey Police had been transparent with the information provided to the Panel; and would continue to do so via regular updates on the Programme and the current Strategic Estates Assessment that was underway.
2. The PCC welcomed the Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) and the Building the Future Programme Director (Surrey Police) to present the item.
3. The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) highlighted that:
  - The Programme was initiated in 2016 and the high-level strategic business case was approved in April 2017.
  - Following the purchase of the Leatherhead site the strategic business case was updated in October 2018 and the Programme Director was formally appointed in February 2020.
  - The delivery of the Programme followed the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Plan of Works which consisted of eight stages.
  - The Programme and finances were on track as noted in the review undertaken a year ago by the Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA).

*Councillor John Robini joined the meeting at 10.56 am*

- The three main elements to the Programme's scope as at October 2019 were:
  - Neighbourhood Policing Base: required in Reigate and Banstead to ensure that there would be no reduction in police provision as a result of the sale of Reigate Police Station.
  - Agile Working Project: accelerated as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and had benefitted productivity.
  - Disposals Project: whereby a number of buildings and estates were disposed of, originally four into one, later becoming five into one; the separate pieces of work taking place in parallel were not joined up: Operational Estate, Housing Stock and Vacant Estate.
- The Programme along with the Surrey Police Estates Strategy and the Surrey Police Housing Strategy were later aligned in early 2021 to ensure efficiency, value for money and a comprehensive estate that served the needs of Surrey Police and in turn Surrey's residents.
- Stage 2 with a robust cost plan was completed in March 2021, the Building the Future (BTF) Board approved the move to Stage 3 and following that move it was an opportune moment to carry out a review - undertaken by CIPFA.
- A recommendation had been made to the previous PCC that the CIPFA review in March 2021 should be conducted due to several key reasons:
  - The financial position of Surrey Police and the country was different compared to 2016 due to the pandemic, the savings requirement needed over the next four years to keep pace with

- inflation and that the Programme had the potential to increase the savings requirement in 2022-23 by £8 million.
- To ensure that the Programme was dovetailed with the Surrey Police Estates Strategy and the Surrey Police Housing Strategy.
  - The Programme's scope had increased compared to when it was initiated as the following areas were not fully considered at the outset:
    - The Dog School at Mount Browne which had been there for over seventy years and was well-renowned was not suited to the new site at Leatherhead due to the size and location in a residential area - so an alternative location was being sought.
    - Covert operations were undertaken so it was vital that officers and vehicles would not be seen, the Leatherhead site in a residential area could not ensure the covert element nor was it large enough for the assets required so an alternative site was being sought.
  - Following the CIPFA review findings, the PCC and the BTF Board in June 2021 approved the Programme Director's recommendation to carry out a further Strategic Estates Assessment of the Programme which commenced in July 2021, with three options:
    - Continue to proceed with delivering a new HQ & Eastern Operating Base at the former ERA site in Leatherhead; with alternative sites being sought for the Dog School and covert operations - even if not pursued the site was believed to have increased in value since it was purchased.
    - Remain at Mount Browne which required redevelopment.
    - Locate an alternative site in Surrey - the option was ruled out in August 2021 following a comprehensive search.
  - The Strategic Estates Assessment of the Programme was due to be completed in October 2021 for the Building the Future Board's consideration in late November 2021.
4. The Chairman welcomed the presentation and noted surprise that the requirements around the covert operations and Dog School were not initially taken into consideration.
  5. A Panel member queried what the cost would be in terms of remaining at and redeveloping Mount Browne.
    - In response, the Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) noted that the costs concerning the two options would be included within the Strategic Estates Assessment of the Programme due to be completed in October 2021.
  6. A Panel member noted that the original announcement about the proposed move to Leatherhead was well-received by local residents and he welcomed the openness of the Programme. He asked what the impact would be on the Eastern Operating Base in Reigate if the decision was for the Force (Surrey Police) headquarters to remain at Mount Browne in Guildford and whether that decision would be made at the November BTF Board meeting.
    - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) welcomed that feedback, noting that Surrey Police had strived to be open from the inception of the Programme, meetings had been held with the Leader and Chief Executive of Mole Valley District Council and public question and answer sessions had been held.

