

## **Police and Crime Commissioner Webcast Management Meeting – September**

**18<sup>th</sup> September 2013**

**11am**

**Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston**

### **Attendees:**

Kevin Hurley (PCC – Police and Crime Commissioner)  
Shiraz Mirza (APCC – Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner)  
Alison Bolton (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)  
David Mason (Chief Inspector – Surrey Police)

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

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Subject/Note</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. He thanked Surrey County Council for hosting the meeting.</p>
<b>Item 1</b>	<p><b>Surrey Police Progress Against the Six People’s Priorities</b></p> <p>The Chief Constable (CC) explained that the papers she would refer to throughout the meeting were available to view on the PCC’s website. The papers gave a detailed briefing of all agenda items.</p> <p>The CC reported that there had been an increase in the level of ‘violence with injury’ in comparison to last year. The PCC asked for clarification on what was recorded under this category. The CC explained that it was anything from a slap on the face to a stabbing. The Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) explained that there had been a recent change in the Home Office counting rules – the incidents that the public may regard as minor had been pushed up to a more serious category – it was therefore difficult to compare statistics to the previous year. The Force was using a number of measures to combat violent crime and these were explained in more detail in the report.</p> <p>There had been a small percentage increase in domestic burglary. Although this was a pattern that was also repeated in surrounding forces it was still of concern. The DCC explained that burglaries tended to rise in the autumn and the force was working on an initiative to address this. He hoped to report on an improving position at the next meeting. The PCC asked what the breakdown of</p>

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

robbery type was. The CC said that Surrey did not suffer from significant commercial robbery but more personal theft i.e. mobile phones.

The CC wanted to emphasise that the Force was doing a lot of work in relation to detections. From August 2012 the Force had been counting detections differently and the PCC should be able to see year on year data from the end of September 2013. The 'Taking Into Consideration' (TIC) team had been focusing on offenders who had been arrested or charged for serious acquisitive crime (household and personal crime where items are taken) to obtain secondary detections through TIC. Since March 2013 the team had obtained 117 TICs of which 50 were for burglary dwelling offences. The PCC highlighted that this was a good result especially for the victims of those 50 burglaries.

It was noted that funding for drug referral testing in custody was suspended on 20<sup>th</sup> June due to funding issues for the Drug Intervention Programme (DIP). The Chief Constable said that she would appreciate the support of the PCC in determining future funding so that the testing can resume as soon as possible. The PCC reported that he had recently met with the Director of Public Health for the county and this was one of the issues that had been discussed.

The PCC noted the Force's efforts in tackling the issue of drugs in schools. It had been raised with him as a concern by a number of parents and the work that the Force was doing to tackle the problem was ground breaking. This was an excellent direct response to one of the People's Priorities.

The report contained a financial performance summary in relation to the seizure of assets and some highlights of specific incidents that had resulted in confiscation orders and cash forfeitures. The PCC recognised that the Force was doing a lot of work in this area and was pleased with the results so far.

The CC reported that the Force's review of the Special Constabulary had gone live on 1<sup>st</sup> August. Specials were a valuable resource and recruitment had reopened. The PCC welcomed those watching the webcast to apply to become a Special.

The Force had received excellent feedback following the HMIC (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary) report on policing in austerity. The CC was pleased that the Force had been acknowledged nationally for their work in this area.

The PCC noted the examples of good work in the report.

The PCC asked what the position was on defibrillators. The CC said that some police vehicles contained defibrillators but not all of them. The Force was currently looking at plans to extend them to all vehicles – if they could then they would. Three hours training per officer was required so the logistics of this were being looked at. The PCC supported this approach.

The CC was delighted with the recent results of victim satisfaction. The PCC was pleased with the increase in BME satisfaction. He thanked his Assistant PCC Shiraz Mirza and Sergeant Nolan Heather for their work in improving relationships with taxi drivers in Woking.

The PCC raised a concern about the way some victims of crime were treated in court. He would be raising this issue with partner agencies to ensure that

victims were treated better. The CC welcomed the PCC's support in regard to this matter. The DCC had already raised the problem with the CPS including the frustrations that officers had with CPS timelines. The PCC stated that he had expressed an interest in becoming a 'Super PCC' which would involve greater oversight of the CPS and courts. This project was still in its early stages though.

The CC explained that Local Policing Boards had been set up in all eleven boroughs and districts. Some had been more popular than others. The Force would be reviewing them and would then bring some proposals to the PCC on how to take them forward. The PCC welcomed the use of social media to engage with the public via online police panel meetings. He was keen to see the outcome of the boards and the issues that were being raised by the public – it was important that he was aware of public concerns.

The recent Staff Survey had received its highest response which was positive but had resulted in a number of negative indicators. This wasn't a surprise and the issues would be picked up by senior management. The PCC was equally concerned about this. He wanted those watching to note the unsatisfactory pay that a new police constable received - circa £1400 per month for working a 7 day shift pattern.

The CC updated the PCC on the Police Staff Pay Negotiations – Unison members had rejected the offer of a 1% pay increase – the Force was currently engaging with Unison on next steps. The PCC was sympathetic to the rejection but emphasised that the Force could not afford a larger increase. He was also mindful of the officer turnover rate noting that the Metropolitan Police Service was an attractive move due to the increase in pay. He said that the officers he had into contact with were all enthusiastic and highly motivated which was a credit to the leadership team.

There had been a small increase in the number of complaint cases recorded in the early part of 2013. There was a significant increase in the number of allegations recorded but it was noted that one complaint could contain multiple allegations. The DCC was leading a piece of work, along with the head of the Professional Standards Department, to change the Force's approach to complaints. The main objective was to be fair and to be seen to be fair and to encourage more people to report wrong doing.

From September 2013 all officers (up to and including the rank of Chief Constable) would have to take a mandatory fitness test. The report contained more information on this.

The CC reported that she had received a number of letters of thanks, two of which included a donation to the Chief Constable's nominated charity.

The PCC asked the CC to explain in more detail about powers designated to PCSOs and whether all PCSOs were able to use all the powers that could be designated to them. The CC explained that she designated a wide selection of powers to PCSOs – indeed they used more than the standard set required for their role. Local authorities were also able to designate powers but she was concerned that if this was allowed then her officers would pick up responsibilities that should come under the local authority. She suggested that Councils should be giving powers to their own officers. T/ACC Gavin Stephens was currently involved in a piece of work that was looking at what powers

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>Councils currently gave to their staff. The PCC welcomed the comprehensive report and would look forward to an update on T/ACC Stephens' findings.</p> <p>Assistant PCC Shiraz Mirza suggested that the agenda for the management meeting needed to include a 'Matters Arising' and 'AOB' so that items discussed at the previous meeting or matters not on the agenda could be discussed.</p> <p>He reported that he had recently gone out on patrol with officers from Guildford and Runnymede and wanted to know whether the CC supported him going out and visiting officers. This was a concern that he had previously raised with the CC and was waiting for an update.</p> <p>The CC said that she had been in contact with the PCC's office about this. She had a concern that officers would confuse who was operationally responsible for the Force if the PCC, Deputy PCC and Assistant PCCs visited them and asked them to report any issues and concerns that they had. She was happy for visits to take place from a learning aspect but not for the PCC's office to deal with any issues directly as these should be dealt with by her and her leadership team.</p>
<p><b>Item 2</b></p>	<p><b>Financial Monitoring</b></p> <p>The CC referred to the written report which contained detail about the Force's current financial position. It was noted that there was a current over spend of £66k. However, this wasn't unusual for so early in the financial year and would balance at the end of the year.</p> <p>The Head of Finance (HoF) gave a brief summary of the revenue and capital budget. The PCC noted that the income and expenditure indicated that both the Response and Investigation Strand were over budget. He asked whether this was unusual or whether any money needed to be moved into their budgets. The HoF explained that this was a transitional issue – it would be worked through at the regular finance board meeting and necessary adjustments would be made.</p>
<p><b>Item 3</b></p>	<p><b>Estate Strategy Review</b></p> <p>The CC presented the report which gave an update on the on-going estate strategy reviews. She reported that Jacobs had been appointed as the external consultants to carry out the review of the disposal of police stations and also the development potential of the headquarters site in Guildford and Woking Police Station. The Chief Executive reported that she had received a report from Jacobs on their proposals but this was yet to be seen by the PCC.</p> <p>The PCC asked whether the report gave assurance that more capital could be generated from the sales of the remaining police stations. The CE said that this appeared to be the indication but that the PCC needed to see the report and make a formal decision about the sale of the remaining stations.</p>
<p><b>Item 4</b></p>	<p><b>ICT Strategy</b></p> <p>The CC explained that the report contained an interim update as the Force was waiting for a report from Accenture on their proposals of the future structure of ICT/HR and Finance. The PCCs from both Surrey and Sussex would be</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>updated on their proposals at a joint meeting taking place on 7<sup>th</sup> October. The report also contained detail on the sustainability of current IT systems.</p>
<p><b>Item 5</b></p>	<p><b>Health and Safety</b></p> <p>The DCC was the lead for Health and Safety in the Force. He was currently doing a piece of work into officers injured on duty. It was noted that there had been three significant injuries sustained by officers in the last 18 months which was very unusual as a majority of injuries were minor bruises, grazes, reddening of the skin etc.</p> <p>The PCC asked whether the CC and DCC thought that officers on patrol had adequate defensive equipment, for example, Tasers. The CC said that Surrey had a higher percentage of Tasers than a number of other forces and her current view was that this was enough. However, the DCC was carrying out a threat and risk assessment in this area. The PCC said he was most supportive of as many officers as possible being equipped with Tasers.</p>
<p><b>Item 6</b></p>	<p><b>Mental Health</b></p> <p>The CC was pleased to receive the request from the PCC to report on mental health as this was a significant concern for the Force. She explained that an additional report would be presented to the PCC in Part Two of the meeting which outlined the timeline of a typical case involving an individual with mental health issues and the involvement of Surrey officers. It was inappropriate to present this aspect of the report in the public part of the meeting as the detail could potentially reveal the identity of the individual concerned. The Force currently had a good relationship with Surrey Borders NHS Trust at a strategic level but the county lacked facilities for children and there were not enough beds for adults. Police custody was not an appropriate place for mental health patients – consequently the police were bearing the risk for other agencies.</p> <p>The PCC shared the CC's concerns. There was a lack of secure accommodation for mental health patients and it should not be the responsibility for police officers to look after patients. He had raised his concerns with a junior health minister who lived in the local area. Ultimately the Government needed to do more. The CC emphasised that the issue was not just about guardianship, it was also about the time taken by officers to look after the patient until they were able to find a suitable hospital for them.</p>
<p><b>Item 7</b></p>	<p><b>Scrutiny of Out of Court Disposals</b></p> <p>The CC presented the report which explained in detail about out of court disposals. The Force was currently involved in the establishment of a panel which would scrutinise out of court disposals to ensure that they were being carried out effectively. She congratulated Superintendent Alison Barlow who was leading this piece of work.</p> <p>The PCC thanked the CC and her officers for their good work. He noted that burglary remained a concern but welcomed the work being carried out by the Force. He was also pleased that the DCC was reviewing the risk assessment around officer safety.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	Part One of the meeting concluded
--	-----------------------------------