

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

9 October 2015 – at a meeting of the Panel held at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

David Simmons	Adur DC
Paul Wotherspoon	Arun DC
Emma Daniel	Brighton and Hove CC
Dee Simson	Brighton and Hove CC
Eileen Lintill	Chichester DC
Michael Jones	Crawley BC
John Ungar	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
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
Sandra Prail	Independent

*Please see minute 41 below.

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).

Declarations of Interest

37. 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	Senior Service Delivery Manager for Victim Support charity Member of Crawley Community Safety Partnership Board
Dave Simmons	Chairman of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing 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

Minutes

38. The Panel noted a correction to the minutes of the last meeting. Claire Dowling's declaration of a personal interest as Chairman of the Safer Wealden Partnership required inclusion in the record.

39. Resolved – That subject to the inclusion of the correction in minute 38 above the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 3 July 2015 be confirmed as a correct record.

Road Safety

40. The Panel received a report from the Commissioner regarding road safety (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) which outlined the role of Sussex Police in relation to road safety and how the Force was held to account for the reduction of Killed and Seriously Injured (KSIs) statistics on the roads of Sussex. The report was introduced by the Commissioner's Office and the Panel was informed that: a recent increase in the level of KSIs was attributable to the increase in cycling rates; the road safety performance of the Police was scrutinised by the Commissioner during Performance and Accountability Meetings (PAMs) with the Chief Constable; and the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) was the local oversight body for road safety in Sussex and its membership included the Commissioner and Local Authorities including highways authorities.

41. Val Turner joined the meeting at 10.43 a.m.

42. The Panel raised the following issues with the Commissioner:

- In a number of communities across Sussex there was a desire to see the introduction of 20mph zones however such zones were often not supported by Sussex Police as the speed limits were felt to be unenforceable. Although 20mph limits were considered unenforceable in some areas the Police should take account of the wishes of local communities. *The Commissioner confirmed that local views were taken into account by the Police and the SSRP could consider consistent enforcement within 20mph zones. The Commissioner would be prepared to raise this issue at a forthcoming meeting of the SSRP. Where 20mph zones were introduced there was an assumption that the local highway network would ensure that the speed limit was self-enforcing; Operation Crackdown and Speedwatch groups could assist with enforcement. Speeding issues in 20mph zones could be raised with the*

district commander and enforcement in these zones was a decision for local policing.

- *The involvement of local residents in speed safety. Speedwatch groups across Sussex could operate where an assessment of suitable enforcement areas had occurred and after appropriate training had been provided.*
- *How the Commissioner would monitor the effectiveness of the £24,090 passported from the Safer in Sussex Community Fund to the SSRP to support road safety initiatives? The SSRP would decide how to allocate the funding and monitor its use. The Partnership had recently been subject to an audit.*
- *In Kent speed cameras were introduced in areas where there were persistent reports of speeding issues, the Commissioner was asked if she supported the introduction of cameras in problem areas. The siting of speed cameras was part of the responsibilities of the SSRP and the Commissioner did support the siting of cameras in problem areas.*
- *Concern regarding the increase in KSIs relating to cyclists. The enforcement of the use of cycle lanes by cyclists and if statistics were available for the occurrence of accidents involving cyclists in areas where they was infrastructure provision. There was no provision to enforce the use of cycle lanes. A Cycle Safety Campaign would be taking place in November to educate local cyclists around safety issues. The SSRP would have statistics relating to accidents involving cyclists.*
- *It was queried whether the police had sufficient capacity to undertake effective roads policing particularly at night. The issue could be raised with the Chief Constable; the allocation of funding for road policing was the decision of the Chief Constable.*
- *Previous concerns regarding the operation of the SSRP in the Commissioner's Annual Report considered at the previous Panel meeting on 31 July. Had the Commissioner been reassured about the performance of the Partnership since the meeting? An audit report had been conducted on the SSRP which focused on Governance arrangements; the report had produced an opinion of satisfactory assurance on the control environment of the Partnership.*
- *Some members of the Panel expressed concern regarding the emphasis placed upon the SSRP which was an unaccountable body; it was suggested that a member of the Partnership attend a forthcoming meeting of the Panel which would include discussions relating to road safety. It was the responsibility of the constituent local authorities to the SSRP to hold the body to account. Further scrutiny of the Partnership would be conducted by the CSPs and three Strategic Boards.*
- *The increase in the use of mini-motorbikes was raised as a concern. The incidence of anti-social driving of mini motorbikes should be reported to Operation Crackdown.*
- *The suitability of sites for speed cameras was raised and the importance of using local intelligence to target problem areas effectively. The SSRP would be able to provide advice on the policy for the location of speed cameras in Sussex.*
- *It was noted that a balance was necessary between education and enforcement in relation to road safety. Enforcement was only a small*

element of road safety; of greater importance was education and road engineering.

- Facilities to report dangerous and anti-social driving needed to be made easier to use.

43. Resolved – That the Panel notes the Commissioner's Road Safety report.

Medium Term Financial Forecast and Budget Timetable 2016/17

44. The Panel received a report from the Commissioner regarding the medium term financial forecast and budget timetable 2016/17 (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) which outlined the latest budget planning assumptions in 2016/17 and included the Medium Term Financial Forecast (MTFF) up to 2020. The report was introduced by the Commissioner's Office and the Panel was informed that a further report would be presented to the Panel in January with further information and a proposed precept for 2016/17. Currently the Commissioner's Office was awaiting the outcome of the Treasury's spending review and an announcement on how the Police Fund would be allocated in the future which would impact upon future funding levels.

45. The Panel raised the following issues with the Commissioner:

- Further detail regarding the operational and corporate risk posed by the proposed savings was required. This needed to be provided in accordance with detail relating to the financial robustness of proposed savings. *The working group of the Panel had been engaged in the consideration of savings proposals and budget and precept options.*
- The financial modelling of 25-40% reductions was queried. The impact of these levels of reductions would be significant and there was concern regarding the effect on operational policing in Sussex. *All unprotected government departments had been asked to model 25-40% reductions as part of budget planning for 2016/17 and a 25% reduction had been modelled as part of planning for the next financial year. Confirmation was awaited in the Autumn Financial statement of the grant from the Home Office in 2016/17 and changes to the police funding formula. Reductions in the Home Office grant were anticipated and it was currently unclear what effect the changes to the formula would have upon funding but it was predicted that the changes could result in an increase or decrease in funding of 5%. The fundamental nature of policing was changing within an era of increasing costs (e.g. cybercrime and historical abuse cases) and reducing funding. The Panel requested an update on the development of the new policing model to the next meeting in January.*
- The lack of clarity from the Home Office concerning the police funding formula was felt to be unhelpful and the impact on reserves of a decrease in the level of funding in 2016/17 was queried. Further information regarding the identified risk, in the report, that reserves were adequate to meet unplanned demand was requested. *Before the use of reserves was contemplated clarification regarding funding for 2016/17 was required. The*

use of reserves was not a preferred solution to funding reductions but if necessary they could be used. The use of reserves was a balancing act and there was a need to highlight the risk involved in the allocation of reserves to meet funding shortfalls. A recent audit of the reserves had concluded that good practice was being followed with regard to the level of reserves. Greater clarity regarding the financial context for 2016/17 would be available at the next meeting in January. The Commission had lobbied the Home Secretary on decreasing budgets and the need for adequate funding to ensure the effective operation of the Force.

- It was recognised that local policing was under great strain with significant savings identified within this element of the Police budget over the next three years. It was requested that the report brought to the January meeting provide an assessment of the impact of funding reductions on local policing. It was felt that in light of savings and reductions in local authority services there was a continuing and pressing need for local policing. *The proposed savings outlined in the report were subject to the completion of comprehensive business cases. An updated savings table would be presented to the January meeting which set out finalised savings priorities.*
- Concern was expressed regarding the impact on morale of the changes included in the Target Operating Model, the proposed savings and the limit of a 1% pay rise. *There was an awareness of the importance of morale in the force and the Commissioner worked closely with the Chief Constable to understand the impact of current circumstances on the force.*
- An update was requested on when information regarding the future operating model would be published and what the proposed intentions were. *The Target Operating Model was a five year rolling programme and consultation was currently taking place with local authorities, CSPs, local residents and departments of the police force.*
- The proposed savings resulting from the reduction of the number of PCSOs was a significant concern for the Panel. Greater detail on the proposals was required. *Work was on-going with the Sussex Association of Local Councils (SALC) on a project to allow Parish and Town Councils to ensure the continuation of a community presence in the form of a warden or village agent.*

46. Resolved – That the Panel notes the content of the report.

Police Complaints Working Group

47. The Panel considered a report by the Clerk to the Panel regarding a proposal to establish a Police Complaints Working Group to assist the Commissioner in the development of a response to the current consultation regarding Police Complaints (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes).

48. The Panel agreed the establishment of the working group, the terms of reference in appendix A and the membership. Dave Simmons volunteered to attend the working group as the representative of the District and Borough Councils in

West Sussex. Graham Hill would act as the Independent Member on the Working Group and Sandra Prail would act as his substitute as appropriate.

49. Resolved- that the Panel agrees:

- The establishment of the Police Complaints Working Group;
- The terms of reference in the Appendix to the report; and
- That Dave Simmons joins the membership of the Working Group as the representative of West Sussex District and Borough Councils and Graham Hill as the Independent member.

Quarterly Report of Complaints

50. 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

51. 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). The Panel requested a written response to item 3 of the first question in the report submitted by Mr Nixon.

Members' Feedback

52. The Members of the Panel provided feedback on recent visits to Victim Support in Shoreham and to the Youth Commission event. Members were impressed by the proactive approach taken by Victim Support and the quality of service provided under the high level of demand-led pressure. Members who attended the Youth Commission event spoke of the energy and professionalism of the members of the Commission.

Commissioner's Question Time

53. The Panel raised the following questions of the Commissioner:

- The Commissioner was asked whether she was in support of the proposal to bring Fire and Rescue Services in Sussex under the authority of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. *The Commissioner welcomed the debate on the proposals and stated that the decision would not be taken unilaterally and would only be implemented if it was shown to be in the public interest.*
- A recent news report in Crawley claimed that charges only resulted from 1 in 10 burglaries in the Borough; the Commissioner was asked if this was reflected across the rest of Sussex and whether there were sufficient resources committed to the detection and prosecution of burglaries? *The Commissioner regularly challenged the Chief Constable over the performance of the force in relation to burglaries. Operation Magpie was in effect in Sussex which was in the top quartile for the detection and solving of burglary cases.*
- The Commissioner was asked about concerns expressed by the Police Federation regarding the low level of morale in the force. *The Commissioner*

met regularly with the Police Federation and staff across Sussex to gauge morale in the force. Morale had improved as a result of the introduction of mobile technology. Enabling police with technology including handheld devices and body worn videos has positively influenced morale.

- The Commissioner was asked about seemingly conflicting statistics regarding the reduction of crime in Sussex and the increase in the reporting of crime. Such statistics provided mixed messages and were confusing. *The crime survey across East and West Sussex had established that there had been no increase in the level of crime and a decrease in crime in West Sussex. There had been an increase in the accuracy of the recording of crime.*
- The need for greater detail regarding the benefits of the Target Operating Model was raised with the Commissioner. It was explained that local meetings were being updated on the project but the information provided was lacking in detail.

The meeting ended at 1.10 p.m.

Chairman