

Stop & Search Reference Group (SSRG) Minutes

Date: 26/07/2023, 16:00 – 18:00 (via Teams)

Chair: Franstine Jones

Minute Taker: Travis Dickerson

Number in attendance: 13

Travis Dickerson (TD), Sharon Lee (SL), Savi Tyandale-Biscoe, (STB), Simon Mills, (SM), Tim Passmore (TP), Naomi Lofthouse (NL), Matthew Lees (ML), David Brown (DB), Matthew Lakin (ML), Jordan Gooch (JG), Franstine Jones (FJ), David Horne (DH), Keiran Manners (KM),

Item	Discussion	Response	Comments	Action by whom & when
<p>Introduction of the purpose of the meeting</p> <p>Introductions</p>	<p>PM provides a summary regarding the SSRG and how the groups work is essential to making sure the community members feel that stop and search is being carried out correctly by the police.</p> <p>All members of the group introduce themselves.</p>			
<p>Actions from last meeting:</p>	<p>SL Updates the group with the two forms actions from the last SSRG meeting. The group had requested some further information from two pervious stop and search forms reviewed.</p> <p>SM: Wanted to provide a formal apology regarding the quality of the last meeting.</p> <p>NL: Seconds this apology.</p>	<p>SL: The first form ending in 2337. I received an email from Claire providing some further information. The form was in reference to a 13-year-old. The group wanted to know if GOWISLEY was covered and if appropriate authorisation was given. It was reported in the email that GOWISLEY was given along with authorisation.</p> <p>SL: Secondly the form ending in 3413. The group needed further information and greater detail. Why was this specific individual stopped out of a group? Were they seen disposing or smoking cannabis? Were elements of GOWISLEY given. The information the group received back covered, that the location was recently linked to open ASB in respect to drug use. From a glass fire door, the officer could see 6 teenagers with one of them smoking an unknown substance. A strong smell of cannabis was coming from that area. GOWISLEY was given to all persons.</p> <p>Former action points completed</p>	<p>SM: I contacted the officer and asked the question why the whole group was searched. He made me aware that due to it being a group anti-social behaviour the whole group was searched. I was comfortable with this response.</p>	

