

## Sussex Police and Crime Panel

20 January 2017 – at a meeting of the Panel held at 11.00 a.m. at County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

Len Brown (1)	Arun DC
Emma Daniel	Brighton and Hove CC
Eileen Lintill	Chichester DC
Michael Jones	Crawley BC
John Ungar (2)	Eastbourne BC
Bill Bentley	East Sussex CC
Rosalyn St Pierre	East Sussex CC
Warren Davies	Hastings BC
Kate Rowbottom	Horsham DC
Tony Nicholson	Lewes DC
Mandy Thomas-Atkin (3)	Mid Sussex DC
Eleanor Kirby-Green	Rother DC
Claire Dowling	Wealden DC
Sandra James	West Sussex CC
Nigel Peters (4)	West Sussex CC
Val Turner	Worthing BC
Graham Hill	Independent
Susan Scholefield (5)	Independent

- (1) Substitute for Paul Wotherspoon
- (2) Substitute for Alan Shuttleworth
- (3) Substitute for Norman Webster
- (4) Substitute for Brad Watson OBE
- (5) Substitute for Peter Nightingale - \*see minute 72 below.

Apologies for absence were received from Paul Wotherspoon (Arun DC), Alan Shuttleworth (Eastbourne BC), Norman Webster (Mid Sussex DC), Brad Watson OBE (West Sussex CC), Lee Wares (Brighton and Hove CC) and Peter Nightingale (Independent).

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 (OPCC); Iain McCulloch, Chief Finance Officer of OSPCC; and Ninesh Edwards and Matthew Evans (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

### Declarations of Interest

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

Panel Member	Personal Interest
Graham Hill	Volunteer at Victim Support charity
Bill Bentley	Chairman of East Sussex Safer Community Board Member of LGA Safer and Stronger Communities Board and LGA National Member Champion for domestic abuse
Emma Daniel	Member of Brighton and Hove Safe in the City Partnership Board
Eileen Lintill	Member of Chichester Community Safety Partnership

Tony Nicholson	Chairman of Lewes Community Safety Partnership
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
Claire Dowling	Chairman of Safer Wealden Partnership
Val Turner	Member of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing
Eleanor Kirby-Green	Member of Safer Rother Partnership
Susan Scholefield	A serving Magistrate
Nigel Peters	Member of Safer Arun Partnership
Len Brown	Member of Safer Arun Partnership

## Minutes

64. The Panel noted a correction to the minutes of the last meeting to include the two declarations below to the minutes of the previous meeting on 23 September 2016.

Claire Dowling	Chairman of Safer Wealden Partnership
Eleanor Kirby-Green	Member of Safer Rother Partnership

65. Paragraph 47, bullet 4 - The Panel requested an update on the recruitment of PCSO's in the autumn. *The Commissioner advised that 196 PCSOs would be in post by the end of January.*

66. Paragraph 61, bullet 6 - The Panel requested an update on attempts to increase the level of recruits from BME communities and what the current percentage was in terms of recruitment of women and BME. *The Commissioner explained that she would provide the statistics following the meeting.*

67. Resolved – That, subject to the correction in paragraph 64 above, the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 23 September 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

## Urgent Matters

68. The Panel noted the circulation of the supplementary agenda and the addition of a Part II item for consideration at the end of the present meeting. The item concerned the minutes of the Panel's recommendations relating to the appointment of the Chief Finance Officer to the Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner at its meeting on 4 July 2016.

## Police and Crime Plan and Precept Working Group

69. The Panel received and noted a report concerning the outcomes of the meetings of the Working Group with the Commissioner and her staff to assist in the formulation of the budget and precept and the new Police and Crime Plan 2017 – 2021.

70. The Panel made the points below in the discussion that followed:

- Concern was expressed regarding the lack of accountability in the Plan, particularly the lack of clearly defined measures relating to the objectives. The Panel questioned how the Commissioner could be held to account for performance against the objectives in the Plan without tangible measures or indicators of success. *The Commissioner asserted that the role of the Panel was to scrutinise decisions; measures and targets were contained in the Plan. The Commissioner had been re-elected on the objectives contained in the Plan. The Plan had been compiled in accordance with national guidance advising that Plans should outline a vision rather than set targets. Each objective in the Plan had a measure and the Commissioner's Annual Report would outline achievement under each aim.*
- The Panel was concerned that the Plan was not serving its function of presenting the Commissioner's vision to the public with clarity particularly in relation to local policing.

## **Revenue and Capital Budget 2017/18**

71. The Panel received the report by the Police and Crime Commissioner providing the draft budget 2017/18. The report was introduced by the Chief Finance Officer, OPCC, who explained that the draft budget set the context for the Commissioner's proposed precept. There had been an effective cut to funding announced in the settlement which did not take account of inflation. The precept proposal was to increase the Band D charge by £5.00; Sussex was in the lowest quartile of charging. Greater clarity surrounding medium term planning would be possible once the review of the Police Core Funding Model had been completed, expected in May, which would impact on the grant received from central government. The risks to medium term planning were presented in the report including inflation and interest rates. Capital investment during the year would focus on fleet, estate and IT and would be funded initially through capital receipts and reserves. A policy existed to retain reserves at 4% however earmarked reserves would be utilised for capital investment.

72. At the invitation of the Chairman Susan Scholefield joined the meeting at 11.30 a.m.

73. The Panel made the points below in the discussion that followed:

- The potential savings relating to a review of specialist crime teams was queried and how this would impact on the work of units such as cyber-crime and sexual crime teams. Concern was expressed that these were critical areas and the impact of any savings needed to be carefully judged. *The Commissioner explained that there was an intention to look at potential efficiencies particularly in this services shared with Surrey. An example existed in the collaboration of Surrey and Sussex homicide teams. Examples of the specialist teams included in the review would be provided in the Commissioner's Annual report.*
- The level of underspend contained in the report and the likelihood of additional underspend in the current year. *The Chief Finance Officer reported that there was some underspend with the recruitment of new officers.*
- The Commissioner had projected a budget surplus over the next two financial years therefore the savings requirement was a political choice and represented unnecessary cuts to front line policing. Recruitment of new members of staff was misleading as it involved new employees to staff the Commissioner's new initiatives. The investment case for the new initiatives was not felt to be compelling and scrutiny of the Commissioner's budget was

considered to be rushed; at local authorities, savings proposals were published and considered months in advance of the approval of the final budget. There had not been sufficient time for the Panel to consider and understand the budget proposed by the Commissioner. *The Commissioner explained that the savings targets had been set at a level to ensure that the actual savings requirements over the medium term could be achieved in a shorter time frame. The time given to the Panel to consider the budget was felt to be sufficient and if members wanted greater sight of budget proposals at an earlier stage they were encouraged to join the Working Group.*

- The likelihood of further precept increases in future financial years would present a paradox in respect of the savings targets in the report. *The Chief Finance Officer explained that the medium term plan made no assumptions about the precept in future years.*
- The forecast level of uncommitted reserves by 2021 was nil; a query was raised to ask what level would be ideal and if this projection may result in an increase to the precept. Concern was expressed that the depletion of reserves could result in a need for borrowing. *Capital investment would be funded by reserves initially, then capital receipts would be utilised and borrowing if necessary. Any increase to the precept would be considered at the relevant time. The reduction of the estate and generation of capital receipts to invest in capital projects was a conventional practice which could be supplemented by borrowing if necessary.*
- It was queried where in the budget spending on agencies by Sussex Police was contained and whether spending had increased over the previous two years. *The data was summarised into general categories, information would be made available after the meeting*
- There was concern that the proposed savings and the new policing model would diminish the provision of a local policing service and residents' experience of policing would suffer. The reduction in the number of PCSOs represented a diminution in local policing. *The Commissioner responded to explain that the reduction of PCSOs was consistent with the introduction of a new local policing model. Spending on local policing in Sussex represented 31% of the budget, above the national average of 29%. The Chairman highlighted that spending plans and savings for the Force were subject to robust scrutiny, and that the Governance Map would be circulated to members of the Panel.*
- An update was requested regarding the status of the high risk savings identified in the current year and information on what was being done to achieve the savings particularly with regard to the reported underspends. The lack of this information in the report undermined the role of the Panel to consider the draft budget and determine the proposed precept. *Further information would be provided following the meeting on the current status of savings in the current year.*

## **Precept Proposal**

74. The Panel considered a report by the Police and Crime Commissioner on the proposed precept for 2017/18. The Chief Finance Officer, OPCC introduced the report and advised the Panel that Sussex had the fifth lowest council tax in the country and the fourth lowest net expenditure per capita. The budget had been drafted on the assumption of a 0% precept and proposed savings in 2017/18 were not reliant on the proposed precept; the precept would fund the investment priorities outlined in the report. A public consultation exercise undertaken on the precept had resulted in 4,504 responses with 80% of respondents in support of the proposed precept increase of £5.00 on a Band D property.

75. The Panel raised the following issues and questions in the discussion that followed:

- What consultation was being conducted with officers over the potential role of being armed and has the impact of armed officers in shared facilities been considered? *The Commissioner explained that the Chief Constable would look at the process for appointing armed officers but there would be no consultation or survey of officers in the Force. Fire arms officers would retain other duties and the arrangements for locating officers in shared accommodation would be resolved by the Chief Constable.*
- The graphic indicating the distribution of Safeguarding Investigation Units (SIUs) across Sussex indicated a reduction in staff in Brighton and Hove. *The Commissioner explained that there would be an increase in public protection investigators who would work across all areas of Sussex irrespective of where they were based. The location of public protection investigators was predicated on the calculation of greatest risk and resources would be deployed where required.*
- The Commissioner was asked where the Community Priority Crime Teams would be based, what form the operating model would take and how they would work in collaboration with the Expert Youth Teams. *The Commissioner explained that there would be a Community Team in each Division which would work with the Youth Team to address anti-social behaviour, drug problems and persistent reoffending.*
- The Community Priority Crime Teams were symbolic of a response to local need only and not a credible replacement for local PCSOs. The transition to the new model could lead to operational confusion; the Commissioner was asked how she would learn from previous experience and ensure a fluid and instantaneous transition. *The Commissioner explained that the new model would be monitored and scrutinised by HMIC through the PEEL inspections. The Chief Constable would be held to account by the Commissioner for the introduction of the new model.*
- Local residents wanted an improvement in local policing and regretted the reduction in PCSOs, there was no indication in the report where the Local Community and Youth Teams would be based and how they could react to issues reported in local communities. *The Chief Finance Officer reported that Substantial investment has been made in public protection. This is predicated based on threat, risk and harm. Public protection is assessed on a monthly basis. This was recognised by HMIC as best practice. The Commissioner explained that under the new model PCSOs were more effective in their role and it was misleading to emphasise changes to the numbers of PCSOs alone. Youth Teams would be involved in prevention.*
- The average age of the population in Sussex was rising but the increase in vulnerable people living alone was not reflected in the Plan or investment priorities. *The Commissioner explained that Sussex Police had introduced Operation Signature as a response to crimes against the elderly.*
- The Commissioner was asked about local authority cuts to youth services, the impact of these cuts on policing and what liaison was conducted with leaders of local councils. *The Commissioner responded to explain that cuts at upper tier authorities in Sussex had a direct impact on crime and policing. No local authorities has consulted with the Commissioner prior to budget setting. The new policing model had been influenced by austerity and the national policing vision 2025 asserted the need for police forces to work in partnership with other bodies.*

- The lack of meaningful consultation conducted by the Commissioner with local communities and Parish Councils regarding local policing was raised.
- Clarity around the consultation conducted and a breakdown of the response across the areas of the Sussex was required. The presentation of the statistics in the appendix to the report was not a credible document in support of the proposed precept. The inclusion of detail regarding the proportion of residents within the policing districts expressing support for the precept would have augmented the statistics in the report. The presentation of the statistics in the appendix to the report provided further detail regarding the proportion of respondents by policing district.

76. The Panel noted the draft Revenue and Capital Budget 2017/18.

77. A motion was proposed and seconded to veto the proposed precept and consider a revised precept at the provisional meeting date in February. The proposal to veto was moved as a consequence of unresolved concerns regarding local policing and a lack of information regarding the precept and budget. The Panel voted by a majority to reject the motion.

78. A motion was proposed and seconded to oppose the precept on the grounds that insufficient data has been provided and greater clarity around the investment proposals was required. The Panel voted by a majority to reject the motion.

79. A motion was proposed and seconded to agree the proposed precept. The Panel voted by a majority to accept the motion.

80. Resolved – That the Panel agrees the proposed precept of £153.91 (on a Band D property), an increase of £5.00, equivalent to an increase of 3.36%.

### **Police and Crime Plan 2017 - 2021**

81. The Panel considered a Report by the Police and Crime Commissioner which introduced a new Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021 following the re-election of the Commissioner in 2016. The Chief Executive, OPCC, introduced the report and advised the Panel that during the production of the Plan consultation was undertaken with the public, the PCP working group and a reference group. The Plan was formulated in accordance with official guidance. The Plan included a section on measuring success and would incorporate links to partners and agencies in line with the recommendations of the Working Group.

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

- There was disappointment expressed that the Plan was not inspirational.
- The absence of definitive measures in the Plan and how the success of the objectives could be determined. In particular, measures to assess the success of the introduction of the Local Policing Programme (LPP) were required.
- The new Plan appeared to be a continuation of existing policy and was a missed opportunity to introduce new priorities and areas of work. There were no tangible measures in the Plan and there was insufficient effort to involve the public in setting the objectives.
- A query was raised regarding the level of cases heard in Sussex that involved a victim statement. The section of the Plan concerning victims should

encourage people working with victims to make statements. *The Commissioner would attempt to find out the level in Sussex.*

- An appropriate and tangible measure for accessing local policing services could be the maximum time a caller would have to wait for a call to the 101 phone line to be answered. The Commissioner was asked if she had a commitment on maximum call answering times. *The Commissioner explained that of importance was the caller satisfaction with the outcome of the call. Work was ongoing with the Chief Constable to determine if improvements to the 101 service could be made but a measure on call answering times in the Plan was not appropriate. The Commissioner will continue to monitor call handling times and will work with the Chief Constable to improve performance in this area.*
- The project in the three Mid Sussex towns to upgrade CCTV was raised and the possibility that it could be included in the section of the Plan relating to use of technology. *The Commissioner would provide an update on the project.*
- The absence of a foreword to the Plan was raised and the Commissioner was asked what would be included in the passage. *The Commissioner confirmed that it had not been written but note had been made of the Panel's desire to see greater inspiration in the document.*
- The paragraph in the Plan relating to roads in Sussex was bland. To represent areas in Sussex, with a high level of KSIs, the Commissioner should incorporate specific measures in the Plan to assess performance against the objective to address causes of death and injury on the roads of Sussex. *The Commissioner explained that the Plan was a strategic document and the operational delivery plan established by the Chief Constable would include measures in respect of this objective.*

83. The Panel agreed that a summary of comments concerning the draft Plan would be composed by the Clerk to the Panel and submitted to the Commissioner.

84. Resolved – that the Panel notes the draft Police and Crime Plan and delegates to officers the composition of a summary of comments on the Plan to be sent to the Commissioner.

### **Local Policing Programme – Progress Update**

85. The Panel considered a Report by the Police and Crime Commissioner which provided an update on the introduction of the new Local Policing Programme. In a correction to the report the Commissioner explained that projected savings of £29m would result from the introduction of the new model and paragraph 1.3 should be amended to remove reference to the delivery of this level of savings each year.

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

- Greater detail was required concerning how the Chief Constable would engage communities to communicate the implementation of the LPP. It was not felt that the message regarding the new model was being adequately communicated and it was queried how the Chief Constable would ensure that communities felt safe and confident in the new model. It was requested that a plan of how the Chief Constable would approach communications to local communities be made available. The Commissioner explained that she would continue to hold the Chief Constable to account for the delivery of the Local Policing Programme.

- The Panel expressed concern regarding the reduction of PCSOs as outlined in the report.
- The study conducted by Cambridge University into targeted patrols of PCSOs across Sussex was queried and the cost incurred by Sussex Police for the production of the study. The Chief Executive explained that the work was instigated by the Cambridge University Institute of Criminology and was commissioned by the College of Policing; there was no cost to Sussex Police. The purpose of this research was to look at resources and demand. *The pilot model for PCSO deployment was being trialled in Sussex with an emphasis on prevention of prominent trends in crimes such as anti-social behaviour.*
- Concern was expressed that requiring officers to be multi-skilled could lead to a diminution of specialist skills with consequences on crime and disorder. The example of a reduction in the number of licencing officers and subsequent increase in the level of drink-related disorder was cited as an example.
- A summary of the comments of the Panel would be sent to the Commissioner for the attention of the Chief Constable.

87. Resolved – that the Panel notes the report and update relating to the introduction of the Local Policing Programme.

### **Resolution Centre Tour Feedback**

88. The Panel provided feedback on a recent visit to the Resolution Centre. A summary of the comments arising from the discussion would be sent to the Commissioner.

89. The Panel raised the points below in the discussion that followed:

- The tour was a revealing experience.
- The forms of promotion undertaken to inform the public of the work of the Resolution Centre was queried. It was felt that communications which highlighted the role of the Centre and its benefits would be valuable. Operators on the 101 service should also explain to callers the role of the Centre and why a call was being transferred.
- A query was raised regarding call-handling on the 101 phone line. If callers hung-up before calls were answered would this distort the crime figures. *The Commissioner explained that new facilities for the reporting of crime were being developed; the Metropolitan Police was investigating the reporting of crimes by social media. The holding message on the 101 phone line directed people to the Sussex Police website to report crime.*
- The centre was very busy with a high level of calls and reports from the public. It was felt important that operators at the centre maintain sensitivity toward the impact of crime on victims. Crimes that may be perceived as relatively minor could have profound effects upon the victim.
- The Panel would continue to monitor the performance of the Centre and what progress was made in the future.
- A summary of the comments of the Panel would be sent to the Commissioner for the attention of the Chief Constable.

### **Quarterly Report of Complaints**

90. The Panel received a report from the Clerk to the Panel providing an update on complaints received in the last quarter.



91. The Panel was concerned regarding the response received to the Hewitt and Grey complaint concerning an inappropriate relationship between the Force and a local author. The response from the Commissioner was considered bland and undermined the significance of the complaint. Appropriate checks and balances were required to avoid a repeat of such a situation and in the event of a reoccurrence a more robust response would be necessary.

92. Resolved – that the Panel notes the report.

### **Written Questions**

93. 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**

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

- The Commissioner was asked about her involvement with Police ICT and what duties she had assumed outside her remit as Commissioner. *The Commissioner confirmed she had not taken on any duties that were outside her remit and would provide a written response to clarify and include detail of the boards she attended.*
- The Commissioner was asked what replacements for the Neighbourhood Management Panels were planned. *A full response to the question was contained in the response to the third written question.*

### **Date of next meeting**

95. The next meeting date of 7 April 2017 was noted.

### **Exclusion of Press and Public**

96. Resolved – That under Section 100(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I, of Schedule 12A, of the Act by virtue of the paragraph specified under the item and that, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information

### **Minutes (Part II) of the meeting held on 27 June 2014**

Exempt: paragraph 1, Information about individuals

97. Resolved – that the minutes (Part II) of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 4 July 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

The meeting ended at 1.45 p.m.

Chairman