

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** held at 10.30 am on 7 February 2020 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

1/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Councillors Ken Harwood (Chairman), John Furey and Richard Barratt.

The Vice-Chairman chaired the meeting.

2/20 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Vice-Chairman.

3/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

4/20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

None received.

5/20 POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S PROPOSED PRECEPT 2020/21 [Item 5]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner
 Ian Perkin, Treasurer (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) wished the Chairman well as he was unable to attend the meeting and he introduced the report explaining that:
 - The delay in the 2020-21 Police Finance Settlement (including the police precept capping limits) which was only issued in late January, meant the OPCC went out to consultation before the precept level was known.
 - The online public consultation garnered 3,112 responses from residents with 61% in favour of the proposed precept level of 5% and 39% in favour for the lower proposed precept level of 2%. Some residents responded that they were disappointed they were not given the option of no change in the precept - that option was not considered as the PCC did not want to reduce police numbers - and another key response were queries as to where the additional funding from the precept went last year as residents did not see the increased police numbers as promised. The PCC stated that many of those extra officers were still in training.
 - The final proposed precept level was set in between the higher and lower figures in the consultation at 3.84% which equated to an extra £10 to Band D in Council Tax without triggering a local referendum.
 - The result of that precept level would be a sustained increase in police officers and staff numbers across departments, with a special focus on increasing neighbourhood policing as that was a key area to residents as identified within the eleven community engagement events the PCC attended. Confidence in Surrey Police was good and rising and it would take more than a year to address the shortage of police over the last decade.
 - There was a proposal for further savings in the report in order to increase efficiency and reduce unnecessary waste.
2. The Vice-Chairman explained that there was a handout to Members which was an updated table of the Tax Base and Collection Fund Surplus/Deficit by district and borough councils, which would be attached to the minutes as (Annex A).
3. A Member thought the public would support the £10 a year increase on Band D, but was disappointed that the report omitted how the precept would affect the numbers of crimes solved and prevented, to address the recent HMIC report which showed a 7% national decrease in the detection rate of crimes. He asked that more detail be provided over the next three years on how Surrey's allocation from the additional 20,000 police officers - Operation Uplift - would be allocated and how residents would see an improved performance in policing as a result. In response the PCC explained that page 6 of the report outlined key areas which would be addressed as a result of the proposed precept. The level of crime detection in Surrey was not as low as the national figure highlighted in the HMIC report, despite being under-resourced and in high demand. However, the PCC would like to see an increase in the crime solving rate in Surrey which was a focus in the regular performance meetings with the Chief Constable - a problem solving unit was established to focus on crime solving.
4. The PCC noted that the force's future workforce plan set realistic expectations in which an additional 330 police officers and 170 staff

were needed - provided to the Panel at its last meeting in Part 2. There would be 190 new officers by the end of March 2021 as a result of last years and this year's precept, Surrey Police's allocation from the 20,000 new officers and the 25 posts protected as a result of last year's precept increase. There would be more officers if the funding formula was not flawed as it largely focused on social deprivation factors which was disadvantageous to Surrey Police.