<p>Form ID: 370376/110423/152035</p> <p>SEE – Police saw two (2) males walking shoulder to shoulder in GIPPESWYK PARK. The males were walking towards a dis-used toilet block. The toilet block itself is in a dead end and offers no thoroughfare onto ANCASTER ROAD.</p> <p>KNOW - two males approaching a known drug taking and drug supply area. Shortly prior to the above subjects being stopped, there was what appeared to be a congregation of approx. 5-6 CLASS A drug users coming out of GIPPESWYK PARK as police arrived.</p> <p>SUSPECT – The subjects stated that they were going out for a walk into a dead end and a dis-used toilet block that is locked and secure. The subjects could not account for how they knew each other stating that they had just bumped into each other.</p> <p>ISCRE comments: What was it that made the officer suspicious of the males walking in the first instance, particularly as they were not near the toilet blocks when first seen? Why were handcuffs used, were they resistant? Can we please view the BWV on this Stop and search for further scrutiny.</p>	<p>Body worn video (BWV) was requested by ISCRE for a review, but it was unavailable.</p> <p>FJ: Raised a question regarding the time difference on the form for the initial stop and then the search. Secondly was the other male searched?</p> <p>STB: How long were the handcuffs used for?</p> <p>FJ: This can be confirmed from the BWV if its available.</p>	<p>SM: Regarding BWV, a new system is being put in place called DAMS in autumn. Within this stop and search footage will have a minimum retention date of three months. This will provide a better opportunity to view BWV.</p> <p>SM: Simon provides a response from the officer: Suspicion was raised due to the men walking towards the disused toilet block in the corner of the park. The toilets are locked and are hidden from public view. Use of forces was used as the officer noticed nervous behaviour from one of the males, he was unable to stand still and hide his hands within his pocket. It was a concern he may either attempt to make off from me, discard evidence or have items on his person that could cause harm.</p> <p>DH: This area is patrolled on a regular basis for drug use and drug dealing. Specific areas of the park are used for this kind of activity like the toilets as mentioned as they are hidden from public view.</p> <p>SM: The officer should have specified that in these grounds. I will go back to the officer in relation to that. Regarding use of force, the officer mentioned he was worried the suspect could run off so this should have been added to the original grounds.</p> <p>DH: It is stated on the form that the officer did not have a copy of the record; The form does self-populate the time once it has been completed. The officer may have completed the form once returning to the station.</p> <p>SM: Provides the grounds and supervisor comments from the form relating to the other male in this situation. Nothing was found on this person although the form has been saved as evidential meaning, we can look to retrieve the BWV from this search to add further context to both searches.</p>	<p>PM: Discussed the following Items in detail.</p> <p>1. How areas known for drug use/ drug dealing are not stand-alone grounds to stop and search someone in said area. Especially public places</p> <p>2. Behaving nervously should not be a valid reason for use of force.</p>	<p>FJ: Yes, please Simon, if you can look to retrieve the BWV from the other individuals search in this situation for further review.</p> <p>SM: If it is available me and Sharon can have a catch up relating to this form.</p> <p>SL: Yes agreed.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>Form ID: 370952/120423/010809</p> <p>Male encountered within a vehicle driven by a second male. Vehicle stopped by PC 1205 Feist who detected a smell of cannabis from within. Driver admitted to have smoked cannabis recently and stated that there was cannabis in the vehicle. Drug drive and cannabis possession on driver. Passenger was left alone within vehicle whilst PC Feist dealt with the driver with ample opportunity to secrete cannabis.</p> <p>ISCRE comments: What was it that made the officer suspicious in the first instance for police to stop vehicle? Driver admits cannabis is in the vehicle, but the outcome is nfa, assuming nothing found. Could we please review the BWV for this stop & search.</p>	<p>BWV was requested by ISCRE but was unavailable.</p> <p>FJ: Would like some for clarification on why this driving behaviour caused suspicion.</p> <p>FJ: What is meant on the form when it reads "Passenger was left alone in the vehicle with ample opportunity to secrete cannabis".</p>	<p>SM: We have started to bring in the officers who have a direct relation to the form so they can provide more details themselves. Matthew Lees completed this form.</p> <p>Matthew Lees: Explained he did not stop the vehicle it was the PC mentioned in the grounds. Vehicle was stopped due to manner of driving late at night. Vehicle turned into a junction then pulled into the side of the road sharply. PC felt this was suspicious activity. Stopped and engaged with the driver. Smell of cannabis was then noticed from the vehicle. PC then expected a drug driving offense. Drug wipe was used and came back positive. Suspect also admitted to cannabis being present in the vehicle.</p> <p>Matthew Lees: While the PC was engaging with the driver outside the vehicle, it was possible the passenger within that vehicle could have secreted items about his person.</p> <p>Matthew Lees: I have since had training regarding the see/know/suspect format and this will be adapted to future forms.</p>	<p>SM: Added that under section 163 any vehicle can be stopped for any reason. If we see activity from a driver that justifies a stop it will be stopped.</p> <p>FJ: To give Matthew some more context: Previously we had regular comments on forms relating to "Smell of cannabis". This was a constant reason for stopping and searching. As of now the smell of cannabis in isolation is not reasonable grounds for a stop and search to take place.</p>	
<p>Form ID: 371643/200423/002940</p> <p>Reports of a male wearing black, with a rucksack on a mountain bike trying car door handles on Shakespear Road, heading towards Whitton Church Lane, males Guy seen on Whitton Church Lane,</p>	<p>SL: Now that we are aware of this further detail it adds more context, if only it had been put in the see/know/suspect format on the original form.</p>	<p>DH: Informed the officer about the see/know/ suspect format. This was his response. Seen: Members of the public saw male dressed in black trying car doors on a bike. Know: Officer is aware of the area and the individual matched the description Suspect: that the male could have stolen items or tools to assist with theft.</p>	<p>SM: Its worth noting that going back five or six years we would have a larger sample of forms being sent back</p>	

<p>matched the description, stopped on Old Norwich Road for search of himself and ruck sack he was carrying, and he was on a bike.</p> <p>ISCRE comments: Grounds for this search are not clearly recorded by the officer to ascertain a lawful search. Although the supervisor has said they are satisfied with the search, we have not seen the additional information for scrutiny. Can we have an updated recording on the grounds please.</p>	<p>FJ: How and why was the see/know/suspect model introduced?</p>	<p>SM: To add some context - this is an incident lead stop and search, so we are responding from a report from the public.</p> <p>SM: The model was introduced by West-Yorkshire police. I strongly believe within the next twelve months this will become a nationwide model. We are in the process of changing our technology so in the future officer will no longer have a "grounds" box. They will have to fill out a form using the see/know/suspect model.</p>	<p>to us but comparing it to now we only get a handful. These are the forms that don't have the right level of detail or use the right model.</p>	
<p>Form ID: 371671/200423/004658</p> <p>SEE</p> <p>On Wednesday 19th April 2023 I attended Sainsburys Supermarket and saw the female offender as identified to me by the undercover security officer within the back area of Sainsburys.</p> <p>KNOW</p> <p>Report from staff at Sainsburys and undercover security officer within store that female offender who was identified has walked around the store, has failed to scan some of her shopping before paying for the scanned items at the till, and leaving the store before being stopped by security. Receipt checked and the goods in trolley did not match this receipt. Stolen goods have been recovered by security.</p>	<p>STB: Where is it lawful in relation to questions a suspect?</p> <p>SL: It's important to note that the supervisor for this form and the previous similar situation both said the power to conduct the search was not present. We need to understand why.</p>	<p>SM: Provided a response in several parts:</p> <p>It is not an unlawful search.</p> <p>Due to this form being similar to the previous form I contacted our training department to ask if we are teaching this and the response was no. I then went to the sergeant and asked when and where they were taught this. He was informed in 2013 so it's quite old. And this reassured me staff are not being trained in this.</p> <p>There is some confusion about section one PACE can only be done in a public area. The legislation reads that someone can be stopped and searched under section one of PACE anywhere but a dwelling. It relates to this situation as despite the location not being a public place (back office, security office) security has taken that person there and given them implied permission to be there. Ultimately there is nothing wrong with the officer's use of section one PACE.</p>		

<p>SUSPECT</p> <p>Female offender to have additional stolen objects within her possession. Looking for any potential items which are likely to be sold in Sainsburys.</p> <p>I searched the female under section 1 of the police and criminal evidence act. Looking for stolen objects. The female was informed soft this along with my details, she was offered a copy of the search form but declined.</p> <p><i>I have however noted that the search was conducted in the staff area of the store, which is not part of the building which the public have access too, and as such is not a 'public place'. This means that the power to conduct the search was not actually present, as for a S1 PACE search, the female would require to be detained in a public place – though she could then have been moved out of public view for the physical search.</i></p> <p>ISCRE comments: A case seeking clarification for the panel. We would like to seek clarification on this search. A similar search occurred last scrutiny meeting, where an officer detained a suspect in an area that was not a public place. We were informed that the search was in fact lawful and not as stated as unlawful by the supervisor. Is this search lawful? if not, what happens to the suspect who would have been unlawfully detained?</p>		<p>DH: Stated it is down to the officer's interpretation with the information they have got. For this form it seems the officer was looking to deal with the situation by not arresting and instead using section one PACE. However, with the information we can see they could have been arrested and used section thirty-two if needs be. Overall using correct powers for correct reasons.</p> <p>DH: In response to Savi: Arrests and questioning can be done anywhere by the police, and it all depends on the situation.</p> <p>SM: To add Savi TB: The legislation reads to search someone it must be in a place without a dwelling. It's about officers understanding this legislation and where they can best make use of that power.</p> <p>SM: In response to Sharon L: Both the supervisors are active sergeants. This being the second time a form has come to the group the question is asked are we teaching this? The answer to that is no, we are teaching the right thing.</p>		
---	--	--	--	--

<p><i>Supervisors comment for this search below</i></p>				
<p>Form ID: 370598/160523/112834</p> <p>Driven past and seen handling clear plastic deal bags, recent Intel in relation to possession of cannabis.</p> <p>ISCRE comments: The grounds for this search lack detail. Who was the suspect seen handling bags to. How was it identified they were deal bags? How recent was the intel?</p>	<p>BWV was requested and reviewed by ISCRE prior to the meeting.</p> <p>FJ: I am aware of this area and chantry library. I find it impossible that the officer was able to see the small clear plastic bags used for selling drugs. How would he have seen them?</p> <p>SL: Also, the search took place right next to a bench located near the library. From the BWV we could see this was a very public area and saw members of the public throughout the BWV review. The officer did not offer to take them anywhere a little more private.</p> <p>PM: Would like to raise a question regarding the grounds. I am just wondering about the inconsistency between the original grounds with little information to a response which offers much more details. What are we doing to make sure we don't see forms like this in the future?</p>	<p>SM: Very poor grounds. Officers need to be clear as to why they are dealing with a specific person and a specific area. Provides a response from the PC involved with the form. Male seen handing out small clear plastic bag outside chantry library. Could not see if they contained items within. Chantry Library has recently been an issue regarding anti-social behaviour and cannabis use. Male has been on our radar for drug dealing. Male has also been seen by other members of the team with another known person connected to the drug scene. Most recent drug intel related to him prior to the stop and search was dated to 17/03/23.</p> <p>Officer has failed to mention on the form that he was aware of this intel.</p> <p>Also, to add some further context, there was a group of young people stopped and this was the only individual searched.</p> <p>SM: In response to Franstine: Sharon has also raised this question within the BWV review, and I am unable to answer or add to that question. But there is something to take away from this, that being the BWV was not turned on at the start of the search which is an issue and that we could see four officers in the BWV review which looking back was not necessary. See/know/respect would have helped within the form's grounds.</p> <p>SM: To answer that Phaniel earlier this year we did some supervisor input training. This was delivered to all supervisors. The reason for this is because supervisors are the first party to receive stop and search forms from there team, meaning they can have input early on and have some impact. This was</p>	<p>SM:</p>	

		<p>completed in March. Now we need to deliver the training to all the front-line officers. This will begin on the 02/08/23 with the west and south teams. This will then be mandatory training for all front-line officers and have been planned to go forward in the autumn.</p>		
<p>Form ID: 371650/040523/233342</p> <p>At around 0153hrs I was asked to attend WOODBRIDGE ROAD EAST in IPSWICH as there was a report of a male who was stumbling in the road.</p> <p>I arrived at around 0210hrs and located two males who were sitting in the doorway of WILLIAM H BROWN estate agents, I engaged with the males who said they were sitting there as they were homeless and wanted to get out of the wind. It was dark given the time of night and all businesses were closed, there was no one else around on foot in the local area.</p> <p>I was obtaining one of the males' details when PC 529 noticed some white powder on a money note on the ground next to them, she asked "WHATS THAT ON THAT NOTE", a male who I now know to be XX leant forward and snorted the white powder, I suspected this to be a class A drug so both males were detained for a search, during the search cannabis and other white substances were located</p> <p>ISCRE comments: good search, clear grounds and well recorded.</p>	<p>BWV video was reviewed by ISCRE prior to the meeting</p> <p>SL: Very well written form. Also, good use of see/know/suspect.</p> <p>FJ: Can this positive feedback go back to the officer. Very well put form</p>			

AOB	<p>FJ: Simon could you please speak about the presentation you gave about how good practice is being achieved in Suffolk.</p> <p>PM: Wanted to speak to the group regarding the SSRG's progress and secondly discuss and show a report of proportionality of stop and search use In Suffolk. PM focuses the group towards the proportionality of handcuff use in Suffolk stop and searches Which currently shows members of the BME community are more likely to be handcuffed while stopped and searched. This shows that further work is needed.</p>	<p>SM: I was asked to present for an hour, and I decided to share some history to add some context for our journey. This was done as some other forces are a little early on their journey compared to where we currently are. This showed Ipswich and Suffolk have come a long way. I then talked about the formation of the SSRG and the fear surrounding the SSRG in 2009. I went into detail regarding the SSRG and how the partnership work with ISCRE and the public meeting. I then spoke about some of the cultural changes that have been made regarding stop and search such as how our focus has changed from positive outcomes of a search and is now the 65% being negative outcomes and what the impact is of that. I then followed this up with use of force. Finally, I discussed the consistency of ISCRE's involvement and myself within the SSRG. Overall, this was all received well and was a positive.</p>		
-----	--	--	--	--

	<p>FJ: Thanks to Phaniel for sharing these figures. Regarding the use of force figures we can see a clear difference between other ethnic backgrounds and BME, so further research is needed into this.</p> <p>TP: Yes, we need to understand why this is and what we can do about it. I would like to mention a major change coming to county policing coming later this year. We will have a larger amount of engagement officers and I hope that will make a significant difference.</p> <p>6:01 Meeting Ends</p>			
<p>Next Meeting: September 27th</p>	<p>Set to take place at the University of Suffolk, time to be confirmed.</p>			