

OFFICIAL

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

18th November 2015

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 (Advisor to the Police and Crime Commissioner)
Ian Perkin (Treasurer – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)
Johanna Burne (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)
Stuart Cundy (ACC – Assistant Chief Constable – Surrey Police)
Bev Foad (Financial Accounting Manager - Surrey Police)
Paul Cliff (Head of Learning and Development – Surrey Police)

Sarah Gordon (Minutes – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

Agenda Item	Subject/Note	Action
	The PCC opened the meeting by acknowledging that Force's efforts in looking after the people of Surrey following the recent events in Paris. He had received an update on Force activity.	
Item 1	<p>Matters Arising and Minutes of the last meeting – 17th September 2015</p> <p>The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record and the following actions updates were given:</p> <p>Victim surveys – PCC was taking this one forward via the APCC</p> <p>Attendance at community meeting - cuts in policing budgets meant the Force had to look at ways to delivering a better service whilst dealing with other demands. The CC explained that work had started to look at changes in operating practices. An update would be included in local PIYN briefings later this month and during December.</p> <p>Police pay – It had been planned that officers would receive a 1% pay rise The paper had read as if staff would receive 2%. It was clarified that the negotiation needed to OK'd with staff associates but 1% (of the 2%) was about training, retention etc. The paper was amended to reflect that. The changes were reflected in the finance paper to be presented later in the agenda.</p>	

OFFICIAL

	<p>Fuel card – decision agreed by PCC Retention package – agreed by PCC</p>	
<p>Item 2</p>	<p>Surrey Police Progress Against the Six People’s Priorities</p> <p>Serious acquisitive crime had seen a decrease but there had been a rise in violent crime and cyber related crime. Part of the increase was due to confidence in victims coming forward to report crime, improvement in service delivered by police and also a change in recording rules. Two new offences were now including in the violent crime category which was increasing the figures, to ‘<i>disclose private sexual photographs and films with intent to cause distress and sending letters etc with intent to cause distress or anxiety</i>’.</p> <p>Domestic abuse had seen a year on year increase – the CC was pleased to see an increased number of victims coming forward but resources were stretched. The PCC had recently approved the PIYN (Policing in Your Neighbourhood) business case which included changes in the area of dealing with the increase of workload in vulnerable areas. CSE incidents were being recorded as occurrences and crimes. It was classed as an occurrence when first reported and following an investigation would become a crime depending on the outcome of the investigation. Therefore the number of occurrences was outweighing the number of crimes. The PCC commended the forces work in this area.</p> <p>The DPCC wanted the public to be reassured that the force wasn’t ‘cuffing’ the figures by classing some incidents as occurrences and some as crimes. The CC said this was not the case. The DCC chaired a board that monitored the accuracy of crime recording and a Public Protection Implementation Team also focussed on accurate recording.</p> <p>There had been an increase in the number of reported serious sexual offences. It was noted that not all reports were of recent incidents, more that 50% had occurred historically. The volume of cases had increased and the level of resource required would need investment. 12% of the Force’s current resource was invested in this area but this was likely to increase.</p> <p>The PCC was concerned about the visibility of officers in the community when a high level of resource would be focussed in this area. He acknowledged the Force’s need to make changes to their operational policing.</p> <p>Reductions in burglary were continuing and the Forces national position had improved. Despite what other Forces had said the CC stated that Surrey wouldn’t be withdrawing resources for burglary investigation. The PCC commended the work in this area and noted that there had been an almost 40% drop in reports of burglary over a 3 year period.</p> <p>With regard to positive outcomes the Force’s national position had improved in each area listed in the report. Previously this had not been a good area for Surrey. There were more positive outcomes compared to the number this time last year. The Force was working hard to catch offenders. The CC gave detail of a recent case that involved the POLIT (Paedophile Online Investigation Team) team where they had caught an offender who had also been involved in incidents in Lancashire. This showed the work of an unseen team</p>	

OFFICIAL

<p>that was dealing with national work as well as local. Another case included a number of offences that had occurred in America – funding didn't take these national and international cases into account.</p> <p>The PCC agreed that it showed the challenges that were faced on a diminishing budget.</p> <p>The figures showed that there hadn't been as many positive outcomes in burglary as this time last year but there was still a significant amount of outstanding work taking place. The CC mentioned a number of other good work reports. The PCC said that these jobs showed the good collaborative work with the SEROCU (South East Regional Organised Crime Unit) which was another example of Surrey doing its best with the money available. He had recently been apprised of a case involving the JET (Joint Enforcement Team) in Spelthorne who had secured a charge against an offender for 40 flytipping offences. This was an example of good partnership working.</p> <p>The report gave details of resource availability and sickness. Staff affected by the PIYN sensitive to the fact that some staff would be going through yet another change programme.</p> <p>The CC mentioned the outstanding work of financial investigators involved in POCA (Proceeds of Crime Act) work. A more detailed report would be given later in the agenda. The PCC acknowledged this good work of another unseen team where the assets seized were either returned to the victims or put back into policing.</p> <p>The force was sustaining a good performance on the 999 number and 101 performance was increasing however there were still times when the public couldn't get through. A consultation was taking place with the public on what calls should be dealt with via telephone and whether some reports could be dealt with via online mechanisms. The DPCC emphasised that the Force received approximately 2000 calls per day.</p> <p>The CC said that a social media campaign was also being launched to inform the public about the different reports the Force had to deal with on a daily basis, some that had nothing to do with policing at all. The public would be surprised. The PCC said he received a high amount of praise from across the county about the Force. He noted that there was however no room for complacency as some people didn't get the service that they should.</p> <p>The court attrition rate had improved with the figures operating above the national average after the Force had been in the bottom quartile. This was due to a lot of work by the DCC.</p> <p>The DCC explained that PCD stood for pre-charge decision. A non-PCD was where the police had decided to pursue charges. He was pleased to see the improvement in this area. PCD was where the CPS (Crown Prosecution Service) made the decision on cases. Various issues in this area were being addressed at CPB (Crime Performance Board).</p> <p>The current victim satisfaction survey currently omitted victims of vulnerable crimes. Performance relating to serious acquisitive crime was broadly static. Changes relating to PIYN should improve victim contact and satisfaction – this would be closely monitored when the changes came in to play in April 2016. Confidence figures remained</p>	
--	--

OFFICIAL

	<p>high at 91%.</p> <p>The Force continued to engage with the public via the Local Policing Boards, a number of which took place via Facebook which was a different and popular way of engaging communities. The Force was also supporting the PCC in his round of crime summits.</p> <p>There was currently a high turnover rate of officers and staff. The revised retention package would hopefully provide some stability. The CC and PCC had both recently raised the issue of pay and conditions with the Pay Review Body.</p> <p>The report listed the number of complaints that the Force was dealing with and the number of officers who were currently on restricted duties due to IPCC investigations. The CC had expressed her concern with the IPCC (Independent Police Complaints Commission) about the length of time it was taking to progress these investigations. The CC had also received a number of letters of thanks since the last meeting.</p> <p>The PCC was concerned about the substantial number of officers leaving the force. He emphasised that the cost of recruiting and training an officer was significant. It was a constant battle and the number leaving was a direct result of the high cost of living in Surrey. The PCC said that the Home Office had recently carried out a study of the police funding formula however some of the figures had been flawed and forces would now have to wait another year to learn the outcome of the formula. This put Surrey in an uncertain position about what their budget would look like for the coming years. The PCC did praise the Policing Minister for his leadership in the study and also the support of local MPs, Jonathan Lord and Dominic Raab for their continual support for the Force in raising the funding issue higher up in Government.</p>	
<p>Item 3</p>	<p>Policing In Your Neighbourhood (PIYN) Update</p> <p>The CC explained that the reason for the new project, Policing In Your Neighbourhood (PIYN) was to present a model of delivery within the current funding envelope. The funding was currently unknown for the next four years due to a delay in the Home Office's review of the Police Funding Formula. The Chief Officer Group (COG) would be meeting with the PCC next week to discuss options for future financial plans. Collaboration was continuing with other forces and other emergency services and with the Force's primary collaboration partner, Sussex Police. Work with Sussex included sharing HR, ICT and Finance functions and continuing to collaborate in specialist crime areas, firearms and roads policing.</p> <p>A significant analysis had been carried out by the Force to assess the threat, risk and harm incidents that were dealt with on a daily basis. There were increases in incidents of cyber crime and reports in the area of public protection. PIYN was predicated on visible local policing. Larger Area Policing Teams would be formed with CID and Safeguarding Units working alongside them. The changes had been communicated to staff and would now be communicated to the public and to stakeholders at a number of stakeholder briefing sessions. The project was on track for an April 2016 start date.</p>	

<p>Item 4</p>	<p>Surrey Police Strategic Learning and Development Financial Review and Priorities Plan</p> <p>The CC said that the Force had invested £1m into the training budget last year at the PCC’s approval. The PIYN project would require officers and staff to undergo training and Paul Cliff (PC), Head of Learning and Development, had been tasked with carrying out a TNA (Training Needs Analysis) to ensure that officers and staff would be trained appropriately.</p> <p>PC said that the Force had a commitment to invest in core skills, leadership development and professional development. The PIYN business case had a resulted in a readjustment to the capability requirement and ERP being brought in in 2017/18 with Sussex would bring in savings. PC gave detail about the training activities that would take place within this financial period. The College of Policing have introduced three schemes that would impact on Learning and Development; Leadership Review, National Police Promotions Framework and Defining and Assessing Competence. The Force would be running a ‘Police Now’ scheme as seen in the Metropolitan Police. Apprenticeship schemes were being developed as part of a Home Office funded scheme.</p> <p>The DPCC asked whether the Force had the capacity to train Special Constables if there was a doubling of their numbers. PC said that adjustments to the budget would have to made. The Force could currently make a 10% reactive adjustment and if that figure was exceeded then further discussions would need to be made about making a priority decision in this area.</p> <p>The CC asked whether the PCC was happy to agree the recommendation as set out in the paper.</p> <p>The PCC said that he would consider 7.1 and 7.2 in the Part 2 discussion but he fully supported 7.3 onwards. He said that if any additional money was required then he would consider moving some out of the reserves.</p> <p>The CC expressed her thanks to PC and his team for their work in this area.</p>	
<p>Item 5</p>	<p>Special Constabulary Update</p> <p>The DCC presented the report which built on previous updates given at earlier meetings. He said that the Special Constabulary played a vital role in supplementing regular colleagues. There had been a deliberate decrease in the number of Special Constables, the reason for this was largely to bring in a focus of quality and commitment to the role. There had been a slight increase in attrition rates but this rate was now in line with the national average. ACC Stephens was leading a piece of work to look at the rebuild of the Special Constabulary and this would fall under the overarching volunteer strategy. The strategy was in place and the new Volunteer Manager would be starting at the end of November. The Special Constabulary line management structure would be looked at as part of this work. Concerns had been raised by a number of Special Constables about the current structure. The training plan will also be redesigned. The PCC would be kept updated on progress.</p>	

OFFICIAL

	<p>The PCC was fully supportive of the plans that were in place. Special Constables acted as a good conduit with the community. An increased number of officers in uniform can be a valuable visible resource. He acknowledged that not all volunteers could give up as much time as might be required to currently be a Special Constable but some people may still want to help. He suggested that these volunteers could be drafted in for specific and significant events throughout the year.</p> <p>The CC agreed and said that this was already due for consideration as part of the strategy.</p>	
Item 6	<p>Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) Spend Update</p> <p>The paper focussed on the spend of assets seized via POCA and ARIS (Asset Recovery Incentivisation Scheme). The paper proposed that the Force continued with current activities regarding spend which included providing more visible street policing. Three vehicles had been purchased that were marked as being bought with assets seized from criminals. It was proposed that the Panel currently held between the DCC and ACC Local Policing would continue to discuss future spend.</p> <p>The PCC was content to give his approval for all recommendations. He also stated that at present the Force only received 1/6 of monies that were seized with the remainder being retained by Government. He was supporting other PCCs in lobbying Government to get this changed so that Force's received more.</p>	
	<p>PART TWO – IN PRIVATE – NOT FOR PUBLICATION</p>	