- The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) commented that if the decision was taken to remain at Mount Browne, there was a possibility that Reigate Police Station would be retained. He stressed that the local policing presence and the ability to respond quickly to incidents would not be negatively affected.
  - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) explained that the decision should be made at the November BTF Board meeting where the two options would be considered in detail.
7. The Panel member further asked whether there was a mid-option between the two options for the new headquarters.
    - In response, the Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) noted that those two discrete options were the only options being considered.
  8. A Panel member asked whether there had ever been a budget for the Building the Future Programme.
    - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) confirmed that there was a budget which was included in the Force's financial returns, due to the complexity of the Programme which had changed over time, there were hidden costs and so it was a good time to have the Strategic Estates Assessment.
  9. The Panel member asked that if the Leatherhead site was chosen whether the Dog School would have to move to a different site.
    - In response, the Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) explained that the Dog School could not be located at the Leatherhead site due to its location in a residential area and lack of space.
    - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) explained that regarding the Surrey Police Housing Strategy, the Force was keen to have new starter housing provision for police officers in Surrey particularly due to the high turnover of police officers and the number of officers commuting into Surrey as it was expensive.
  10. A Panel member asked whether the Force had considered that keeping Mount Browne operational whilst going through a major refurbishment would pose large challenges and that the costs would be significantly higher as the refurbishment work would be done in phases.
    - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) recognised that concern and noted that in addition to the costs of building a new headquarters at Mount Browne, there would be costs involved in moving staff from one place to another and whilst many staff do not want to move there would be good recruitment opportunities in Mole Valley and Leatherhead should the Leatherhead site be chosen and it was a slightly more central position within the county with good transport links.
    - The Building the Future Programme Director (Surrey Police) responded that building a new headquarters at Mount Browne would be a difficult project, with both challenges and opportunities, the occupancy level at Mount Browne was lower due to Covid-19 and new ways of working. The building work could be phased to help the Force's cash flow and the savings needed.
  11. The Chairman commented that he hoped that the Force as a stakeholder had responded to the South Western Railway December 2022: Timetable Consultation which would affect both Guildford and Leatherhead through the proposed reduction in services.

*Councillor Valerie White joined the meeting at 11.17 am*

12. The Vice-Chairman welcomed the presentation, noting the surprise felt by the Panel at June's Panel meeting in the sudden shift in the Programme's progress as a result of the Strategic Estates Assessment of the three options.
- Discussing the process around the Programme with the parameters shifted as a result of the issues around the Dog School, the Vice-Chairman asked how confident Surrey Police was going forward with the Programme particularly due to the experience over the past eighteen months as a result of the pandemic and agile working; and what measures were being built in to make sure that going forward the Programme is reviewed in the context of overall Surrey Police Estates and Housing Strategies.
    - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) explained that in relation to the changed parameters when the Programme was initiated it was known that the Dog School would have to move elsewhere. Towards the beginning of the Programme whereby five sites would be moved into one site, the Leatherhead site had not yet been identified. When identified, the Leatherhead site had been considered to be suitable and so was purchased, it was then discovered that it would not be suitable to accommodate the Dog School nor the covert operations, the Programme then became a move from three sites into one.
    - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) noted that the Force was in a good position going forward - following the IPA and CIPFA reviews and advice from independent consultants - to understand what the requirements and costs are, and how it could maintain a good service.
    - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) noted that the Strategic Estates Assessment would ensure a holistic approach through the increased drive around agile working as a result of the pandemic and the Surrey Police Estates and Housing Strategies.
    - The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) noted that a new headquarters at an alternative site would incur significant costs initially but would be efficient over the long-term, as currently Mount Browne was inefficient and expensive to run; whilst a phased development was an option if the headquarters were to remain at Mount Browne.
  - Discussing the finance around the Programme, the Vice-Chairman noted the upcoming item on the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) which provided a forecast for revenue and the £20 million in savings needed over five years and in turn what that implied for the capital programmes; and asked how the Programme's planning and review process going forward was fit for purpose.
    - The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) explained that the Programme was based on the fact that it would be self-funding over a period of time from the savings generated from the new premises such as less energy and maintenance costs which would cover the funding of the borrowing required to build a new headquarters.
    - The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) noted that the previous reviews and current Strategic Estates Assessment would inform the planning around the financing of the new headquarters, it was vital to ensure that the Programme would not affect the revenue used to deliver

