

**Police and Crime Commissioner  
Management Meeting – November**

**20<sup>th</sup> November 2014**

**2pm**

**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)  
 Johanna Burne (Chief Executive – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)  
 Ian Perkin (Treasurer – 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)  
 Ben Rowntree (CIO - Chief Information Officer – Surrey and Sussex Police)

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

Agenda Item	Subject/Note	Action
<p><b>Item 1</b></p>	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were accepted as a true and accurate record. The actions from the last meeting were updated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian Gold – the DCC explained that the Force was continuing the same approach towards Asian gold theft as had been reported at a Management Meeting earlier this year. He again reiterated that it was difficult to say whether a property had been targeted specifically for Asian gold. The borough of Reigate and Banstead had suffered the most incidents but they were largely spread all over the county. APCC Mirza said that many Asian electronic and print media outlets had been in contact with him as they would like to reach out to victims of Asian gold burglaries in the Woking area.</li> <li>• Offender address information – the DCC explained that research had been conducted and there was a 50/50 split between offenders that live within Surrey and those that live outside. Those that live outside were mainly coming from just over the border in Sussex, Hampshire and London.  <b>ACTION: DCC to share the detailed report with DPCC</b></li> <li>• Officers/staff suffering human bites – the DCC explained that for the year to date (as at September 2014) there had been ten incidents of officers being bitten whilst on duty. Seven offenders had been charged, two were awaiting CPS decision and one</li> </ul>	<p><b>DCC</b></p>

RESTRICTED

	<p>was not charged due to mental health issues – it would not have been in the public interest to proceed with charges. Of the seven that were charged they were either fined, given a community order or given a suspended sentence. The DPCC said that these sentences were not acceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSE Report – Due to the sensitivity of this matter it wasn't appropriate to discuss it in Part One of the meeting so it would be discussed in more detail in Part Two. The CC did give reassurance that the Force was doing all it could to protect children against CSE but, as with other areas in the country, there is more that could be done which is subject to review.</li> <li>• ICT Disaster Recovery – this item would be discussed in Part Two due to the sensitive nature of the information.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Item 2</b></p>	<p><b>Surrey Police Progress Against the Six People's Priorities (Standing Item)</b></p> <p>The CC reported that the Force had recently received the HMIC Crime Data Inspection report which had contained positive feedback. The HMIC had found no evidence of corrupt practice or dubious performance targets being used by the Force. There was one area of work where the Force did need to improve and that was the recording of secondary crimes e.g. if an officer responded to an allegation of domestic violence and the victim disclosed a previous incident that hadn't already been reported then it would need to be recorded as a secondary incident. This did happen in some cases but not all so the CC said it was currently being addressed.</p> <p>The PCC explained that the report praised the Chief Constable and her senior team for ensuring the highest standards in integrity. The report also made reference to the need for training for crime recording staff. He made the point that the lack of Government funding made it hard for the Force to maintain levels of training.</p> <p>The CC reported that there had been a reduction in burglary. The PCC remarked that the 21% reduction was fantastic and was spot on with meeting the People's Priorities. The CC agreed and acknowledged the hard work of the DCC and his team for this achievement.</p> <p>There had been an increase in incidents of violent crime but this was partly due to the changes in recording practices. The increase in serious sexual offences had also increased and along with violence with injury offences approximately half of these cases combined were reports of domestic abuse.</p> <p>The DCC explained that the Force had looked at a number of problem profiles over the summer months with regard to violent crime including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Licensed premises/town centres – the level of violence with injury had not significantly increased from the previous year. The Force was good at looking at problems and mitigating them early</li> <li>- There had been an increase of incidents in residential areas. These were sporadic and difficult to predict. The increase may</li> </ul>	

RESTRICTED

	<p>be partly due to a person's propensity to report an incident where they might not have done previously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yuletide campaign/Operation Nightguard – these campaigns would be maintained. Currently they did not address residential areas but this would be addressed.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION: To include figures as well as percentages for detection rates</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: To check what resources the CPS has to investigate rape cases compared to that of 5-10 years ago</b></p> <p>It was difficult to attract staff to work in the teams that dealt with serious sexual offences and domestic abuse – senior management would have to post people into the vacant roles if there wasn't enough interest. The reasons for not wanting to work in these areas were the challenges in dealing with these disturbing incidents and also the fear of handling the risk especially when the Force was scrutinised in these areas.</p> <p>The CC gave some examples of some good work relating to drug offences. The examples gave a broad cross section of the variety of teams involved in dealing with incidents that affected local communities e.g. Safer Neighbourhood Teams, Covert Operations and the South East Regional Organised Crime Unit. It was noted that there had been a 400% increase in drug seizures.</p> <p>With regards to the Proceeds of Crime Act the Force was on track to achieve seizures of £1million by the end of the financial year. A portion of the funds previously seized had been given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Road Policing Unit for extra patrols for accident prevention and enforcement activity in the lead up to Christmas</li> <li>- Divisions - to deal with the increase of violent crime incidents</li> </ul> <p>The performance around the non-emergency 101 number was an area of concern. Work was currently in progress in conjunction with Sussex Police to address the issues. The increased use of Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs) should reduce calls into the Contact Centre. Calls handlers were also being trained to be multi-skilled. Engagement via digital services was also likely to reduce calls.</p> <p><b>ACTION: DCC to share detailed briefing note outside the meeting</b></p> <p>The September performance figures didn't paint an accurate picture as the results had been distorted by one telephone number calling the 101 number several thousand times in error. The PCC said that the 101 number was the shop window of the organisation and that it needed the Force's focus but he was aware that work was in progress to tackle the current issues.</p> <p>It had been reported to the DPCC that there was some inconsistency across the Force when engaging with local Neighbourhood Watch (NHW) groups. The CC said she would be happy to feedback this point but she also said that there was a question of balance – it was not possible for officers to attend all NHW meetings. A number of PCSOs had been replaced by PCs and their workloads were very different.</p>	<p>DCC</p> <p>DCC</p> <p>DCC</p>
--	---	----------------------------------

RESTRICTED

	<p>The CC expressed her concern over the employee turnover rates (wastage). Unplanned wastage for police officers had increased from 3.2% in August to 3.3% in September which was the equivalent to 62 officers over a 12 month rolling period. As well as transferring to other forces some were now leaving to take alternative employment. The PCC also expressed his concern. A lot of money was invested in officer training and it was a shame to lose any especially to alternative employment. The DPCC questioned whether there was a problem with recruiting people. The CC said that recruiting officers wasn't a problem and HR was currently looking into the issue. There was a similar pattern of high turnover for police staff.</p> <p>The DPCC reported that the number of OPCC complaints had doubled in the last month. He said he would discuss this with the DCC outside the meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION: DPCC and DCC to discuss the rise in OPCC complaints</b></p> <p>The DCC explained that the Force had previously had a backlog of complaints which had been unacceptable as a delay in dealing with a complaint could in turn exacerbate a complainant's view of the Force. An investment in the Professional Standards Department had addressed the issues and there was no longer a backlog.</p> <p>The PCC asked how the Force was progressing in increasing its number of Special Constables and other volunteers. The CC explained that Sussex Police was currently doing a piece of work in this area. She said that people join as a Special for one of two reasons; 1 – in addition to their day job or 2 – to gain experience in order to join as a regular officer. The desire would be to have an increase in career Specials rather than short term ones as the cost of training was expensive.</p> <p>The PCC thanked the CC for the detailed report.</p>	<p>DPCC/ DCC</p>
<p><b>Item 3</b></p>	<p><b>Update on Collaboration</b></p> <p>The CC gave a verbal update on the progress of collaboration with Sussex Police. A number of areas that the Forces already collaborated on were forensics, firearms, major crime, fleet, procurement and insurance services. The next areas to look at would be HR, ICT and Finance. Surrey and Sussex both had different divisional models and different budgets. The focus was now on the back office rather than front facing departments and any proposed plans would be fed back to both the Surrey and Sussex PCC at the regular Collaboration Governance Board.</p> <p>The DPCC said that the emphasis was on the savings target that Surrey could achieve. Sussex had a larger savings gap to meet which could impact on collaboration opportunities. The CC agreed that Sussex's projected budget gap was larger than Surrey's over the same period. The PCC touched on his proposal to hold a referendum to increase the policing portion of council tax. If he was successful then he would ensure that Surrey council tax paid for policing in Surrey and not Sussex.</p>	

RESTRICTED

<b>Item 4</b>	<b>Financial Report – Month 5 – 2014/15</b>  The Head of Finance presented the report which gave an update on the financial position at month 5, August 2014. There was currently a £2.7m underspend within the budget due to three main factors; the freezing of recruitment for specific posts due to the future funding reductions in 2016/17, change projects delivering ahead of schedule and planned expenditure not required. One of the options was to use the underspend on the police staff pension scheme but this needed more work and discussion amongst Chief Officers.	
<b>Item 5</b>	<b>AOB</b>  Fatal RTCs – the DPCC said that it had been brought to his attention that the number of fatal RTCs in the county had doubled in the last year. He was concerned about this significant increase. He was going to raise it with Surrey County Council and ACC Gavin Stephens outside the meeting.	
	<b>PART TWO – IN PRIVATE – NOT TO BE PUBLISHED</b>	