5. A Member welcomed the additional police officers and staff but was concerned with retention rates. In response, the PCC explained that he did not have detailed figures on retention to hand and agreed to provide them to the Panel, but it was slowly increasing with more detectives being recruited. Retention had to be offset with leavers of the force which will be a key issue to be raised with the Chief Constable at the upcoming performance review meeting in Mole Valley. The PCC noted that he agreed with the Chief Constable that providing good work life balance and career progression was essential for retention.
6. In response to a Member's concern on the lack of attendance to low grade crimes which included burglaries in some cases leading to a loss in police confidence, the PCC did not feel there was a loss of public confidence and stressed that crimes had to be prioritised by the Contact Centre based on the available resources. Response rates to grade 1 serious crimes was good and the PCC noted that responses to lower Grade 2 and 3 crimes had to be improved.
7. A Member agreed with the proposed precept level, welcoming the steady increase in police officers as a result and hoped that more crimes such as burglary would be attended in order to meet residents' expectations. Crime prevention would benefit hugely from more resources in neighbourhood policing. The PCC responded that there was a high level of burglary three years ago which has now decreased, although there had been a recent spike in burglaries to which the special burglary unit was established to address. He noted that Surrey was a wealthy county attractive to international criminals and he had called for longer sentences for career burglars.
8. A Member noted that the proposed precept level was appropriate and commended the holding of public consultation in the absence of the precept capping level. He added that the consultation lacked an opportunity for residents to respond with priority areas for the force. The PCC responded that the inclusion of a 'free text' box partially allowed for residents to outline their priorities. The PCC did not want to raise public expectations with a detailed list of priorities due to uncertainty surrounding funding, which included the issue of police pensions last year. However, the PCC attended eleven community engagement events, one in each borough to ascertain residents' opinions in a number of areas.
9. In response to a Member query on the low number of responses to the online public consultation considering the county's population, the PCC noted that there were 3,112 responses - which was less than last year's longer running consultation, but on par with previous years - out of 1.2 million Surrey residents and was reasonably confident that it captured the mood of residents.
10. A Member raised the concern of burglary in her Borough Council which was a priority to victims of the crime, in response the PCC explained that Surrey Police had a through process of evaluating crimes called THRIVE: Threat, Harm, Risk, Investigation, Vulnerability

and Engagement. The Contact Centre assessed calls based on THRIVE and noted that many calls were not police matters. High demand and low resources affected the attendance to every single burglary, especially if there was the likelihood of there being insufficient evidence.

11. In response to a Member query on the effect of the 2019/20 pay award for police officers at 2% and 2.5% for staff on the proposed precept, the PCC explained that there was an extra £15 million compared to last year's 2019/20 Revenue Budget aided by inflation and covered salary increments.
12. The Vice-Chairman informed the Panel that bullet points 4 and 5 concerning the 'savings programme' on page 7 of the supplementary agenda were included in error.
13. In response to a query by the Vice-Chairman, the Treasurer explained that the £700,000 savings in IT were a result of the rationalisation in the number of IT suppliers which the new head of IT would be implementing throughout the financial year.
14. A Member commented that Elmbridge Borough Council had a large Collection Fund surplus in respect of the proposed precept and stressed that as a result residents wanted to see value for money with more visible police officers and PCSOs. In response, the PCC commented that he was aware of the concerns in Elmbridge as identified within the community engagement meetings. He stated that Elmbridge had a good Borough Commander and that there would be a substantial increase in neighbourhood policing going forward.
15. The PCC informed Members that intelligence and covert operations were vital to catch burglars. Although police visibility on the streets was important, cybercrimes such as fraud and online paedophilia were solved online by highly trained officers.

RESOLVED:

The Panel voted unanimously:

That it agreed the proposed Surrey Police Council Tax Precept of £270.57p for a Band D Property for the financial year 2020/21.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. **R1/20** - On behalf of the Panel, the Vice-Chairman will write to the Commissioner to confirm agreement of the 2020/21 precept proposal.
2. **R2/20** - The PCC to provide more detail on how the precept and future strategic measures by police forces nationally would affect Surrey Police performance through the numbers of crimes solved and prevented.
3. **R3/20** - The PCC to provide an update report every three months detailing the allocation of newly recruited officers as a result of the 20,000 uplift, how many officers were in training and how many were on patrol.
4. **R4/20** - The PCC to provide detailed figures on the retention rate and how it would be improved, considering the net difference between incoming recruits and leavers from the force.

6/20 OFFICE OF THE POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER'S BUDGET FOR 2020/21 [Item 6]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner
Ian Perkin, Treasurer (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC - and later the Vice-Chairman on behalf of the Panel - paid tribute to the Treasurer for his long-standing service to the OPCC as it was his last meeting of the Panel before retirement. As a result there was a slight increase in the OPCC's costs due to the competitive and full-time salary for the new Treasurer.
2. Another small increase in Office costs was due to the reform in the police complaints process which came into force on 1 February 2020, in which the PCC took over the appellate function and a Complaints Review Manager would be appointed in March 2020 to assist him.
3. A Member stated that it would be useful to see how Surrey OPCC's costs compared to other OPCCs'. In response the PCC explained the difficulty in comparison as all OPCCs operated differently, for example the OPCC in Hampshire ran its own estates and in other cases some OPCCs leased their staff from their police force, but the PCC noted that he would look into providing a comparison. The Treasurer added that Sussex's OPCC ran their own communications operation rather than their police force and informed the Panel that HMIC did publish information on OPCC costs across the country.
4. A Member commented that the PCC did himself a disservice on the budget which was presented as a series of corporate costs, as the PCC had given many grants to vulnerable groups. However, the Member queried the 3% reduction in funding for the Victim and Witness Care Unit. In response the Treasurer explained that the costs to victim support - as covered by the Ministry of Justice grant for Victim Services - were managed differently, there was no reduction but rather the different allocation to staff costs within the unit and the inclusion of uncommitted grants.
5. In response to a Member query on the reinvestment of the £50,000 previously contributed to the Community Safety Board Project Fund, the PCC explained that he was the chair of the Community Safety Board (CSB) which would be merging with Surrey's Health and Wellbeing Board. The PCC noted that although the CSB Project Fund was ineffective, he was increasing the general Community Safety Fund Grant Budget by £35,000.

RESOLVED:

That Members noted the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

R5/20 - The PCC and Treasurer will look into providing a comparison of costs between Surrey's OPCC and other OPCCs.

**7/20 SURREY POLICE GROUP FINANCIAL REPORT FOR MONTH 8
FINANCIAL YEAR 2019/20 [Item 7]**

Witnesses:

Ian Perkin, Treasurer (OPCC)

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Treasurer outlined that the report showed a satisfactory financial position as of November 2019 with an over spend of £312,000, he was confident that there would be an under spend of £642,814 by the end of the financial year.
2. He also noted the difference in the presentation of the financial report due to a new software package. The software listed portfolios that better reflected the current management arrangements as opposed to the previous breakdown by department.
A Member sought clarification on why there was a greater income than expected from the Camera Partnership under 'Operations' and the over spend in Transport within 'Commercial & Finance Services' - he asked that the Panel would be informed on the number of police vehicles, as it was raised at some community engagement meetings. In response, the Treasurer explained that the money from the Camera Partnership was generated across the county in terms of speeding and the Panel would receive the costs in detail at a future meeting.
3. The Member also queried the unnecessary £1.3 million cost within 'Commercial & Finance Services' to fund the replacement of Airwave handsets. In response, the Treasurer explained that the replacement was needed to keep the existing emergency communications system operational before the Emergency Services Network (ESN) was in place which was delayed nationally. The PCC added that it was a waste of money as it did not improve the current service and all forces faced the same unexpected cost.
4. In response to a Member query on the assumption that the over spend on the 'Local Policing' costs would decrease when more police officers were in place, the Treasurer commented that the 'Local Policing' costs did not include the cost of police officers as those costs were managed in totality under the Non Delegated - Police Pay portfolio which gave greater flexibility for deployment.
5. A Member raised the concern of over-budgeting and the use of temporary staff and overtime to compensate which was not an efficient use of the budget. In response, the PCC explained that overtime was necessary in some cases and the overtime budget has reduced in recent years due to greater resources. The PCC stressed that it was difficult to ascertain how many new police officers would be in place over the next few months due to the nature of the police.
6. In response to a Member query on the reasons for the over spend in the EQUIP project on staff pay and agency costs and the project's expected date of completion, the PCC noted that EQUIP was reported in detail at the last informal meeting of the Panel. Due to the over spend and delays the project remained a large risk, but it had been under control and the PCC noted that the force hoped to reap its benefits in the autumn. The PCC was happy to provide the Panel with regular updates in Part 2.

RESOLVED:

That Members note the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. **R6/20** - The Treasurer would provide the Panel with the breakdown of costs generated from the Camera Partnership at a future meeting.
2. **R7/20** - The PCC was happy to provide the Panel with regular updates on the progress of the EQUIP project in Part 2.

8/20 OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER 2019/20 END OF YEAR FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 8]**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. Members made no comments on the report.

RESOLVED:

The Police & Crime Panel noted the financial performance of the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Surrey for the eight-month period ending 30th November 2019.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

9/20 BUILDING THE FUTURE - UPDATE [Item 9]**Witnesses:**

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner
Lisa Herrington, Interim Chief Executive (OPCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The PCC informed the Panel that he had hoped to announce the final contractual arrangements for the possession of the new Surrey Police headquarters in Leatherhead, but there was a delay. A new Programme Director had been recently appointed to assist the project's delivery and the PCC emphasised that Building the Future did not affect the provision of local policing negatively. A local policing presence would be retained in every borough and agile working would increase effectiveness.
2. In response to a Member query on the main risks of the project, the PCC noted that large property developments were always risky and any difficulties would be overcome through sound financial planning and good governance. The PCC also reported that the property consultants Vail Williams were advising him.
3. The PCC responded to a Member query on the reduction of office space with the move to the new Leatherhead headquarters by stating that the loss was substantial as both Woking and Reigate police

headquarters would be lost. He assured the Panel that there would be a re-provision of local policing from the loss of Reigate.

4. In response to a Member query on what a 'touch-down' area was, the Interim Chief Executive (OPCC) explained that it was an informal open area where police staff and officers could use to work and have meetings particularly if they moved around bases. Surrey Police were moving to a more agile way of working which was an important factor with the project and was the freedom to work when and where individuals wanted, assisted by technology.

RESOLVED:

That the Panel noted the contents of the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

10/20 POLICE COMPLAINTS REFORM [Item 10]

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Vice-Chairman suggested that the Panel would liaise with the Committee Manager - Democratic Services, in order to canvass views to consider how the Panel wished to scrutinise the OPCC in fulfilling the new duties as a result of the complaints reform.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Panel noted the changes to the police complaints system and would consider how it wished to scrutinise the OPCC in fulfilling the new duties.

Actions/further information to be provided:

R8/20 - The Committee Manager will liaise with Members to consider how they wished to scrutinise the OPCC in fulfilling the new duties as a result of the complaints reform.

11/20 FEEDBACK ON PERFORMANCE MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF CONSTABLE [Item 11]

Witnesses:

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Member highlighted the typographical error on page 45, noting that the changes in police complaints reform would come into effect in spring 2020 - not 2019 as previously scheduled.
2. A Member was disappointed that the Chief Constable did not attend the recent community engagement meeting in Epsom and Ewell Borough Council despite being advertised to do so. In response the Police and Crime Commissioner noted that he was in attendance and

members from the senior leadership team and senior police officers aimed to attend.

RESOLVED:

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

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

12/20 COMMISSIONER’S QUESTION TIME [Item 12]

There were no questions put to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

13/20 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING [Item 13]

Key points raised in the discussion:

- 1. The Complaints Sub-Committee had received one complaint since the last Panel meeting, which would be reviewed within four weeks of receipt and the outcome presented to the Panel at its next meeting.

RESOLVED:

The Police and Crime Panel noted the content of the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

14/20 SURREY PCP BUDGET 2018/19 - ADDENDUM [Item 14]

Witnesses:

Emily Kavanagh, Senior Finance Business Partner (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

- 1. The Vice-Chairman queried the high percentage allocation for Democratic Services Officers supporting the Panel at 90% Full Time Equivalent charge during that year, as support officers looked after a number of other committees. He also queried the high amount of days spent by Legal officers, Accountants and Managers assisting the Panel under the Employee Costs breakdown 2018/19, which was excessive as the Panel met formally five times a year. In response the Senior Finance Business Partner explained that the percentage allocation of time spent supporting the Panel was estimated by the support officers.
- 2. A Member concurred with the Vice-Chairman that the explanations in the budget report and addendum did not satisfy the questions asked by the Panel and wanted more information to be provided on the allocation of support officer time - noting that the Home Office grant was public money.

3. In response to a Member query on where the under spend of the Home Office grant went, the Senior Finance Business Partner assumed that it would be returned to the Home Office but would look into the matter.
4. A Member queried the £120 spent on refreshments between three meetings in 2018 as she recalled only be provided with water. In response the Senior Finance Business Partner explained that the County Hall Catering team had sent those refreshment charges to Finance and she would investigate that expenditure.

RESOLVED:

The Police and Crime Panel noted the additional information provided regarding the Police and Crime Panel expenditure.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. **R9/20** - The Committee Manager will provide Members with an explanation as to how the percentage allocation of time and days spent on assisting the Panel within the Employee Costs breakdown 2018/19 was calculated.
2. **R10/20** - The Senior Finance Business Partner will look into where the remaining unspent grant from the Home Office went.
3. **R11/20** - The Senior Finance Business Partner she would investigate the £120 expenditure in refreshments in 2018 as charged for by the County Hall Catering team.

15/20 REPORT ON INDEPENDENT MEMBERS - RECRUITMENT [Item 15]

Witnesses:

Amelia Christopher, Committee Manager - Democratic Services (SCC)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Vice-Chairman introduced the report and noted that two new Independent Members needed to be recruited, with one to be in place with immediate effect and the other after the 2020 Police and Crime Commissioner elections - pending the outcome of the interviews.
2. A Member asked for more detail on the recruitment process, in response the Vice-Chairman explained that there needed to be a new round of public advertisement. He suggested to Members that they shared the job advert once live to their local borough or district council and local neighbourhood watch for example - the Committee Manager would provide Members with the link to the job advert.
3. In response to a Member query on ensuring that the new job advert was more broadly circulated, the Committee Manager informed the Panel that it was a paid advert and widely circulated on the Council's website, job websites and across the voluntary sector in the county.
4. A Member asked to be reminded of the recruitment process and the Vice-Chairman stated that after sifting the applications a small panel would be formed to interview the selected candidates.

RESOLVED:

The Panel noted the current open recruitment process to appoint two independent co-opted members to the Panel.

Actions/further information to be provided:

R12/20 - The Committee Manager will circulate the job advert to Members once live so they can share it where they saw fit.

16/20 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 16]**Witnesses:**

David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Member suggested that it would be helpful to assign months where possible to the actions on the tracker that had the broad suggested date of completion of 2020.
2. In agreement with the Vice-Chairman the Panel agreed that action R35/19 on Transit Sites and action R44/19 on CCTV be marked as complete, as short updates of those matters was provided by some Members and appended to the actions tracker.
3. In response to the action on Transit Sites, the PCC informed Members that the Government was undertaking an important consultation on unauthorised encampments which would end on 4 March. The focus of the consultation considered whether aggravated trespassing should be made a criminal offence rather than remaining as a civil offence. The PCC thought it should be as long as there was a strict criteria, whilst police nationally urged that it remained as a civil offence.

RESOLVED:

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

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

17/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]

The next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel will be on 20 April 2020, at County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 12.01 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Surrey Police & Crime Commissioner’s Precept Setting Proposal
for the Financial Year 2020/21**

7 February 2020

Updated table of the Tax Base and Collection Fund Surplus/Deficit by district and borough councils – handout provided to the Panel

Authority	Tax Base	Collection Fund Surplus/Deficit	Precept
		£	£
Elmbridge	65,228.00	117,895.00	17,648,739.96
Epsom and Ewell	33,019.91	13,886.10	8,934,197.05
Guildford	57,645.42	-	15,597,121.29
Mole Valley	40,883.00	10,281.00	11,061,713.31
Reigate & Banstead	61,128.80	200,373.00	16,539,619.42
Runnymede	34,099.00	-	9,226,166.43
Spelthorne	40,085.00	81,000.00	10,845,798.45
Surrey Heath	38,525.86	202,500.00	10,423,941.94
Tandridge	38,646.10	(10,886.00)	10,456,475.28
Waverley	55,467.10	126,545.00	15,007,733.25
Woking	41,579.79	31,661.00	11,250,243.78
Total	506,307.98	773,255.10	136,991,750.15

This page is intentionally left blank