- police services. The cash flow issue by 2025/26 would be managed through a phased approach.
- The Vice-Chairman referring to the cash flow issue in 2025/26 highlighted that whilst the future headquarters might be beneficial in terms of reducing the current operating costs, there would be a period of dual running costs and the additional costs of financing the Programme in order to derive those future benefits.
13. A Panel member noted that previously the Force gave a commitment that Woking Police Station would stay operational until the opening of the Leatherhead headquarters, he asked whether that was still the intention or whether that would be known after the Strategic Estates Assessment and if so whether that would be a managed move.
- In response, the Building the Future Programme Director (Surrey Police), explained that the neighbourhood policing element was moved out of Woking Police Station three years ago to Woking Borough Council offices. Woking was one of the disposals that underpinned the business case for the new headquarters at Leatherhead and there was a number of challenges around HM Coroner's Court at Woking and it was anticipated that Woking Police Station would not be disposed of until the move to the new headquarters.
14. Echoing a previous comment, the Panel member asked how much had been spent so far on the BTF Programme before the Strategic Estates Assessment.
- The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) would liaise with the Building the Future Programme Director (Surrey Police) on the costs so far on the Programme and would inform the Panel members via email.
15. A Panel member noted the discussions about the positives around the fire, police and ambulance services working together and asked whether the Force had looked at any gains in terms of sharing facilities with the other emergency services.
- The Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) noted that discussions had been had with Surrey Fire and Rescue Services (SFRS) - there were no current plans to co-locate with any of the other emergency services - and Surrey County Council, Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils and other public sector providers.
16. A Panel member noted that the BTF Board would be considering the outputs of the Strategic Estates Assessment at its meeting at the end of November and asked whether in anticipation of that a Part 2 briefing to November's Panel would be possible.
- In response, the PCC noted that the current timeline would allow that.
17. The Chairman noted that the Programme was a serious matter which had been ongoing for five years and welcomed an in-depth report at a future Panel following the Strategic Estates Assessment on what RIBA Stages 4-8 would entail as well as the timescales between the stages and overall costs so far and for each of the two options for the new headquarters - Panel member comments would be followed-up in a collated action.
- In response, the PCC thanked the Deputy Chief Constable (Surrey Police) and the Building the Future Programme Director (Surrey Police) for attending and she provided assurance that the Panel would continue to be kept up to date on the Programme.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Panel noted the report.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. **R21/21** - The OPCC will look into whether a Part 2 briefing on the outputs to be considered regarding the Strategic Estates Assessment can be provided at November's Panel in advance of the decision to be taken by the BTF Board in late November.
2. **R22/21** - The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) will liaise with the Building the Future Programme Director (Surrey Police) on the costs so far on the Programme and would inform Panel members via email.
3. **R23/21** - An in-depth report will be provided to the Panel in due course following the Strategic Estates Assessment on what RIBA Stages 4-8 would entail including:
  - the aligning of the Surrey Police Estates Strategy and the Surrey Police Housing Strategy: including decisions around the Eastern Operating Base in Reigate/Reigate Police Station, Woking Police Station, the Dog School, covert operations, agile working.
  - the timescales between the Stages.
  - how the financing of the Programme would be reviewed and the impact of the Medium Term Financial Plan 2021/22 to 2025/26, the overall costs and budget so far (see action 2), including for each of the two options for the new headquarters - to remain at and redevelop Mount Browne or to carry on with delivering the new headquarters at the Leatherhead site.

**67/21 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN DEVELOPMENT [Item 6]****Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend - Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

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

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

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The PCC highlighted that the development of a Police and Crime Plan was one of the main responsibilities of PCCs, the new Plan was currently in development and under phase one of the consultation Panel members should have been invited to provide their views; phase two would be a survey open to all of Surrey's residents and stakeholders.
2. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey (DPCC):
  - Explained that in phase one she had hosted twenty-five focus group style sessions to gather the views of schools - further sessions were to come - councillors and subject matter experts, as well as view gathering when out and about meeting residents and stakeholders.
  - Urged Panel members to complete the tailored survey link regarding phase one of the consultation.
  - Noted that some clear themes had emerged which she did not delve into so as not to pre-empt the data driven analysis led by the OPCC, the

themes would feed into phase two which would be a broader public consultation piece and she welcomed Panel members' support in terms of sharing that consultation survey once ready widely across Surrey.

