

Police and Crime Commissioner Monthly Management Meeting – December

12th December 2012

9.15am

PCC's Office

Attendees:

Kevin Hurley (PCC)

Lynne Owens (CC)

Jeff Harris (DPCC)

Craig Denholm (DCC)

Alison Bolton (CE)

Paul Bundy (HoF)

Ian Perkin (Treasurer)

Sarah Thomas (Minute Taker)

Agenda Item	Subject/Note	Action
Item 1	<p>Police and Crime Plan</p> <p>The CE explained that the draft Police and Crime Plan would be presented to the Police and Crime Panel on 6th February, together with the proposed precept. The PCC said that his six promises, which he campaigned on during the elections, would be the basis of the plan. He wanted to include a small number of measurable targets that would enable the panel and the public to ascertain whether the overall strategy was being achieved. The PCC was happy to give the Chief Constable the professional discretion to determine the most appropriate measures in the first instance.</p> <p>The CC suggested that serious acquisitive crime should be one of the measures – this included burglary which was one of the six promises. The PCC agreed but wanted the wording of the measure to mean something to the public – serious acquisitive crime did not mean anything to the public and needed to be broken down and explained under the three main categories - burglary, robbery and vehicle thefts etc.</p> <p>The PCC also explained that he wanted to include a joint measure that included partners, for example, success in dealing with anti-social behaviour. He would be suggesting holding 'Joint Action Days' within all boroughs/districts to focus on joint problems. The CC said that some boroughs already worked together but she urged caution in placing reliance on partners to deliver against targets. The PCC pointed out that this was a Police and Crime Plan and that the intention was that it was broader in its remit than the police alone. The DCC suggested having two sets of targets; one set that was solely police focused and another that was a joint focus with partners. The PCC felt that this would be a good opportunity to increase joint</p>	

	<p>working with partners and do some good in the community and agreed that the two sets of targets could work.</p> <p>A discussion took place around the seizure of assets under the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA). The HoF explained that POCA is currently used to finance the financial investigations but could be used as reinvestment in the future. The PCC felt that the split in assets was unfair and said that he would be discussing this further with the courts/CPS. The DCC said that there was also a problem with the distribution of assets when the case involved the regional teams.</p>	
<p>Item 2</p>	<p>Budget/Precept</p> <p>The HoF tabled a number of reports that explained the current situation regarding the budget. He explained that the reports were built on a 2% precept assumption (as previously indicated by the PCC) and that the plans were subject to the Government funding announcement on 19th December.</p> <p>The CC explained that she and members of the former Police Authority had previously met with Members of Parliament (MPs) for Surrey to explain how the funding formula worked and the negative impact it had on Surrey Police.</p> <p>She said that Surrey would be getting less funding for PCSOs than other forces because the Neighbourhood Policing Fund was to be amalgamated into the funding formula. She explained that ACC Kirkby was looking at the model for Neighbourhood Policing within the Force and would be able to present a full report in January 2013. There was currently work on-going, being led by ACO Davies, to look at the workforce mix of the Force. The PCC agreed that the balance needed to be redressed and was fully supportive of the CC's plans.</p> <p>The CC said that SIREN savings had been taken out of the savings plan as it would not deliver the savings as previously anticipated.</p> <p>The HoF explained that as part of the collaboration work with Sussex, there was an opportunity to reduce officer numbers by a small number. He suggested that rather than take these savings and lose the posts, the equivalent number of officers could be kept within the business and used as detective posts. The resulting shortfall could be recovered by using the general reserves. The CC said that general reserves had been set at an over-cautious level in previous years and it would be a good opportunity to improve the workforce mix and reduce the general reserve. The reserve could be used for the next two years but would be recoverable again in 2015. The PCC agreed to this proposal having sought the Treasurer's view.</p> <p>ACTION: CC to bring back proposals detailing options for the allocation of the 16 officers.</p>	<p>CC</p>

	<p>The HoF said that the Force would wait to hear the Government's announcement on funding before making the final decision on the reserve.</p> <p>The Treasurer suggested that the precept assumption for future years should be reduced to 2%. The current estimate of 2.5% was unrealistic in the long term. The HoF said that he would amend to 2%.</p>	
Item 3	<p>Financial Regulations, Contract Standing Orders, Scheme of Consent</p> <p>The CC explained that there was a difference between the levels of consent for the Surrey and Sussex Chief Constables within financial regulations and the scheme of consent, with Sussex's Chief Constable having greater flexibility. The CC felt that Surrey should be brought in line with Sussex as the two forces were now working together in the area of procurement.</p> <p>The PCC questioned what level was reasonable for public control. The Treasurer explained that the current level had been a starting point and reflected the views of the previous Police Authority, but that giving greater flexibility to the Chief Constable would mean less bureaucracy.</p> <p>ACTION: Treasurer and HoF to meet with Sussex counterparts to finalise financial documents and agree appropriate levels of consent.</p>	Minute Taker
Item 4	<p>Collaboration</p> <p>The CC explained that she had received a report the previous day which set out proposals for future collaboration with Sussex Police. The report concluded that both forces were in the same place with regards to collaboration and had recommended that both Chief Constables worked with their PCCs to set an ambition for this work. She said that she was meeting with the CC of Sussex tomorrow to talk through the report and future plans.</p> <p>The PCC was due to meet the Sussex PCC in January and they would be discussing collaboration. One of the areas he was keen to progress was potential for collaboration around custody suites. The CC said that there was a lot of work to be done in this area but it was being looked at.</p> <p>The PCC asked whether more collaboration with Hampshire was possible for the future. The DCC said that the Force currently had a good working relationship with Hampshire and would be happy to collaborate with them. However, it was agreed that Sussex was the preferred partner as Surrey was already collaborating in a number of areas with them and Hampshire</p>	

	had strong ties to Thames Valley and the County Council.	
Item 5	<p>New Year Engagement Events</p> <p>The PCC explained his plans for his New Year Engagement event. Three dates had been set in the first few weeks of January where he would address the public with a 'State of the Nation' talk and then open the floor for a question and answer session. He had invited the Chief Constable to attend the events to be on hand to answer any operational questions. These events would allow him to test his priorities for the Police & Crime Plan and fulfil his responsibilities around consultation.</p> <p>The PCC also explained that, looking to the future, he would be holding a monthly 'summit' meeting in a different borough each month. The PCC said that he wanted to involve the Chief Executive and Leader from each borough/district council. In addition, he wanted to hold monthly meetings in each borough where the relevant neighbourhood inspector and local officers as well as other local authority staff and members.</p> <p>The CC pointed out that there was already a neighbourhood panel structure in place. She saw value in the additional panels if they were made up of partners and the PCC expressed his intention for that to be the case. The CC suggested that the Partnership Policy Officer, Sarah Haywood, draw up the proposals in more detail and then bring back to a further Management Meeting to be agreed. The PCC said that he had meetings arranged with all Chief Executives and Leaders and would make them aware of his plans. It was important that they understood what the problems were in their communities and that he held them to account.</p> <p>ACTION: Sarah Haywood to meet with PCC to discuss plans for engagement with Chief Executives and Leaders</p>	Minute Taker
Item 6	<p>Ways of Working</p> <p>The CC expressed her concern over the increased level of requests for information from the Office of the PCC (OPCC) to her officers/staff. She suggested that a single point of contact (SPOC) be appointed that the OPCC could use within the force to make any requests.</p> <p>The CE agreed that it was sensible to use a SPOC for commissioning pieces of work. However, there was also a need to ensure that information could be obtained in a timely way, particularly when a response was needed for a member of the public.</p> <p>The PCC agreed that the new SPOC arrangement would be trialled and that the CE meet with the DCC to discuss the practicalities.</p>	

	<p>A discussion took place regarding who best to answer letters from MPs in the future. The PCC pointed out that, whilst many would still refer to operational matters, it was now his role to respond to MPs on letters holding the Force to account.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The meeting ended at 11.15am</p>	<p>CE/DCC</p>
--	---	----------------------