

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 6 February 2017 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)  
Chris Sadler  
David Reeve  
Margaret Cooksey  
Anthony Mitchell  
Charlotte Morley  
Pat Frost  
Beryl Hunwicks  
Bryan Cross  
David Fitzpatrick-Grimes

**1/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Graham Ellwood and Peter Waddell.

**2/17 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 1 DECEMBER 2016 [Item 2]**

The minutes from the previous meeting held on Thursday 1 December 2016 were agreed by the Panel as a true record of the meeting.

**3/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

**4/17 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

None received.

**5/17 SURREY POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER'S PRECEPT SETTING PROPOSAL FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2017/18 [Item 5]****Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) introduced the report by informing the Panel that for this year at least, the proposed precept increase of 1.99% was a carefully considered decision on his part. It would have been an easy and simple decision to recommend this increase for the financial year 2017/18 if there had been no projected underspend against the current year's budget. As current projections indicated a year end underspend of more than £3 million the Commissioner said that he had considered very carefully if a rise in the precept could be justified.
2. On balance the PCC said he had come to the conclusion that a 1.99% was the correct amount by which to increase the precept, as the Force needed to find £5.5 million of savings to balance the budget next year. The proposed increase was in line with the guidance given by the Minister of State for Policing which stated PCC's who increased the precept by the maximum allowed without triggering a referendum would not suffer a financial reduction to their central government funding.
3. It was noted that a crucial factor in the PCC's decision making was the underspend in Surrey Police's budget and whether in these circumstances it was appropriate to increase the tax burden on local residents. The PCC explained that the primary reason for this underspend was the difficulty in retaining Police Officers. The PCC shared the view that although this had a positive financial impact, this had a negative impact on operational policing.

4. The PCC highlighted that there were good plans in place to manage the retention issue and that the magnitude of the under spend would be a temporary matter going forward.
5. It was further reported that the Surrey Police budget was stable and this has been achieved by both investing, making significant savings and cost reduction.
6. The PCC advised the Panel that there were reports that the technical work for the new policing funding formula was developing well and this would be in place in a year's time. However it was noted that there was also a huge risk in terms of the final funding formula, which could possibly reduce the amount of central government funding given to Surrey police.
7. The Chairman referred to the new funding formula and requested that Government recognised how much Surrey residents pay towards their Police Force in comparison to other parts of the country where it is significantly less.
8. A Member made reference to the Policing in your Neighbourhood report, Recommendation 1 and whether the PCC had plans to improve the statistics in relation to recruitment and retention. The PCC advised the Panel that there was no difficulty in recruitment and that training courses were fully booked. However the issue was retaining staff when other neighbouring Police Forces were also recruiting.
9. The PCC further informed the Panel that there was a shortage of detectives in Surrey which was a concern for both the PCC and Chief Constable and a priority going forward.
10. There was a discussion around the Home Office top-slicing charges in relation to police forces using the national police computer systems. It was explained this was increased each year by amounts in excess of the prevailing rate of inflation. The PCC advised the Panel that increases above inflation were common and that there was a legal duty to contribute to the strategic policing requirement.
11. A Member sought more information around the new Gang Masters Labour and Abuse Authority (GLAA). The PCC advised that this related to modern slavery which was taken very seriously by Surrey Police who were giving this matter greater priority.
12. It was noted that there were a variety of measures in place to keep Police Officers in post. Members were informed that the Chief Constable had raised the South East allowance payments to Police Officers. The Government had given permission for this payment to be made but had not given any central funding to pay for it.
13. The PCC expressed the view that one way to solve the issue of retaining officers is to make Surrey a good place to work in terms of stability and support.

14. The PCC was asked to provide more information around 'top slicing' and whether this saves Surrey Police money. Members were advised that 'top slicing' allows for the development of the police transformation fund as funding allocated to Police forces by Government was used to develop the Police at a national level.
15. The Panel noted that two new £1 million specific reserves had been established. One of these reserves allows Surrey Police to bid against a Local Innovation Fund which will focus on cost efficiency and better ways of working. The PCC assured the Panel that if this approach did not work other avenues would be explored.
16. Following discussions around 'top-slicing', a Member enquired whether the Home Office Police grant would be affected by the forces under spend figure. The PCC explained that the grant amount received by the Government would not be affected by Surrey Police's under spend. There were concerns Government would reduce funding on the assumption that Surrey Police can raise money for itself because residents pay a higher council tax.
17. The PCC further advised the Panel that the money in 'reserves' would allow the Chief Constable to control and regulate risk.
18. A Member queried what savings have been achieved with the collaboration with Sussex Police as nothing had been circulated to show progress. The PCC informed the Panel that in addition to various areas, merging back office functions had made a number of savings.
19. It was noted that cases including rape, assault, cyber crime, new crimes and newly recognised crimes such as modern slavery were listed as of key areas Surrey Police plan to invest money.
20. A Member raised concern with the need to use money from reserves when Surrey Police were already under spending. The Treasurer for the OPCC advised that the under spend was a unique occurrence and a one-off which was not intended to be repeated in the future.
21. Following the above discussion the PCC was reminded that Surrey Police under spent last year and this was not a unique as suggested. The Panel were informed that there was a history of under spend however Surrey Police were not making savings because there was a deficit but making savings because this was a positive thing to do. The Treasurer for the OPCC went on to say that although the force had a history of under spending, there was a strong belief that the Chief Constable would be successful in using the allocated funding for 2017/18.
22. It was stated that the number one cause for Police Officers leaving the force was work life balance and not necessarily due to salary. The PCC informed the Panel that work was in progress to alleviate this concern and the matter was on the Surrey Police radar.

23. Questions came to a close and the Panel went to a vote. To ensure transparency, Members in favour of the proposed precept were asked to raise their hands. The Panel reached a unanimous decision supporting the PCC's proposed recommendation.
24. The Chairman indicated that a formal response would be drafted to confirm the Panel's decision and forwarded to the PCC by 8 February 2017.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel agreed the proposed Surrey Police Council Tax Precept of £224.57p for a Band D property for the financial year 2017/18.

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

R1/17 For the Panel to formally respond to the PCC's proposed precept which was agreed on 6 February 2017.

**6/17 BUDGET UPDATE [Item 6]**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The PCC introduced the report outlining the budget proposed for the Office of the PCC by informing Members that a substantial amount of funding was received from the Government to deal with Victim Services and that this was entirely separate from the budget.
2. The PCC was pleased to report that in setting the 2017/18 budget for the OPCC he had achieved a saving compared with the previous year's budget. This was due to the reshaping of the budget by reducing staff members and putting a sharper focus on services for residents, especially vulnerable residents.
3. The Panel noted that some funds had been put to one side for contingencies. These include plans for the Estate Strategy and the possibility of Fire and Rescue Service governance changes.
4. The Treasurer informed the Panel that another increased cost the PCC would be expecting would be from employing a Sergeant to run the Volunteer Cadets Force.
5. It was also highlighted that the PCC was setting up a grant for the Community Safety Board (CSB) in the sum of £50,000. This would allow the CSB to effectively pump prime any projects or plans that will improve community safety across Surrey.
6. It was further noted that the PCC is including within the OPCC budget a total of £75,000 for consultancy and project work, which would give the PCC sufficient resource to provide adequate support for new areas of activity.

7. Despite these increases the Office budget would still achieve a gross saving of £31,370.
8. A Member requested more information regarding the rise in audit fees. The Treasurer explained the Joint Audit Committee determines the audit programme and the rates are charged on a daily rate basis. The number of days fluctuating according to the number of days that are authorised by the Joint Independent Audit Committee, who will increase audit coverage where there are identifiable areas of concern which can lead to higher fees.
9. Following the discussions around auditing, the Panel noted that Surrey Police's internal and external auditors were separate firms. Members were advised that Surrey Police internal auditors were RSM Tenon and their external auditors were Grant Thornton.
10. A Member expressed positive feedback on the increase of funding for the Community Safety Fund and queried whether the process for bids on this fund would be the same as the previous year. The PCC advised that the system for allocating grants has changed, which is now operating under a two tier system. Any applications for amounts under £5,000 was simple and could be applied for online. However amounts over £5,000 would mean identifying partners and looking to work with them longer term.
11. The PCC's office was commended for reducing expenditure and achieving savings for the year.
12. It was noted that the HMIC publish statistics on the performance of OPCC offices across the Country. In comparison to other forces the Surrey OPCC did reasonably well. However not every office recorded or measured their costs in the same way which made comparisons difficult.
13. It was stated that only 8% of the communication budget has been used and the PCC was asked whether he was satisfied with this. Members were informed at this stage that the PCC was comfortable with the level of communication with residents. The PCC welcomed any invitations from members and was keen to attend if his diary permitted.
14. There was a discussion around 'In the know' system and how this had replaced the old neighbourhood watch communication system. The Chairman indicated that it would be useful to have an item on the new system at the next Panel meeting. The PCC noted this suggestion and agreed to have this added to the Forward Work Programme.
15. It was highlighted that in previous years Surrey Police employed retired Police Officers. A Member asked whether these Officers were recognised in the staff head count or as Police Officers. The PCC confirmed that these Officers were included as Police staff.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the budget updates.