- Noted the timeline with the draft Plan to be provided to Panel members in mid-November in advance of the November Panel meeting, with the aim to publish the Plan by early December.
3. A Panel member sought assurance whether the Police and Crime Plan (2016-2021) produced by the previous PCC remained a valid document whilst the new Police and Crime Plan was being drafted - particularly in the event of its publication being delayed to 2022.
    - The PCC explained that the Police and Crime Plan (2016-2020, extended to 2021) remained in place until a new Plan is published, she was required in law to publish the new Plan by the end of March 2022, and noted that it was on track to be published this December.
  4. A Panel member asked whether an evaluation of the current Plan and its impact would be undertaken as part of the development of the new Plan, and whether incremental changes were being looked at or the new Plan would start from a clean slate.
    - The PCC responded that all options were being considered.
    - The Chief Executive (OPCC) explained that as part of the development of the new Plan, the performance against the existing Plan would be reviewed to ensure the priorities set by the PCC are relevant, in addition to the consultation work, other documents would be considered such as reports from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, the Strategic Policing Requirement, and information from the Chief Constable.
  5. A Panel member noted that he was pleased that the work was progressing well but noted that proposed timings often slipped. He sought assurance that the Panel would be provided with the draft Plan far in advance of November's Panel meeting so Panel members could review the significant document.
    - The PCC explained that unlike other PCCs who had been keen to produce their Plan quickly within the first three months of their election, she noted that it was important to take the time to consult widely - which aligned with the legislative timetable for Plans to be published by the end of March 2022.
    - The draft Plan was on track to be provided to the Panel in mid-November, she emphasised that although it was an important document it would not be extensive as it would contain headline priorities to remain in place over its three years.
  6. The Chairman proposed two additional recommendations (2 and 3) which were agreed.
    - Referring to the second recommendation, the PCC was happy to share the information on how the plan was developed, which would be aggregated due to the vast amounts of information.
    - Referring to the third recommendation, the PCC emphasised that the Plan would not be developed credibly without the public understanding that it was for them; in terms of explaining the role of the PCC to respondents that was a wider piece of work that covered not just the Plan but the role of the PCC and Panel.



**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Police and Crime Panel noted the progress being made on the development of the Police and Crime Plan 2021-2024.
2. That at the same time the draft Police and Crime Plan 2021-24 is submitted to the Panel, the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey would submit to the Panel all of the evidence which informs the draft Plan and is suitable for disclosure to the Panel.
3. The Panel was of the view that the forthcoming consultation on the proposed priorities for the Police and Crime Plan 2021-24 should clearly and concisely explain to respondents the role of the PCC and the nature and purpose of a Police and Crime Plan.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. **R24/21** - That at the same time the draft Police and Crime Plan 2021-24 is submitted to the Panel - on track for mid-November - the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey will submit to the Panel all of the evidence which informs the draft Plan and is suitable for disclosure to the Panel.
2. **R25/21** - The PCC will note the Panel's view that the forthcoming consultation on the proposed priorities for the Police and Crime Plan 2021-24 should clearly and concisely explain to respondents the role of the PCC and the nature and purpose of a Police and Crime Plan.

**68/21 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (MTFP) UPDATE 2021/22 TO 2025/26  
[Item 7]****Witnesses:**

Kelvin Menon - Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)  
Lisa Townsend - Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) highlighted that:
  - The report outlined an initial attempt at a Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) forecast based on the current budget with assumptions of two percent for inflation, that funding would stay level and the Council Tax increase was capped at two percent meaning that an increasing gap would develop as costs were increasing and revenues were static.
  - The MTFP forecast highlighted that the Force needed to take action on where it could be more efficient, a review on efficiencies had started for each individual department to ensure savings going forward particularly if the Government settlement 2022/23 was inadequate.
  - The PCC was working with other PCCs to press upon the Government the importance of policing and adequate funding to cover pay increases and to re-visit the funding formula; which was unlikely until the end of forecast.
  - As more information became available, the forecast would be reviewed and would be discussed further with the Panel's Finance Sub-Group in the budget setting time.

