

Bill Bentley
Vice Chairman
Sussex Police and Crime Panel

County Hall
West Street
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RQ
Switchboard: 01243 777100

First Class Post

Office of the Sussex Police and Crime
Commissioner
Sackville House
Brookes Close
Lewes
East Sussex
BN7 2FZ

26 January 2017

Dear Commissioner,

Proposed Precept 2017/18 and Police and Crime Plan 2017 - 2021

At the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel on Friday 20 January the proposed precept and the refreshed Police and Crime Plan were considered.

I am writing to confirm that the Panel supported the proposed precept of £153.91 (on a Band D property) or an increase of £5.00 equivalent to 3.36%.

The Panel also considered the Police and Crime Plan 2017 - 2021 and provided the enclosed comments.

Yours sincerely,

Bill Bentley
Vice Chairman
Sussex Police and Crime Panel

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 of Office of the PCC 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 from 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 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 a maximum call answering time. *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 project in the three Mid Sussex towns to upgrade CCTV was raised and the possibility that it could be included in the section 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 such as East Sussex, where there was 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.*