

Hertfordshire Community Stop and Search Panel

Thursday 29th May 2025, 10am – 1pm

Hertsmere Borough Council Offices

Minutes

Attendance:

Demitrius Nurse (Chair)	DN	Dennis Elam	DE
Jerry Rudd	JR	David Reynolds	DR
Jacqueline Gaffin	JG	Robert Lloyd	RL
Eddie McCarroll	EMc	Insp Clare Cray	CC
John Gillett	JG	Rhiannon Sawyer	RS
Valerie Shrimplin	VS	Keeley Smiley	KS
Paulette Reed	PR	James Coady, OPCC	CB
		Sue McNeill, OPCC (minutes)	SMc

Also present:

PS Pickering, PC Hitchcock and PC Harrison (JH)

1	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies
1.1	The Chair (DN) welcomed panel members, officers from the Constabulary and observers.
1.2	Apologies were noted from: Supt Owen Pyle, Ch Insp Ricky Bartlett, PS Adrian Pikett, Catherine Boon, Tara Bullworthy, Phil Millard, Linda Blake, Andy Taylor, Mohammad Islam Ruman, Ben Platt and Jeffrey Burke.
2	Minutes of the Previous Meeting, Actions and Matters Arising.
2.1	The minutes of the previous meeting held in March 2025 were agreed (see pack item 1) and the action tracker was updated (item 2.)
2.2	Prior to the meeting, Constabulary feedback was provided by presentation on the individual concerns raised (Item 3). JGi noted that several records highlighted by scrutiny had not been reviewed by a supervising officer, although the Constabulary's response to the concerns raised was good. All agreed that the feedback system was working effectively.

3	Panel Feedback – Countywide																																																						
3.1	At the March meeting, due to technical error, the panel was unable to grade two records. These were included in the records for Group Three at this meeting.																																																						
3.2	The scrutiny took place between 10.30am and 12.00pm. The below grid represents the gradings as recorded by the panel. A registration sheet is cross-referenced with the individual records for accuracy. The figures in brackets relate to scores given for the BWV footage as this is also fed back to the Constabulary but separated so not to distort record review figures. Where the panel was split in its decision, the poorest grade has been recorded.																																																						
3.3	As there were insufficient panel members present for five subgroups, groups four and five records were not scrutinised. DN reminded the panel of the importance of offering timely apologies.																																																						
3.4	<table><tr><th>Group no.</th><th>Checked</th><th>Green 1 Excellent</th><th>Green 2 Satisfactory</th><th>Amber 3 Not confident</th><th>Red 4 Serious concerns</th></tr><tr><td>Grp 1 BWV</td><td>4 (3)</td><td>2 (2)</td><td>1 (0)</td><td>1 (1)</td><td>0 (0)</td></tr><tr><td>Grp 2 U18 strip search</td><td>2</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Grp 2 standard searches</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Grp 3 standard searches</td><td>9</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Grp 4 standard searches</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Grp 5 standard searches</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">TOTAL</td><td>18</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>4</td><td>1</td></tr></table>						Group no.	Checked	Green 1 Excellent	Green 2 Satisfactory	Amber 3 Not confident	Red 4 Serious concerns	Grp 1 BWV	4 (3)	2 (2)	1 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	Grp 2 U18 strip search	2	0	0	1	1	Grp 2 standard searches	3	1	2	0	0	Grp 3 standard searches	9	5	2	2	0	Grp 4 standard searches						Grp 5 standard searches						TOTAL		18	8	5	4	1
Group no.	Checked	Green 1 Excellent	Green 2 Satisfactory	Amber 3 Not confident	Red 4 Serious concerns																																																		
Grp 1 BWV	4 (3)	2 (2)	1 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)																																																		
Grp 2 U18 strip search	2	0	0	1	1																																																		
Grp 2 standard searches	3	1	2	0	0																																																		
Grp 3 standard searches	9	5	2	2	0																																																		
Grp 4 standard searches																																																							
Grp 5 standard searches																																																							
TOTAL		18	8	5	4	1																																																	
3.5	General feedback: - The panel reported that whilst Group 1 reviewed four records, the footage provided for one incident did not cover the actual stop/search and the engagement was therefore not graded.																																																						

	- Group 2 reviewed two strip searches and explained that one was graded red as the panel felt the level of intelligence received did not support the initial stop, particularly as the search related to an infant (nappy removed by Ambulance Service.) Once graded, an officer present at the meeting, told the panel that he was aware of this incident and that the family was known to take a child out when drug dealing, believing the child would not be searched for drugs. This was the reason for the application to conduct the strip search of the infant. The panel accepted the justification for the strip search but reminded that this intelligence was not provided in the record. - Two amber grades were awarded by Group 3, as concerns were raised regarding suspect descriptions and behaviour what was seemingly unsuspicious. Whilst not serious concerns, the panel wanted to ensure these were reviewed and fed back to the panel.
4	Meeting Frequency
4.1	RS reminded that, for transparency, the points raised by several panel members had been collated and circulated with the agenda. Concerns had been addressed with a plan to protect the fidelity of scrutiny and the decision to move to bi-monthly meetings would take effect immediately. This decision, however, will be reviewed in 12 months.
4.2	Considerable discussion followed, including some panel support for the reduction in meetings, times, venues and wider recruitment. DN noted that no data pack had been provided ahead of this meeting, highlighting his concern that within the bi-monthly model, data would not be reviewed in a timely and relevant fashion when issues arise. JC advised the panel that significant issues within the Data Engineering Team (DET) had been the reason no data pack could be provided, adding that CCr would liaise with the DET manager to understand capacity and future capability issues.
4.3	At a recent outreach engagement, DN delivered a mock panel similar to that presented to young people in colleges and the university. Whilst the attendees enjoyed the mock panel presentation, it was apparent that no one present had any prior knowledge of the scrutiny panels. He suggested a significant

	improvement in public awareness may help justify the move to bi-monthly meetings. Having heard that the Outreach & Engagement Advisor will be working with 'lesser heard' groups in terms of volunteer recruitment, DN was keen to invite him to a panel meeting. Action: Outreach & Engagement Advisor to be invited to panel
5	Complaints
5.1	KS shared a presentation (pack item 4) which related to complaints data for March–May 2025. In brief, complaints were up on the last quarter. Seven complaints were received involving the Stop/search element, making up 3% of the total number of complaints received. Six of these were dealt with by the Complaints Resolution Team (CRT) and minor learning identified for only one case (the officer did not provide their surname when explaining the reason for the stop.) One allegation involving PAVA (as considered a firearm) was referred to Professional Standards Dept. Full details of all cases were provided in the circulated presentation.
5.2	KS advised the panel that with each Stop & Search complaint dealt with, the CRT case handler will invite the complainant to observe a panel meeting. To date, none have taken up this offer.
6	Any Other Business
6.1	Considerable discussion was had relating to the transfer from OWL to Herts Connected. Whilst the development of the platform is outside of the OPCC's control, it was accepted that reach had been reduced due to this change. Having been asked by DN, JH agreed to work with the office in terms of developing an approach to further engage with younger people. JGi suggested that major companies in the county with corporate social responsibility policies should also be approached.
6.2	No other items were raised and DN closed the meeting.
6.3	Date of next meeting: Wednesday 30th July 2025, 5.30pm, Titan Court, Hatfield (hybrid opportunity.)