

**Police and Crime Commissioner  
Monthly Management Meeting – January**

**14<sup>th</sup> January 2014**

**3 - 5pm**

**Council Chamber, Mole Valley District Council Offices, Dorking**

**Attendees:**

Kevin Hurley (PCC – Police and Crime Commissioner)  
 Jeff Harris (DPCC – Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner)  
 Shiraz Mirza (APCC – Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner)  
 Alison Bolton (Chief Executive (CEX) – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)  
 Ian Perkin (Chief Finance Officer (CFO) – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

Lynne Owens (CC – Chief Constable – Surrey Police)  
 Nick Ephgrave (DCC – Deputy Chief Constable – Surrey Police)  
 Paul Bundy (HoF – Head of Finance – Surrey Police)

Sarah Thomas (Minute Taker – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Subject/Note</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>The PCC introduced the webcast management meeting and explained that it was an opportunity for him to hold the Chief Constable to account as per his statutory duty. Introductions were made.</p>	
<b>Item 1</b>	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p>The PCC reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting and the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cracked/ineffective trials – the DCC expected to be taking chairmanship of the Surrey Criminal Justice Board in the future and would be taking this matter forward at that meeting. He didn't have any statistics to share at present. The CEX said that both the CPS (Crown Prosecution Service) and Courts Service had been invited to a meeting with the PCC and CC in February to discuss this further.</li> <li>• The DCC reported that the Surrey Police website had been updated so that the information on Local Policing Boards was more easily accessible. The process for the PCC's office to be updated after each Board was now working well.</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Item 2</b></p>	<p><b>Surrey Police Progress Against the Six People’s Priorities</b></p> <p>The CC reported that robbery and domestic burglary reports were seeing a reduction year on year. Burglary was down by 131 offences on the same time last year. This was a credit to the DCC and his team. Operation Candlelight had proved very effective in helping to reduce burglary offences.</p> <p>Reports of serious sexual offences had increased. The PCC said that this could be seen as a positive thing as it could mean that people felt more confident in reporting such incidents to the police. The CC said that the arrest rate had increased as the Force was taking a more robust stance in this area.</p> <p>The Force launched Operation Yuletide over the Christmas period looking at violent crime as reports of violent crime tended to increase over the Christmas holiday period. Early figures showed a reduction in reported incidents.</p> <p>The CC acknowledged the recent media reports in relation to police forces manipulating crime figures. She made it clear that Surrey didn’t do this. Surrey used community resolution as per the guidance and offenders no longer received multiple cautions.</p> <p>The DPCC recently chaired the ICV (Independent Custody Visitor) Steering Group where a concern was raised about the increased number of detainees in custody. He asked if the Force could provide him with some information on detainee numbers.</p> <p><b>ACTION: DPCC to be provided with data on the number of detainees brought into custody over the past year and information on what they had been arrested for.</b></p> <p>The DCC spoke about his work into whether the Force was detecting and recording crime with integrity. He explained that he had set up a Board called ‘Strategic Crime, Incident and Risk Recording Group’. The purpose of the group was to scrutinise crime recording and detection practices including looking at the percentage of calls that are translated, how often crime types are reclassified, checking reports for ASB, looking at ‘no crime’ rates and the reason behind them. The DCC was grateful for attendance by the CEX which gave an aspect of independence to the group. He emphasised that he would rather have a detection rate to rely upon than a list of multiple cautions.</p> <p>The DPCC asked what a ‘detection’ was in terms of figures – and whether a community resolution would be included as a detection. The DCC explained that currently, a detection could be recorded in three ways; a charge, a caution or a TIC (Taken into Consideration):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charge – where the police would investigate an offence and present evidence to the CPS. The CPS would assess and inform the police whether they had authority to charge and proceed to court. The vast majority of detections were attained this way.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CC/DCC</b></p>
----------------------	---	----------------------

- Caution – same as a charge but if the offender admitted the offence and it was a first offence the CPS may advise a caution instead of a charge. The PCC asked whether it was always the decision of the CPS to advise a caution. The DCC explained that a majority would go to the CPS but if the offence was low value/low damage – non-violent crime then the police could caution without going to the CPS e.g. a low level theft.
- TICs – where an offender was charged for one offence and although there may be similar offences that they could also be charged these would be considered by the Judge in Court who would decide whether to take the other offences into consideration when hearing the case. There still needed to be evidence and admission of the other offences. The police could close other crimes by doing this and satisfy victims of crime. The offences that this would be used for were, for example, theft from motor vehicle/theft of motor vehicle.

The CC and DCC invested time to make their expectations clear to all officers on this matter. The CC communicated with staff via a blog and had written some strongly worded ones in relation to this subject. The figures would satisfy the PCC that the Force is working with integrity.

The Enforcement Pilot was due to launch on 1<sup>st</sup> April. The CC was considering a proposal for delegation of powers between the Force and the local authorities concerned.

The Force was putting together a problem profile with regard to drugs in schools. The Force took immediate and timely action when it came across these incidents.

The CC gave details of a drug trafficking case – more details of the case can be found in the written report.

The DPCC wanted to know what Surrey was doing about detection rates as the figures were very disappointing. The CC responded by saying that not all of the detection rates were disappointing. Burglary detection was poor, but then she had already explained that these were now being counted differently and multiple cautions were no longer being used by Surrey although they were still in use by other forces. She wasn't defending the figures but reiterated that Surrey wanted to detect via charge/caution/TICs.

The PCC said that it was important that the public were aware of the complexities of investigating a burglary. The CC gave an example of a case.

The DCC explained that he had chaired the Crime and Performance Board since October 2013 and the group had a very strong focus on detections. Without the use of multiple cautions the detection rate had severely reduced. He was looking at a whole range of areas to improve upon which would increase the detection rate.

The PCC brought attention to the crime prevention methods

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>available to the public to record/protect their property e.g. Smartwater/SelectaDNA/Immobilise – details of these could be obtained on the Surrey Police website or from the local neighbourhood teams.</p> <p>A new initiative had been introduced where Surrey Police was sharing unidentified CCTV images with the Metropolitan Police. They had a team of 'super recognisers' who are particularly skilled at putting a face to a name – this was proving successful and one person has been identified after sharing only three images.</p> <p>The CC reported that the Force was on track and likely to exceed the previous year's target in relation to seizure of assets. ACC Cundy was considering how POCA funds could be used for visible street policing, rather than community projects which were better funded through the Community Safety Fund. The PCC again expressed his concern about how the Government automatically received 50% of monies seized, and the CPS and Courts received 16% each. This left only 18% for police which was not right. The PCC in West Yorkshire was currently making a case to the Government to change this.</p> <p>Niche, the CIS replacement computer system had gone live successfully on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and had had some early operational successes. Both Surrey and Sussex had been able to access each other's intelligence systems to make arrests. The next stage was to launch Case and Custody which would be a joint roll out for Surrey and Sussex. The PCC recognised the benefits of Surrey and Sussex being able to look at each other's intelligence. The DPCC formally recorded his appreciation to all those that had been involved in the roll out of Niche. To be able to train 3000 staff in 6 weeks was a huge task and compliments must go to the project team. The CC also formally recorded her thanks to DCC Giles York from Sussex Police who was the SRO and Superintendent David Leeney and his team at Surrey.</p> <p>The PCC was keen to see more Specials and so was the public and asked whether there were any plans in place to recruit more. The CC explained that the Special Constabulary had previously recruited high numbers which had proved wasteful in terms of training and cost of uniform when they were not frequently available for deployment. A review had recently taken place and a new Chief Officer was in post, Chris Chapman. The focus was now on the hours worked; Chris was looking at the Constabulary's ability to provide enough hours to deploy efficiently. The motivation for Specials was different as they were not getting paid to do the role. The CC was confident that both Chris Chapman and Volunteers Manager, Jan Langley, would ensure that the processes in place were efficient and effective.</p> <p>The victim satisfaction rate was good but the CC was concerned about the performance of other criminal justice partners. The CPS currently had a backlog of cases which was not helpful for victims and witnesses. She said that this would be addressed at the meeting that she and the PCC were due to have with the CPS/Courts Service</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>in February.</p> <p>The Force was at the forefront of social media and the Communications Department had recently won two awards for its use of Twitter and its campaign work.</p> <p>The PCC had recently attended two Youth Shout events which had been organised by the Force. The feedback from attendees was very positive and they were very supportive of visible policing and wanting the police to keep them safe. The views of the attendees were contrary to how young people were sometimes portrayed in the media. The PCC asked for his thanks to be passed on to those in the Force who arranged these events.</p> <p>The Force's 'wastage' rate remained at 3% - one reason was officers transferring to other forces. Surrey is not able to use financial incentives for officers to stay. The CC was concerned that all forces across the country offered the same rate of pay although Surrey had a higher cost of living. The PCC shared this concern. It showed that other forces were bearing the benefit of Surrey officers already being trained. Surrey officers should, in his view, get paid more/benefit from living in an expensive area.</p> <p>The DPCC asked what the difference was in Surrey Police Staff pay compared to other parts of the country. The CC explained that most forces, except Surrey and the Metropolitan Police Service, belonged to the Police Staff Council, where pay negotiations took place nationally. Surrey had always opted out of this and had negotiated pay locally. The reason for the strike by staff at the Metropolitan Police was due to the fact that they were unsuccessful in their pay negotiations. Sussex were part of the Police Staff Council so if further collaboration was to take place then Surrey would have to look into a way forward for the future.</p> <p>The PCC said that it was important to recognise that a number of police officers and police staff were out with other rescue services during the floods and missed Christmas with their families. He had already formally expressed his appreciation to the CC.</p> <p>In relation to standards of police driving and collisions, the PCC expressed his concern that officers may feel a sense of pressure to respond to incidents quickly to meet a target. His view was that he wanted them to get there safely and not to put themselves or others at risk. The CC shared the same concern and regularly went out on patrol with response officers.</p> <p>The description of a collision was 'any incident where a vehicle has been damaged'. This was not helpful when trying to understand the issue. The DCC had looked into this and had provided figures in the report that didn't include 'non-responsive' collisions, such as minor parking-related incidents. He went on to explain the figures. Most related to minor incidents and the DCC would continue to monitor. The IPCC were currently investigating two significant incidents relating to police driving.</p>	
--	---	--