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

R2/17- For an item on the new community messaging system '*In the know, Surrey and Sussex*' to be added to the next Panel meeting agenda.

## **7/17 PROGRESS AGAINST THE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN [Item 7]**

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

1. The PCC informed the Panel that he was pleased with the progress against the Police and Crime in his 8 months in post and acknowledged there was a lot more work to achieve a firmer foundation for the future years in office.
2. A Member raised a request whether the PCC would attend a Joint Committee in Woking to discuss his role. The PCC advised that upon a formal invitation he would attend if there were no other diary commitments.
3. The PCC noted the concern with the reduction in positive outcomes in relation to serious acquisitive crime statistics and assured the Panel that this was a priority for the Chief Constable and PCC.
4. It was noted that a campaign into tackling the use of mobile phones whilst driving took place in November 2016 and January 2017. This campaign raised awareness of the impact of using mobile phones behind the wheel and promoted the prevention of it.
5. There was a discussion around the PCC's relationship with the Courts and Tribunals Service and Court closures. The PCC was queried as to whether he could liaise in the matter of court closures and encourage police staff morale. The PCC noted this concern and said he had recently assumed the Chairmanship of Surrey's Criminal Justice Board which would be the main mechanism in improving this matter. The PCC went on to say that OPCC liaised with the Court Service on a regular basis.
6. Following the above discussion the Chief Executive of the OPCC assured the Panel that a working group has been established to ensure some mitigating action has been put in place with the impacts of court closures and the changes to listings. It was understood that court closures would also negatively impact on victims of crime.
7. It was stated that 101 had made a number of significant improvements and the PCC was pleased with the system. It was noted that there was still progress to be made going forward and this included following up with victims and making sure they were provided with the right support.
8. The PCC was asked about his Police and Crime plan performance measures as listed on page 65 of the agenda. Panel members highlighted that some of these measures had shown a drop in

comparison to 2015/16. The PCC accepted the drop in performance and highlighted measure four which centred on victim satisfaction as being his biggest concern. The PCC explained that feedback from victims of crime is collated over a period of time from a number of different services and sources. The PCC stated that the current performance figures for 2016/17 were satisfactory in comparison to other forces.

9. A member of the Panel queried whether a named contact for rural crime had been appointed. The PCC informed members that the team had been struck by a period of sickness but rural crime was now an integral part of the Surrey Police recording system. The PCC went on to further say that a named contact for rural crime reporting would be embedded shortly.
10. A Member queried whether statistics would be recorded for any crimes committed during the period when the street lights in Surrey are turned off between 12:00 – 05:00am. The PCC noted this concern and advised he would take this away to review but stated that Surrey Police had already been consulted on the County's street lighting proposal.
11. The PCC was asked about the progress in relation to the threat of terrorism and assured Members that effective plans were in place. The PCC explained that the threat of terrorism was at a severe level and that the 'Prevent Strategy' required more co-ordination. Although firearm officer numbers had been a concern, the force was confident the number required by Surrey police was under control.

#### **RESOLVED:**

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

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

None.

### **8/17 POLICING IN YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD (PIYN) UPDATE [Item 8]**

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

1. A Member raised concern that Local Parishes felt isolated as there was a perceived lack of communication regarding Policing in Your Neighbourhood (PiYN). The PCC assured the Panel that in an effort to strengthen communication he was happy to work with Parishes and would look into formal ways of communicating with Parishes.
2. The Chairman indicated that it would be useful under PiYN for Officers to work with Councillors and Members, particularly in relation to Cyber Crime to make sure it is well understood to promote effective awareness in tackling the issue.



3. There was a discussion around the key findings from the PiYN report and Recommendation 30 on training. The PCC informed the Panel that training had been positive and that the service is regulated regularly. Following from this discussion, Members enquired how training fits with rest days. The PCC advised that rest days are not affected by PiYN and are authorised as per the previous system.
4. Members shared the view that there was a lack of police visibility especially in the last few months and were concerned this influenced the rise in the number of burglaries. The Panel were informed that with changing police priorities the only way a member of the public would see a police officer is if a crime had been committed. The PCC expressed the view that the core of PiYN was sound however it was clear more work was to be carried out.
5. The Vice-Chairman indicated that the PiYN report was confusing and complicated and should be less technical especially when made available to the public. The Panel were advised that the report was written by a Police Officer for an internal audience (although had been shared with members for information) and therefore would be technical.
6. The Vice-Chairman further requested whether victims could be asked whether they were happy to be contacted by Councillors to discuss their experiences with the Police and check if they were receiving all the support they needed. The PCC did not feel this approach was appropriate and did not believe it was appropriate to create extra responsibilities for Police Officers.
7. The PCC agreed on having a presentation on PiYN at the next Panel meeting to understand the basics of the new way of working. Members highlighted that no glossary was provided and crucial information in the full PiYN report which had been sent to the Panel separately had been redacted.
8. From the report it was evident that the number of deployable assets were not high as they should be. The PCC agreed that more could be done.
9. It was stated that the public had input into the report which was controlled via Surrey Police. The PCC agreed that the details around the PiYN report needed investigating.
10. A member of the Panel raised concerns around whether discussions were straying into operational policing. The PCC stated that the border between strategic and operational policing was 'blurred' but always tried his best to give the Panel answers to questions.
11. A Member raised concern that the report was a very significant change for the residents of Surrey and that it should be communicated well so it is fully understood. The Member suggested that this could be covered by having a frequently asked questions section in the report. The PCC noted this concern and agreed communication was vital in assuring the message was relayed properly.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report and the PiYN post implementation review executive summary.

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

R3/17- For the Panel to receive a presentation on the PiYN structure at the next Panel meeting.

**9/17 FEEDBACK ON PERFORMANCE MEETINGS [Item 9]****Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The PCC was asked to provide more information on the transition occurring in the Coroners Office. The Panel noted that this referred to the transfer of staff from Surrey Police to Surrey County Council and further information could be provided later as discussions were still ongoing.
2. Upon request the PCC agreed to give the Panel more details regarding Employee Retention Proposal.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the update on the PCC's Performance meetings.

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

R4/17 – For the PCC to provide the Panel with details of employee retention proposals as discussed at the November performance meeting with the Chief Constable.

**10/17 POLICE AND CRIME PANEL: COMPLAINTS PROTOCOL [Item 10]**

The Chairman thanked Members for their contribution and patience throughout the process.

**RESOLVED:**

- a. The Panel noted the draft revised Police and Crime Panel Complaints Protocol.
- b. The Panel agreed in principle the adoption of the draft revised Police and Crime Panel Complaints Protocol. Formal adoption of the draft revised Complaints Protocol is required at the Annual Panel meeting on 13 July 2017.

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

None.

## **11/17 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 11]**

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.

## **12/17 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [Item 12]**

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

A Member requested that the Panel consider an item on the collaboration work between Surrey and Sussex Police Forces which would also cover what savings had been achieved.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Panel reviewed the Forward Work Programme and Recommendations Tracker.

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

R5/17- For the Panel to receive an update report on Collaboration between Surrey and Sussex Police Forces at the 12 September 2017 Panel meeting.

## **13/17 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 13]**

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

1. The Vice- Chairman raised an advance request regarding the number of Police Officers across the county. This information was circulated to the Panel Vice-Chairman prior to the meeting.
2. The PCC advised this information was confidential and was not to be released in the public domain as it could be made use of by criminals in identifying gaps in the system.
3. It was noted that trials for the Cadet Force were taking place in Runnymede, Woking and Epsom. The PCC informed the Panel that the scheme was working very well.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Panel raised issues/queries concerning crime and policing in Surrey with the PCC.

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

None.

### **14/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 20 FEBRUARY 2017 [Item 14]**

The meeting provisionally scheduled for 20 February 2017 was cancelled.

The next meeting of the Panel will be held on 13 July 2017, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames. This will be the Annual Panel meeting.

The Chairman informed the Panel that she would not be standing for re-election in May and that today's meeting was her last as Chair of the Panel. The Chairman thanked old and new Panel Support Officers, Officers from the OPCC, the Chief Executive of the OPCC and Panel Members for all their support and dedication over the years.

The Vice-Chairman commended Councillor Dorothy Ross-Tomlin for her excellent chairmanship throughout the years and wished her well for the future.

Meeting ended at: 12:50pm

---

**Chairman**