

**Police and Crime Commissioner
Performance Meeting - November**

19th December 2016

Mole Valley Borough Council and Webcast

Attendees:

David Munro (Police and Crime Commissioner) DM
 Alison Bolton (Chief Executive – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner) AB
 Ian Perkin (Treasurer – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner) IP
 Nathan Rees (Communications Manager – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)
 Harriet Doe (Minutes – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)

Nick Ephgrave (CC – Chief Constable, Surrey Police) NE
 Gavin Stephens (DCC – Deputy Chief Constable, Surrey Police) GS
 Paul Bundy (Head of Finance - Surrey Police) PB

Agenda Item	Subject/Note	Action
	<p><u>PART ONE</u> <u>In Public</u></p>	
	<p>DM introduced the meeting and noted that he had been impressed by staff of the Force and also people in the community he had come across during recent visits – he could see that individuals understood the importance of policing.</p> <p>DM began by saying that there were firstly 2 main issues at the top of his list: Retention of trained officers Policing in Your Neighbourhood (PiYN)</p> <p>Retention of trained officers: NE explained that Surrey Police was one of a few forces that sought to increase their officer numbers during this austere time (to 1,944). The difficulty in reaching this target isn't recruitment, but is retaining existing officers. The 'unplanned' attrition rate has increased to approximately 16 officers a month. When Surrey Police look at why, there are a range of issues – most common is work-life balance and erosion in pay and conditions; the cost of living is much higher here in Surrey than other areas. There are many officers that live in Sussex and Thames Valley for example, but work for Surrey Police, travelling</p>	

	<p>in and out of the county. Now neighbouring forces are recruiting, some Surrey Police officers are transferring into the area where they live in order to reduce travelling time and associated costs</p> <p>DM asked what was being done about this. NE answered that Surrey Police were really doing all they can. The existing government funding formula takes no account of the cost of living, and is being reviewed at the moment. Outside of the funding formula there is some flexibility within Police Regulations; Surrey Police pay bonus payments to firearms officers for example. The amount of money is small per officer, however. The Government has also increased the cap on the South East allowance, meaning that some forces can pay up to £3,000 a year – but no additional money is given by the Government to support this. Chief Constables from across the South East region have considered this and in Surrey there will be an increase of £500 per annum to officers. NE also explained that Surrey Police is trying to make the culture of the force an attractive one.</p> <p>DM commented that the worry was that neighbouring forces would then also increase allowances, but he does support the Chief Constable. In terms of exit interviews money is not the top reason why officers are leaving – work life balance is. DM asked NE what was being done about this.</p> <p>NE commented that there is no doubt that demand on officers has increased, as well as the complexity in the types of crimes, for example identity fraud and online grooming are fairly new crimes that require officers to learn a new skill set and investigate in a different way. Work to ensure that children are safeguarded also carries more personal risk. Officers feel they are working harder than before and there is more risk than before. To try and address the issue Surrey Police re-profiled the organisation. The workload per officer has been reduced in the Public Protection area, and Surrey Police work hard with partner agencies to understand repeat demands, for example with missing people.</p> <p>DM thanked NE for his response and noted that it was critical that Surrey residents get the service that they pay for.</p> <p>PiYN – Policing in Your Neighbourhood: DM explained that this was a local policing model which was now 8 months old. An initial review had been undertaken, which concluded that the model is a sound one. However, there is more to be done, particularly around engaging the public.</p> <p>NE noted that PiYN is the Surrey Police’s response to the increasing challenge of rising demand. There were broadly 2 options – to centralise everything or devolve down to the lowest local level possible. Surrey Police took the option to devolve down, based upon a philosophical approach that local, accountable policing is the bedrock of good service. Under the new model, there has been an increase in accountability locally, with officers taking responsibility right through from reporting of a crime to potentially a disposal at</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>court. Whereas previously a victim of crime was never sure who was dealing with their investigation, now it remains with one officer. Every Borough and District has an Inspector, and a small but dedicated Safer Neighbourhood Team, which supplement the Area Policing Team by solely problem-solving long term issues. Surrey Police discovered that last year only approximately 20% of calls related to crime, and the Contact Centre have had to think how to triage calls. Many officers hadn't investigated crimes before, and so lots of training had to be undertaken. The positive outcome rate is now better than before PiYN.</p> <p>DM mentioned that he was getting a trickle of comments saying that individuals aren't seeing a visible presence of officers. He recognised that a visible presence would not necessarily be any help in tackling crime in the 'private space'. NE answered that the new PiYN model requires patrol officers to attend court etc., and so even though there are more officers on patrol than before PiYN, they are having to do more.</p> <p>DM thanks NE and stated that they would continue to return to the topic.</p>	
<p>1.</p>	<p>Performance Report against Police and Crime Plan</p> <p>DM noted that some statistics were not looking as good as others – one being the increase in violent crime. NE noted that violent crime has risen this year, and there are 2 elements as to why. Firstly, a lot of time has been spent encouraging vulnerable victims to come forward, and so one element of this increase is increased reporting. NE explained that this is one rise in crime that Surrey Police should welcome as the service being provided is now better.</p> <p>Secondly, the drive spearheaded by Sir Tom Winsor and HMIC regarding data integrity has meant that all allegations, however minor, must now be recorded as a crime – there is no discretion. A schoolboy fight, for example would need to be recorded as a crime, regardless of how the matter was resolved.</p> <p>NE went on to explain that, for example, if you look at ASB there is actually a significant decrease in the recording of this issue which correlates exactly with an increase in low level violent crime. Effectively, what used to be recorded as ASB is now being recorded as violent crime.</p> <p>DM asked about the reduction in performance relating to domestic burglary. NE answered that the domestic burglary offending rate has actually dropped year on year for roughly 5 years and that levels are still low, although he didn't want to sound complacent. NE explained that the detection rate was what DM was referring to. Surrey Police have had to make difficult choices and move experienced detectives to other areas in need. Burglary teams are now smaller and less experienced than they were. This had been a tough choice to make, but one that had to be made.</p>	

	<p>DM stated that there were examples of really good areas of work also. He noted that NE was wearing his white ribbon badge, a demonstration of how Surrey Police are dedicated to tackling abuse (particularly against women).</p> <p>NE noted that the Force's response is significantly improved with regards to Domestic Abuse. There has been lots of support from other services which is incredibly important, for example ESDAS (East Surrey Domestic Abuse Services). In terms of higher-end offending (rape and serious sexual offences) the success rate for prosecuting offenders has risen enormously. Better relationships with the CPS (Crown Prosecution Service) and highlighting the issue of delay in advice has now led to an improvement in the turnaround time for advice files, which means that victims would get to court quicker. There is lots to be positive about.</p> <p>DM thanked NE and added that taking victims through the Criminal Justice process is still an issue, and he was unhappy with the current situation/progress.</p> <p>DM mentioned that he wanted to return to Rural Crime at a later date. He noted that he was pleased with improvements that had been made regarding the 101 non-emergency number, but there was still a way to go.</p> <p>DM asked NE to outline details regarding collaboration.</p> <p>NE commented that the ability of individual Chief Constables to tackle the breadth and complexity of modern demand on their own is virtually impossible and so Surrey Police have worked with Sussex Police to make the most of Specialist Capabilities – Specialist Crime and Special Operations are areas that have been shared with Sussex and have benefited from resilience increases. For example, both the Shoreham disaster and the flooding across Surrey and Sussex a couple of years ago were policed by both forces. A bilateral arrangement whilst beneficial is limited though, and there has been a successful application for money to support collaboration across the region (which included Surrey, Sussex, Thames Valley and Hampshire). There is also the potential future collaboration across other blue light services, including when or whether to add Surrey Fire & Rescue to the Commissioner's portfolio.</p> <p>DM asked for an update on Body Worn Video (BWV). NE explained that GS has led the programme, which is about to launch the first tranche in Guildford. GS added that Surrey Police took the decision to go with the same equipment as Sussex Police, and were initially let down by suppliers around infrastructure. Implementation kicks off in Guildford before rolling out more widely, and next year there will be a focus on editing, management and storage of information.</p>	
<p>2.</p>	<p>Financial Report</p>	

	<p>DM commented that now was an interesting time financially. There are 2 major issues for Surrey Police:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surrey Police are underspent by some margin 2. There is still the need for savings to be made <p>NE noted that the main factor in the underspend is the inability to maintain officers at 1,944. NE added that Surrey Police have been able to use the underspend to provide support to officers on the frontline, however. There has also been more money spent in overtime. In terms of savings, NE explained what the colours meant: Green = savings that the Force are highly confident will be available Amber = savings that will potentially be available, with a degree of movement in the date Red = concern that there will be no savings Purple = Areas where no business cases have been developed yet, but areas that show potential for savings. This is the most volatile area.</p> <p>DM highlighted how important it was that savings are achieved.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>HMIC – Preparedness for Management Standards</p> <p>The item was noted. It would be returned to at a future meeting.</p>	<p>JB</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Pension Arrangements</p> <p>DM stated that pension arrangements was a very important part of the Surrey Police’s budget.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA)</p> <p>DM asked NE how important it was that Surrey Police extract the maximum amount of money available.</p> <p>NE explained that there is a dedicated Economic Crime Unit (ECU) who pursue criminals both pre and post-conviction for money. Whilst Surrey Police can seize money, the Force can’t keep it all – some money goes to the Government, for example, with confiscation orders Surrey Police keeps less than 20% of money seized. NE explained that Surrey Police use the income gained to fund officers in the Economic Crime Unit, which amounts to roughly 5 officers – a virtuous circle. There has been a reduction in this money in the past couple of years, which means that Surrey Police may have to invest in the ECU in the future. It is important for the unit to pursue criminal assets as this is value for money for the Surrey public.</p> <p>DM commented that it wasn’t just about the money; it further inhibits criminals. DM went on to state that he was interested in the position nationally, and stated how important POCA was.</p>	

	<p>DM noted that the main part of the meeting had come to an end. There are many areas of concern as policing is so complex, but he is pleased with the performance of individual officers and staff. There is a way to go – and HMIC reports will continue to be looked at to ensure that Surrey Police is on track. DM confirmed that his overriding priority is to cut crime and build safer communities.</p> <p>NE concluded that the last year has been a challenging one, which started with the damaging HMIC report around protecting vulnerable people. Surrey Police have now massively improved in this area. There has also been the implementation of PiYN which has been challenging, and NE noted that he recognises that visibility is important. There is more work to be done regarding PiYN with 31 recommendations to address following Surrey Police’s own review on the model.</p> <p>DM closed the meeting.</p>	