

SUSSEX POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held at Council Chamber, County Hall, Lewes on 22 January 2016.

PRESENT :

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

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

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

In attendance: Kathy 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 Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner (OSPCC); and Ninesh Edwards and Matthew Evans (Host Authority – West Sussex CC)

Welcome and Introductions

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

10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

11 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Agenda item no. 2

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

Minutes

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

meeting had been tabled at the current meeting (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes).

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

12 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN WORKING GROUP - FINAL REPORT

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Plan

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

Proposed Precept

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

13 URGENT MATTERS

No urgent matters

14a Revenue and Capital Budget 2016/17

62.

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

14b Police and Crime Commissioner Proposed Precept **Precept Option 2016/17**

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

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

- The increases in the reporting of child abuse, rape and domestic abuse raised the need for an increase in the provision of refuges. It was questioned if such priorities were assessed against counter-terrorism which could be seen as a distraction to local policing priorities. *Counter-terrorism was funded nationally, £30 million had been allocated as a transformation fund in the Autumn Statement to fund counter-terrorism however clarity over these arrangements was required and a report was expected which would provide greater detail on funding. Sussex Police was responsible for*

armed officers at Gatwick Airport. The proposed precept would support two investment areas; digital forensics and protecting vulnerable people.

- The risk posed by employment tribunal cases was raised. *There was a risk resulting from a recent ruling on overtime, holiday pay and entitlement; Bear Scotland v Fulton.*

- There was concern regarding the impact on Neighbourhood Policing of the savings requirements. *The Commissioner was working with the Chief Constable to understand the impact on Neighbourhood Policing.*

- It was the perception of some members of the public that the consultation had informed local residents where investment would be allocated rather than allowing them an input in determining funding of significant local issues. *Through the consultation exercise local residents had been offered the opportunity to make additional comments including specific mention of local issues. The Commissioner was happy to speak to members of the public unhappy with the consultation arrangements.*

- The investment priority of protecting vulnerable people was welcomed to help address an increase in serious sexual crime and domestic abuse reporting rates. It was recognised that the increase in reporting rates necessitated a greater level of resources dedicated to the investigation of such crimes.

- It was noted that reserves had reduced but assurance was requested that sufficient reserves existed to provide adequate contingency. *There was assurance that the level of reserves was appropriate to meet future anomalies.*

- The use of performance data in determining policies and the operational plan.

There was a data analyst in the OSPCC who had access to all performance and operational data and assessed the relevance of priorities and policies against this information.

- The Policing Together programme and how this realise greater levels of savings. *Work was on-going between the Chief Constables of Sussex and Surrey Police to investigate opportunities for greater collaboration between the two Forces. Hampshire and Thames Valley Police were also party to*

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

discussions and a recent example of collaboration was the project to introduce Niche across all four areas.

- The Panel expressed concern regarding the late settlement notification and

the remaining uncertainty that existed regarding funding. *There was clarity regarding the budget for the 2016/17 year with only changes of 1 or 2 % expected in the figures in the report. Medium term planning was less clear with unknown elements including the level of funding for counter-terrorism.*

- Local Residents did not support the reduction of PCSOs and it was queried how PCSOs could be reduced at a time when Anti-Social Behaviour was increasing. It was noted that the policy related to PCSOs has changed dramatically since 2004. *There was a current consultation operating on the future of PCSOs and the Chief Constable was looking at additional roles and powers. The interest of local residents in PCSOs was understood and the outcome of the consultation exercise would result in a decision on the future of PCSOs.*

- It was questioned whether the role of the Commissioner was to simply increase the precept by the maximum allowable amount every year. *The Commissioner explained that a significant element of the role of the office was to ensure that victim support services were commissioned to ensure that adequate services existed in the local area for victims of crime. Setting the precept was a large part of the role but the Commissioner was responsible for setting strategy, holding the Chief Constable to account, commissioning services and supporting the work of CSPs.*

- The settlement received for the local area was relatively poor and the Commissioner was urged to send a stronger message to government that the area needs a better deal. *The Commissioner explained that she had delivered strong messages to government about the settlement provided.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

70. Resolved – that the Panel:

1) notes the draft revenue budget, 2016/17; the latest Medium Term Financial Forecast; the latest savings schedule to 2019/20; and the Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel draft capital budget for 2016/17 and capital and investment programme to 2019/20; and

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

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

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

15 POLICE AND CRIME PLAN 2014 - 2017 REFRESH

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

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

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

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

16 PROGRESS ON THE LOCAL POLICING MODEL

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

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

to reduce the level of demand on local policing and was a significant element of the new model in the future.

17 HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORATE OF CONSTABULARY'S (HMIC'S) POLICE EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY AND LEGITIMACY (PEEL) PROGRAMME

79.

The Panel received and noted a report from the Commissioner regarding the outcomes of HMIC's annual inspection of Sussex Police (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). HMIC had undertaken reviews of Efficiency and Effectiveness which were intended to assess the 'health' of Sussex Police. The two inspections had resulted in 'Good' ratings for Sussex Police. In addition a further report on the performance of the Force in respect of domestic abuse and child sexual exploitation had also resulted in a 'Good' rating with mention made of the involvement of the Commissioner and effective partnership working. The areas that had been highlighted as requiring improvement were being actively addressed. Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/confirmation at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel.

18 QUARTERLY REPORT OF COMPLAINTS

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

19 WRITTEN QUESTIONS

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

20 COMMISSIONER'S QUESTION TIME

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

- The increasing incidence of rough sleeping in Sussex. *Sussex Police were working with partners and an analyst had been engaged to compile data to facilitate a greater understanding of the issue. Sussex Police was working with Health representatives, social services and housing services to target areas with a 'pop-up' hub and triage rough-sleepers. The Commissioner was keen to support the work being undertaken by local authorities*

- The attendance of officers at community meetings such as Local Community Panels. *The new policing model would contain arrangements to ensure that a link between the Police and local communities was retained.*
- The morale within Sussex Police following reorganisation and any survey of satisfaction undertaken within the Force. *When the Commissioner was first elected it was recognised that there was an issue regarding morale in the Force.*

The Commissioner has met with Unison, associations of officers and staff groupings to raise awareness of changes and developments in the Force.

- How policing informs licencing and substantiating objections from the Police to licensing applications. *The issue would be raised with senior officers.*
- Restorative justice and outcomes of the policy. *The programme had been arranged through the Commissioner's Office and had been considered a success with 500 cases delivered successfully since its introduction. The programme had been recognised as an effective method of preventing crime and reducing reoffending.*

- Update on Special Constables. *The number of Special Constables was increasing with a further 30/40 to be recruited in February 2016.*

- The perspective of the Commissioner on the consultation regarding Police and Fire Service collaboration. *The Commissioner welcomed the opportunity for greater collaboration between the Police and local Fire and Rescue Services.*

21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

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

The meeting ended at 12.58 p.m.

