

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 27 June 2019 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 Ken Harwood (Chairman)
- \*Mr Bryan Cross (Vice-Chairman)
- \*Cllr Andrew Povey
- \*Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- \*Cllr David Reeve
- \*Mr David Fitzpatrick-Grimes
- \*Cllr Hazel Watson
- \*Cllr Fiona White
- \*Cllr Christine Elmer
- \*Cllr Will Forster

**Apologies:**

- Cllr Richard Barratt
- Cllr Victor Lewanski
- Cllr John Furey

**31/19 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN [Item 1]**

Councillor Ken Harwood was proposed by Mr Bryan Cross and seconded by Councillor David Reeve.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel agreed the appointment of Councillor Ken Harwood as Police and Crime Panel Chairman for the Council year 2019/2020.

**32/19 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 2]**

Mr Bryan Cross was proposed by Councillor Ken Harwood and seconded by Councillor David Reeve.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel agreed the appointment of Mr Bryan Cross as Police and Crime Panel Vice-Chairman for the Council year 2019/2020.

**33/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 3]**

Apologies were received from Councillors Victor Lewanski, Richard Barratt and John Furey.

**34/19 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 4]**

1. The minutes of the meeting held on 5 April 2019 were agreed as a true record of that meeting and were signed by the Chairman.

2. Cllr Watson requested that the item at minute number 20/19 on CCTV be allocated a date and was assured by the Chairman this would be discussed in relation to the Forward Plan later in the meeting.

### **35/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]**

There were none.

### **36/19 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

No public questions were received.

### **37/19 POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER'S ANNUAL REPORT [Item 7]**

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

1. The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) explained that the annual report was one of his statutory duties and that he had seen steady progress made against his plan but noted that there was always room to do more and the Panel's comments on the draft plan would be incorporated into the final version.

Members noted that although crime had not increased as much as the national average it had still increased and asked the PCC to expand on this.

2. The PCC suggested amending the report to highlight that while reported crime had increased, actual crime was static according to the Crime Survey of England and Wales. He expressed that an increase in reported crime could be seen as neutral or good news. It could be seen as neutral because the Home Office definition of crime had changed which impacted the statistics. He noted it was positive because people were reporting more and were more ready to discuss crimes such as Domestic Violence, Child Sexual Exploitation and Modern Slavery than they had been previously.
3. The PCC noted that some crimes had seen a real increase in occurrences, such as breaking and entering into vehicles, but that the police had been running public awareness campaigns to make people more aware of their personal belongings.
4. The PCC was confident that the police were on top of crime and would ensure Surrey stayed safe. He noted one exception to this and expressed that he was concerned about cybercrime which needed more attention nationally to reduce rates.
5. It was also noted that rates of clearing up crime were too low nationally and that this was true in Surrey, but that the PCC was holding the Chief Constable to account in this area.

Members highlighted areas of the report that needed editing before the final version was published.

6. Members commented that the report only went into detail of four of the six priorities outlined in the Police and Crime Plan and asked that the final report include all priorities.
7. It was noted that the "Year At A Glance" did not mention the problems identified with disclosure and the fact that the PCC had asked for a

- review of this. The PCC noted that disclosure needed to be discussed in the final report as the issue was ongoing.
8. It was pointed out that the “Year at a Glance” stated that 75% of tax payers were happy to pay extra for additional officers and police staff, but actually it was 75% of people surveyed, and this should be made clear. The PCC agreed that the report should make it clear that 75% of people surveyed were happy with the rise in the Precept and this change would be incorporated into the report.
  9. No mention of collaboration with other forces was given in the part of the report which focused on the “Making Every Pound Count” priority and this should be considered. On collaboration with other forces, the PCC noted that as well as collaboration with Sussex Police, Surrey was joining a four area collaboration with partners in Thames Valley and Hampshire.
  10. Members commented that there was no real mention of terrorism and that if the information that came out of the Parsons Green attack was from the last year, this should be discussed. The PCC noted that although the Parsons Green attack took place a few years prior, reverberations were still having an impact and that these should be commented on.
  11. Members queried why there was only one reference to counter-terrorism in the report given the substantial cost that goes into training counter-terror police. It was asked that the PCC detailed plans for the public on how he aims to protect them from the threat of terrorism. The PCC assured the Panel that counter-terrorism policing was taken very seriously and by its nature most work was done away from the public eye. He stated he was happy that there were enough resources in place. He clarified that this report was not his policing plan but that something could be added to the report to put people’s minds at ease.
  12. Members commented that the percentage related to confidence in police dealing with these crimes, rather than in the instances of crimes themselves, and this needed to be reported more clearly.

There was a query about whether the report needed to clarify where the 100 extra officer roles would come from.

13. Members noted that the report was not consistent and sometimes implied there were 100 new roles being created while at other times suggested that 25 roles were being saved and 75 new roles were being created. The PCC stood by the statement of 100 extra officers, and felt that the language used was accurate, open, honest and consistent. He further commented that due to extra space in the budget this number was now 104 as 79 new positions could now be added.
14. The PCC explained that this would positively impact neighbourhood policing because the expected loss of 25 positions would have hit neighbourhood policing the hardest as this was one of the few places where substantial cuts could be realised but that fortunately this did not need to happen.
15. The PCC explained that these officers and staff would not be instantly visible to the public because of the time it takes to recruit, train and deploy people into certain roles. He noted that due to funding being done on a yearly basis he could not plan how many officers he would be able to recruit next year. If the Chancellor put forward a 3-year

funding plan it could help planning for future recruitment and would allow residents to see visible increases.

Members scrutinised the drop in confidence in police being able to deal with anti-social behaviour from 77.7% to 71.6%.

16. Members highlighted that the report stated 'local issues' were responsible for the drop in confidence in police being able to deal with anti-social behaviour but that there was no information about why the public think the police had not responded, and that it was instead focused on the causes of the anti-social behaviour.
17. It was of some concern that close to 30% of people were not confident in the police being able to deal with anti-social behaviour and the Panel wanted more detail on how the PCC and Chief Constable planned to address this.
18. It was noted that despite a drop in the percentage of people who felt confident that the police could deal with anti-social behaviour and crimes in their area, the number remained high. The PCC made clear that it was among his main focuses moving forward but that he understood why people wanted more to be done about anti-social behaviour. He noted that of the 104 new police recruited many would be directed specifically to deal with local issues as feedback from public engagement meetings with the Chief Constable showed that people were concerned by issues such as noisy neighbours, speeding, inconsiderate driving, and tensions caused by unauthorised encampments.
19. The PCC also commented that the Policing in Your Neighbourhood system was now bedded down and that community commanders were dedicated to stop these low level crimes.
20. On the issue of speeding particularly it was noted that speeding enforcement officers were in place but there was limited funding to do this. The PCC suggested that it was important to press the County Council to revitalise the Drive Smart partnership which he was frustrated at the progress of. It was also noted that Community Speedwatch was increasing in coverage and was doing positive work. The PCC praised the work of the volunteers and groups who provided the service.
21. Members noted concern for the safety of Community Speedwatch Volunteers who had reported having things thrown out of windows at them. The PCC agreed to raise this at a course he was due to go on.
22. The Panel requested more information and timescales on the PCC providing transit sites to ease tensions from unauthorised encampments. The PCC expressed that the transit sites were not police responsibilities, and that this lay with the borough, district and county councils as they were the biggest land owners and had planning responsibilities. It was noted that the PCC had met with local and county leaders but that there was not yet a publically identified transit site in the county.
23. The PCC paid tribute to the County Council for making three sites available as negotiated stopping places, but that under the law they had not been designated as transit sites and lacked the facilities needed meaning police could not move people from unauthorised encampments to these sites. The PCC suggested Panel Members encouraged their districts and boroughs to move this process forward.

Members asked the PCC to give more detail about the in-house Victim Support and Witness Care Unit, particularly about how it is staffed.

24. The PCC explained that the unit was set up on 1 April 2019 and that after a few teething problems it was now fully staffed with no backlog and was fully operational.
25. He noted that there was no more money available so numbers of users would remain stable.
26. The PCC noted that the staffing contract had previously been with Victim Support which was largely a voluntary based organisation. He paid tribute to the dedicated volunteers, many of whom had been brought on as staff. He further noted that recruitment was ongoing for additional staff.
27. It was explained that bringing the service in-house not only fulfilled the County and the PCC's statutory responsibilities, but provided victims with a single point of contact and a more seamless service than previous methods of helping victims.

The Panel raised the issue of rural crime which they thought was not covered enough in the report.