2. A Panel member noted that Surrey Police had made many cuts previously in relation to reviewing its bureaucracy, he could not see that substantial savings could be made due to previous cuts over many years and asked what savings figure was expected.
  - The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) explained that in terms of the gross budget, £6 million in savings was needed for one year against a spend of £250 million. Police officer numbers could not be reduced due to the Government's Operation Uplift.
  - The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) explained that any reduction in personnel would fall on police staff which would impact the service the police could deliver and instead collaboration opportunities and procurement could provide savings.
  - The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) recognised that Surrey Police had made significant savings over last five years plus, so making any further savings going forward would be difficult and it was a wider public sector issue.
3. The Vice-Chairman noted that unless the funding available increased, there was a risk going forward in terms of the review of the funding formula and the funding allocation; whereby prosperous areas such as Surrey would continue to be allocated less and residents would have to pay more via their Council Tax. He sought views on how the issue could be pressed upon the Government.
  - The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) noted that Surrey was viewed as a prosperous area with low deprivation and that affected the funding it received from the Government.
  - The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) noted that the case made for increased funding was that Surrey had crime travelling in and out from London, Surrey had two airports and a lot of traffic, the inadequate funding of Surrey Police was a long-standing issue and had lobbied the Government over many years to which the PCC would continue to do.
  - The PCC noted that it was good that people saw Surrey positively, conversely the extent of the pressures and challenges that Surrey Police faced was not known.
  - The Vice-Chairman noted the considerations made above concerning the justification for an increased funding allocation to Surrey Police and that it was vital to keep pressing the Government on the matter.
  - The PCC provided assurance that she had and would continue to lobby the Home Office.
4. The Chairman asked how the pessimistic assessment of Surrey Police's budget and its funding allocation would affect the drafting of the new Police and Crime Plan.
  - In response, the PCC noted that the themes being gathered on the draft new Police and Crime Plan were as expected, that it was an ongoing battle for Surrey Police to do more with less and so it was vital to ensure efficient and collaborative ways of working to provide the best public service to Surrey.

**RESOLVED:**

1. The Panel noted the initial outcome of the forecast, the likely need for additional savings and the challenge that this will present.

2. The Panel noted the current assumptions being employed in the scenarios and the risks therein.
3. The Panel commented on the report as appropriate.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**69/21 SURREY POLICE RECRUITMENT AND WORKFORCE PLANNING UPDATE  
[Item 8]**

**Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend - Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Chairman highlighted the following corrections to the report:
  - Page 46: regarding the July 2020 PC Intake last Column on the “Commencement of Next Stage”, the figure should be “all remaining 34 Officers” and not “38”.
  - Page 46: regarding the Oct 2020 Detective Intake last column, the sentence should read “This cohort received Independent Patrol status as of 03/05/2021”, not “will receive”.
2. A Panel member noted that each of Surrey’s District and Borough Councils and their residents would be interested to know how many police officers were allocated across each of the Districts and Boroughs.
  - The PCC explained that the allocation of police officers to each District and Borough in Surrey was not uniform, the uplift of police officers was not equally divided by eleven as it was used to ensure that Surrey Police could service the public as a whole across the county. The issues faced across each District and Borough differed, and when there is a major incident it was vital to ensure that resources across Surrey could be channelled.
  - The PCC would consider the point and suggested that the operational issue be raised with the Chief Constable at the informal Panel meeting in October.
3. A Panel member queried whether the recruitment plan included police staff.
  - The PCC explained that the report was specific to the uplift which concerned uniformed police officers as opposed to police staff.
4. The Chairman asked whether the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship (PCDA) and the Degree Holder Entry Programme (DHEP) were the only current entry routes to the police.
  - In response, the PCC confirmed that those were the only two entry routes at present. She explained that the matter was under discussion amongst Conservative PCCs across the country, she recognised the importance of other entry routes such as via the military and would continue to speak to the Minister of State for Crime and Policing, and the Home Secretary.
  - The Chairman noted that it would be helpful for Panel members to be provided with historical information about the two entry routes, such as

the applicant rate, appointment figures, retention rate and the demographics of applicants.

- The PCC responded that recruitment via the two channels resulted in a young cohort with advantages and disadvantages, she was happy to provide a future update on the historical figures concerning the two entry routes.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. **R26/21** - The PCC will consider the Panel member comment around providing a breakdown of the police officer allocation to each of Surrey's Districts and Boroughs, noting the difficulty as the allocation was not uniform nor static.
  - Panel members will consider raising the operational issue at the informal Panel meeting with the Chief Constable in October.
2. **R27/21** - The Panel will be provided with historical information about the two entry routes into Surrey Police: Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship (PCDA) and the Degree Holder Entry Programme (DHEP), such as the applicant rate, appointment figures, retention rate and the demographics of applicants.

**70/21 COLLABORATION REPORT [Item 9]**

**Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend - Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

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

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The PCC explained that collaboration was vital for police forces across the country, and that it was important for collaboration to be constantly reviewed; a number of different forms of collaboration were outlined in the report.
2. The Chairman welcomed the report as it detailed the extent of collaboration in relation to Surrey Police, he noted that the Panel also collaborated with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel.
3. The Chairman noted that over time the Panel would consider the benefits and disbenefits of collaboration concerning Surrey Police, and he asked the PCC whether collaboration should be further extended regionally.
  - In response the PCC noted that part of her role was to keep collaborative arrangements under review, as such arrangements provided opportunities to increase efficiencies through formal arrangements such as with Sussex Police and informal collaboration with the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC).
  - The PCC noted that the protest activity on the M25 that morning was an example of the importance of collaboration as both Surrey and Hertfordshire were affected; she had spoken to Hertfordshire's PCC on the issue.

4. A Panel member welcomed the report and outline of the benefits and disbenefits of collaboration, noting that local authorities were undertaking parallel discussions on collaboration. He queried what the extent of collaboration was with the Metropolitan Police and the British Transport Police:
  - In response, the PCC explained the two-way relationship between Surrey Police and the Metropolitan Police, particularly in the north of the county where crime moves between London and Surrey, also noting the support provided by the Metropolitan Police on Monday regarding protest activity.
  - The DPCC explained that she had attended a shift with Surrey Police officers where British Transport Police officers attended to support a job featuring a railway issue, noting that there was good and natural collaboration when needed.
  - The Chairman noted that the British Transport Police collaborated with all police forces.
  - The Panel member further noted that it would be helpful for Panel members to be informed of how the Metropolitan Police and the British Transport Police operated collaboratively with Surrey Police.
  - The PCC suggested that the Panel might want to raise the operational issue at the informal Panel meeting with the Chief Constable in October.
5. The Panel member further sought information on the informal collaboration arrangements with local authorities.
  - The PCC responded that in terms of local authority collaboration, the PCC explained that she worked closely with Surrey's council leaders through regular council leader meetings and discussions, to ensure the safety and wellbeing of Surrey's residents.
  - A further Panel member asked whether a summary could be provided to Panel members via an email or within a second report on the wider collaborative arrangements such as with local authorities in Surrey, the NHS and the Criminal Justice System.
  - The PCC explained that the report focused on policing and blue light services collaboration, she noted that she would look to provide Panel members with headline information on the wider collaborative arrangements requested.
  - The Chairman asked the OPCC to provide a summary of the collaborative arrangements with local authorities in Surrey, the NHS and the Criminal Justice System in the first instance, for Panel members to review and in the future request a second collaboration report if deemed necessary.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Panel noted the report.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. **R28/21** - Panel members to consider raising the operational issue of how Surrey Police operated collaboratively with the Metropolitan Police and the British Transport Police at the informal Panel meeting with the Chief Constable in October.

2. **R29/21** - The PCC will look to provide Panel members with the information on the wider collaborative arrangements with local authorities in Surrey, the NHS and the Criminal Justice System via an initial summary of the headline information for Panel members to review.

#### **71/21 FEEDBACK ON PERFORMANCE MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 10]**

##### **Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend - Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

##### **Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The PCC noted that the report outlined the agenda items covered in the last private performance meeting and that the next public performance meeting was on 21 September 2021 - the recording would be uploaded on the OPCC's website.
2. The Chairman asked if it would be possible for the OPCC to circulate the agenda for the upcoming performance meetings to Panel members.
  - The PCC noted that the OPCC would be happy to share the relevant information from the OPCC's website.

##### **RESOLVED:**

That the Panel noted the update on the PCC's Performance Meetings.

##### **Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. **R30/21** - The OPCC will share the relevant information such as the agenda on the upcoming performance meetings as included on the OPCC's website.

#### **72/21 PCC DECISIONS AND FORWARD PLAN [Item 11]**

##### **Witnesses:**

Kelvin Menon - Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)

Alison Bolton - Chief Executive (OPCC)

##### **Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. A Panel member referring to Appendix A - OPCC Decision Log 2021, queried what decision number 31: 'Use of OPCC Reserve' related to.
  - In response, the Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) explained that all reserves were under the control of the PCC so required a formal decision which was published on the OPCC website. Decision number 31 related to the use of the reserve to pay for the DPCC, an additional amount for property advice and for an analyst that the OPCC appointed who was focused on gathering data for grant applications.
  - The Panel member further asked for a breakdown of the £150,000 spend amount regarding decision number 31: 'Use of OPCC Reserve'.

- The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) responded that the detail on the decision was published on the OPCC's website.
2. The Panel member referred to Appendix B - OPCC Forward Plan, noting that having compared the OPCC Forward Plan provided in the September agenda against that provided in the June agenda, he noted that decisions that he expected to see in Appendix A - OPCC Decision Log 2021 concerned the Concordat with the Chief Constable, the PCC to Approve Expenses schemes and the appointment of the DPCC - the publication of the Annual Report and approval of the Draft Financial Statements for 2020/21 were not included as he deduced that those were simply reports rather than decisions.
- The Chief Executive (OPCC) responded that since the agenda item was published, the OPCC Forward Plan had been updated. She explained that the PCC is obliged to make public key decisions, the appointment of the DPCC was in the public domain via the Panel's June minutes, so where that was the case the OPCC did not always publish a separate decision number, however going forward she would look at providing a definitive OPCC Decision Log.
  - The Panel member suggested that going forward to ensure completeness the OPCC Forward Plan should identify any key decisions which would then be included in the OPCC Decision Log.
  - The Chairman asked if an email could be circulated from the OPCC regarding what decisions are deemed 'key', such as those taken by the PCC as opposed to an officer.
  - The Chief Executive (OPCC) explained that the OPCC Forward Plan informed the work of the Office as a whole and not just 'key decisions' to be taken by the PCC. She would look at the way it was presented going forward.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Panel noted the report.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. **R31/21** - The Chief Executive (OPCC) will look at the way both the OPCC Forward Plan and the OPCC Decision Log were presented to the Panel going forward, providing an explanation to Panel members on which decisions and why are deemed as 'key'; to ensure that key decisions identified on the OPCC Forward Plan are included in the OPCC Decision Log when necessary so that a definitive record is kept.

**73/21 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 12]**

*See Annex A - Submitted Questions and Responses*

**Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend - Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey

## Key points raised in the discussion:

### 1. *Councillor Paul Kennedy (Mole Valley District Council):*

Thanked the PCC for her response and welcomed the PCC's previous visit to Fetcham and upcoming visit to Bookham.

Regarding the timing of review of the existing Surrey Police CCTV Strategy, he asked when the PCC would be able to share the outcome of the review with Surrey's District and Borough Councils; asking whether the outcome could be shared before the end of the year.

In response, the PCC noted that:

- She was not aware of a specific timeline for the review of the Surrey Police CCTV Strategy and so would look into the matter.
  - The use of CCTV remained a long-standing issue and proposed that the Panel may want to look at in more detail going forward.
  - She had discussed CCTV with other PCCs across the country and where it worked best was where local council leaders formulated a joint CCTV plan.
  - The challenge for Surrey Police concerning CCTV was that there was not a uniform CCTV plan amongst Surrey's District and Borough Councils, formulating one with input from the Panel would help inform Surrey Police and its CCTV Strategy.
- A Panel member referred to the following sentence in the PCC's response "about how Surrey Police are taking advantage of new tools and ways to gather information", and asked to what extent that involved artificial intelligence (AI) such as facial recognition technology and 'predictive policing' through algorithms. He welcomed transparency on such tools and information gathering, considering the issue of biased algorithms for example.
    - In response, the PCC noted that the Chief Constable was keen for both Surrey and British policing to be at the forefront of global policing in using the best technology in the right way, the Chief Constable had raised the issue of surveillance technology with the Prime Minister recently and suggested that the issue is raised with the Chief Constable at the informal Panel meeting in October as it concerned operational matters.
  - A Panel member asked whether the PCC would like to put a formal action on Panel members to seek collaboration from Surrey's District and Borough Councils on a joint CCTV plan across the county.
    - In response the PCC welcomed Panel members' support on the issue.
    - The Chairman noted an action for the Panel to consider scrutinising how CCTV could be used effectively in Surrey; looking at the different approaches to CCTV across Surrey's Boroughs and Districts and other counties.
    - A Panel member noted the importance of Panel members taking a lead on the issue within Surrey's District and Borough Councils but emphasised that the PCC needed to take a lead on the matter too.

## RESOLVED:

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



**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. **R32/21** - The PCC will look into whether there is a specific timeline of the review of the Surrey Police CCTV Strategy, so Panel members could share the outcome with Surrey's Districts and Borough Councils.
2. **R33/21** - Panel members to consider raising the operational issue of artificial intelligence (AI) such as facial recognition technology and 'predictive policing' through algorithms regarding surveillance and CCTV at the informal Panel meeting with the Chief Constable in October.
3. **R34/21** - The Panel will consider scrutinising how CCTV could be used effectively in Surrey.

**74/21 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 (SCC) explained that since the last Panel meeting, one collated complaint composed of thirty-seven complaints had been received as detailed in Appendix A.
2. The Committee Manager (SCC) explained she was seeking legal advice on the handling of the complaint in order to assess how the multiple complaints on the same issue were to be brought to the Sub-Committee; details on the action taken would be provided at the next public Panel meeting in November.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report and Appendix A: that one (collated) complaint since the last Panel meeting had been received and would be referred to the Complaints Sub-Committee.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**75/21 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 14]****Witnesses:**

Lisa Townsend - Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey  
Amelia Christopher - Committee Manager (SCC)

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. Referring to R9/21 which had been marked as complete, a Panel member noted that the action was in two parts and the second part had not been

answered; whereby the PCC was to confirm whether she would give a similar response to her predecessor regarding an increase in 20 mph speed limit areas in Surrey.

- The PCC responded that she had not seen the previous PCC's response, and was conscious that the response was said during purdah.
- 2. Referring to R14/21, the Chairman reminded Panel members to share and publicise the Panel's Annual Report 2020-21 to their respective Borough and District Councils, and local areas; and to report back on the matter.
- 3. Referring to R17/21, the Chairman sought a nomination to fill the outstanding vacancy on the Finance Sub-Group.
  - A Panel member suggested that it would be helpful in terms of political balance to have a Conservative Panel member join the Finance Sub-Group.
  - In response, Councillor Valerie White filled the vacancy.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**76/21 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 15]**

**RESOLVED:**

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**PART 2 – IN PRIVATE**

**77/21 ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING (EQUIP) PROGRAMME [Item 16]**

**Witnesses:**

Kelvin Menon - Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Chief Finance Officer (OPCC) provided a Part 2 verbal update on the Enterprise Resource Planning (EQUIP) Programme, outlining its purpose and its future.
2. The Chairman suggested the removal of the ERP (Equip) Programme as a standing item under Part 2, the Panel agreed, and the item would be kept

under review receiving future Panel updates as and when there was substantial information to report.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Panel noted the Part 2 verbal update.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. **R35/21** - The ERP (Equip) Programme will be removed as a standing item under Part 2 but will remain under review in the Forward Work Programme with future Panel updates to be brought as and when there is substantial information to report.

**78/21 PUBLICITY OF PART 2 ITEMS [Item 17]**

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel agreed that no confidential information within the item(s) considered under Part 2 of the agenda should be made available to the Press and Public.

**79/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 18]**

The Panel noted that its next public meeting would be held on 24 November 2021 at Woodhatch Place, Reigate.

The Chairman reminded the Panel that the private informal meeting for Panel Members with the Chief Constable will take place on 27 October 2021.

Meeting ended at: 12.36 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank