

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 26 April 2018 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:

(*Present)

- *Cllr Charlotte Morley (Vice-Chairman in the Chair)
- *Cllr Chris Sadler
- *Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- *Cllr David Reeve
- *Cllr Graham Ellwood
- *Cllr Margaret Cooksey
- *Cllr Beryl Hunwicks
- *Mr Bryan Cross
- *Mr David Fitzpatrick-Grimes

Apologies:

Cllr Ken Harwood
Cllr Dorothy Ross-Tomlin

76/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence was received from Ken Harwood and Dorothy Ross-Tomlin.

Charlotte Morley was in the Chair.

77/17 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2018 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

That under Minute 65/17 the last sentence of the first paragraph should read:

'The precept would amount to a £12 increase for Band D homes and more than 2,000 consultation responses showed that a majority of those that responded supported the increase.'

78/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

79/17 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

There were none.

80/17 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN QUARTERLY UPDATE [Item 5]**Key points raised during discussion:**

1. The Panel requested that wording be uniformly used when describing data. For example in paragraph 1.1 a 3% increase was describes as significant but in paragraph 1.4 and 3% decrease was described as slight. The PCC explained that these were based on detailed statistical/mathematical analysis and whether something was statistically significant or not depended on the baseline. The PCC was happy to amend the wording.
2. The Panel asked why Surrey was number 163 on the Stonewall Index and others were at a higher level despite not being in it for so long. The PCC shared this concern and was looking into it but overall it was a good achievement compared to the previous year.
3. There was some discussion around the 101 response service. Some Members were unaware that 101 responders were the same people responding to 999 calls. There was some feeling that rural areas were doing poorly from the 101 response times. The PCC explained that the 101 service was for everyone and there was no difference in attitude of officers whether the report was from town or rural setting and that a response was based on analysis of threat. He explained the pressure that an increase in 101 calls was putting on handlers but that staff were coping well. He offered for Panel Members to visit the 101 centre.
4. The Elmbridge Panel Member expressed thanks to the PCC for funding used for homelessness as he had heard good reports on the work they were doing.
5. The Woking Panel Member stated that she could see a change for the better in Woking and put this down to having longer serving inspectors, building up their knowledge and continuity in the area.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

81/17 SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PLAN REFRESH [Item 6]**Key points raised during discussion:**

1. The PCC introduced his suggested refreshed Police & Crime Plan which he said looked to the future. He had taken stock at his mid-term and explained how he hadn't fully appreciated the interconnections when he started the role. There was now good partnership working which he hoped to take further. Whilst there had been many comments made on the consultation for the refreshed plan there was no themes to them.
2. The PCC explained how priority 1 was not just about armed response but about working with partners to prevent terrorism. There would be no reduction in the number of firearms officers. In response to a

Member query the PCC stated that he would put more detail in the plan on rural crime

3. In response to a question regarding how success was to be measured the PCC explained that he hadn't set rigid targets as they could distort outcomes. Instead he would have a raft of indicators based on satisfaction. The indicators were currently being worked on but it was thought that they would be more in line with police targets.
4. There was some discussion around resources and the use of those resources. The PCC explained the rise in precept which was approved by residents and described Surrey as being in a stable financial state but no more. There were further savings to be made. Some money was to be put aside for an innovation fund in order to use resources better.
5. The PCC confirmed that he would continue to support Junior Citizen this year and that he would be funding the booklets given to every junior citizen. However, he could not guarantee this for future years.
6. In response to specific queries on the plan the PCC stated that this was a strategic plan which sits on top of many action plans that are the responsibility of the police. He went on to explain how the OPCC was now much more integrated with police action boards. The public had indicated during the consultation that they wanted to see specific targets and have these explained to them.
7. The PCC went on to explain that Neighbourhood Watch was working well in most areas and that he had visited the co-ordinator recently and was please that it was working well. He also requested details from Panel Members if they felt that any particular area was not working well.
8. The PCC recognised the need to work better with children's homes, social services and health in order to prioritise actions to reduce the number of repeat missing young people.
9. The Panel were informed that the new complaints regulations had been put off until next year. The PCC did not want to extend his role in this regard as he believed complaints should, as much as possible, be dealt with as close to the source as possible. He did not envisage an enhance role for the Panel. He also thought that there would be a rise in the number of complaints which would have a resource issue and may have to expand his own office to cope with that.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

82/17 SURREY POLICE ESTATES PROGRAMME [Item 7]

Key points raised during discussion:

1. There was discussion had about the location and vision for the new police headquarters. The PCC explained that this would likely be a new build as it needed to be fit for purpose. It was also thought that the new headquarters would house many of the specialist areas.
2. The PCC confirmed the following:

- A police presence would be retained in Staines Police Station.
 - There would be another station located in the east of the county as Reigate Street was not fit for purpose.
 - Woking police station would not be retained but no front line service was provided from Woking.
 - There would be a police presence in every borough but these may change location if good offers arose.
3. One Member requested to know in advance where the replacement for Reigate Street was to be located due to the impact on moving the CCTV. She also had concerns about partnership working but hoped that these would diminish when the changes were in place.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

None.

83/17 FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 8]

Key points raised during discussion:

1. There was some discussion around the slight underspend for February which then changed to an overspend in March. The PCC explained the nature of fluctuations in budget but was satisfied that these were acceptable. Members wanted more detail as it was unusual for forecasts to change so late in the year.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

That the PCC would provide more details on the forecasts from February to March to explain why the late fluctuation.

84/17 UPDATE ON THE HMICFRS INSPECTION RESULTS [Item 9]

Key points raised during discussion:

1. The PCC introduced this report and explained that inspection reports were much improved and that comments were taken seriously and acted on.
2. There was some discussion around treating the workforce with respect which was not rated as high as Members would have liked. The PCC responded that this was treated very seriously but in the overall context of improvement in the force it was something that could be handled.
3. In response to a Member expressing disappointment that more resources was not being put into finding and arresting outstanding

suspects the PCC stated that he continually challenged the Chief Constable on this.

- 4. It was noted that the vetting of staff was not resolved and that the problem related to the time needed to vet.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

The PCC would give further updates to future Panel meetings.

85/17 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 10]

Key points raised during discussion:

The Chairman introduced the report for noting.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

The outcome of complaint PCP031 to be reported to a future meeting.

86/17 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 11]

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

ACTIONS/FURTHER INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED:

It was requested that those items without dates on the workplan be timetabled.

Under Minute 67/17 there was a request for a report on fraud and this was to be put onto the tracker.

87/17 COMMISSIONER QUESTION TIME [Item 12]

There were no further questions put to the Commissioner.

88/17 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 13]

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item 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.

89/17 SURREY POLICE ESTATES PROGRAMME [Item 14]**RESOLVED:**

Members noted the Part 2 paper in relation to item 7.

90/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 15]

The next meeting of the Panel would be held on 28 June 2018.

Meeting ended at: 12.13 pm

Chairman