28. The PCC acknowledged that under the previous PCC many rural residents felt their needs were not being addressed but that they had not been forgotten.
29. He explained that the NICHE system of recording crime had a specific flag to categorise rural crimes so that statistics could be gathered to help inform police work.
30. The Commissioner detailed how Surrey Police had gone from one to two pan-county rural liaison officers with the specific remit of making sure that colleagues across the force take rural crimes seriously.
31. Members appreciated the increase in rural liaison officers but commented that given the size of the rural area this was concerning.
32. The PCC agreed that there were too few officers but that the 100 extra officers and staff would go some way to give necessary resources in this area. He also noted that there was also push-back from urban areas that they do not have enough police presence because rural areas are too heavily focused on and that there was a fine balance to be struck.
33. Members wanted to know if any of the 104 new officers who are yet to be assigned a remit could be directed to rural crimes. The PCP agreed and noted that some of these new recruits would be directed to rural crimes but they were largely to help in local policing. He pointed out that local policing included the policing of rural communities.

Members expressed concerns about cybercrimes and asked that the PCC addressed this in more detail in the report, and provided information to residents on how to protect themselves.

34. Members were concerned that no information had been given to residents about how to protect their interests, nor about where to go for help if they had been targeted.
35. The PCC said that he felt pessimistic about cybercrime and commented that more needed to be done on a national and international level. It was expressed that this was an issue he had

repeatedly asked for more action on and hoped that Central Government would think more seriously about.

36. Despite this, he noted that Surrey Police do a lot to address cybercrime and the message to residents was to take precautions to protect themselves.

Members asked that the PCC provided more details on Independent Custody Visitors (ICVs).

37. Members requested that the PCC provided a more detailed explanation of ICVs including their role and the impact that their actions had so that the public could see the importance of the work that they do.
38. The PCC praised the work of the people who volunteer as ICVs and explained that the scheme was run from his own office. He commented that he was aware that the report could contain too much technical language and that he would take a look at the report to highlight the work done by the volunteers.
39. Members wanted to feedback some positive points to the PCC. They noted that close partnership working with police within Elmbridge to tackle tensions around unauthorised encampments had been particularly good, and that Community Speedwatch volunteers would like to pass on praise to Surrey Police for the training they had received.
40. It was noted by the Panel that more central locations should be used for community events to encourage better attendance from the public to which the PCC responded that areas where reports of particular concern had come from were largely selected but that new locations would be used for engagement meetings in the autumn.

#### **RESOLVED:**

Members of the Police and Crime Panel commented on and noted the annual report prior to its formal publication.

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

That the Panel formally writes to the PCC with the comments and feedback raised in the discussion.

### **38/19 SURREY POLICE GROUP FINANCIAL REPORT FOR MONTH 12 FINANCIAL YEAR 2018/19 [Item 8]**

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

1. The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) introduced the report, and noted that the Surrey Police group as a whole had underspent in the year 2018/2019. He noted that the total underspend of £664 thousand came from a £50 thousand underspend from the OPCC and a £614 thousand underspend from Surrey Police Force.
2. Members asked for an update on the Body Worn Video project, and whether projects which were underspent because they had not been

implemented had since been implemented, or were likely to be rolled out by the end of this financial year.

3. The CFO commented that the Body Worn Video would be rolled out by the end of the financial year and that the new Head of IT was carrying out a review of current IT projects to ensure they were best value for money. He noted that some might be abandoned but the majority could be expected to be implemented by the end of the year.
4. Members asked for an update on the Body Worn Video project, and whether projects which were underspent because they had not been implemented had since been implemented, or were likely to be rolled out by the end of this financial year.
5. The PCC expressed that he was happy to update the Panel further on this in Part 2 as the information contained sensitive financial and contractual information.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the report.

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

None.

**39/19 OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER 2018/19 END OF YEAR FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 9]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The CFO introduced the report and re-stated that the OPCC had underspent by £50 thousand in the financial year 2018/2019.
2. The PCC stated that he had done an investigation into the costs of the OPCC compared to the costs of the old Police Authority and found the OPCC to be considerably cheaper.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the contents of the report.

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

There were none.

