

## Sussex Police and Crime Panel

Members are hereby requested to attend the annual meeting of the Police and Crime Panel, to be held at 10.30 a.m. on Friday 9 October 2015 at County Hall, Lewes.

### Tony Kershaw

Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel

1 October 2015

#### Webcasting Notice

Please note: This meeting will be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via East Sussex County Council's website on the internet – at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm that the meeting is to be filmed. Generally the public gallery is not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. The webcast will be available via the link below: <http://www.eastsussex.public-i.tv/core/>,

#### Indicative timetable

Item 1	10:30 – 10:40	Declarations of Interests
Item 2		Minutes of Previous Meeting
Item 3		Urgent Matters
Item 4	10:40 – 11:40	Road Safety
Item 5	11:40 – 12:25	Medium Term Financial Forecast and Budget Timetable 2016/17
Item 6	12:25 – 12:35	Police Complaints Working Group
Item 7	12:35 – 12:45	Quarterly Report of Complaints
Item 8	12:45 – 13:10	Written Questions
Item 9	13:10 – 13:25	Members' Feedback
Item 10	13:25 – 13:40	Commissioner's Question Time
Item 11	13:40 – 13:45	Date of Next Meeting

## A g e n d a

### 1. Declarations of Interest

Members and officers must declare any pecuniary or personal interest in any business on the agenda. They should also make declarations at any stage such an interest becomes apparent during the meeting. Consideration should be given to leaving the meeting if the nature of the interest warrants it. If in doubt please contact Democratic Services, West Sussex County Council before the meeting.

### 2. Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting on 3 July 2015 – [attached](#) on buff paper.

### **3. Urgent Matters**

Items not on the agenda which the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.

### **4. Road Safety**

Report by the Police and Crime Commissioner – [attached](#)

The attached report outlines how Sussex Police is held to account in reducing the amount of people killed and seriously injured on the roads of Sussex. The report also provides detail of the Commissioner's perspective of the role of the Sussex Police in relation to road safety.

The Panel is asked to consider the report and raise any questions or queries it has of the Commissioner.

### **5. Medium Term Financial Forecast and Budget Timetable 2016/17**

Report by the Police and Crime Commissioner – [attached](#).

The attached report sets out the medium term financial forecast and budget timetable for 2016/17, including planning assumptions for precept income, and will be introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Panel is asked to consider the report and comment on the planning assumptions, the potential new commitments, and the risk analysis.

### **6. Police Complaints Working Group**

Report by the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel – [attached](#).

The report attached to this agenda provides a proposal for the establishment of a Police Complaints Working Group to assist the Commissioner to develop a response to a current consultation regarding Police Complaints.

The Panel is asked to consider and agree the establishment of the working group, the terms of reference in the appendix and appoint members to the group.

### **7. Quarterly Report of Complaints**

Report by the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel – [attached](#).

Two people have contacted the Panel since its last meeting. The attached report provides details of the complaints and any action undertaken.

There are currently no complaints on hand awaiting final determination by the Panel or the Clerk to the Panel.

### **8. Written Questions**

Report by the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel – [attached](#).

Written questions may be submitted by members of the public up to two weeks in advance of a meeting. The Chairman of the Panel or the

Commissioner will be invited to provide a response by noon of the day before the meeting.

Questions have been received from **three** correspondents prior to this meeting of the Panel. The questions to the Commissioner and the responses are attached for the Panel to note.

Please can members ensure that any supplementary questions relate specifically to the subject matter of the initial question.

#### **9. Members' Feedback**

Since the last Panel meeting, members have undertaken tours of the Victims' Assessment & Referral Centre in Shoreham, and attended the Sussex Youth Commission Conference 2015.

Members are invited to verbally feedback to the Panel on their experiences, in particular on any issues which could usefully inform the Panel's future work programme.

#### **10. Commissioner's Question Time**

The Panel is asked to raise any strategic issues or queries concerning crime and policing in Sussex with the Commissioner.

Please can members ensure that any supplementary questions relate to the subject matter of the initial question.

#### **11. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Panel will take place on Friday 22 January 2016, 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Lewes.

The Panel is asked to note that the meeting currently scheduled on Friday 15 April 2016 has been rearranged to Friday 22 April 2016.

**To: All Members of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Sussex Police and Crime Panel

3 July 2015 – 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
Emma Daniel	Brighton and Hove CC
Lee Wares (2)	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
Andrew Cartwright (3)	Hastings BC
Tony Nicholson	Lewes DC
Pru Moore (4)	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

- (1) Substitute for Paul Wotherspoon
- (2) Substitute for Dee Simson
- (3) Substitute for Warren Davies
- (4) Substitute for Norman Webster

Apologies for absence were received from Paul Wotherspoon (Adur DC), Dee Simson (Brighton & Hove CC), Warren Davies (Hastings BC), Kate Rowbottom (Horsham DC) and Norman Webster (Mid Sussex 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 Katherine De La Mora (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

## Election of Chairman

1. The Panel proposed and seconded Brad Watson as Chairman of the Panel for the forthcoming year. The appointment was agreed by the Panel.
2. Resolved – that Brad Watson is elected Chairman of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.
3. The Chairman welcomed both new and returning members to the Panel and advised that if members required any advice or support on the work of the Panel to please contact Ninesh Edwards.

## Election of Vice-Chairman

4. The Panel proposed and seconded Bill Bentley as Vice-Chairman of the Panel for the forthcoming year. The appointment was agreed by the Panel.
5. Resolved – that Bill Bentley is elected Vice-Chairman of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.

### **Declarations of Interest**

6. In accordance with the code of conduct members of the Panel declared the personal interests contained in the table below. Paragraph X also contains declarations of interest.

<b>Panel Member</b>	<b>Personal Interest</b>
Len Brown	Member of Safer Arun Partnership
Bill Bentley	Chairman of East Sussex Safer Community Board
Andrew Cartwright	Chairman of Community Alcohol Programme A member of the East Sussex Safer Communities Board.
Emma Daniel	Member of Brighton and Hove Safe in the City Partnership Board
Graham Hill	Senior Service Delivery Manager for Victim Support charity Member of Crawley Community Safety 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
Dave Simmons	Chairman of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing Chairman of Safer West Sussex Partnership
Rosalyn St Pierre	Chairman of East Sussex Corporate Parenting Panel (in relation to Item 9)
Val Turner	Member of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing.
John Ungar	Member of East Sussex Community Safety Board
Brad Watson	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership

### **Minutes**

7. Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 24 April 2015 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **Review of Membership**

8. The Panel considered a report by the Clerk to the Panel which set out the political makeup of the Panel's constituent authorities (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The Panel was asked to: consider the reappointment of the two independent co-opted members; consider whether the two County Councils should be invited to make one additional appointment each to address the political balance of the Panel; and agree the party political affiliation of any additional members.

9. Resolved – that the Panel agrees:

- 1) To a Panel membership of 18 with two independent members.

- 2) To renew the appointment of the two independent co-opted members for a period of one year;
- 3) The appointment of two additional local authority members from the County Councils for a period of a year; and
- 4) That the two additional County Council appointments should be made as follows: the additional member from West Sussex County Council should be drawn from the UKIP Group and the additional member from East Sussex County Council from the Liberal Democrat Group.

### **Public Question Time**

10. The Chairman introduced the public question time which was an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions of the Panel and the Commissioner. No questions had been received prior to the meeting, and no members of the public attended to ask a question.

11. The Chairman agreed to consider the possibility of receiving an officer report or setting up a small Working Group in the future to look at ways to publicise the work of the Police and Crime Panel and to consider how the Panel could carry out their role more effectively.

### **Police and Crime Commissioner Annual Report**

12. The Panel considered the Commissioner's Annual Report (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) which provided an update of the Commissioner performance against the priorities, objectives and measures as set out in the Police and Crime Plan for the period 1 April 2014 – 31 March 2015.

13. The Commissioner introduced the report, highlighting the aim to deliver an effective and efficient service across Sussex, within the recognised financial challenges. Sussex had a 55% overall reduction in recorded crime over the last ten years. A 7% increase in the reporting of crimes relating to domestic abuse, serious sexual offences anti-social behaviour and hate crimes was recorded over the last year due to the promotion and encouragement of reporting these types of crimes. The Commissioner also highlighted the work that had been completed under the four key objectives, including investment in frontline policing, safeguarding and tackling cyber-crime; the development of the victim services contract, the work of the Sussex Youth Commission and the Performance & Accountability meetings (PAMs) that the Commissioner held monthly to hold the Chief Constable to account for the performance of Sussex Police.

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

- The Panel highlighted residents' concerns in local policing and asked if PCSO levels would continue to be maintained as they had been in 2014/15. *The Commissioner advised that Sussex Police were currently reviewing neighbourhood and local policing and would be able to provide details once the review was complete.*

- The Panel queried the 7% increase in reporting of certain crimes and asked what benchmarking had been done against other Police Forces who had also promoted improved reporting to seek assurance that the rise did not reflect an actual increase in crime. *The Commissioner identified two areas that had affected the increase in crime reporting. Firstly a national report had indicated that 82% of crimes were being reported accurately by Sussex Police. As a result a lot of work had been carried out to improve recording of crimes, with crime integrity data now at 97%. Secondly, the reporting of these types of crimes (domestic abuse, serious sexual offences, anti-social behaviour and hate crimes) had been encouraged and were traditionally very underreported.* The Panel asked for a breakdown of the increase of each of the different strands of crime identified.
- The Panel welcomed the achievements of the Commissioner, however requested that information on areas that required improvement or further development were also included in future reports. *The Commissioner highlighted the financial challenges that faced the police force and that the Local Policing Model would be implemented over the next 4-5 years to tackle this. The nature of crime was also changing, for example cyber-crime and online fraud, and the Sussex Police needed to look at how they flex to react to these changes. The Commissioner assured the Panel that the Chief Constable was clear on the key requirements for the Police; catching criminals and protecting the vulnerable. The Commissioner also highlighted that Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) was carrying out an efficiency inspection, with the outcomes expected in September. The report would be available on the [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk) website and the Commissioner would respond to the report and follow up the recommendations at the PAM meetings with the Chief Constable. The financial challenge was the biggest that faced Sussex Police and the Commissioner would continue to challenge and monitor the implementation of the Local Policing Model.*
- The Panel highlighted that the number of killed and seriously injured (KSI) on the roads in East Sussex was in the top quarter nationally and that this needed to be addressed by the Commissioner. The Panel also raised the increased use of 'legal highs' and the impact this could have on KSI rates. *The Commissioner agreed that it was a concern, and that the issue had been discussed at recent PAM meetings with the Chief Constable. Operation Crackdown had been re-established and Operation Dragonfly had been introduced to target drink and drug driving offences. Sussex Police were also one of the first forces nationally to publish details of offenders online. The Commissioner sat on the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership Board and would continue to challenge the current figures and how they could be reduced.* The Panel highlighted that the high figures were a continuous trend and suggested that a more proactive approach needed to be taken to address the issue, recognising that it was also closely linked to road engineering.
- The Panel asked what the Commissioner's view and role was in relation to combating terrorism and suggested that this information is included in future reports. *The Commissioner confirmed that terrorism was part of the national strategic policing requirements and that part of her role was to ensure that*



*the Strategic Policing Requirement is adhered to. The Commissioner agreed that this information could be included in her Annual Report in the future.*

- *The Panel asked what challenge the Commissioner had given to the Chief Constable to support communities to tackle the impact of 'legal highs', for example the increase in anti-social behaviour. The Commissioner confirmed that reference was made to legal highs in the Queen's Speech and that legislation would be considered in the future. Meanwhile the issue was high on the police agenda and laws that were currently available to them to address the issue were being used, for example to seize legal highs at events.*
- *The Panel queried whether any underspend could be allocated to fund victim of crime support given the increased pressure on services through increases in crime reporting. The Commissioner confirmed that budget commitments were already in place to recruit 36 new Serious Offence Liaison Officers and that a significant amount of the precept was being used for victim support.*

15. The Panel thanked the Commissioner for a very interesting report.
16. Resolved – That the Panel accepts the Commissioner's Annual report, and agrees to write to the Commissioner to outline the comments made.
17. The Panel held a minute's silence at 12pm to remember the victims of the terrorist attack in Tunisia on Friday 26 June.

### **Annual Report from the Host Authority**

18. The Panel considered the annual report from the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel (copy appended to the signed copy of the minutes) which provided the annual budget report setting out the costs of the operation of the Panel over the course of the last year and a summary of the main achievements of the Panel. In addition the report asked the Panel to note the new mileage rate of 49.26p per mile and the requirement for the publication of Panel expenditure on the Police and Crime Panel website.

19. The Chairman thanked the host authority for their work in supporting the Panel over the last year and East Sussex County Council for the use of their facilities.

20. Resolved – that the Panel:

1. Notes the budget outturn for 2014/15
2. Notes the new mileage rate of 49.26p per mile
3. Notes the requirement for the publication of Panel expenditure on the Police and Crime Panel website.

### **Police and Crime Panel Work Programme 2015/16**

21. The Panel considered the Work Plan of the Panel for 2015/16 (copy appended to the signed minutes). The Chairman invited the Panel to make any comments on the topics highlighted in the Work Programme and make suggestions on any further topics that should be considered by the Panel.

22. The Panel raised the following points:

- That the potential set up of a Working Group to look at the new policing model should be included on the Work Programme for the Panel to consider at its meeting in January.
- Suggested that the Panel receive a report on Road Safety with input from Sussex Police and local highways. The Chairman agreed to discuss with the Commissioner the best way to handle this topic.
- Requested that the results of the HMIC report on efficiency (expected in September 2015) be added to the Work Plan a potential agenda item for a future meeting.

23. The Commissioner advised that a consultation had recently been published to explore how Police complaints were handled and she would welcome the support of the Panel to explore the best way forward, potentially through the establishment of a Working Group.

24. The Panel agreed to add the complaints consultation to the Work Plan as a potential topic for a Working Group and also for a short agenda item to a future meeting.

25. Resolved – That the Panel agreed the Work Plan, subject to the additions as set out in paragraphs 2.1- 2.3 above.

26. Claire Dowling left the meeting at 12.20pm

### **The Police and Crime Commissioner enabling the approach to tackle child sexual exploitation (CSE)**

27. The Panel considered a report by the Commissioner (copy appended to the signed minutes) that provided an overview of the activity the Commissioner was undertaking in relation to tackling child sexual exploitation (CSE).

28. Michael Jones declared a personal interest as a member of the Safer Crawley Partnership.

29. The Chief Executive of the OSPCC introduced the report and highlighted the following points:

- CSE was now a national Strategic Policing Requirement and was recognised as very complex area including a large number of crimes and activities.
- The Commissioner was in constant liaison with the Chief Constable to be briefed on the work being done by Sussex Police to understand the local problem profile and what action plan was being put in place.
- Sussex Police were leading on an assessment of 'what the picture looks like for Sussex', recognising the importance of multi-agency working and with the intention of creating a new Pan-Sussex Safeguarding Structure.
- Brighton and Hove was a pilot area for the 'See Me, Hear Me' initiatives.

30. The Chairman recognised the serious and complex nature of the issue and confirmed that the Panel's role would be to monitor the work of the Commissioner, whilst recognising that this was a much wider issue affecting multiple partners across the region.

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

- Asked if the trust young people have in the police was an issue that affected the number of CSE related crimes that were reported and if any work would be undertaken to increase young people's confidence in the police. *The Commissioner confirmed that Brighton was one of three pilot areas for the See Me, Hear Me initiative that would be carried out over two years, looking specifically at child exploitation. The work and evaluation were being underpinned by the University of Sussex to help create clear outcomes on best practice. Any learning would be disseminated across Sussex immediately through the Pan-Sussex Domestic Abuse and Sexual Abuse and Exploitation Group.* The Panel asked if the data from the pilot would distinguish between new and historic crimes. *The Commissioner advised that the evaluation criteria would be set by the Office of Child Commissioner.* The Chief Executive advised that in the last year approximately 4,000 crimes had been reported that linked to CSE. Of these, 40% had been reported within one month of occurring, 14% over a year of occurring and 4% of the crimes were classed as historic (having occurred up to 25 years ago).
- Questioned whether the increased media coverage of CSE had resulted in a large number of historic cases being reported to Sussex Police and what impact this was having on resources. *The Commissioner confirmed that part of the precept increase over the last two years had been used to increase funding in this area. A Serious and Sexual Offence Unit had been established, constituting of 36 officers and the Commissioner would be constantly reviewing the resourcing in place to ensure it was adequate.* The Panel welcomed the addition of the Sexual Offence Liaison Officers (SOLOs) and asked what additional support is provided to victims following court cases, recognising that the increased number of cases was putting a strain on voluntary organisations. *The Commissioner confirmed that an additional £250k had been invested in Specialist Advisors and that she would continue to monitor the capacity of post-court specialist services across Sussex.*
- Asked what the timetable would be for the development of an action plan and when it would be completed. *The Chief Executive confirmed that a lot of work was currently being undertaken. The Safeguarding Boards all had action plans in place. The Sussex Police Action Plan would look at what additional work was required to enable resources to be targeted accordingly. The majority of risk had been identified as local cases, e.g. 'sexting' and therefore a campaign was already underway to work with schools to educate pupils of the risk, including the production of a video 'Charlotte's Story'.*
- Asked how residents/communities with concerns of suspected CSE activity can report this. *The Commissioner advised that residents should use the 101 service or Crimestoppers if they wished to remain anonymous. Reporting was included in the See Me, Hear Me pilot and so it would be interesting to await the outcome of that.* The Panel highlighted that the 101 system was not always the most straightforward for residents to use and suggested that a dedicated local number could be explored as a potential option.
- Recognised the increased responsibility of schools and asked what the Safeguarding Boards were doing to ensure that schools were adhering to the safeguarding principles. *The Commissioner confirmed that she regularly met with the Chairmen of the three Boards and school activity was monitored.*

- Asked what work was done to help tackle organised CSE crime and whether anything further needed to be done to help ensure sufficient evidence was gathered and children were suitably informed. *The Commissioner confirmed that work was on-going with local authorities on the organised crime aspect. A pilot site would be run in Sussex, in collaboration with Surrey, to run through a test case to see how all the organisations work together and establish any key learning.*
- Asked whether any work was being done to focus on potential problem areas, for example host families for language schools and home-to-school transport. *The Commissioner agreed to raise these as potential problem areas.*
- Queried what work would be carried out beyond September 2015, as outlined in the Work Programme in Appendix 3 of the papers. *The Commissioner advised that the Work Programme focused on the work of the CSE analyst and that Local Authorities will be invited to help continue the work beyond September.*

32. The Chairman thanked the Commissioner for the report and answers to the Panel's questions and recognised the importance of the Panel keeping up to date as the work progresses.

33. Resolved - that the Panel notes the reports.

### **Quarterly Report of Complaints**

34. 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**

35. 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**

36. The Panel welcomed the debate and topics that had been covered in the meeting and had no further questions for the Commissioner at that time.

The meeting ended at 1.20pm.

Chairman



Agenda item no. 4

<b>To:</b>	The Police & Crime Panel for Sussex
<b>From:</b>	The Police & Crime Commissioner for Sussex
<b>Subject:</b>	Road Safety Report
<b>Date:</b>	9 October 2015
<b>Recommendations:</b>	That the Police and Crime Panel note and comment on the content of the report

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 This report sets out how the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner scrutinises, supports and challenges Sussex Police in respect of performance around road safety.
- 1.2 The report explains how this scrutiny is carried out through Performance & Accountability Meetings (PAMs), Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP), Safer in Sussex Community Fund, Public Engagement and Correspondence to the Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (OSPCC).

## **2.0 Killed and Seriously Injured Performance**

- 2.1 The number of individuals killed and seriously injured (KSI) on the roads of Sussex reduced by 12% from 2005 to 2012. However, increased numbers of KSIs across 2013/2014 (+17%) and 2014/2015 (+1%) have replaced this long-term reducing trend. This rise in KSIs can be attributed to increases in the number of collisions involving drivers and riders (+20%) in the vehicle types: pedal cycles (+45%), cars (+16%) and motorcycles (+9%). The latest KSI performance figures are included as an Appendix to this report.

## **3.0 Performance & Accountability Meetings**

- 3.1 The Commissioner has challenged the Chief Constable regarding road safety and the performance of Sussex Police in this area at the following monthly PAMs:  
  
2013 – Theme at 2 meetings (18 October and 20 December)  
2014 – Theme at 5 meetings (17 January, 25 July and 19 December)  
2015 – Theme at 4 meetings (16 January, 20 February, 26 June and 31 July)
- 3.2 This challenge has been made under a number of different themes, including Killed and Seriously Injured, Safer Sussex Roads Partnership, Christmas/Summer Drink Drive Campaign, 20mph Enforcement and Operation Crackdown. The webcasts from the previous PAMs can be viewed on the OSPCC website. The minutes of the above meetings are included as an Appendix to this report.

## **4.0 Sussex Safer Roads Partnership**

- 4.1 The SSRP is the primary group which directs road safety activity throughout Sussex. The vision of the SSRP is to "create a safer environment for all road users, significantly reduce life changing injuries and eliminate fatalities".

- 4.2 SSRP membership consists of Brighton & Hove City Council, East Sussex County Council, West Sussex County Council, The Highways Agency, East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service, West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service and Sussex Police. The "Road Safety Strategy 2014–2030" for the SSRP is included as an Appendix to this report.
- 4.3 The Commissioner is a member of the SSRP Board of Directors since March 2015. In her role, the Commissioner challenges, supports and informs the work being carried out through the SSRP to tackle and prevent the main causes of serious injuries and deaths on the county's roads. More recently the Commissioner has proposed a more effective mechanism for the allocation of funding by the SSRP.
- 4.4 A recent Internal Audit carried out by West Sussex County Council in August 2015 confirmed that "satisfactory assurance" can be placed on the effectiveness of the overall control environment of the SSRP. The Commissioner has also sought better information for the public on how the SSRP determines how road safety improvements are decided on and prioritised.

## **5.0 Safer in Sussex Community Fund**

- 5.1 The Commissioner has allocated £24,090 from the Safer in Sussex Community Fund (now known as the Community Safety fund) to support local projects which aim to improve community safety through road safety initiatives (including Community Speed Watch schemes).
- 5.2 The Commissioner has transferred this money directly to the SSRP for them to disseminate according to priority and need and to monitor progress.

## **6.0 Public Engagement & Correspondence to the OSPCC**

- 6.1 The Commissioner regularly attends Parish, Town and District Council meetings throughout the county and understands the importance that the residents of Sussex place on road safety. The Commissioner recognises that safer roads and communities can be created by working together and sharing the roads responsibly and this remains a priority in her Police & Crime Plan.
- 6.2 Approximately 10% of all the correspondence received by the OSPCC relates to road safety. The Commissioner recognises the importance of deploying resources to locations where they will have the most impact and generate casualty reduction outcomes and encourages individuals and communities with specific road safety concerns in their local areas to report these to the SSRP and Operation Crackdown. This enables intelligence regarding repeat offenders, vehicles, times and locations to be developed which can be used to plan, target and deploy police resources.

## **7.0 Conclusion**

- 7.1 Road safety remains an important priority for the Commissioner and is embedded in the Police & Crime Plan. The aim to reduce the number of KSIs is also a fundamental element of the Chief Constable's Operational Delivery Plan.
- 7.2 Sussex Police will continue to work alongside a range of partners delivering programmes of enforcement, education and engineering to positively affect and influence driver behaviour. The Commissioner will closely monitor the progress of Sussex Police in this important area.

**Recommended** – that the Police & Crime Panel note and comment on the content of the Report.

**Mark Streater**  
**Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer,**  
**Office of Police & Crime Commissioner for Sussex**

**Appendices:**

- A. Sussex Police – Killed and Seriously Injured Performance
- B. Performance & Accountability Minutes – Road Safety
- C. Sussex Safer Roads Partnership – Road Safety Strategy 2014–2030

This page is intentionally left blank





Agenda item no. 5

<b>To:</b>	The Police & Crime Panel for Sussex
<b>From:</b>	The Police & Crime Commissioner for Sussex
<b>Subject:</b>	Medium Term Financial Forecast and Budget Timetable 2016/17
<b>Date:</b>	9 October 2015
<b>Recommendations:</b>	That the Police and Crime Panel note the content of the report

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the latest budget planning assumptions for the financial year 2016/17. It also contains the Medium Term Financial Forecast (MTFF) covering the period up to 2020.
- 1.2 The MTFF takes into account the estimated implications of on-going and potential new commitments, as well as anticipated changes in funding and other cost pressures. It is based on previous Home Office and Treasury announcements, as well as local market intelligence.
- 1.3 Funding to Sussex Police from central government currently represents 66% of the overall budget. The Treasury's Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) will set out the government funding, at departmental level, over the next four financial years. It is due to report on 25 November 2015 and is expected to show continued reduction in grant levels; with non protected departments asked to prepare options for reduced spending of between 25-40%.
- 1.4 Alongside the CSR the Home Office have announced intentions to change the way in which funding is allocated to police forces in England and Wales. The new police funding formula will take effect from 1 April 2016 and has been subject to public consultation.
- 1.5 The Home Office are refining the funding model in light of responses to the consultation and are expected to share details in October 2015. Initial feedback suggests that individual police force allocations could increase/decrease by up to 20%. The impact for Sussex Police is not yet known and so the current MTFF does not take account of any potential changes as a result of the new formula.
- 1.6 The main changes to the medium term forecast since the budget for 2015-16 was approved in February 2015 are:
  - restatement of the 2016-17 baseline budget taking into account savings expected to be achieved in 2015-16;
  - inclusion of an additional year of financial planning to 2019-20, reflecting the next CSR period;
  - 5% cash reduction in grant (increased from 3% in previous plan), reflecting CSR announcements to date;
  - 1% pay cap for the public sector;

- an increase in the council tax base across Sussex; and
- estimated new cost pressures

1.7 The MTFF and budget planning assumptions for 2015-16 will be updated between now and February 2016, when the final budget is expected to be approved by the Police & Crime Commissioner.

## 2.0 Savings

2.1 The latest MTFF generates a savings requirement for the next four years (2016-20) of £61m. This is in addition to the £65m savings achieved since 2010.

### Estimated Savings Requirement 2016 to 2020

2016-17 £'000	2017-18 £'000	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000
18,753	14,568	13,759	13,519	60,599

2.2 A summary of the savings planned to 2019-20 are set out below and in more detail in Appendix 3.

### Latest Savings Position

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Support Services	258	288	0		546
Corporate Services	37	0	0		37
Specialist Crime	627	214	0		841
Local Policing	8,300	9,600	9,600		27,500
Business Enablement	(165)	0	0		(165)
Contact & Deployment	475	10	0		485
Other Savings Initiatives	209	500	500		1,209
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>9,741</b>	<b>10,612</b>	<b>10,100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30,453</b>
Surplus/-Deficit brought forwards	1,408	(7,605)	(11,560)	(15,219)	<b>1,408</b>
<b>Total Savings Plan In Year</b>	<b>11,148</b>	<b>3,008</b>	<b>(1,460)</b>	<b>(15,219)</b>	<b>31,861</b>
Savings Target (MTFF)	18,753	14,568	13,759	13,520	<b>60,600</b>
<b>Annual Surplus /(Deficit)</b>	<b>(7,604)</b>	<b>(11,560)</b>	<b>(15,219)</b>	<b>(28,739)</b>	<b>(28,739)</b>

2.3 The savings schedule includes the total savings expected from proposals agreed as part of the Local Policing Programme but only those for the Policing Together Programme (joint services with Surrey Police) and enabler services (estates, fleet etc) where a business case has been approved.

2.4 The planning assumption and target for these areas is a 20% savings target. If a 20% target is achieved for all of these areas of business (Policing Together and enabler services) then the total savings required up to at least March 2019 will be achieved.

- 2.5 All budgets are being reviewed in order to identify further savings, particularly to address the current shortfall in 2016-17, including savings from existing programmes which can be brought forward. In addition, one off or on-going reductions to contingency budgets, capital financing or other discretionary funding is being explored. The one-off use of reserves is also being considered, whilst ensuring a level of contingency remains to cover the overall uncertainty in 2016-17 funding.
- 2.6 Some options have already been identified to help balance the 2016/17 budget, including:
- £1m from the Estates Maintenance budget (achievable for one year but will be reviewed for future years);
  - £2m from capital financing, cost of change and other contingency budgets (this requires a reduction in capital commitments and removes in year flexibility in the budget);
  - £2m from the roll forward of the 15-16 surplus (this requires a positive plan to ensure this is realised in year but based on current forecasts and assumptions is achievable); and
  - £3m from new saving plans from Policing Together Programme and other services outside scope of the Local Policing Programmes.

### 3.0 Assumptions

- 3.1 Assumptions supporting the MTFF are set out Appendix 4. Some of the key assumptions are detailed below.
- 3.2 **Government grant** to individual police forces for 2016-17 will not be announced until December. Based on latest indications, a cash reduction of 5% has been included for 2016-17 and beyond. This does not account for any changes in the funding formula used to allocate the funding (see paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5).
- 3.3 **Pay Inflation:** police officer and staff pay is to be capped at 1% from 2016 for 4 years.
- 3.4 **Non pay inflation** is based on the latest Bank of England Market Median rates and is included at 1.2% in 2016-17 and 2% thereafter for planning purposes. Fuel and utilities are based on an average 5% increase. A different inflation rate will only be applied where there is a contractual commitment or specific market assessment.
- 3.5 **Precept:** the MTFF assumes a modest increase in tax base and a nil increase in precept each year. There has been no announcement on whether a council tax freeze grant will be payable in 2016-17. Previous years have attracted a freeze grant, at a level equivalent to a 1% precept increase but this has not been assumed in the MTFF.

- 3.6 **National Insurance (NI):** police officers and staff in the Police and Local Authority Pension schemes are currently opted out of higher rate NI contributions. In March 2013 the Chancellor announced an acceleration of his plan to implement a single tier state pension from April 2016. An element of this plan is to increase employers NI contributions from the current 10.4% 'contracted out' rate to the 13.8% 'contracted in' rate. Based on the latest information on the scope of the change, this is estimated to increase costs by £4.7m in 2016-17 and subsequent years.
- 3.7 **Police staff pension funding:** the police staff pension scheme is managed by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and employer contributions are currently 17.4% of police staff pay. WSCC previously confirmed that the annual contribution will continue to increase by 1% per year up to 2016-17. This is estimated to cost an additional £0.6m per year. The next triennial valuation review is due in April 2017 and the MTFF assumes the continuation of a 1% increase per annum thereafter.
- 3.8 The following table sets out how changes in assumptions would impact on the MTFF and savings requirement. The key sensitivities are in relation to reductions in grant funding and agreed pay increases. Each +/-1% reduction in core grant funding would change the savings requirement by +/- £1.6m per year; the same change for pay increases would change the savings requirement by +/-£2.4m per year.

**MTFF Sensitivity Analysis**

	<b>Movement</b>	<b>Value</b>
Core Grant	1%	£1.6m
Precept	1%	£0.8m
Pay award	1%	£2.4m
Tax base	0.5%	£0.4m

#### **4.0 Precept Options**

- 4.1 In January 2015, when considering the Police and Crime Commissioner's proposed budget for 2015-16, the Police and Crime Panel supported a precept increase of 1.98%.
- 4.2 The increase to the Band D council tax for 2015-16 was £2.79 per household, making the total Band D council tax for Sussex £143.91. This compares to a national average for all Police & Crime Commissioners' (excluding London) of £164. Sussex remains the 4th lowest level of precept in England and Wales and this position will be maintained unless significant precept changes are agreed.
- 4.3 As in previous years, the Police & Crime Commissioner has asked the Chief Constable to present a business case for any new investment required in 2016-17.

## 5.0 Risks

- 5.1 There is always the possibility of other issues affecting the MTFF and these will be regularly reviewed. Some key risks are set out in Appendix 5.
- 5.2 The outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) and any changes to the police funding formula are not known. However, based on announcements from the Home Office and Treasury the maximum impact is assessed as;

	<b>% change</b>	<b>Value</b>
Spending review	40%	£64m
Funding Formula	20%	£32m
<b>Total</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>£96m</b>

- 5.3 The current MTFF assumes the level of grant reduction will be 25% (in real terms) or £31m. In the event that the worst case scenario of a 60% reduction in grant occurs, additional savings of £65m will need to be found, above the level already shown in the MTFF.

## 6.0 Capital

- 6.1 Proposals for an updated capital programme to 2019-20 are currently being developed. This is being overseen by a Joint Investment Board, which will review existing projects and consider new investment. A draft capital and investment programme will be prepared in November, together with proposed financing.
- 6.2 The current capital programme to 2018-19 is set out in the table below with a more detailed view attached at Appendix 6.

**Current Capital Programme**

	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>Total 2014 -19</b>
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
ICT Strategy	6,123	4,363	1,964	1,380	295	14,125
Fleet Strategy	2,817	2,889	2,675	2,636	3,143	14,160
Estates Strategy	6,670	13,653	11,549	8,649	0	40,521
Major Change Initiatives	5,171	2,989	2,200	0	0	10,360
Operational Investments	1,140	1,551	675	328	102	3,796
<b>Total Capital &amp; Investments</b>	<b>21,921</b>	<b>25,445</b>	<b>19,063</b>	<b>12,993</b>	<b>3,540</b>	<b>82,962</b>

## 7.0 Reserves

- 7.1 Reserves are maintained for general, specific and investment purposes. They provide the main financing source for the capital programme with capital receipts and investment reserves totalling nearly £16m estimated to be used to fund capital investment over the next three years.
- 7.2 A summary of current and forecast reserves is set out in Appendix 7 and summarised below:

	Estimated Balance as at year end			
Reserve	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Investment	18,262	8,954	5,005	5,005
Single Purpose	14,653	13,914	13,636	13,584
Contingency & Risk	3,706	3,706	3,706	3,706
General	10,916	9,566	9,316	9,316
<b>Total</b>	<b>47,537</b>	<b>36,140</b>	<b>31,663</b>	<b>31,611</b>

- 7.3 A formal review of reserves and the reserves policy will be undertaken in October for the Police and Crime Commissioner to agree as part of budget setting for 2016-17.

## 8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 Based on the latest MTFF and current savings plans, it is forecast that a balanced budget can be achieved for 2016-17. However, the risks highlighted in this report should be noted, particularly in the context of £65m savings already achieved for the period 2010 – 2015.
- 8.2 The financial climate will remain uncertain and challenging throughout this upcoming CSR period (2016 – 2020). The position is kept under constant review, including using information provided by HM Treasury and the Home Office and will be further updated once announcements are made in November and December.

**Recommended** – that the Police & Crime Panel note the content of the report.

**Carl Rushbridge**  
**Chief Finance Officer**  
**Office of Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner**

**Mark Baker**  
**Director of Finance**  
**Sussex Police**

**Contact: Carl Rushbridge, Chief Finance Officer**  
Email: [carl.rushbridge@sussex-pcc.gov.uk](mailto:carl.rushbridge@sussex-pcc.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01273 481582

**Contact: Mark Baker, Director of Finance**  
Email: [mark.s.baker@sussex.pnn.police.uk](mailto:mark.s.baker@sussex.pnn.police.uk)  
Tel: 01273 404008

**Appendices:**

1. Medium Term Financial Forecast
2. Medium Term Financial Forecast - Incremental Budget Changes
3. Savings Programme
4. Medium Term Financial Forecast Planning Assumptions
5. Areas of Financial Risk 2016-17 and Beyond
6. Current Capital Programme
7. Estimated Reserve Balances

This page is intentionally left blank



## Sussex Police and Crime Panel

9 October 2015

### Working Group on Police Complaints

#### Report by The Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel

##### **Recommendations**

That the Panel agrees:

1. To establish a Working Group to work with the Commissioner on implementing the provisions pertaining to policing complaints within the Police and Criminal Justice Bill, once enacted.
2. The terms of reference of the Working Group outlined in Appendix A; and
3. Appointments to the membership of the Working Group.

#### **1. Background**

- 1.1 In the Queen's Speech 2015, the Government set out legislative plans to bring forward a Policing and Criminal Justice Bill, which will include plans to overhaul the police complaints system.
- 1.2 Complaints about operational policing matters are currently the responsibility of Sussex Police to investigate and resolve, with an ultimate right of appeal to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). The Bill will likely propose changes to the current arrangements, although it is expected that the provisions which are ultimately enacted will not be overly prescriptive, allowing some degree of local variation.
- 1.3 Given that the Panel meets roughly quarterly, it is proposed to create and appoint a Working Group now, so that it is properly constituted and available to meet at relatively short notice once the law is between completion and implementation.

#### **2. Proposal**

- 2.1 It is proposed to appoint a time-limited Working Group to inform the adoption of any new arrangements for the handling of operational policing complaints in Sussex.
- 2.2 It is intended that the Group will meet with the Commissioner and officers of Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner once, to consider and scrutinise the

manner in which relevant provisions of the new law are implemented in Sussex.

- 2.3 The Group will produce a report to the Panel, which will outline its findings and recommendations to the Commissioner. However, given the Panel's schedule of meetings, it is possible that the Panel will not have an opportunity to formally agree the Group's recommendations before these have to take effect. Therefore, the Group will likely deliver its recommendations and advice directly to the Commissioner, but report these to the Panel at its first subsequent formal meeting, for information and transparency.
- 2.4 The draft terms of reference contained in the appendix to this report provide for a membership of six Panel members. It is proposed that a broad cross-section of the local authorities on the Panel is represented on the final agreed membership. The first meeting of the Working Group will agree the appointment of a Chairman.

### 3. **Resource Implications and Value for Money**

- 3.1 The cost of establishing and administrating the Working Group will be met from the funding provided by the Home Office.

### 4. **Risk Management Implications**

- 4.1 Scrutinising the actions and decisions of the Commissioner is the Panel's statutory duty, and a failure to adequately do so risks creating arrangements which do not reflect the needs of Sussex's residents, and risks causing a loss of public confidence in policing.

### 5. **Other Considerations – Equality – Crime Reduction – Human Rights**

- 5.1 Not applicable

**Tony Kershaw**

Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel

#### **Contact:**

Ninesh Edwards

(T) 0330 222 2542

(E) [ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk)

[Appendix A – Police Complaints Working Group - Terms of Reference](#)

## Sussex Police and Crime Panel

9 October 2015

### Complaints about the Police and Crime Commissioner

#### Report by The Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel

##### Recommendations

That the Panel considers the complaints against the Commissioner since the last meeting, and any action that the Panel might take in respect of these.

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 In accordance with the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2011, the Sussex Police & Crime Panel (PCP) is responsible for the initial handling of complaints against Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC).
- 1.2 At its meeting of 26 November 2012 the Panel decided to delegate its initial handling duties to the Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel, and to consider a report of the complaints received, quarterly.
- 1.3 Serious complaints (those alleging criminal conduct) are referred automatically to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). A sub-committee meets to consider complaints against the PCC requiring informal resolution (those considered "non-serious").

#### 2. Correspondence Received from 17 June to 29 September 2015

- 2.1 The Panel takes the view that all correspondence raising issues with policing in Sussex should be recorded, whether or not the issues fall within the Panel's statutory remit.
- 2.2 During the subject period, two people contacted the Panel to raise issues, and both pieces of correspondence were recorded. The Clerk to the Panel considered both pieces of correspondence to determine if any matters raised fell within the remit of the Panel.

##### Complaints

- 2.3 During the subject period no correspondent raised issues which constituted a serious complaint, as defined by the Regulations (see 1.3).
- 2.4 No correspondent raised issues which constituted a non-serious complaint, as defined by the Regulations (see 1.3).

**Correspondence Recorded, but not Considered by the Clerk to be a Complaint within the Panel's Remit:**

- 2.5 Concerning correspondence received and determined by the Clerk to the Panel not to be (within the terms of the Regulations) a complaint within the Panel's remit:
- One of the individuals contacting the Panel raised issues about operational policing matters, which are the responsibility of the Chief Constable, and not the Commissioner. The correspondent was informed of the Clerk's findings in writing.
  - The other individual purported to have a complaint about the Commissioner's conduct, and plans to set out the details in due course. The correspondent was advised of the process following receipt of their initial email. Any development will be reported to the next Panel meeting.
3. **Resource Implications and Value for Money**
- 3.1 The cost of handling complaints is met from the funds provided by the Home Office for the operation and administration of Sussex Police and Crime Panel.
4. **Risk Management Implications**
- 4.1 It is important that residents can have confidence in the integrity of the system for handling complaints against Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner and her Deputy (where one has been appointed).
5. **Other Considerations – Equality – Crime Reduction – Human Rights**
- 5.1 Not applicable

**Tony Kershaw**

Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel

**Contact:**

Ninesh Edwards

(T) 0330 222 2542

(E) [ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk)

**Sussex Police and Crime Panel****9 October 2015****Written Questions****Report by the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel**

The table below provides a schedule of the written questions received prior to this meeting and where possible responses have been included. Responses will be tabled at the meeting that were not available at the time of despatch. Written Questions must be received 2 weeks before a meeting of the Panel and the Commissioner or Panel Chairman is invited to provide a response by noon of the day before the meeting.

Questions that relate to operational matters of Sussex Police will be passed to a relevant officer at Sussex Police for a response and a brief summary of the question will be provided below. For the current meeting two questions have been received for a response by the Commissioner.

Date received	Question	Response
14 September 2015	<p>Domestic violence is a number 2 priority of the Sussex police and crime plan however it has come to my attention that there is an inconsistent approach being adopted by Sussex police officers with regard to the DASH (domestic abuse, stalking and 'honour'-based violence) risk assessments that are completed with victims of domestic violence, with some police officers doing the assessments informally with victims while other police officers are doing the assessments more formally face to face with the victim and asking and recording their answers to the 26 DASH questions. By having an inconsistent approach to DASH risk assessments some victims of domestic violence are not receiving the correct support from Sussex Police and other statutory bodies like social services.</p> <p>1. Can the Commissioner discuss this observation with the Chief Constable, assuming she has not already?</p> <p>2. If the consistency was as widespread as I believe, what would be her response, given her high profile focus on domestic violence?</p>	<p>Questions 1 and 2.</p> <p>Tackling domestic abuse remains a key priority in my Police &amp; Crime Plan because it is essential that victims have confidence in the service that they receive from the police and partners. Increasing the reporting of domestic abuse crimes and incidents is a key measure in both my Plan and the Chief Constable's Operational Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is important to emphasise that a policing response alone is rarely sufficient to provide the support that victims of domestic abuse require and Sussex Police will continue to strive to further improve the way that they engage with community safety and criminal justice partners to increase reporting and to reduce repeat offending.</p> <p>I can confirm that throughout Sussex a high-level of partnership working exists between the statutory agencies which have a responsibility for supporting victims of domestic abuse. These governance arrangements help to ensure that all services are joined up and minimises the risk of inconsistent support and further harm to victims.</p>

	<p>Domestic violence is No.2 priority of the Sussex police and crime plan but the plan does not address at all the issue of false allegations of domestic violence which are often made when couples are going through divorce and relationship separation. Whereas Sussex police react promptly to investigate real allegations of domestic violence as lives are in danger there does not seem to be the same prompt response by Sussex police to false allegations of domestic violence, where a life is not in danger. Finally when the suspect who has made the false allegations of domestic violence is then prosecuted, the state or crown is seen as the victim of the crime of perjury / perverting the course of justice and not the person who the false allegations are made about in the first place, who is only treated as mere witness of the crime"</p> <p>3. What is the Commissioner's position on false allegations of domestic violence – both Sussex Police's response and the prosecution of such crimes?</p> <p>Richard Nixon of Crawley</p>	<p>Through this partnership working, a one-day training package on domestic abuse was delivered to all frontline (approximately 1,400) officers within Sussex Police to further embed a consistent approach in recognising the signs of domestic abuse and taking the most appropriate action. This training package was designed in partnership with the Independent Domestic Violence Advisers (IDVAs), who are the specialist provider of support to victims of domestic abuse.</p> <p>Operationally, all Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Harassment and Honour Based Violence (DASH) forms are reviewed by dedicated officers and staff within the Adult Protection Team (APT) who are highly skilled and knowledgeable. This is a particularly important stage to ensure that the level of risk identified by the responding officer is both consistent and correct and that the most appropriate response is in place.</p> <p>External scrutiny in this area is also provided by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC). This is another important mechanism available to me to better understand areas which require improvement. Following the publication HMIC's report "Everyone's business: Improving the police response to domestic abuse". I challenged the Chief Constable regarding the management of risk at my Performance &amp; Accountability Meeting (PAM) in April 2014 which was dedicated to the HMIC report, "Everyone's business: Improving the police response to domestic abuse".</p> <p>At this PAM, the Chief Constable also gave me strong assurances that Sussex Police complete and grade their DASH forms in line with the National Decision Model framework. The Chief Constable was also confident that where any DASH forms have been retrospectively re-graded, this has been done for the right reasons, making the most appropriate assessment of all risks involved. This session is archived and can be viewed on my webcast using the following link: <a href="http://www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/">www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/</a></p> <p>Furthermore, Sussex Police has just invested in an additional 700</p>
--	---	--

		<p>units of body-worn video (BWV). This BWV technology is particularly important when responding to domestic abuse incidents, to independently and accurately capture any available evidence.</p> <p>I will continue to closely monitor the progress of Sussex Police in this area. I will also seek to use my position on the National Oversight Group for Domestic Abuse to further improve national policy, resourcing and support in this important area.</p> <p><i>Question 3.</i></p> <p><i>I am still awaiting information regarding Sussex Police's position on false allegations of domestic violence and I will be in a position to provide a response at the Police &amp; Crime Panel meeting on 9 October 2015.</i></p>
22 September 2015	<p>Deaths and serious injuries from road traffic incidents has increased in West Sussex for the last couple of years. Particularly alarming is the huge increase in deaths and serious injuries of vulnerable road users</p> <p>What is the commissioner's plan to crack down on dangerous and anti social driving in order to reduce deaths and injuries on Sussex roads?</p> <p>Colin Tweed of East Grinstead</p>	<p>I have challenged the Chief Constable regarding the performance of Sussex Police in this area at the following monthly Performance &amp; Accountability Meetings (PAMs):</p> <p>2013 – Theme at 2 meetings (18 October and 20 December)  2014 – Theme at 5 meetings (17 January x2, 25 July x2 and 19 December)  2015 – Theme at 4 meetings (16 January, 20 February, 26 June and 31 July)</p> <p>The webcasts and minutes from the previous PAMs can be viewed on the OSPCC website.</p> <p>Sussex Police continue to take road safety seriously and long-term performance (2005 to 2012) in this area demonstrated that the number of individuals killed or seriously injured (KSI) on the roads of Sussex reduced by 12%. However, increased numbers of KSIs across 2013/2014 (+17%) and 2014/2015 (+1%) have replaced this long-term reducing trend. This rise in KSIs can be attributed to increases in the number of collisions involving drivers and riders (+20%) in the vehicle types: pedal cycles (+45%), cars (+16%) and motorcycles</p>

		<p>(+9%). Sussex Police follow guidance produced by the Department for Transport and KSI statistics indicate that the risk in Sussex is in urban areas as opposed to rural locations.</p> <p>Speed is usually the primary causation factor in any collision but this is only regarded as one of the 'Fatal Four'. The other three include: not wearing seatbelts, drink/drug driving and using mobile telephones at the wheel. Mrs Bourne recognises the importance of deploying resources to locations where they will have the most impact and generate casualty reduction outcomes. This highlights the important role of Operation Crackdown to develop intelligence regarding repeat offenders, vehicles, times and locations which can be used to plan, target and deploy police resources.</p> <p>The Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) is the primary group which directs activity across Sussex to refine and develop strategies in key areas to make the county's roads safer, build safer communities and engage with members of the public. The SSRP is made up of Brighton &amp; Hove City Council, East Sussex County Council, West Sussex County Council, The Highways Agency, East Sussex Fire &amp; Rescue Service, West Sussex Fire &amp; Rescue Service and Sussex Police.</p> <p>A governance structure exists to determine the SSRP priorities on an annual basis. The priority groups for 2015/2016 include motorcyclists, pedal cyclists/pedestrians and professional drivers. Available data demonstrates that these groups are more likely to be at risk or involved in a collision.</p> <p>The education, engineering and enforcement activity of the SSRP is directed by an evidence base which is made up of the intelligence generated through Operation Crackdown. Individuals and communities with specific road safety concerns in their local areas are encouraged to report these to the SSRP.</p> <p>The Local Policing Programme will not impact on Road Policing Unit resources and local Neighbourhood Policing Teams will continue to ensure that community engagement around road safety issues</p>
--	--	---



		exists.
22 September 2015	<p>In March 2015 we wrote to the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner regarding the decision by Sussex Police to remove Neighbourhood Schools Officers from East Sussex primary schools. We pointed out to the Commissioner that the schools officers are an integral part of our school curriculum and they had developed a good and trusting relationship with our school children. Also, the decision to remove schools officers was made without any consultation with schools or consideration of the impact their decision would have.</p> <p>We received a response from the Commissioner on 9th April 2015 stating that Sussex Police will continue to 'maintain a footprint' in schools and referred us to the Sussex Police's new Local Policing Model. The Commissioner had forwarded our concerns to the senior Sussex Police officer responsible for implementing the model. We received a letter from Superintendent Taylor, Sussex Police on 16th July advising that consultation would be undertaken but have heard nothing since. We have also studied the new Policing Model to which the Commissioner referred (Sussex Police in 2020 - Working for a Safer Sussex) and can find no mention of schools whatsoever within the plan so are unsure as to what the Commissioner means when she refers to 'maintaining a footprint' in schools.</p> <p>We note that under section 1(8)(e) of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 the Commissioner MUST in particular hold the Chief Constable to account for the effectiveness and efficiency of the their arrangements under Section 34 of the Act, engagement with local people. This provision includes ensuring that arrangements are made for obtaining the views of persons within each neighbourhood about local crime and disorder, for providing persons within each neighbourhood information about policing in that neighbourhood and for ensuring regular meetings between</p>	<p>Question 1.</p> <p>I attended sessions with the Chief Constable and his senior command team as different aspects of the Local Policing Programme (LPP) were presented and scenario tested. Having seen the proposal to remove schools officers I made it clear to the Chief Constable that Sussex Police must continue to listen to and engage with young people and that a continued police interface exists within schools. However, I also recognise that this cannot continue to be done in the same way that it has been previously and it will be up to the Chief Constable to determine how this is serviced.</p> <p>I will continue to challenge the Chief Constable regarding the impact of the LPP, including the school/police footprint, at my Performance &amp; Accountability Meetings.</p> <p>Question 2.</p> <p>It is imperative to the success of the LPP that police officers are focused on core policing work. This means that all non-core activities will be reconsidered, and this includes dedicated schools officers.</p> <p>The physical deployment of officers and resources is an operational decision that is the responsibility of the Chief Constable and is delegated through his command structure. Whilst I cannot direct officer deployment, in my role as Police &amp; Crime Commissioner, I can influence the design of the LPP and challenge the Chief Constable on the performance of the service.</p> <p>Question 3.</p> <p>We are delighted that the Sussex Youth Commission (SYC) has been acknowledged as a success. The SYC has moved on from being an initiative to engage with young people around policing and crime to</p>

	<p>people in that neighbourhood and police officers carrying out policing in that area. The decision to withdraw neighbourhood schools officers means that our children and we as a school will no longer have regular meetings with our local police, or the opportunity to discuss issues of crime and disorder and no information has been given on any new policing arrangements. This seems to contradict the requirements under the Act. The Commissioner in her letter stated that 'she had provided constructive challenge throughout the process, representing the public's interest and their likely concerns'. With regards to the Commissioner's legal responsibility to hold the Chief Constable to account can we ask the Panel with regards to the withdrawal of schools officers the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. how did the Commissioner hold the Chief Constable account regarding the withdrawal of schools officers, and what specific concerns did she raise that represented the views of schools and pupils?</li> <li>2. when the Commissioner states that 'Sussex Police will continue to maintain a footprint in schools' what does that mean and as the Sussex Local Policing Model makes no reference to that, how will the Commissioner hold the Chief Constable to account for maintaining that footprint?</li> <li>3. We applaud the Commissioner's initiative to establish a Youth Commission for 14 to 25 year olds but what provision has the Commissioner made to give a voice to children under 14 years of age on policing and crime?</li> </ol> <p>We ask this last question in light of Sussex Police's decision to withdraw Neighbourhood School's Officers. It is interesting to note that under Section 176 of the Education Act 2002, local authorities and schools are legally bound to consult with pupils in connection with the taking of decisions that affect them. We support this provision and our experience shows that children under 14 years of age are more than capable of presenting their views. Whilst we recognise that the Commissioner and</p>	<p>become a valuable asset and critical friend to Sussex Police.</p> <p>The SYC members want to continue to make a difference and I would like to explore how they could link up with the existing school councils referred to in the letter which accompanied these questions to discuss giving a similar voice on policing and crime to children under 14 years of age.</p> <p>The Chief Constable and I agree that engaging young people with policing is hugely important but that this has to be achieved within the means available. Superintendent Laurence Taylor, Policing Lead for Children and Young People in the South East, has undertaken a piece of work to look at the options available which could include supporting volunteers to deliver programmes to young people around policing and crime through a smarter use of technology, video and social media.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Sussex Police have no such legal obligation, we suggest that as a matter of good practice, the decision to remove neighbourhood schools officers is a decision that affects our pupils and we believe they should have been consulted. Our school, along with other schools in our locality, has a robust and effective school's council which could provide the Commissioner and Chief Constable with an effective consultative route for any future policing decisions that affect the youngest in our community.</p> <p>We submit our questions in accordance with Section 17 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 whereby the local policing body must have regards to the views of local people about policing in their area.</p> <p>Kevin Scott, Chair of Governors Wallands Community Primary School, Lewes</p>	
--	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank