



Community Scrutiny Panel – Stop & Search Vehicle Stops

Date:	9 th April 2026
Time:	17:30-20:00
Location:	Leamington Spa
Chair:	Vicky Hoppitt
Attendance:	Vicky Hoppitt (Equality and Engagement Officer), Community Scrutiny Panel members.
Clips viewed:	6 Stop Search Body Worn Video (BWV) reviewed
Next meeting:	13 th May 2026 - Rugby

This document provides a summary of feedback from the Community Scrutiny Panel. Panel members are independent members of the public. They are not employed or paid by Warwickshire Police to provide these views.

The content is taken from feedback forms completed by panel members following the session. Responses have been reviewed and summarised to highlight key themes and remove repetition. This document does not include full verbatim comments but aims to present an accurate and balanced overview of the feedback provided.

Feedback from the panel is shared with Warwickshire Police learning and development teams to support ongoing reflection and to help identify potential training and development needs.

Overview

Overall, the panel identified consistently good performance across all cases. Average scores ranged between 3 and 3.75 out of 4, reflecting professional, fair and proportionate policing. Officers demonstrated strong interpersonal skills and appropriate use of powers. There are, however, some recurring themes where practice could be strengthened, particularly around consistency of process and communication.



Key Positives

- Officers were consistently described as polite, respectful, calm and non-confrontational.
- Interactions were friendly, professional and often described as “pleasant”, “low key” and “business-like”.
- Officers demonstrated strong rapport-building skills, including gaining trust and forming positive relationships with subjects.
- Communication was generally clear and helped reduce tension during encounters.
- Encounters were assessed as fair, legitimate and transparent, with appropriate decision-making evident.
- Searches were thorough, efficient and carried out with consideration for individuals’ welfare (for example, maintaining comfort in cold weather and taking care not to cause harm).
- Officers managed situations well, keeping encounters calm and avoiding escalation.
- Core elements of the stop and search process, including grounds and object of the search, were generally communicated.

Areas for Improvement

1. Consistency in providing required information during searches

There were repeated gaps across cases in how officers provided information during searches. Missing or inconsistent details included warrant information, station details, the right to a record, and clear explanations of the legal powers used and the detention for the search.

2. Communication confidence and clarity

One case identified a need for greater confidence when delivering information, and there was isolated feedback regarding tone (for example, perceived sarcasm).

3. Procedural compliance and recording

Inconsistencies were identified in offering or providing receipts and in asking or clearly recording ethnicity. In some cases, these steps were not clearly evidenced on BWV.

4. Officer safety and deployment

One case raised concerns regarding single crewing and the potential risk if the situation had escalated.

5. Awareness of tone and perception

There was isolated feedback suggesting that tone may at times be perceived negatively, even where the overall interaction was appropriate.

Development areas:

- Clear and confident communication of legal powers
- Awareness of tone and how interactions are perceived