**40/19 FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 10]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. Members wanted to know how the PCC felt partnership working was going on joint prevention work. The PCC noted that partnership working was improving and that he would shortly be signing a concordat with the Leader of Surrey County Council to establish a framework for how the police and council could work together to cover areas such as social services to provide for Surrey residents.
2. He reported that on the ground Joint Enforcement Teams (JETs) were working well and that he was providing £50 thousand to local

authorities wanting to set these up. He commented that he would like to expand the powers of JETs and grow the programme further.

3. Members wanted to know what actions were being taken by the Chief Constable to improve feedback to the public when reporting crimes. The PCC stated that the Chief Constable, police and PCC do a lot of work to brief the public on what they do. He noted that Surrey Police have a vast social media following and use websites such as Twitter to engage the public but that this could be improved and done in a more systematic way going forward.
4. Members asked for an update on the 101 forwarding message and whether the Chief Constable had reduced the length of the message. The PCC stated that the message still included important information to remind the public not to make inappropriate calls and that they could also use the online system to report crimes. The PCC noted that the Chief Constable was reluctant to re-record the message himself but that the PCC would check the message to see if there had been any changes.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the update on the PCC's performance meetings with the Chief Constable.

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

That the PCC provide information to the Panel on ways the public are briefed and provided with information relevant to them.

**41/19 RECRUITMENT AND WORKFORCE PLANNING [Item 11]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The PCC introduced the report and noted that he had asked the force to provide information to him about how Surrey Police should aim to look in size and shape in the future. Members asked that they be able to see the findings of the information the PCC will receive from the force.
2. Members welcomed the increase in the neighbourhood support officers and in the recruitment of PCSOs. They noted the valuable work done by PCSOs who were approachable and knowledgeable about their local areas. The PCC also expressed thanks to PCSOs for the variety of skills they had to offer. He noted that in the short term he aimed to bring in more PCSOs because they were quick to train and that it was common for PCSOs to use the role to transition to becoming Police Officers.
3. Members asked how the PCC thought the 75% of people surveyed who supported the Precept increase would react to the different types of staff being recruited that were not neighbourhood police officers. The PCC stated that the additional money from the Precept increase was never intended to be solely for local neighbourhood policing and that all money is used to keep the public safe.

**RESOLVED:**



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

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

The PCC to provide the findings of feedback from the force on what the force should look like in the future.

**42/19 UPDATE ON FUTURE POLICE ESTATES [Item 12]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The PCC introduced the report and noted that information was sensitive but could be shared with the Panel in Part 2 of the meeting.
2. Members asked for clarification over who had ownership and responsibility for the Future Police Estates project to which the PCC noted that he had the final sign off as the owner of police buildings and controller of funding on behalf of the taxpayer, but that the foundation of the estates project was operational, meaning the Chief Constable had input.
3. Members asked for information on project management and governance. The PCC stated that governance was being refined as part of the project as it moved from purchasing to building and that the Chief Executive was paying close attention to governance. It was stated that the PCC had external advisors to directly advise the OPCC in addition to the project team governance. The Chief Executive clarified that she was currently working through governance and assembling an Executive Board with the Chief Constable and lawyers. She agreed that the Terms of Reference of this board could be presented to the Panel and that building the future was about culture and agile working as well as the building and so needed robust governance.
4. Members noted that the date for the move was not until 2024 but asked the PCC if he could update them on when police counters were likely to happen in areas such as Woking and Reigate which were due to have stations closed. The PCC clarified that moves had no impact on local policing and that there would be a local police presence in every district and borough and that was a pledge for the remainder of his term as PCC. He also noted that nothing would happen until the Leatherhead site was complete and this would take time.
5. The PCC noted that the “so-called” Woking Police Station and Reigate Police Station host non-local elements and could be located anywhere in the county and so these functions would move to Leatherhead allowing for the disposal of what is called Woking Police Station. He explained that this site was not actually Woking Police Station as this was in Woking Borough Council’s offices. He expressed that the front counter would be moving next month into the council offices but as this was an operational matter it was not within his remit. He noted that the local police in Reigate would need a new building provided when the current building was disposed of but that the local policing team would remain in the borough.
6. Members asked for details on commercial negotiations with the existing tenant and how crucial these were to ensuring the move date in 2024 could go ahead. The PCC agreed to answer this in Part 2 of

the meeting as it was information regarding negotiations and contracts that was not suitable to be discussed in a public forum.

**RESOLVED:**

The Police and Crime Panel noted the progress in relation to the new estates model.

