

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

18th November 2013

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 – Equality and Diversity)
 Alison Bolton (CEX - 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)

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

| Agenda Item | Subject/Note | Action |
|--------------------|---|---------------|
| | <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> | |
| Item 1 | <p>MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>None</p> | |
| Item 2 | <p>SURREY POLICE PROGRESS AGAINST THE SIX PEOPLE’S PRIORITIES</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 overall reduction in crime in most areas which she was very proud of especially as this didn’t appear to be replicated across the country. There had been a significant reduction in burglary offences following the recent Force initiative, Operation Candlelight.</p> <p>There had been an increase in the number of reports of serious sexual offences however this was seen as a positive sign as it suggested that victims were more confident about reporting incidents.</p> <p>There had also been an increase in reports of violent crime with injury –</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|------------|
| | <p>indications suggested that this was due to the increase in reports of domestic abuse and also a change in the Home Office Counting Rules relating to the classification of such incidents.</p> <p>The PCC was very pleased about the reduction in burglary and welcomed the increased reporting of sexual offences – it was a sign of improved confidence in the police. The CC emphasised that she was not complacent about burglary.</p> <p>The CC reported that the detection rate was still an area that the Force needed to improve on - the Crime and Performance Board was addressing the issues.</p> <p>The DCC explained that there had been a slight increase in the burglary detection rate – due to an increase in primary detection (those caught at the time of the offence or following fingerprint retrieval) and also TICs (offences Taken Into Consideration). This was an encouraging sign but there was still work to do.</p> <p>The PCC asked what was being done to address the issue of drugs in schools. The CC explained that the DCC sat on the Children and Young People Partnership Board as outlined at the last meeting it appeared there was an intelligence gap between what the Commissioner was being told and what was reported to Surrey Police. As such, he had made a request for the other agencies represented to provide information about this issue – he would be able to report back at a further meeting.</p> <p>The PCC asked what systems were in place to ensure that crimes were being recorded properly. The DCC explained that the Force Crime Registrar checked compliance for various crime types and reported to him on a monthly basis. The reports gave the DCC confidence that the system was robust and he scrutinised them with the other senior leaders.</p> <p>The CC encouraged members of the public to read the report as there were also many examples of good work.</p> <p>The CC reported on the Force’s progress on the seizure of assets (the written report gave specific details). The PCC asked whether there had been any changes in the approach of dealing with seizures. The CC said that frontline officers and staff had received more training and the Force would also be working more with partners as part of the Enforcement Pilot. A portion of the Community Safety Fund had been ring fenced for the Enforcement Pilot and part of this would be used for training.</p> <p>The CC commended Chris Chapman, Chief Officer of the Special Constabulary for his role in leading the Special Constabulary following its review earlier this year. There were now 191 fully operational Specials in Surrey with three intakes planned for each year going forward. The PCC welcomed this good news. He asked what the current attrition rate was. The CC explained that this was being addressed as there was a risk of losing Specials to the Metropolitan Police as they were currently recruiting and offered free travel which Surrey wasn’t able to offer. The PCC said that he had been in recent discussions with British Transport Police with an aim to get free travel on South West Trains for Surrey Specials as well as Surrey regular</p> | <p>DCC</p> |
|--|---|------------|

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| | <p>officers.</p> <p>The CC reported on call handling and response times. The Force was in a strong performance position in relation to these areas. Equally victim satisfaction performance remained strong including in relation to people from Black Minority Ethnic Communities. Being a small force, the number of BME victims was low and individual cases could therefore be assessed and any issues addressed.</p> <p>The CC raised concerns about the criminal justice arena and the way that victims and witnesses were treated, a view that the PCC shared. She expressed her appreciation to Assistant PCC Jane Anderson for her support and feedback on looking at the processes that were currently in place. The DCC said that he took a personal interest in this area and was looking into the performance around effective, cracked and ineffective trials. The PCC suggested that the CPS' performance indicators were driving perverse processes. He had offered his office to be a pilot site for a 'Super PCC' which would drive cohesive working with the CPS and Courts Service.</p> <p>The Deputy PCC asked whether this piece of work would include hours spent by officers at cracked/ineffective trials. The DCC said he should be able to include that.</p> <p>The CC reported that the Force had been trialling different ways of delivering the Local Policing Boards. The Boards that had been done via social media e.g. Facebook were proving to be more popular than attending an actual meeting. She would bring a full report to the PCC in due course. The PCC was aware that Inspector Craig Knight (Epsom and Ewell) regularly used Facebook for his meetings and got over 1000 participants. He said it was important that the Inspectors captured the important issues and made him aware so that he could provide feedback to his colleagues in the Borough and District Councils.</p> <p>The DCC said that he had looked at the Surrey Police website and had had difficulty finding the dates for the Boards. Advertising needed to improve and he had asked that dates be included on the front of each borough main page. The headlines from each Board would be collated and sent to the PCC's office.</p> <p>The recent staff survey had raised issues around pay and conditions, compulsory severance and staff redundancies – the Chief Officer Group was keen to address the areas where results were showing a decline. The PCC said that he favoured redeployment over redundancy – he didn't want to lose people. He wanted to be confident that everything was being done to support those who were committed to the organisation.</p> <p>The CC spoke about officer turnover rates and planned and unplanned wastage. Unplanned wastage had increased and it was suggested that this could partly be due to officers transferring to the Metropolitan Police. Surrey was an expensive place to live and the Metropolitan Police offered additional financial rewards to their officers that Surrey could not. This was an area of great concern to the PCC. He said that he had breached national recommendations in order to pay a starting salary to officers of £2000 more than the national rate but pay and conditions had been cut recently so it was no surprise that the Force was facing challenges around retaining officers.</p> | <p>DCC</p> <p>DCC</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|

| | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | <p>The final part of the report related to standards. A list was enclosed which gave details about officers and staff who had been subject to misconduct hearings.</p> <p>The CC also reported on a recent death in custody which was currently being investigated by the IPCC (Independent Police Complaints Commission). She couldn't comment any further at this stage. The PCC hoped that the IPCC would report on their findings ASAP.</p> <p>The IPCC was currently investigating two collisions involving police vehicles. The DPCC asked how long they had been with the IPCC for. The CC estimated that one was submitted a year ago and the other nine months ago. The PCC said it was completely unacceptable for the IPCC to be taking so long and he would be raising this matter with them.</p> <p>The PCC was pleased with the move back to the geographic model and that Chief Superintendents and Superintendents were back out on division. The CC reported that the moves had been very well received.</p> <p>APCC Mirza asked for more information to be included in future reports about officers injured on duty. The PCC agreed that it was useful information especially to remind the public of what officers endure – their commitment is often forgotten. He was also keen that officers had the necessary defence equipment e.g. tasers.</p> <p>OPCC confirmed he already received this data and would share it with others in the office.</p> | <p>PCC</p> <p>CC</p> |
| <p>Item 3</p> | <p>PARTNERSHIP WORKING</p> <p>The CC explained that a detailed report had been given at the previous Management Meeting so this report was just an update.</p> <p>As discussed at the previous meeting the PCC noted the inadequacy of mental health provision in the county. The under-investment in secure accommodation for those with mental health problems resulted in a significant amount of police time being taken up with looking after patients. This was unsuitable for officers and was also distressing for mental health patients.</p> <p>The CC reported on the progress of the joint enforcement pilot – the Force was working with the PCC's office to decide next steps. The PCC explained that there was scope for the CC to designate powers to the council and vice versa. He saw this as crucial to the success of the enforcement pilot. The CC noted this point, but emphasised that she didn't want police officers to become solely responsible for all enforcement that currently sat with local authorities.</p> <p>Police/Fire and Ambulance Chiefs had recently met to talk about the emergency services collaboration in Surrey. Their shared vision now had to be signed off by politicians before they could start planning the future. The PCC said that this tied in well with on-going collaboration work with Sussex.</p> <p>The DPCC asked whether the changes to Neighbourhood Policing would impact on Neighbourhood Watch. The CC said that different</p> | |

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| | <p>areas currently had different levels of support but changes may be made to bring them all in line. The local teams would provide a good level of service but she wasn't in a position to commit her staff to writing Neighbourhood Watch newsletters.</p> <p>The PCC would like to discuss the merits of getting Speedwatch volunteers to issue FPNs (Fixed Penalty Notices) to motorists driving with excess speed. The CC explained that the College of Policing was looking at proposals to make better use of volunteers and may be able to consider this.</p> | |
| Item 4 | <p>MEETING THE STRATEGIC POLICING REQUIREMENT (SPR)</p> <p>The CC explained that a detailed briefing had been given at the last Management Meeting and this report was just an update. She explained that collaboration between Surrey and Sussex meant that lead responsibilities were split between both forces with Sussex having lead responsibility for public order and civil emergencies and Surrey having lead responsibility for organised crime and cyber-crime and terrorism was covered regionally. She went on to report on force capacity and arrangements under each area.</p> <p>The PCC found the update very helpful especially for those watching who weren't previously aware that police forces had national responsibilities as well as local. The report helped him discharge his responsibility to ensure the Force had due regard to the SPR.</p> | |
| Item 5 | <p>TREASURY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>It was a statutory requirement that the PCC showed that he was compliant with the CIPFA Code of Practice in relation to treasury management.</p> <p>The Treasurer gave a brief overview of the content of the paper which included a mid-year report, performance regarding the prudential code indicators and an update on the Icelandic Banks.</p> | |
| Item 6 | <p>SURREY POLICE MANAGEMENT OF CUSTODY CLOSURES</p> <p>The CC explained that the report had been prepared following a concern raised by the Deputy PCC about the closure of custody suites. The report didn't provide all of the answers that the CC had been expecting and she would be discussing the matter further with her Chief Officer colleagues at a meeting tomorrow (19th November). She wanted to know specifically why staff hadn't been available at the weekend in questions, the escalation of decision making and also the statement about Woking being 'mothballed'. She said that she would be able to give an update following the meeting but had already asked for a piece of work to be done to forecast staff availability and to put in place a new escalation in the decision making process.</p> | |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| Item 7 | AOB None | |
| | PART 2 – IN PRIVATE – NOT TO BE PUBLISHED ON WEBSITE | |