

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 27 November 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)

- *Councillor Ken Harwood (Chairman)
- *Mr Bryan Cross (Vice-Chairman)
- *Councillor Andrew Povey
- *Councillor David Reeve
- Councillor Victor Lewanski
- *Councillor Hazel Watson
- *Councillor Fiona White
- *Councillor John Furey
- *Councillor John Robini
- Councillor Will Forster
- *Councillor Josephine Hawkins
- *Councillor Christine Elmer
- Councillor Richard Barratt

67/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

None received.

Mr David Fitzpatrick-Grimes had retired from his role as an Independent Member and his vacancy was currently being recruited to.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

R49/19: The Chairman on behalf of the Panel would send him a letter expressing his thanks.

68/19 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

69/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Councillor Hawkins declared a personal interest in item 5 as she knew Mr Menon.

70/19 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

There were none.

71/19 CONFIRMATION HEARING - APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER [Item 5]

Councillor Hawkins declared a personal interest as she knew Mr Menon

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Kelvin Menon - candidate, Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)

Lisa Herrington - Chief Executive (Interim), Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chairman welcomed Mr Kelvin Menon to the meeting and in accordance with Schedule 1, paragraph 11 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, stated that this was the formal confirmation hearing for the proposed appointment of Chief Finance Officer of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey.
2. The Chairman explained that the Panel was invited to question the candidate on whether he had the professional competence and personal independence to exercise the role and the Panel would go into a private session to decide upon its recommendation to the Commissioner.
3. Following the meeting, under paragraph 10, Schedule 1 of the Act the Panel would review the proposed appointment and make a report with a recommendation to the PCC within three weeks of the Panel's notification of the proposed appointment.
4. The current postholder Ian Perkin would retire in March 2020 and as a result a selection process for the new Chief Finance Officer was undertaken and Kelvin Menon was identified as the preferred candidate.
5. The Panel and PCC offered a vote of thanks to Mr Perkin.
6. The Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) stated that Mr Menon had undergone a thorough selection process and thanked those involved for their advice and firmly recommended that Mr Menon be appointed to the role of Chief Finance Officer.
7. At the request of the Chairman, Mr Menon summarised his professional qualifications: he was a qualified chartered accountant with ten years' experience in public practice as an auditor and accountant, he then became a finance director for a number of property developers before moving into the public sector where he headed the finance department at Berkshire East Primary Care Trust, before his move to Surrey Heath Borough Council as Executive Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer - where he had been for the last twelve years, working on diversifying the council's investment portfolio.
8. Mr Menon stated that working within the OPCC presented a new challenge where he would use his combined past experiences. Surrey Police's move to its new headquarters at Leatherhead was an exciting venture.

Panel Members were invited to question Mr Menon and a summary of the questions and responses can be found below:

9. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Menon stated that contractually the earliest he could start was the beginning of March.
10. A Member noted that the budget for the OPCC was significantly larger than that of Surrey Heath Borough Council and was asked how he saw the relationship between the OPCC and Surrey Police. Mr Menon explained that despite the difference in budget size, both Surrey Heath

Borough Council and the OPCC would have similar budget constraints so he would use similar techniques. He noted that there would be a close relationship between himself at the OPCC and with the Chief Finance Officer of Surrey Police as it was important to align their objectives.

11. In response to the Vice-Chairman's query over his membership of both the Institute of Chartered Accountants and the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA), Mr Menon explained that he had gained CIPFA whilst at Surrey Heath Borough Council as it gave him a greater knowledge of public sector accounting.
12. In response to a Member question over the strategic advice given on large scale capital projects, Mr Menon commented that at Surrey Heath Borough Council he oversaw the redevelopment of the area to the north of Camberley which involved taking control of the site. Particularly he was involved in the tender process for the site which cost in excess of £100 million and was currently in the process of negotiating a development agreement.
13. Mr Menon was asked by the Chairman as to whether he had considered the relationship between Sussex and Surrey Police forces, he stated that it was advantageous to have a closer association between the two but there would be differing priorities between them.
14. In response to the Chairman's query over how he would handle his relationship with the PCC if he found him diverging from his role, Mr Menon stated that he would hope to have a strong relationship based on mutual trust and they would address issues jointly.
15. Mr Menon was asked by the Vice-Chairman about his experience with IT projects and noted that he had some experience in Surrey Heath Borough Council where he implemented a new financial system. It was essential that IT projects focused on user experience and provided good value for money, not underestimating the amount of resources.
16. In response to a Member query over the timescale of the Panel's recommendation for the proposed appointment of Mr Menon, the Chief Executive (Interim) commented that the Panel had three weeks from receipt in the published agenda to contact the PCC.

The Chairman brought the discussion to a close by thanking Mr Menon for attending and answering the questions put to him.

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Exclusion of the Public (Part 2): 11.03am

The Panel considered the appointment of the proposed candidate for the role of Chief Finance Officer under Part 2.

Exclusion of the Public (Part 2) ended: 11.07am

RESOLVED:

The Panel reviewed the proposed appointment and would publish a report to the Commissioner on the proposal recommending the appointment of the candidate, Kelvin Menon.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

R50/19: The Panel will publish a report to the Commissioner - within the three week period - on the proposal recommending the appointment of the candidate, Kelvin Menon.

72/19 SURREY POLICE GROUP FINANCIAL REPORT FOR MONTH 12 FINANCIAL YEAR 2019/20 [Item 6]**Witnesses:**

Ian Perkin - Treasurer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)
David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Treasurer introduced the report and noted that individual budget variances were outlined in the report.
2. A Member queried the budget variance for the Building the Future project and if that was the result of deliberate non-appointments. In response, the Treasurer explained that people were being appointed but the process took longer than expected. He also noted that the PCC chaired the Building the Future Board which had identified governance changes.
3. In response to a Member question, the Treasurer stated that the early purchase of the new headquarters at Leatherhead had not increased the cost of the project. Costs were reduced as the property had been withdrawn from market and then put back on it. As a result, subsequent renegotiations led to a £5 million saving.
4. Similarly, the Treasurer responded to the Vice-Chairman's query, by explaining that the high £867,000 of unbudgeted interest costs for the new Leatherhead headquarters was due to the site being purchased earlier than expected - as it was placed back on the market. The loan from the Public Works Loan Board was at a fixed rate of 2% but would see no additional costs due to balancing out over its 20 year period.
5. In response to a Member questioning the total underspend of the individual budget variances, the Treasurer explained that in total there was a £61,000 forecasted underspend for the force at the end of the year and a £74,000 underspend for the OPCC. There were delays in recruiting officers due to the precept increase last year - resulting in the large underspend in the police payroll and there were delays in the Building the Future project.
6. In response to a Member's disappointment over the raised precept in order to recruit and then the subsequent underspend, the PCC noted that there was an enormous recruitment effort. The PCC clarified that the original plan before raising the precept was to reluctantly reduce officer numbers by 25 - they were later retained as the precept cap was lifted leading to recruiting 75 officers and staff to 100. This was later increased to 104 as there was room in the force's budget. The

- PCC would report the exact figures on the change of the amount of police staff and officers at the Panel's next meeting.
7. The PCC explained that retention was an issue, but noted positively that many detectives had transferred in and many Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) had transferred to become police constables. In response to a Member question over the underspend in the Police Payroll budget, the Treasurer stated that using PCSOs and Investigative Officers was less costly but only to be used on an interim basis whilst recruiting.
 8. Surrey's share of the Government's 20,000 uplift would be 78 next year and recruitment targets would be met, the PCC was uncertain on future years. He noted that nationally the police should have had a steady increase in officers over the last decade rather than erratic and inadequate recruitment drives - the uplift only equalled policing numbers of 10 years ago.
 9. The PCC stated that within the consultation on next year's precept, the public would receive updated figures on police numbers before the Panel as soon as the Government informs police forces on their uplift amounts.
 10. In response to a Member query over the Vehicle Replacement overspend of £280,198, the Treasurer noted that the figure was in fact the year-to-date variance and the force would equal its forecasted budget.
 11. The Treasurer noted a Member's concern on the change mid-way through the year from a total overspend to an underspend and provided reassurance that the budget was managed regularly over the year without the need for one-off reductions. Staffing was a large part of the force's expenditure and this had to be balanced based on new recruits and vacancies.
 12. A Member commented that a further increase in the precept for next year would be difficult for residents to understand due to the force's total underspending - especially with increased crimes in his local borough. The PCC noted that Surrey remained a low crime county, but more police officers were needed to tackle the rise of crime in certain areas. Next year's uplift and last year's precept rise redressed low officer numbers, but future uncertainty remained on the grant amount from the Government.
 13. In response to the Vice-Chairman's query on the significant change in overspend on Estates and Facilities by the end of the year, the Treasurer noted that the budget would be profiled - spreading the annual budget across the months of the year where expenditure would be anticipated. Subsequently, the overspend had been amended in the end of year forecast as profiling on the business rates was not done correctly by the new management accountant system.
 14. The Treasurer responded to the Vice-Chairman's question on the force's Capital Budget underspend in which it would spend £17 million in the next six months, by noting that underspending the budget had been a re-occurring problem by Surrey Police.
 15. The Treasurer and the PCC urged the force to over-programme spending as for good reasons key capital schemes often slipped and the PCC noted that it was important to avoid the last minute rush in March to fund ill-thought out projects solely to balance the budget.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

R51/19: The PCC would report the exact figures on the change of the amount of police staff and officers at the Panel's next meeting - including the use of PCSOs and Investigative Officers.

73/19 OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER 2019/20 END OF YEAR FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 7]**Witnesses:**

Ian Perkin - Treasurer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Treasurer introduced the report and informed the Panel that spending was in line with what was expected for October, individual budget variances were detailed in the report.
2. In response to a Member question concerning the specific funding for the Victim and Witness Care Unit (VWCU) non-inclusion in the report, the Treasurer explained that the OPCC were making a grant to Surrey Police to run the service in-house - previously run by Victim Support.
3. In agreement with the PCC, the Treasurer would notify the Head of Policy and Commissioning, Damian Markland who was the budget holder for the VWCU to amend the figures to explicitly show the costings and he also noted that the figure on page 37 referred to the Home Office grant. That was not the same as the figures spent by the OPCC.

RESOLVED:

The Panel commented on and noted the financial performance of the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Surrey for the seven-month period ending 31st October 2019.

(the 'nine-month' period in the original recommendation was incorrect)

Actions/Further information to be provided:

R52/19: The Treasurer will speak to the Head of Policy and Commissioning to amend the budget figures for the Victim and Witness Care Unit so that it is explicitly listed in the force's budget.

74/19 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN [Item 8]**Witnesses:**

Ian Perkin - Treasurer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)
David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Treasurer introduced the report and explained that the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) made assumptions about future pay and non-pay inflation, central Government's grant, and precept increases.
2. He noted that grant income would remain stationary in cash terms as per previous years whilst the precept income would increase by 1.99% per annum - with a 2.5% increase for staff, in-line with officers next year.
3. As a result of these changes savings of £11.5 million must be found over the next four years in order to balance the financial position and £1.2 million had been identified - leaving a £10.3 million deficit.
4. There was uncertainty on next year's Home Office grant and the upcoming precept limit due to the pending general election, as the Autumn Statement had not been made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer - further information would not be available until the New Year.
5. As per the report, the Treasurer noted the possible variations on the force's base scenario.
6. In response to a Member question on 'other unavoidable costs' from £9.1 million in 2019/20 to £1.4 million by 2023/2024, the Treasurer explained that the higher costs in 2019/20 would not be encountered in future years due to specific contractual obligations that occurred - those costs were mostly covered due to the precept increase.
7. In response to the Vice-Chairman's query over next year's budget, the Treasurer explained that the current Government had indicated that the uplift of 78 additional police officers would be funded separately from the Home Office's grant.
8. The PCC informed the Panel that the Home Office had asked nationally for police forces' to have a firm baseline for their individual police officer establishment - to prevent any force significantly lowering the baseline and spending the extra funding.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

(the original recommendation in the report was incorrect as it was a duplicate of item 7's recommendation)

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None.

75/19 BUILDING THE FUTURE - UPDATE [Item 9]**Witnesses:**

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC informed the Panel of the two main issues: commercial negotiations with existing tenants; and building a project team. The

Building the Future Programme Director was a key position to which the OPCC were currently out for interview.

2. In response to a Member question over collaboration with Sussex Police, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and Surrey County Council (SCC) over sharing a new site, the PCC noted that both Sussex Police and SCC had been consulted but both declined building a shared site due to differing priorities. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service was not looking for new premises.
3. The central objective for the PCC, was that the new headquarters would be fit for purpose for Surrey Police and that dialogue was still open with others regarding sharing existing sites - the PCC had written to the Leader of Surrey County Council in regards to possible vacant spaces in SCC's new building in Woking.
4. In response to a Member concern over the PCC chairing the Building the Future Board and being the 'sole decision maker'; the PCC commented that he was happy to have the legal responsibility. He noted that he was not an expert in building so sought advice by employing independent advisors, Vail Williams. They were employed on a call-off contract with competitive prices. The PCC would provide the Panel with the costings spent on Vail Williams at an upcoming meeting.
5. In response to a Member question concerning the perceived contradictory language on the Building the Future Board in points 2.4 and 3.3 on page 52, the PCC explained that legally he holds ultimate responsibility and will review the wording 'decision making' and 'advisory capacity'.
6. The PCC informed the Panel that he could not reveal the total budget for the Building the Future project as it contained sensitive contractual information.
7. In response to a Member question, the PCC would provide the Panel with the addendums on the updated existing Scheme of Delegation and the Supplemental Statement of Governance at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

1. **R53/19:** The PCC will provide the Panel with the costings spent on the independent advisors, Vail Williams at an upcoming meeting.
2. **R54/19:** For subsequent papers, the PCC will review the wording 'decision making' and 'advisory capacity' regarding the Building the Future Board.
3. **R55/19:** The PCC will provide the Panel with the addendums on the updated existing Scheme of Delegation and the Supplemental Statement of Governance, at a future meeting.

76/19 RECRUITMENT AND WORKFORCE PLANNING [Item 10]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC stated that he was asked six months ago about how big Surrey Police should be and that question had not been asked before.
2. The paper contained a serious assessment by each department on the number of staff they had said would be necessary for effective policing.
3. The Chief Constable's professional opinion was that an uplift of 500 officers and staff was an aspirational target and a blueprint for future expansion.
4. In response to a Member question, the PCC noted that the retention rate was a large worry and the force could not prevent leavers to other forces. It was crucial to encourage potential leavers to stay as there was particular competition from the neighbours Sussex Police and the Metropolitan Police who offered more flexible work arrangements. The main reason for leaving Surrey Police was the work-life balance, as cited in exit interviews and the Chief Constable (CC) was addressing that through a more modern working environment.
5. The PCC noted that the cost of living in Surrey was high especially accommodation and the CC had increased officers' pay under strict criteria, which was covered by the budget.
6. The PCC acknowledged the Member's concern that transfers out meant the double loss of losing police officers and the cost of training new recruits. The PCC stressed that there were transfers in too, including detectives who moved from the Metropolitan Police to Staines Police station - the general shortage of detectives was a worry as they were highly skilled.
7. The PCC was happy for retention rates and the amount of detectives to be included in the detailed paper on recruitment going to the Panel at a future meeting.
8. In response to a Member question over the police force being an all-graduate profession, the PCC noted that all new future recruits would be expected to have a degree either from university which would be converted, or through the in-service Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship (PCDA) - the PCDA was free, but had a high abstraction rate, meaning trainees could not be on the frontline. The PCC was yet to receive the cost ratio difference between the PCDA and those already with a degree, once obtained the Panel would receive that information.

RESOLVED:

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

Actions/Further information to be provided:

1. The PCC was happy for retention rates and the amount of detectives to be included in the detailed paper on recruitment going to the Panel at a future meeting (**R51/19**).
2. **R56/19:** The PCC will inform the Panel of the cost ratio difference between the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship (PCDA) and the conversion course for those already with a degree.

77/19 VICTIM AND WITNESS CARE UNIT UPDATE [Item 11]

Witnesses:

Lisa Herrington - Chief Executive (Interim), OPCC

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chief Executive (Interim) stated that the report was commissioned by the OPCC to update the Panel on the progress of the current Unit since its launch in April 2019.
2. She explained that it was beneficial to have the Unit in-house as it allowed a closer relationship between investigative officers and the support service, offering a wraparound service.
3. Furthermore, she noted that the OPCC was also responsible for designing the website which was done in-house by the Head of Policy and Commissioning, Damian Markland - designed in consultation with partners and was essential as it provided a shop window for users.
4. In response to a Member question on the feedback from victims on the support received from the Unit, the Chief Executive (Interim) stated that there were Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to gauge victim satisfaction - certain KPIs had to be reported to the Ministry of Justice. A more comprehensive report on victim satisfaction would go to the Panel at a later date, once the early difficulties in data extraction from NICHE were overcome.
5. The Chief Executive (Interim) responded to a Member query on the results of the performance audit of the Unit conducted in October, by explaining that the audit was based on the processes and establishment of the Unit. There was an early positive verbal indication from the auditors and the results of the audit would be shared with the Panel once received.
6. In response to a Member query over the incorporation of a Fraud 'caseworker' into the Unit and if Surrey Police worked with financial institutions to identify fraud victims, the Chief Executive (Interim) explained that Surrey Police were in partnership work with others but not with financial institutions as the fraud 'caseworker' provided invaluable specialist advice. Additionally, the PCC agreed with Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire Rescue Services (HMICFRS) that there must be a radical revision of fraud, which required national coordination and use of the latest technology.
7. In response to a Member question over the number of paid staff compared to volunteers within Unit, the Chief Executive (Interim) responded that there were currently 12 volunteers out of 20 volunteers for full capacity. That the figure of 37 paid staff that the Member identified were not all new posts - such as the team of Witness Care Officers, the Customer Care Improvement Advisor and the Care Co-ordinator - but were combined from Victim Support.
8. The PCC explained that funding for the Unit came centrally from the Government's Victims Fund.
9. In response to a Member question on the use of volunteers such as how they were recruited and trained, the Chief Executive (Interim) stated that they were integral as they provided face-face contact with victims of crime. Volunteers did not replace paid staff, but did vital additional work and many volunteers from Victim Support now worked

for the Unit. A training programme had also been established to attract more volunteers.

RESOLVED:

That the Panel noted the contents of the report.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

- 1. **R57/19:** A more comprehensive report on victim satisfaction within the Victim and Witness Care Unit (VWCU) will go to the Panel at a later date.
- 2. **R58/19:** The OPCC will report to the Panel at a later date once the results of the audit on the performance of the Victim and Witness Care Unit (VWCU) were received.

78/19 FEEDBACK ON PERFORMANCE MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 12]

Witnesses:

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

- 1. In response to a Member question concerning the slight decrease in confidence levels in Surrey Police due to unauthorised encampments, the PCC noted that the rise in unauthorised encampments was a significant issue in 2017 and the joint response by Surrey Police and the landowner - often borough councils was inadequate.
- 2. However at present, Members were reassured that through increased training, police officers in Surrey did know their specific legal powers and had a good liaison with borough councils and other landowners like the National Trust. Although difficult to obtain, the injunctions from the High Court were very useful, whereby Elmbridge Borough Council prohibited travellers on its owned land, reducing the number of unauthorised encampments compared to areas without injunctions - such as in Guildford.
- 3. Some Members urged the Panel to look into transit sites in their boroughs and districts and the PCC emphasised that as travelling was a lawful activity, transit sites were necessary for travellers to go to. It was essential that the new section of the existing act was utilised in Surrey - as it was in Sussex - as it would allow senior officers to direct travellers from unauthorised encampments to legal transit sites.
- 4. In response to a Member concern, the PCC noted that the urgency to establish transit sites had run out this year, himself and the CC remained to urge borough councils on this. Additionally, the PCC stated that the Government had put out paper for consultation on whether unauthorised encampments should be subject to aggravated trespassing laws - as in the Republic of Ireland - but the PCC believed the current law was adequate.
- 5. A Member stressed that breaking into a field was illegal and his residents did not agree that the law was adequate. Surrey Police should include the offence of aggravated trespassing in prosecuting unlawful travelling and he noted a case in his borough and district

where someone's tools were stolen from their van. Surrey Police did not follow-up that case despite the person recording the burglars. In response, the PCC stated that the police could only prosecute with adequate evidence and was open to note any incidents. He urged Members to contact their Member of Parliament if they felt the police were not doing enough.

6. In response to the Member's question, the PCC noted that the recent consultation on the traveller and gypsy policy was in place with borough councils.
7. The PCC responded positively to a Member suggestion that in his election drive in 2020, he should have a specific policy for residents' protection by Surrey Police concerning unauthorised encampments. The PCC noted that this was already in his current Police and Crime Plan, but he would re-emphasise it next year.
8. In response to a Member question on the performance scorecard, the PCC explained that updates on police performance went to the Panel every six months, but agreed that the actual performance scorecard would go to the Panel.
9. In response to a Member query on the 3 and 6 month review - where he thought 6 months prolonged the case - concerning the Positive Outcome Rates on Rape and Sexual Offences, the PCC was happy with that time frame as more frequent reviews would hinder the speed to resolve cases but would look into what was achieved within the 3 month gap between reviews.
10. The PCC stated that the crime-solving rate for all crimes was not as high as he believes it should be due to pressure on resources and the increase in reported crimes. The use of extra detectives to solve crimes would ease pressure from Neighbourhood Policing Teams.
11. In response to the Vice-Chairman's query on 'abstraction' across thirteen of the forces operations this year which affected 'investigative capacity', the PCC explained that abstraction referred to officers being removed from local policing shifts to tackle high priority issues such as Brexit, where the date of exit kept changing. Successful abstraction from as far away as Lancashire was used to assist the European Convention of Hells Angels in Mole Valley in the summer.

RESOLVED:

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

Actions/Further information to be provided:

1. **R59/19:** The PCC to re-emphasise the specific policy for residents' protection by Surrey Police concerning unauthorised encampments within his future Police and Crime Plan.
2. **R60/19:** The performance scorecard will go to the Panel at an upcoming meeting.
3. **R61/19:** The PCC will look into what was achieved within the 3 month gap between reviews concerning the Positive Outcome Rates on Rape and Sexual Offences.

79/19 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME [Item 13]

There were none.

80/19 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 14]

There were none.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the report.

81/19 SURREY PCP BUDGET 2018/19 [Item 15]**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. For the benefit of many of the new Panel Members, the Vice-Chairman explained that he disagreed with the figures in the report noting that the accounts had been prepared on the same basis as in the previous year and he had abstained last year after questioning the basis on which the accounts had been prepared. There had been no change in the basis used for this years' accounts.
2. He proposed to defer the report to an upcoming Panel meeting to be taken under Part 2, with an officer from the Finance department to attend and answer the Panel's questions. Councillor Reeve seconded the Vice-Chairman's proposal and additionally commented that Surrey's Police and Crime Panel website had not been updated since last year.

RESOLVED:

The Panel voted unanimously that the report be deferred to Part 2 at an upcoming meeting, whereby an officer from the Finance department would answer the Panel's concerns.

Actions/Further information to be discussed:

R62/19: Surrey PCP Budget 2018/19 will be deferred to an upcoming Panel meeting, to be taken under Part 2 where an officer from the Finance department can answer the Panel's concerns.

82/19 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 16]**Witnesses:**

David Munro - Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chairman suggested to Members that they report a one-line summary - concerning their respective District and Borough Councils - on actions R35/19 (identifying Transit Sites) and R44/19 (CCTV ownership) to the next Panel meeting. Democratic Services would collate Member's updates.
2. A Member commented that action R35/19 was redundant as two sites had been identified and that the PCC should continue discussion with the surrey leader's group over the matter. In response a Member

stated that a site had not been identified in Guildford and the Chairman noted that he would still like Members to take this issue back to their respective councils.

3. A Member sought more detail with regards to the completed action R45/19 concerning hate crimes being reported to fire stations. In response the PCC commented that it was an initiative by Surrey County Council and Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and he had been recently informed that take-up was poor.
4. Concerning action R38/19, the Chairman reiterated that he would like the Panel to receive a comprehensive glossary of acronyms and key policing terms at every Panel meeting. The PCC notified the Panel that there was a national policing glossary which could be tailored to the Panel.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

1. Democratic Services will send a note to Members informing them as to what should be provided concerning actions R35/19 (identifying Transit Sites) and R44/19 (CCTV ownership), Members' one-line summary on each action will be collated for the Panel's next meeting.
2. Concerning action R38/19, the Panel to receive a comprehensive glossary of acronyms and key policing terms at every Panel meeting from the OPCC - based on the national policing glossary.

83/19 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 17]

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

84/19 RECRUITMENT AND WORKFORCE PLANNING [Item 18]

RESOLVED:

That the Panel noted the Part 2 appendix to item 10.

85/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 19]

The next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel will be on 7 February 2020, at County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 1.04 pm

Chairman