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

The OPCC to provide a report on the project governance at regular intervals.

**43/19 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 13]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

The Chairman set out the purpose of the item for new members.

No questions were received in advance of the meeting

**44/19 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 14]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

There had been no new complaints received since the last meeting.

**45/19 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 15]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. It was requested that item R20/19 on CCTV be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the Forward Work Plan and Recommendations Tracker.

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

That an item in relation to action R20/19 be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

**46/19 RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMPLAINTS SUB COMMITTEE [Item 16]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Chairman explained the role of the Complaints Sub-Committee.
2. Councillor Hawkins expressed an interest in being a substitute Member of the Sub-Committee.
3. Councillor Elmer volunteered herself as a Member.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel agreed the terms of reference for the sub-committee.

The Panel appointed Councillor Elmer as a Member of the sub-committee and Councillor Hawkins as a Substitute Member.

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

To ask absent Members if they were interested in joining the sub-committee.

**47/19 RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FINANCE SUB GROUP [Item 17]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman set out the background and explained the role of the Finance Sub-Group.
2. Councillor Hawkins explained she had been added to the membership in error and requested her name be removed from the list.
3. Councillor Povey volunteered to join the Sub-Group
4. Councillor Watson agreed to join the Sub-Group

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel agreed the terms of reference of the sub-group.

The Panel appointed Councillors Andrew Povey and Hazel Watson as members of the Finance Sub-Group.

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

That Councillor Hawkins be removed from the sub-group as she had been added in error.

**48/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 20]**

*This item was moved up the agenda for public information*

The next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel meeting will be held on Wednesday 18 September 2019 at 10.30am in the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

**49/19 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 18]**

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

**50/19 COLLABORATION UPDATE [Item 19]**

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. Members asked the PCC to explain the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in greater detail. They asked for clarification over who was involved in the agreement and why other partners in the inter-force collaboration (such as Hampshire and Thames Valley) were not included.
2. The PCC explained that the Government lacked leadership and so forces and PCCs were left to come to agreements themselves. He expressed that the MOU was as far as collaborative agreements could go under current laws.
3. Members queried what would happen in the event of conflict between forces and asked whether the document had any teeth. The PCC commented that the document was an expression of intent and that more needs to be done but that national frameworks in place do not allow watertight collaborations.
4. Members wanted to know whether there were any similar agreements in place with partners in Thames Valley and Hampshire police to which the PCC commented that there were but that they were fragmented and unsatisfactory because of the local and national government frameworks.
5. The PCC assured members that the document would hold up as a foundation document in court if PCCs were to take each other to court, but that it is not good enough.
6. Members asked the PCC what he would ideally want to see to rectify the situation. The PCC said he would want to see a parliamentary act to allow the Home Secretary or Ministers to delegate to local areas to allow Commissioners to do what is best for their residents. He would want to see the Chief Constable and PCC have powers, as well as regional and national powers which would allow people to stop tiptoeing around each other and save time and money. He stated that once a new Prime Minister and Cabinet were in place he would be writing to the Home Secretary to explain his feelings and concerns.
7. Members asked whether legal advice had been sought when drawing up the MOU. The PCC commented that it had and it had used money which could have been spend on policing if a better national framework had been in place.
8. Members asked the PCC to provide a list of areas where services are shared and where there is collaboration with other force areas.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the information contained within the report

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

PCC to provide information of what services and collaborative efforts are in place with partner police forces.

**51/19 UPDATE ON FUTURE POLICE ESTATES [Item ]**

*This item was requested at the meeting to discuss Part 2 information*

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The PCC provided background about the sitting tenants on the site that has been purchased in Leatherhead. He detailed each of the three specific cases and the terms of each being removed from the site.
2. Members asked what work has been done on the selling of land for the three buildings that are due to be disposed of and when the Panel could expect to see Part 1 or Part 2 information about this. The PCC noted that there were plans for a detailed financial appraisal to estimate the amount each site could be sold for and that this was part of the wider project plan. He commented that this was not to be done until later in the process as it would be a waste of money to do it this early on.
3. Members requested that from this time next year a standing Part 2 item be added to the agenda to keep the Panel updated on the project. The PCC agreed to this.

**RESOLVED:**

The Panel noted the updates provided.

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

A standing Part 2 Item be added to the agenda starting in June 2020.

Meeting ended at: 12:17pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank