

**MINUTES: of the Meeting of Surrey Police Authority held 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011  
at Mount Browne, Surrey Police HQ, Guildford.**

**Members**

Mrs Louise Rhodes	Mrs Jane Anderson (a)
Mrs Lynn Hawkins	Mr Peter Williams
Mrs Heather Kerswell	Mrs Amanda Mills
Mr Michael Blank (a)	Mrs Claire Storey
Mr Bill Barker OBE	Mrs Yvonna Lay
Mr David Harmer	Mr Ernest Mallett
Mrs Margaret Hicks	Mrs Hazel Watson
Mr Geoff Marlow	Mrs Fiona White
Mr Nick Skellett CBE	

a = absent

**All item numbers refer to the agenda bound with these minutes**

**PART ONE**  
**IN PUBLIC**

The Chairman opened Surrey Police Authority's meeting and welcomed all Members and members of the public.

**121/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

Apologies were received from Mr Michael Blank, Mrs Jane Anderson and Chief Constable Mark Rowley.

**122/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 13<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2011 (Item 2)**

The minutes of the SPA Public Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> October were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**123/11 MATTERS ARISING (Item 3)**

117/11 – To note that an extraordinary meeting had been scheduled for 8<sup>th</sup> December to discuss Business Partnering in Policing (BPP).

**Resolved that,**

The Authority noted the Matters Arising.

**124/11 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (Item 4)**

Miss Lynda Dadak had written to the Chief Executive with two questions to be raised at the meeting. The questions were read out by the Chairman and responded to by the Deputy Chief Constable.

Question 1: What is the difference between a: Rural Community Officer; Beat Officer; and Neighbourhood Support Officer?

The two main types of officer working in communities are Neighbourhood Specialist Officers (NSO) and Police Community Support Officers (PCSO). Both work in a variety of environments and are sometimes referred to as Beat Officers by local communities. As part of a central support team there is an officer dedicated to working with the rural community, but many NSOs and PCSOs cover rural areas. Although we do not designate these as 'rural' officers, local communities sometimes attach their own labels.

NSOs are police officers and PCSOs are police staff with fewer powers than officers.

Question 2: By training the Police Force to be combative (violent and abnormal behaviour), should the Force be excluded from tackling neighbour/housing/domestic/human issues, which would be better handled by Borough Councils (housing dept)?

The Police Service employs and trains a wide range of officers and staff to deal with a broad spectrum of community safety issues. Although all police officers receive conflict training, the first objective is always to try to resolve violent situations through negotiation and verbal communication. The initial response is not 'combative'. These negotiation skills can also be used in dealing with neighbour or housing issues. Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) are not employed to deal with conflict and their primary role is community engagement.

All neighbourhood teams work closely with Local Authorities, including housing departments and associations, to help resolve neighbour and housing issues. It is important that agencies work together to resolve problems rather than just leave them to one particular organisation.

Mr Bill Barker was invited to raise a question on behalf of two of his residents who were unable to attend the meeting:

Question: Thefts of copper cable from BT junction boxes in rural areas such as Shalford, Normandy, Wanbrough and East Horsley have led to widespread dislocation of communication services in these areas. What progress has been made in apprehending thieves, have the police been able to advise BT on better security arrangements, if so are these being followed? There is high public satisfaction with the PCSOs at local level, higher up the CID chain information seems to drop off.

The Deputy Chief Constable responded that the issue of cable theft was unfortunately, not just an issue confined to rural parts of Surrey. It was a national issue, as are all other types of metal theft including rail cabling, lead theft from churches and catalytic converter thefts to name just three other examples. With the price of metals reaching record highs, the Force was aware that there were significant offending levels across Western Europe.

Although there were victims in all cases, it was the disruption caused which could not be measured, particularly in rural areas. The security of BT cabling had been discussed nationally and BT was running a Smartwater deployment programme. However, much of their cabling beneath ground had been in place for up to 40 years, and it would take considerable time to complete the programme. BT was also installing lockable lids beneath their standard lids.

The nature of this offending was clearly widespread, the cables being stripped almost immediately so as to become unidentifiable, so despite considerable work with other forces engaging with scrap dealers, very little evidence was available. Nonetheless the Force continued to develop intelligence which could lead to arrests in the future. DCC Denholm strongly recommended that the question of security was asked of BT to convey the level of inconvenience, and indeed the level of discontent, from paying customers.

Finally DCC Denholm stated that it was disappointing to note that there appeared to be a lack of information from "higher up the CID chain and welcomed the opportunity to discuss this further, in order to redress any imbalance.

Trevor Shotton identified himself as a serving police officer and made the following comment:

‘Surrey Police are refusing to investigate criminality in their own Force.’

The Chief Executive referred to the Authority’s Standing Orders and stated that as a serving police officer, Mr Shotton was not permitted to ask a public question at an Authority meeting.

Mr Shotton accepted this. The Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) stated that he would look into this outside the meeting given it referred to an ongoing matter. Mr Shotton left the meeting.

**125/11 PETITIONS (Item 5)**

No petitions had been received.

**126/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 6)**

No declarations were made.

**127/11 CHAIRMANS’ REPORT (Item 7)**

The Chairman opened his report by paying tribute to Chief Constable Mark Rowley who would be leaving the Force on 4<sup>th</sup> December to take up the post of Assistant Commissioner in the Metropolitan Police Service. He remarked on the outstanding contribution that Mr Rowley had made to

Surrey Police and wished him well for the future on a well-deserved promotion.

He continued by informing Members that the main focus for the forthcoming months would be to embark on a Chief Constable recruitment process, engage in further discussions regarding BPP and also the Winsor pay negotiations. Part Two of the Winsor Report was due to be published in January 2012 and Part One was due to go a Police Arbitration Tribunal (PAT) on 8<sup>th</sup> November where the Chairman would be attending as a member of the Police Negotiating Board (PNB).

Members sought the view of the Chairman and the Chief Officer team on the letter recently received from the Home Secretary about 'professionalising the police service'. The Chairman responded by saying that the Home Secretary was looking favourably at creating a professional policing body which in effect would combine ACPO and the Police Federation into one body.

Members echoed the Chairman's sentiments about Mark Rowley and acknowledged the contribution that he had made to Surrey Police and the county of Surrey and wished him well in his new post.

#### **128/11 CHIEF CONSTABLE'S REPORT – PART ONE (Item 8)**

The Authority received a verbal report from the DCC in the absence of the Chief Constable.

He updated the Members on a number of areas. A knife-point robbery that took place at a branch of Barclays Bank and an armed robbery at a Coop Supermarket had been linked and showed a great example of the public assisting the police. Operation Shield – the use of ANPR in apprehending offenders involved in suspected cross border criminality – had resulted in a number of offenders being remanded in custody.

In respect of performance, latest figures showed a 2% increase in confidence levels, a 2.5% reduction in crime so far this year, a 10% increase in detections and a 44.7% improvement against last year's figures for the drugs target. The DCC emphasised the outstanding performance achieved at a time of financial difficulty and pressures on staff and this was acknowledged by Members.

Members noted that integrated teams were now working with the CPS – a move that was ahead of other Forces. This would be a benefit for SIREN and digitalisation processes. The DCC informed Members that a Surrey PSU (Police Support Unit) led by Inspector Graham Barnett had been deployed to the Dale Farm travellers site and had received positive feedback for their involvement.

Members noted that it was recently agreed at SCB (Strategic Coordinating Board) to introduce an annual fitness test for officers of all rank, including

chief officer level, and those that did not pass could be subject to unsatisfactory performance procedures.

Members also noted the update on the introduction of the 101 non-emergency telephone number which launched in September 2011. The DCC stated that there was no decrease in 999 calls as yet but that it was still early days. Members suggested that more could be done to promote the number and Assistant Chief Constable Jerry Kirkby reassured them that this was in hand.

The Chairman concluded the item by stressing that the Force was performing extremely well at a time of reduced budgets and other pressures.

**129/11 AMENDMENT TO FINANCIAL REGULATIONS (Item 9)**

The Authority was asked to accept the recommendation of the Audit Committee and approve a change to Financial Regulations, relating to the accounting arrangements for depreciating assets.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority approved the revised Financial Regulations Appendix I as recommended by the Audit Committee.

**130/11 ANNUAL STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS (Item 10)**

The Authority received a report on the Annual Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement for 2010/11, approved by the Audit Committee under powers delegated to it by the Authority.

Members recognised the hard work that had been undertaken by the Force finance team to produce the accounts under the new International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS).

The Treasurer offered Members the opportunity to meet with him outside the meeting to discuss the accounts in more detail.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority noted the 2010/11 Annual Governance Statement and the 2012/11 Annual Statement of Accounts.

**131/11 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (Item 11)**

The Authority received a mid-year report on the activities and performance of the treasury management function together with information on the Prudential Indicators.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority noted the content of the report.

**132/11 ANNUAL GOVERNANCE REPORT (Item 12)**

The Authority received a report on the summary of work carried out by the External Auditors during the 2010/11 accounts.

Members noted that the issues raised in relation to the following areas had been resolved following receipt of the report: Related Party Transactions and Archiving of Financial Information. The Treasurer informed the Authority that the issue in relation to Property Deeds was in hand and work was being undertaken to resolve this prior to the introduction of the Police and Crime Commissioner in November 2012. He said that this would be monitored through the Audit Committee.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority noted the content of the report.

**133/11 SPA BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE (Item 13)**

The Authority received a report on the progress of the SPA Business Plan 2011/12 as approved by the Authority in March 2011. The Chief Executive explained that the plan fed into the work plans of all Panels and Committees.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority noted the update.

**134/11 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT (Item 14)**

The Chief Executive gave a brief verbal report and informed Members that HMIC was due to visit the Force and Authority on 14<sup>th</sup> November to discuss progress of Valuing the Police, Collaboration and also progress on transition.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority noted the report.

**135/11 PANEL REPORTS (Item 15a – 15f)**

Mr David Harmer, Chair of the Controlling Crime Panel, informed Members that he had attended a recent training session on public order which was very interesting and informative.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority noted the reports.

**136/11 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 16)**

Under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**PART TWO**  
**IN PRIVATE**

**137/11 CHIEF CONSTABLE'S REPORT PART TWO INCLUDING RISK (Item 17)**

The Authority received a report on Salfords, the Joint Command Major Crime Team, cross border issues, Collision Investigation Unit and Learning and Development issues.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority noted the report.

**138/11 CAPITAL ASSET PROPOSAL (Item 18)**

The Authority received a report on the proposed purchase of a vacant building to be converted into police premises.

**Resolved that,**

The Authority agreed the recommendations as set out in the paper.

**The meeting ended at 11.55am**