

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

22 January 2016 – at a meeting of the Panel held at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

David Simmons	Adur DC
Len Brown (1)	Arun DC
Lee Wares (2)	Brighton and Hove CC
Carol Purnell (3)	Chichester DC
Michael Jones	Crawley BC
John Ungar	Eastbourne BC
Bill Bentley	East Sussex CC
Rosalyn St Pierre	East Sussex CC
Colin Fitzgerald (4)	Hastings BC
Kate Rowbottom	Horsham DC
Tony Nicholson	Lewes DC
Norman Webster	Mid Sussex DC
Eleanor Kirby-Green	Rother DC
Claire Dowling	Wealden DC
Brad Watson OBE	West Sussex CC
Graham Jones	West Sussex CC
Val Turner	Worthing BC
Graham Hill	Independent

- (1) Substitute for Paul Wotherspoon
- (2) Substitute for Dee Simson
- (3) Substitute for Eileen Lintill
- (4) Substitute for Warren Davies

Apologies for absence were received from Emma Daniel (Brighton and Hove CC), Warren Davies (Hastings BC), Eileen Lintill (Chichester DC), Sandra Prail (Independent), Dee Simson (Brighton and Hove CC) and Paul Wotherspoon (Arun DC)

In attendance: Katy Bourne, Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner; Mark Streater, Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer of the Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner (OSPCC); Carl Rushbridge, Chief Finance Officer of the OSPCC; and Ninesh Edwards and Matthew Evans (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

Welcome and Introductions

54. The Chairman welcomed attendees to the meeting and informed the Panel that Sandra Prail would be stepping down from her role on the Panel as an independent member. The Chairman outlined his gratitude for the work undertaken by Mrs Prail and the Panel agreed that a letter would be sent from the Chairman to confirm its thanks to Mrs Prail. Following the current meeting there would be a vacancy on the Panel for an independent member; a recruitment exercise would be commenced shortly to fill the vacancy.

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel

Declarations of Interest

55. In accordance with the code of conduct members of the Panel declared the personal interests contained in the table below.

Panel Member	Personal Interest
Brad Watson	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership
Graham Hill	Volunteer at Victim Support charity
Dave Simmons	Chairman of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing Vice-Chairman of Safer West Sussex Partnership
Bill Bentley	Chairman of East Sussex Safer Community Board
Paul Wotherspoon	Member of Safer Arun Partnership
Claire Dowling	Chairman of Safer Wealden Partnership
Emma Daniel	Member of Brighton and Hove Safe in the City Partnership Board
Eleanor Kirby-Green	Member of Safer Rother Partnership
Eileen Lintill	Member of Chichester Community Safety Partnership
Tony Nicholson	Chairman of Lewes Community Safety Partnership
Val Turner	Member of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing
Michael Jones	Chairman of Safer Crawley Partnership
Kate Rowbottom	Chairman of the Community Safety Partnership at Horsham
Warren Davies	Chairman of the Safer Community Partnership at Hastings
Lee Wares	Applicant to funding provided by the Commission on behalf of a Local Action Team
Colin Fitzgerald	Employee of Solace Women’s Aid (see minute 64)

Minutes

56. The Panel noted two matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting; under minute 49 a volunteer from East Sussex District and Borough Councils was sought to participate on the Police Complaints Working Group; and under minute 51 the outstanding response to the written question at the previous meeting had been tabled at the current meeting (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes).

57. Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 9 October 2015 be confirmed as a correct record.

Police and Crime Plan Working Group

58. The Panel received a report from the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel which set out the recommendations arising from the meetings of the Working Group to review the Police and Crime Plan and the draft budget for 2016/17 (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes).

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel

59. The Panel raised the following issues during the discussion:

- The use of the term ‘visible policing’ was queried and whether changing this to ‘responsive policing’ would be more appropriate.
- The community warden schemes were not necessarily associated with the Police therefore the role of the Commissioner to promote the wardens was questioned.
- Greater detail regarding the difficult financial situation and current pressures faced by the Police should be included in the report.
- The role of community wardens in rural areas was queried and the lack of detail regarding accountability and liability around the provision of this service. The possibility that there could be duplicate payments for community wardens through Parish Council precept and the Commissioner’s precept was raised. There was concern that coverage of community wardens would be inconsistent across areas of Sussex depending on the enthusiasm or the capacity of local councils to afford the service. As a consequence of this lack of detail some members were unable to support recommendation three. *Clarification was provided that Sussex Area Local Councils (SALC) was leading on projects for Community Wardens.*

60. The Panel voted on each of the three recommendations separately. Each was agreed by a simple majority of votes.

61. Resolved – That the Panel agrees the three recommendations arising from the Police and Crime Plan Working Group below:

The Plan

1. That the incoming Commissioner involves the Group as the performance measures for the new Plan’s objectives are developed, to help ensure these are valid, reliable, and not in conflict with one another.

Proposed Precept

2. That the Commissioner continues to work with Sussex Police to explain to residents the evidence underlying the challenge of maintaining a visible policing presence throughout Sussex, given the changing nature of crime in the UK.
3. That the Commissioner encourages the concept of local communities funding their own community warden, where residents consider there to be a need.

Revenue and Capital Budget 2016/17

62. The Panel received a report from the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning the proposed Revenue and Capital Budget for 2016/17 (copy appended

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel to the signed version of the minutes). The report was introduced by the Chief Finance Officer of the OSPCC who advised the Panel that: the review of distributing funding to forces had been postponed and there was a potential impact on medium-term financial planning if the review occurred in the next financial year; the Medium Term Financial Forecast assumed a precept at the highest allowable level; savings were required in order to meet the changes to National Insurance which would produce a liability of £5.6 million; it was estimated that savings amounting to £35 million would be required in 2016/17; and the Comprehensive Spending Review had introduced significant investment areas but without certainty regarding sources of funding.

Precept Option 2016/17

63. The Panel considered a report from the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning the proposed precept (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The precept represented an increase of £5 a year on a Band D property which was within the threshold that would trigger the requirement for a referendum. A public consultation exercise had been undertaken on the proposed precept and over two thirds of respondents had supported the increase.

64. The Panel raised the following issues during the discussion:

- The increases in the reporting of child abuse, rape and domestic abuse raised the need for an increase in the provision of refuges. It was questioned if such priorities were assessed against counter-terrorism which could be seen as a distraction to local policing priorities. *Counter-terrorism was funded nationally, £30 million had been allocated as a transformation fund in the Autumn Statement to fund counter-terrorism however clarity over these arrangements was required and a report was expected which would provide greater detail on funding. Sussex Police was responsible for armed officers at Gatwick Airport. The proposed precept would support two investment areas; digital forensics and protecting vulnerable people.*
- The risk posed by employment tribunal cases was raised. *There was a risk resulting from a recent ruling on overtime, holiday pay and entitlement; Bear Scotland v Fulton.*
- There was concern regarding the impact on Neighbourhood Policing of the savings requirements. *The Commissioner was working with the Chief Constable to understand the impact on Neighbourhood Policing.*
- It was the perception of some members of the public that the consultation had informed local residents where investment would be allocated rather than allowing them an input in determining funding of significant local issues. *Through the consultation exercise local residents had been offered the opportunity to make additional comments including specific mention of local issues. The Commissioner was happy to speak to members of the public unhappy with the consultation arrangements.*
- The investment priority of protecting vulnerable people was welcomed to help address an increase in serious sexual crime and domestic abuse reporting rates. It was recognised that the increase in reporting rates necessitated a greater level of resources dedicated to the investigation of such crimes.
- It was noted that reserves had reduced but assurance was requested that sufficient reserves existed to provide adequate contingency. *There was*

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel

assurance that the level of reserves was appropriate to meet future anomalies.

- The use of performance data in determining policies and the operational plan. *There was a data analyst in the OSPCC who had access to all performance and operational data and assessed the relevance of priorities and policies against this information.*
- The Policing Together programme and how this realise greater levels of savings. *Work was on-going between the Chief Constables of Sussex and Surrey Police to investigate opportunities for greater collaboration between the two Forces. Hampshire and Thames Valley Police were also party to discussions and a recent example of collaboration was the project to introduce Niche across all four areas.*
- The Panel expressed concern regarding the late settlement notification and the remaining uncertainty that existed regarding funding. *There was clarity regarding the budget for the 2016/17 year with only changes of 1 or 2 % expected in the figures in the report. Medium term planning was less clear with unknown elements including the level of funding for counter-terrorism.*
- Local Residents did not support the reduction of PCSOs and it was queried how PCSOs could be reduced at a time when Anti-Social Behaviour was increasing. It was noted that the policy related to PCSOs has changed dramatically since 2004. *There was a current consultation operating on the future of PCSOs and the Chief Constable was looking at additional roles and powers. The interest of local residents in PCSOs was understood and the outcome of the consultation exercise would result in a decision on the future of PCSOs.*
- It was questioned whether the role of the Commissioner was to simply increase the precept by the maximum allowable amount every year. *The Commissioner explained that a significant element of the role of the office was to ensure that victim support services were commissioned to ensure that adequate services existed in the local area for victims of crime. Setting the precept was a large part of the role but the Commissioner was responsible for setting strategy, holding the Chief Constable to account, commissioning services and supporting the work of CSPs.*
- The settlement received for the local area was relatively poor and the Commissioner was urged to send a stronger message to government that the area needs a better deal. *The Commissioner explained that she had delivered strong messages to government about the settlement provided.*

65. Colin Fitzgerald declared a personal interest as an employee of Solace Women's Aid.

66. The Panel made the comments below in the discussion which continued below:

- Support was expressed for the proposed funding to support work to address Domestic Abuse.
- There was concern regarding the level of savings proposed in the budget and the potential impact on local policing. *Police Forces were under considerable pressure to deliver savings and Sussex Police had received a good rating from HMIC regarding its financial future. Progress with the savings plans would be kept under constant review and assurances would be sought from the Chief Constable that policing standards would be maintained.*

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel

67. Michael Jones left the meeting at 12.05 p.m. and returned at 12.07 p.m.

68. The Panel noted the Revenue and Capital Budget 2016/17.

69. A motion was proposed and seconded to agree the proposed precept of 3.4%. The motion was agreed by a majority of members.

70. Resolved – that the Panel:

1) notes the draft revenue budget, 2016/17; the latest Medium Term Financial Forecast; the latest savings schedule to 2019/20; and the draft capital budget for 2016/17 and capital and investment programme to 2019/20; and

2) agrees the Commissioner's proposed precept of 3.4%.

71. There was a brief adjournment at 12.08 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 12.21 p.m.

72. Tony Nicholson and Norman Webster left the meeting at 12.08 p.m.

Police and Crime Plan 2014 – 2017 Refresh

73. The Panel considered a report by the Police and Crime Commissioner containing an updated version of the Police and Crime Plan 2014 – 2017 (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). It was explained that following the elections for Police and Crime Commissioners in May 2016 there would be an entirely new version of the Plan produced for the next 4-year term.

74. The Panel sought details of the outcomes of the objectives contained in the Plan. *It was explained that the outcomes would be reported to the Panel as part of the Annual Report at the summer meeting of the Panel.*

75. The Panel agreed the refreshed version of the Police and Crime Plan 2014 – 2017.

76. Resolved – that the Panel agrees the refreshed version of the Police and Crime Plan 2014 – 2017.

Progress on the Local Policing Model

77. The Panel received and noted a report from the Commissioner regarding progress on work to develop the Local Policing Model (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The development of a new model was intended to instigate a new local policing programme based on three key areas: prevention; partnerships; and investigations. The Chief Constable would present to the Commissioner the outcomes of this work and a proposal for a future model.

78. The Commissioner was asked if she was content with the work undertaken on the new model to date. *It was explained that work was still at a relatively early stage of development but a positive element of the new model was the resolution*

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel
centre which the Commissioner had visited recently. The centre helped the Force to reduce the level of demand on local policing and was a significant element of the new model in the future.

HMIC Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy (PEEL) programme

79. The Panel received and noted a report from the Commissioner regarding the outcomes of HMIC's annual inspection of Sussex Police (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). HMIC had undertaken reviews of Efficiency and Effectiveness (Vulnerability) which were intended to assess the 'health' of Sussex Police. The two inspections had resulted in 'Good' ratings for Sussex Police. The Effectiveness (Vulnerability) report looked at the performance of the Force in respect of domestic abuse and child sexual exploitation and made mention of the involvement of the Commissioner and effective partnership working. The areas that had been highlighted as requiring improvement were being actively addressed.

Quarterly Report of Complaints

80. The Panel received and noted a report providing an update on complaints received in the last quarter and progress made on live complaints (copy appended to the signed copy of the minutes). No new complaints received by the Panel over the last quarter pertained to issues within the remit of the Panel.

Written Questions

81. The Panel received and noted the schedule of written questions submitted prior to the meeting and the responses from the Commissioner's Office (copy appended to the signed copy of the minutes).

Commissioner's Question Time

82. The Panel raised the following issues and questions of the Commissioner:

- The increasing incidence of rough sleeping in Sussex. *Sussex Police were working with partners and an analyst had been engaged to compile data to facilitate a greater understanding of the issue. Sussex Police was working with Health representatives, social services and housing services to target areas with a 'pop-up' hub and triage rough-sleepers. The Commissioner was keen to support the work being undertaken by local authorities.*
- The attendance of officers at community meetings such as Local Community Panels. *The new policing model would contain arrangements to ensure that a link between the Police and local communities was retained.*
- The morale within Sussex Police following reorganisation and any survey of satisfaction undertaken within the Force. *When the Commissioner was first elected it was recognised that there was an issue regarding morale in the Force. The Commissioner has met with Unison, associations of officers and staff groupings to raise awareness of changes and developments in the Force.*
- How policing informs licencing and substantiating objections from the Police to licensing applications. *The issue would be raised with senior officers.*
- Restorative justice and outcomes of the policy. *The programme had been arranged through the Commissioner's Office and had been considered a*

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel

success with 500 cases delivered successfully since its introduction. The programme had been recognised as an effective method of preventing crime and reducing reoffending.

- Update on Special Constables. *The number of Special Constables was increasing with a further 30/40 to be recruited in February 2016.*
- The perspective of the Commissioner on the consultation regarding Police and Fire Service collaboration. *The Commissioner welcomed the opportunity for greater collaboration between the Police and local Fire and Rescue Services.*

Date of next meeting

83. The next meeting date of 22 April 2016 would be cancelled if no substantive business arose.

The meeting ended at 12.58 p.m.

Chairman