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>The DPCC asked whether he could receive some information on how many miles police vehicles had clocked up in the past year and how many incidents this corresponded with. The CC said that this data may be difficult to extract but she would ask a member of staff to look into it.</p>	<p><b>CC/DCC</b></p>
<p><b>Item 3</b></p>	<p><b>Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable People</b></p> <p>The CC presented a brief paper on this subject as the PCC had received a paper at a previous meeting in July 2013. It explained what progress had been made since the previous report and what the Force was doing to train officers and staff in the area of mental health.</p> <p>The Safeguarding Hub (previously known as the Central Referral Unit) had representatives from Surrey Police, Children’s Services and Mental Health teams.</p> <p>Surrey Police continued to progress work with Domestic Abuse Outreach providers and Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVAs).</p> <p>The biggest challenge was the issue of mental health. The CC reiterated that custody was not the correct place for people with mental health issues. She had raised her concern at the Community Safety Board and the Health and Wellbeing Board and was due to meet with the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to discuss the matter further. There was a need for a place of safety 24/7 that wasn’t a police cell, to extend the hours of mental health professionals in custody suites and more training for staff. The PCC shared the CC’s concerns. An appropriate NHS facility needed to be established. APCC Mirza asked whether the local council was involved in supporting the police. The CC explained that she had raised the issue with the lead for Public Health and had received positive comments but there remained a lack of a cohesive, cross agency strategy.</p>	
<p><b>Item 4</b></p>	<p><b>Victims’ Code</b></p> <p>The paper gave information on how Surrey Police was implementing the new Victims’ Code of Practice which had come into effect in December 2013. The Force already had an established Victim Care Board which Assistant PCC Jane Anderson sat on. All officers and staff would be made aware of their obligations under the new code.</p> <p>APCC Mirza again expressed his concern about the issues around mental health and gave his support to the CC.</p> <p>On a separate note, the PCC asked the CC to re-emphasise the dress standards of officers and staff. He knew that she took a strong personal view on this, as did he. He also expressed his appreciation to the CC and all her officers and staff in keeping the public safe.</p> <p>This concluded part one of the meeting and the webcast was concluded.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<b>PART TWO – IN PRIVATE – NOT TO BE PUBLISHED</b>	
	<b>The meeting ended at 16:50</b>	