

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

12<sup>th</sup> May 2014

3 - 4pm

Donaldson Room, Surrey Police HQ

**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)
- Damian Markland (Senior Policy Officer – 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																								
Item 1	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p>The notes from the previous meeting were accepted as a true and accurate record. It was noted that all previous actions had been completed.</p>																									
Item 2	<p><b>Surrey Police Progress Against the People’s Priorities</b></p> <p>The PCC noted that all papers relating to this meeting were published on his website.</p> <p>The PCC congratulated the Chief Constable and the Force on a truly outstanding report. He highlighted the reduction in serious acquisitive crime and the increase in reports of sexual offences – this showed that victims were more confident in reporting such incidents. He also praised the increase in detection rates. The following table gives a breakdown of the figures:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="387 1749 1254 2020"> <thead> <tr> <th>Detection Rates</th> <th>End FY 13/14</th> <th>FYtD 14/15</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Serious acquisitive</b></td> <td>9.6%</td> <td>17.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robbery</td> <td>23.9%</td> <td>26.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domestic burglary</td> <td>11.5%</td> <td>17.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Violence with injury</b></td> <td>37.5%</td> <td>41.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Serious sexual</b></td> <td>30.0%</td> <td>33.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rape</td> <td>19.8%</td> <td>17.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TNO</b></td> <td>26.9%</td> <td>35.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Detection Rates	End FY 13/14	FYtD 14/15	<b>Serious acquisitive</b>	9.6%	17.9%	Robbery	23.9%	26.1%	Domestic burglary	11.5%	17.5%	<b>Violence with injury</b>	37.5%	41.7%	<b>Serious sexual</b>	30.0%	33.9%	Rape	19.8%	17.6%	<b>TNO</b>	26.9%	35.2%	
Detection Rates	End FY 13/14	FYtD 14/15																								
<b>Serious acquisitive</b>	9.6%	17.9%																								
Robbery	23.9%	26.1%																								
Domestic burglary	11.5%	17.5%																								
<b>Violence with injury</b>	37.5%	41.7%																								
<b>Serious sexual</b>	30.0%	33.9%																								
Rape	19.8%	17.6%																								
<b>TNO</b>	26.9%	35.2%																								

	<p>The CC raised concern about the upcoming HMIC inspection looking at crime data integrity. She said that the figures that HMIC would be reporting on were those between September 2012 and September 2013. This was during the period of changes the Force was making in relation to community resolution and cautions so the report would not portray an accurate picture of how the Force was performing now.</p> <p>Since the DCC had arrived he had instigated a piece of work into the reclassification of crime reporting. He held a regular meeting where this was discussed. The previous procedure gave 72 hours for a crime to be classified which was not of benefit to the victim. The Force now classified it straight away for it to be corrected later if the initial classification was found to be incorrect. This new process had been in place since October 2013 so would also be missed in the HMIC inspection.</p> <p><b>ACTION: PCC to write to HMIC raising concern about the dates of the reporting period</b></p> <p>The DPCC suggested that more of the good news reports should be publicised. The CC said that the Comms team worked hard at getting good new stories into the press but unfortunately good news doesn't sell. The PCC would continue to push out these good news stories from his office.</p> <p>The PCC praised the CC on her leadership of the Force and also the DCC on improving the detection rate – they had both managed to achieve great results in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The DPCC asked whether the Force held data in relation to stop and search success rates. The CC informed the DPCC that Chief Superintendent Charlie Doyle ran a Stopwatch meeting that scrutinised stop and search. He would be able to provide a breakdown of data. The CE said that the OPCC already received this information.</p> <p>The PCC was supportive of stop and search – he would encourage the Force to do more of it.</p> <p>The CC had written a response to the Home Secretary following her letter to all police forces about stop and search. She would share this with the PCC.</p> <p><b>ACTION: PCC to also do a response to the Home Secretary's letter.</b></p> <p>The PCC expressed his concern about the projections for the Special Constabulary. He was aware that the attrition rate was far greater than the current recruitment rate and requested that the Force look into this. The CC explained that the review of the Special Constabulary that had taken place in August 2013 had been essential as there were too many constables that were trained but not being deployed. The remaining constables were now more aligned to the core establishment. The DCC had tasked two senior officers into looking at the future of the Special Constabulary and how it should operate to achieve optimum capacity. This work was being progressed alongside a wider look into support services.</p>	<p>PCC/CE</p> <p>PCC/CE</p>
--	---	-----------------------------

	<p>The PCC also expressed his concern about the high officer turnover rate. The CC said that were a variety of reasons for why officers had left the Force; transfer to other forces, retirement, personal reasons and a number of officers had had to transfer to Thames Valley for contractual reasons due to relocation to work in a regional unit that was managed by Thames Valley.</p> <p>The CC also said that she was looking into the leaving procedure as there had been a number of occasions where officers/staff had left the organisation (especially those that were retiring after 30 years' service) without having an exit meeting either with her or one of her fellow chief officers. The current process wasn't working.</p> <p>The PCC noted the number of officers injured on duty. He wanted them to know that he and the public valued what officers and staff did on a daily basis to keep them safe.</p>	
<p><b>Item 3</b></p>	<p><b>Out of Court Disposals Scrutiny Panel</b></p> <p>The report gave an update on the work of the Out of Court Disposals Panel which had been established in October 2013 to scrutinise all cases of community resolution and other forms of out of court disposal. The paper gave more detail of the process.</p> <p>The CC was the national lead for this piece of work – there was some difficulty with other organisations nationally on what the legislation meant but work was being done to progress issues.</p>	
<p><b>Item 4</b></p>	<p><b>Seizure of Criminal Assets</b></p> <p>The DPCC referred to the report and said that it didn't mention the Police Property Act Fund (PPAF) so he still wasn't sure where that fit in to the seizure of assets. The DCC explained that the PPAF should have been transferred for ownership by the PCC.</p> <p><b>ACTION: CE to chase whether PPAF had been transferred to the PCC</b></p> <p>ACC Cundy was looking into how best to explain to the public what seized assets had been spent on. Previously it had been spent on the recruitment of Financial Investigators who carried out the work in relation to seizing assets.</p> <p><b>ACTION: DCC to report back on how assets seized were being spent.</b></p> <p>The PCC suggested the Force could purchase vehicles with the money and then display a sticker on the vehicle to show that it had been purchased with criminal assets. This would be a visible way of showing to the public how the money had been spent.</p> <p>APCC Mirza agreed that this would be a good way forward.</p>	<p><b>CE</b></p> <p><b>DCC</b></p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>On a separate note the PCC said that he would like to give accreditation to Community Speedwatch volunteers so that they could raise fixed penalty notices on the first offence.</p>	
<b>Item 5</b>	<p><b>HMIC Inspection into how Surrey Police tackles Domestic Abuse</b></p> <p>The CC referred to the content of the report which explained how Surrey had responded to the recent HMIC inspection report.</p> <p>The PCC was happy with the way the Force was taking action against the recommendations.</p>	
	<p><b>PART TWO – NOT TO BE PUBLISHED</b></p>	
	<p><b>Next Meeting:</b> The next meeting will be held on 17<sup>th</sup> July at 2pm at Mole Valley District Council Offices</p>	