



SUSSEX POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

FRIDAY, 24 APRIL 2015

10.30 AM COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, LEWES

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 contact Democratic Services, West Sussex County Council before the meeting.

2 Minutes of previous meeting (*Pages 3 - 10*)
To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting on

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 Update on Working Groups

5 Response from PCC following Panel's recommendation on proposed precept (*Pages 11 - 12*)

6 Mobile Policing (*Pages 13 - 14*)

7 Update on 101 Call Handling Performance (*Pages 15 - 16*)

8 Update on Sussex Elders' Commission

9 Quarterly Report of Complaints (*Pages 17 - 20*)

10 Written Questions (*Pages 21 - 26*)

11 Questions for the Commissioner

12 Date of next meeting and close

Contact Ninesh Edwards, Senior Adviser, Democratic Services
West Sussex County Council (033 022 22542),
Email: pcp@westsussex.gov.uk

NOTE: As part of the County Council's drive to increase accessibility to its public meetings, this meeting will be broadcast live on its website and the record archived for future viewing. The broadcast/record is accessible at

www.eastsussex.gov.uk/yourcouncil/webcasts/default.htm

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 2

Agenda Item No. 2

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/correction at the next meeting of the Panel.

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

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

Present:

Len Brown (1)	Arun DC
David Simmons	Adur DC
Geoffrey Theobald	Brighton and Hove CC
Eileen Lintill	Chichester DC
Chris Oxlade	Crawley BC
Bill Bentley	East Sussex CC
Rosalyn St Pierre	East Sussex CC
John Ungar	Eastbourne BC
Andrew Cartwright	Hastings BC
Sue Rogers	Horsham DC
Andy Smith	Lewes DC
Christopher Snowling	Mid Sussex DC
Angharad Davies (2)	Rother DC
Claire Dowling	Wealden DC
Brad Watson	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 Robin Patten

Apologies for absence were received from Paul Wotherspoon (Arun DC), Liz Wakefield (Brighton and Hove CC) and Robin Patten (Rother 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; Mark Baker, Finance Director, Sussex Police and Ninesh Edwards and Matthew Evans (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

Declarations of Interest

104. 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	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership 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

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/correction at the next meeting of the Panel.

	Chairman of Safer West Sussex Partnership
Len Brown	Member of Safer Arun Partnership
Bill Bentley	Chairman of East Sussex Safer Community Board
Chris Oxlade	Member of Crawley Community Safety Partnership
Sue Rogers	Chairman of Horsham Safety Partnership
Andy Smith	Chairman of Lewes Community Safety Partnership
Andrew Cartwright	Chairman of the Safer Hastings Partnership Chairman of the Local Area Action on Alcohol committee in Hastings. A member of the East Sussex Safer Communities Board.
Christopher Snowling	Member of Mid Sussex Safety Partnership
Eileen Lintill	Chairman of Chichester Safer Community Partnership
Val Turner	Member of Adur and Worthing CSP
Claire Dowling	Chairman of Safer Wealden

Minutes

105. The Panel noted the following corrections to the minutes; Andy Smith, Lewes District Council had been omitted from the list of attendees at the previous meeting and Brian Donnelley, Horsham District Council had been incorrectly listed as a member of Lewes District Council.

106. Resolved – That subject to the corrections above the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 10 October 2014 be confirmed as a correct record.

Revenue and Capital Budget 2015/16

107. The Panel received a report from the Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner (OSPCC) which provided details of the draft budget for 2015/16 (version attached the signed version of the minutes). Carl Rushbridge, Chief Finance Officer of the OSPCC introduced the report and advised the Panel of the current financial position which took account of the provisional finance settlement. The final settlement would be known in March and at this time final assurances on the budget could be provided. The report set out the level of spending and savings required; £57million savings were required over the next four years. Sussex Police operated a star chamber programme in relation to realising savings; heads of department were tasked with identifying savings from across the budget as a whole.

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

- The use of the term savings and if the term reductions could be employed in respect of the budget.
- The salary of the Commissioner in light of the average wages of local residents. *It was acknowledged that the Commissioner's salary of £85,000 was a good salary and it was highlighted that the Commissioner did not claim expenses or allowances in order to reduce the cost of her position.*
- The collaboration between Surrey and Sussex forces and the differences in the financial position of the two forces was noted. The Panel asked if, in light of the distinction between Surrey and Sussex, if consideration of cooperation extended to other local forces including Hampshire and Kent. Confirmation of

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/correction at the next meeting of the Panel.

the split in resources and investment in collaboration between Surrey and Sussex Forces was requested. *The Sussex force was involved in a regional group of local Forces including Hampshire, Kent, Surrey and Thames Valley which considered forms of cooperation between the Forces. The Commissioner explained there were no constraints on collaboration with Surrey. The areas of collaboration between Sussex and Surrey, contained in the report, were outlined and it was explained that £5 million in savings would be achieved through the arrangements with Surrey. The split between Surrey and Sussex Forces was 45/55 respectively.*

- The significant investment committed to the replacement of the current Airwaves System. *The new system was a national contract that was led by the Home Office in a project that would run until 2019. It was recognised the new system would produce savings but that transition costs may be significant which may not be reflected in funding received from the Treasury.*
- The Panel queried the Red/Amber/Green system to monitor the achievement of savings initiatives. *Projects with a green rating were achievable, those with a red or amber rating required contingencies or alternative projects to introduce if the original savings proposal proved unfeasible.*
- The Sussex Target Operating Model (TOM) was referred to and when the Panel would be provided with a detailed briefing on the initiative. *The TOM would be addressed by the Future Model of Policing Working Group that would be formed by members of the Panel.*
- The cost of the OSPCC was queried and whether any savings could be realised in the operation of the Commissioner's Office. *The Commissioner explained that her office was relatively small and had been considered the most cost effective Office in the country in an assessment conducted by HMIC. It was confirmed that the cost of the Commissioner's Office had been frozen which had been achieved, even with the additional cost of inflation and whilst maintaining funding to the Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs).*
- The transfer of forensic medical examiners from the NHS to policing was raised and the likely cost to the force. *Sussex Police was currently awaiting guidance from the Department of Health regarding the financial implications to the Force.*

109. Resolved - That the Panel notes the draft budget for 2015/16.

Police and Crime Commissioner's Proposed Precept

110. The Panel considered a report from the Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner which set out the investment priorities for 2015/16 and the proposed precept of 1.98% (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The report was introduced by The Commissioner who advised the Panel that the proposed precept would enable the full generation of investment funding envisaged under the proposed 3.6% precept last year, as supported by the Panel, but precluded by the referendum cap. The Commissioner outlined the investment priorities of safeguarding and cyber-crime that the proposed precept would fund and informed the Panel of the outcomes of the public consultation exercise.

111. The Panel raised the issues below in the discussion that followed:

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/correction at the next meeting of the Panel.

- The difference between the freeze grant and the proposed precept was £800,000 and concern was expressed regarding the additional council tax local residents would have to pay during a continued period of depressed wages. It was felt that the consultation responses may not have been as supportive of the increase if local residents had understood that the precept increase would only generate £800,000 on a budget of £249 million. *It was recognised that the current financial climate was still challenging. The proposed precept would equip the police force with the necessary skills and resources to address those crimes of greatest threat to residents of Sussex. Without the additional investment envisaged in the proposed precept the capability of Sussex Police to address such threats would be less effective.*
- The Panel supported the Safeguarding priority and asked for more information on collaboration with local agencies with responsibility for children's services in Sussex. *The Commissioner was involved in regular meetings with children's safeguarding boards, multi-agency safeguarding boards and a pan-Sussex group that looked at Serious Sexual Offences and Domestic Violence. The level of partnership working ensured that any duplication of effort was identified and addressed and that detailed information was shared between responsible agencies.*
- The proposed precept for 2014/15 had been supported by the majority of the Panel and it was disappointing that the referendum cap had prevented the Commissioner from undertaking the levels of investment she had planned in the areas of safeguarding and cyber-crime.
- The Commissioner was asked for detail on the function of the cyber-crime unit. *The unit had only been launched recently and had already dealt with a cyber-attack on the Sussex Police website. It had also recently secured the arrest of five individuals suspected of involvement in cyber-crime. The Commissioner advised people who were aware of cyber-crime activities to report their concerns to Action Fraud through the 101 telephone service. The Panel was offered the opportunity to visit the cyber-crime unit.*
- Some members of the Panel commented that the proposals advanced by the Commissioner were compelling and justified the proposed precept of 1.98%.
- The Panel referred to the public consultation which demonstrated support for the proposed precept from a majority of the respondents.
- The Panel asked about officer recruitment, and if this represented an increase in the creation or the filling of vacancies. Concern was expressed regarding the retention of PCSOs in local communities where their presence was appreciated highly. *Investment had been allocated to front line policing and mobile technology to ensure that officers could spend greater time in their communities. There were no plans beyond 2015/16 for recruitment of officers; the number of officers on the Force was not of foremost significance currently as the new model of policing was discussed and developed.*

112. The Panel proposed and seconded a motion to accept the proposed precept of 1.98%. The motion was agreed by a clear majority of the members of the Panel.

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/correction at the next meeting of the Panel.

113. Resolved – That the Panel agree the proposed precept of 1.98%.

Police and Crime Plan Working Group – Final Report

114. The Panel received a report from the Clerk to the Panel (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) which provided information on the work and outcomes of the Police and Crime Plan Working Group that had met in September and November of 2014 to consider the draft refreshed Police and Crime Plan and the Budget.

115. Resolved – That the Panel notes the report.

Police and Crime Plan Refresh and Update

116. The Panel received a report from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) which provided the draft Police and Crime Plan, as updated ahead of 2015/16 and received a “to follow” report to provide the terms of reference of the Police and Crime Plan Working Group. The revised Plan was introduced by Mark Streater who informed the Panel of the incorporation of a number of recommendations from the Working Group and the timetable for the publication of the new version of the Plan which would contain reference to the new Target Operating Model.

117. The Panel requested that where the Plan mentioned consultation with local councils it should refer to District, Borough, Parish and Town Councils. It was felt that the sentence referring to the need to treat victims according to their individual needs under the Public Confidence element of the Plan should be highlighted.

118. Resolved – That the Panel agrees the Police and Crime Plan refresh and update for 2015/16 and agrees that the Chairman of the Panel writes to the Commissioner to outline the comments of the Panel.

Commissioning of Services for Victims of Crime

119. The Panel received and noted a verbal update from the Commissioner regarding the Commissioning of services for victims of crime. Following the tendering exercise the contract for the running of services for the victims of crime had been awarded to Victim Support.

Crime Reporting Data

120. The Panel received and noted a verbal update from Mr Streater regarding HMIC’s investigation of the accuracy of crime data reporting at Sussex Police. The initial findings had indicated 83% compliance with the national recording of crimes standards. It had been determined that the errors associated with recording standards were the result of administrative errors and a lack of training and did not show that the misreporting of crimes was intentional. Measures had been put in place since the publication of the report and as a consequence the accuracy of reporting had risen to 97%.

121. Mr Ungar left the meeting at 12.01 and returned at 12.05.

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/correction at the next meeting of the Panel.

Future Model of Policing Working Group

122. The Panel considered a report by the Clerk to the Panel (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) which presented a proposal to establish a working group to consider plans relating to the Sussex Target Operating Model plans. Members of the Panel were asked to agree the terms of reference of the Group and the membership.

123. It was suggested that the membership of the Working Group drawn from local District and Borough Councils should reflect the urban/rural divide in Sussex. A representative of Adur District Council had volunteered for the Working Group therefore a member of a rural District Council was sought to sit on the group.

124. Resolved – that the Panel agrees the terms of reference of the Future of Policing Working Group and agrees the following membership:

- Chairman of the Panel – Brad Watson
- Vice Chairman of the Panel – Bill Bentley
- An independent member – Sandra Prail (Graham Hill) as substitute
- A District Councillor from East Sussex – Claire Dowling
- A District Councillor from West Sussex – David Simmons
- A member of Bright and Hove CC - tbc

Quarterly Report of Complaints

125. 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.

Commissioner's Question Time

126. It was noted that the Chief Constable had received the Queen's Police Medal and the congratulations of the Panel were offered on this honour.

127. A member of the Panel asked the Commissioner about work with local Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG) relating to mental health initiatives and programmes. A good example of joint working existed in Hastings between the Police and the Hastings and Rother CCG. *The Commissioner explained that work was on-going between the Police and CCGs and an update could be provided following the meeting.*

128. The Commissioner was asked about distinguishing local area police forces particularly when representatives of other forces were operating outside the borders of their forces area. *Policing needed to be flexible in order to respond to local demands. Crime was conducted across borders therefore it was likely that local residents would occasionally see police from other forces operating in Sussex.*

129. The Commissioner was asked about the establishment of an Elder Commission. *The Commissioner explained that there were plans for the establishment of an Elder Commission and that any local residents interested in joining the Commission should contact her office.*

Unconfirmed minutes – subject to amendment/correction at the next meeting of the Panel.

130. Angharad Davies left the meeting at 12.30 p.m.

131. The Commissioner was asked about the consultation that would be undertaken during the development of the Sussex Target Operating Model plans to address local concerns about changes to policing. The importance of effective communication with the public regarding the changes was emphasised by the Panel. *The Commissioner explained that all partnerships would be consulted and that plans were being drawn-up relating to consultation and communication.*

132. Andy Smith left the meeting at 12.34 p.m. Rosalyn St Pierre left the meeting at 12.39 p.m.

133. The Panel highlighted the concern of Parish Councils to any prospective loss of PCSOs.

The meeting ended at 12.40 p.m.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



To:	The Police & Crime Panel for Sussex
From:	The Police & Crime Commissioner for Sussex
Subject:	Precept agreement
Date:	24 April 2015
Recommendations:	That the Police and Crime Panel note the agreed precept following scrutiny by the Police & Crime Panel.

Background

Schedule 5 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act requires the Police & Crime Commissioner to issue a precept following completion of public consultation and a scrutiny process through the Police & Crime Panel.

At the meeting on the 23 January 2015, the Panel endorsed the proposed precept presented by Police & Crime Commissioner. As a result the Commissioner determined that the precept would be increased by 1.98%. The [attached](#) letter is provided for information to the Panel setting out the Police & Crime Commissioners formal precept notification to the Chairman of the Panel.

All households in Sussex have now received notification of this increase through the council tax billing process. The 1.98% increase equates to £1.6m in additional annual income for Sussex Police. This has added £2.79 per year per household for a Band D property in Sussex, in order to fund future investment in areas such as investigating serious sexual offending, tackling child exploitation and protecting the most vulnerable victims.

The total sum received in Sussex through precept across all authorities is £83,878,822.79.

Contact Officer

Mark Streater
 Chief Executive
 Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner
mark.streater@sussex-pcc.gov.uk
 (01273) 481561

This page is intentionally left blank



Report to:	Police and Crime Panel
Report from:	The Police & Crime Commissioner
Date:	24th April 2015
Subject:	Mobile Policing

Recommendation: That the Panel notes this update on mobile IT within Sussex Police.

Introduction

The Police and Crime Panel discussed the precept options and the Chief Constable's Local Policing Model (LPM) at its meeting held on 23 January 2015. One element of the investment proposal is funding the on-going revenue costs associated with the roll out of the mobile policing project. The Panel asked for more information on the development of the project. This paper provides further background and explains how the current mobile IT project will support the delivery of the LPM.

Mobile IT in Sussex

The Mobile project will provide an operational capability to Sussex Police that allows police officers and staff to receive, retrieve, update and process policing information required to complete their duties via a smartphone, without the constraint of physical location. Supported by just under a million pounds worth of Innovation Funding from the Home Office, mobile policing will allow officers to work more flexibly. Devices will be issued to all Neighbourhood Policing and Neighbourhood Response officers across the Force up to Inspector rank. The device, a Samsung Galaxy Note 4, was selected because it is large enough to input data into using a separate keyboard, whilst being small enough to carry in a pocket and be used as a phone, obviating the need for both smartphones and tablets. Selection of these devices follows user testing with officers, and feedback has been very positive.

In time the mobile solution will provide access to research and update vital core policing systems, supporting the Police and Crime Plan to maximise officer productivity by ensuring that front-line officers spend more of their time in the community instead of frequently needing to return to police stations. It will also reduce duplication, as for many activities information will be entered only once, direct to the device - rather than being written longhand in a pocket note book and later re-entered onto a computer (sometimes more than once, into different applications) as is currently the case.

Specifically the solution will enable access to view and update our command and control, and core crime and intelligence systems, complete electronic witness statements, and complete stop and search checks, amongst other functionality.

This technology will fundamentally modernise the way the Force works with its introduction representing one of the biggest changes to how the Force operates out and about since computer systems replaced written reports. As the Force moves towards fewer and more integrated systems, officers will have access to a range of information held in one place, and accessible at the scene of an incident. This will ensure officers and staff are better able to use their professional judgement to deliver service, informed by a much richer assessment of the situation and of the issue that needs to be resolved.

The quality of data in policing systems should also increase, as officers will input data directly at the scene, eliminating the errors associated with data re-entry back at the station.

The increased officer productivity and efficiency and ability to do much work without returning to police premises (thereby eliminating much wasteful time and cost in travel) are essential to the successful delivery of the Local Policing Programme (LPP) and smaller workforce. The changes also support work being led by the Estates and Future Workplace Team to have fewer and less costly police buildings (and to improve working conditions across the Force) and support more flexible ways of working.

Officers will spend more time in public, and will therefore be more visible and accessible. They will more often be able to deal with victims and witnesses in a single visit, as they will be prompted for the information they need as they collect it. Other officers will be able to see information as soon as it has been entered. Specialists and supervisors can review information whilst officers are still at the scene which will enable them to assess and direct investigations from an earlier stage. With relation to victim support measures; where lines of enquiry are identified, other officers will be able to act on them immediately, and will be in full possession of the relevant information, rather than having to wait until the attending officer has returned to a station and make another report or another system. These elements will mean that individual members of the public will receive a better, more professional service, and investigations should become more effective.

Project Delivery

Around 100 devices are already in use, with a 'change network' of officers trialling them on an interim infrastructure. It is currently envisaged that the permanent infrastructure which enables the mobile devices to connect to the Sussex Police IT environment will be completed by the end of May. Following this there will be a short interval for testing/identification of any issues, before roll-out of devices to all NRT and NPT officers begins in June.

The policing applications and functionality for the devices are being developed. Some will be available at the point of device roll-out and the remainder will be rolled out over the following months.

Contact details:

Chief Inspector Edward De-La-Rue

Email: Edward.de-la-rue@sussex.pnn.police.uk

Background Papers

None

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

24 April 2015

Non-Emergency Call Handling Arrangements

Report by the Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel

1. Background

- 1.1 The Panel last considered contact management arrangements at its meeting in June 2014. The headline performance information provided at the meeting is summarised herein. Tours of the Contact Centre were subsequently undertaken by Panel members, in Sept/Oct 2014. The Panel agreed to receive a performance update at a future Panel meeting.
- 1.2 The Commissioner will provide a verbal update on current performance and progress.

2. Information provided to the Panel in June 2014

- 2.1 To provide some context to the Commissioner's update, the position in June 2014 is summarised below.
- 2.2 The Communications Department within Sussex Police is responsible for all contact management arrangements. This includes all contact through the emergency (999) and non-emergency (101) telephone numbers to the Police Contact Centre.
- 2.3 Sussex Police received 753,535 calls to the non-emergency number across the performance plan year 2013/2014. 96% of these calls were answered initially within 30 seconds by the switchboard team to triage and assess priority. 563,297 of these calls required further work and were subsequently transferred to the main contact centre. Of those calls transferred, 57% were answered within 60 seconds, with an average wait time of 2 minutes and 15 seconds. However, it was emphasised that the 57% of calls answered within 60 seconds was a reduction of 23% compared to the previous performance plan year.
- 2.4 This decline in performance was identified by the Commissioner and had been attributed by the Chief Constable to the introduction of Niche, a new crime management system. The Commissioner had privately and publically challenged the Chief Constable regarding non-emergency call handling.
- 2.5 The Panel was informed of a number of measures implemented by Sussex Police. These included:
 - Training – All staff in the Police Contact Centre were provided with additional training to assist them in becoming confident in the use of the new system.
 - Recruitment – Sussex Police recruited 30 contact handlers who joined the Force in intakes across March, April and May 2014. A further intake of 30 contact handlers was planned for June, August and September 2014. The Force was also in the process of recruiting 10 controllers.

- Process Work – There were several ongoing workstreams within Sussex Police looking at reducing calling handling times, duplication and streamlining existing processes.
- Channel Shift – Sussex Police acknowledge that more people now want the option to make reports on-line, which provides users with greater control over when they contact the Force, and removes waiting times. The Force planned to continue to facilitate this channel shift.
- Collaborative Working - Sussex Police planned to work closely with Surrey Police to align the contact management arrangements between both forces. Further work with the wider Sussex and Surrey emergency services, including the Fire and Rescue and Ambulance services, was also planned.
- Single Site Communications Department: The Communications Department moved from three individual sites to a single site at Sussex Police Headquarters, Lewes.

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

- 3.1 The cost of producing this report has been met by Sussex Police and Crime Panel, through a grant received from the Home Office.

4. **Risk Management Implications**

- 4.1 A failure to adequately scrutinise the actions and decisions of the Commissioner risks breaching the applicable sections of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.

Contact:

Ninesh Edwards - 0330 222 2542

Background Papers

None

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

24 April 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 2012, 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 13 January 2015 to 8 April 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, five people contacted the Panel to raise issues, and all five were recorded. Of these, two people contacted the Panel directly and three copied the Panel into correspondence to others. The Clerk to the Panel considered all five pieces of correspondence to determine if any matters raised fell within the remit of the Panel.
- 2.3 In each case the decision was notified to the correspondent in writing, via email where no postal address was provided.

Complaints

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

- 2.5 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:

- 2.6 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:
- Four of the individuals contacting the Panel raised issues about operational policing matters, which are the responsibility of the Chief Constable, and not the Commissioner. In three of these cases the correspondent was aware of this, and had already pursued their complaints through the correct channels. In one case the correspondent was not aware, and was provided with the necessary contact details to take their complaint forward.
 - One individual raised issues about officers of the Office of Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner (OSPCC). Complaints against officers of the OSPCC fall to the OSPCC's Chief Executive to consider, and complaints against the Chief Executive fall to the OSPCC's solicitor to consider. The correspondent was aware of this, and had already pursued complaints through the correct channels.
- 2.7 One correspondent raised issues in relation to operational policing matters at Hastings Police Station, the second person to raise allegations concerning this location since the Panel's inception. The Panel has been advised that, in both cases, the allegations have been investigated by Sussex Police, and by the IPCC, and were not upheld.

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

Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

24 April 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 three questions have been received for a response by the Commissioner.

Date received	Question	Response
25 February 2015	<p>Trying to contact the police in Worthing is a marathon. According to your leaflet entitled Policing Worthing, Worthing police Station is open seven days a week including bank holidays from 8 to midnight, in fact the station is only open Monday to Saturday from 9 am to 8 pm, it is closed on Sunday all day and all Bank Holidays. For non-emergency calls you are advised to dial 084560 70 999 which asks you to dial one of two extensions neither of which have I ever managed to get an answer on so presumably the offices are unmanned.</p> <p>If you dial 101 you are kept pushing buttons and listening to statements for 1 and a half minutes before being told that you are being put in a queue and being charged 15 pence for the call.</p> <p>I wished to report an obviously confused, elderly man with every symptom of dementia wandering round Montague Street on Sunday morning. I suspected he may have wandered out from home, either his own or a care home, without somebodies knowledge and was possibly being sought.</p>	<p>It is worth clarifying that there are a number of ways to contact Sussex Police and all calls and emails are managed centrally at Sussex Police Headquarters in Lewes.</p> <p>In an emergency you should always dial 999. For non-emergencies dial 101. Calls to this number cost a maximum of 15p for the duration, whether you are calling from a landline or mobile phone.</p> <p>There is an alternative local number of 01273 470101 which circumvents the national 101 switchboard number by diverting directly to the Sussex Police switchboard. These calls are charged at local rates which means that if you're calling from a landline and have an inclusive package, it may be free of charge. The local number is particularly helpful for callers trying to contact Sussex Police from a different part of the country.</p> <p>It is worth emphasising that all calls are risk assessed and resources deployed appropriately against that assessment of risk.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some members of the public have been</p>

	<p>Having been messed about only to be told I was being charged for the call and was to be put in a queue I gave up.</p> <p>It is ridiculous that there is no straightforward way to contact the police in Worthing other than by dialling 999.</p> <p>Questioner – Mr Smewing, Worthing</p> <p>In follow up to the response provided, Mr Smewing submitted the following supplementary point:</p> <p>The mystery is how did the people who called and were answered within 30 seconds get past the push button time which took me 1 minute 26 seconds before being passed on to other departments. The time it took me was logged on my mobile phone so I know exactly how long I was pushing buttons and listening to unnecessary (to me) waffle.</p>	<p>experiencing delays in their calls being answered when phoning the 101 non-emergency number. Sussex Police apologise for any frustration and inconvenience caused by this and remain committed to tackling this issue and to minimise the impact on public service.</p> <p>A summary of the non-emergency calls received by the Switchboard and the Contact and Command Centre and the average answering times for each are detailed below:</p> <p>2012/2013</p> <p>Sussex Police received 866,447 calls to the non-emergency number across the performance plan year 2012/2013. 96% of these calls were answered initially within 30 seconds by the switchboard team, of which 556,084 were transferred to the contact centre. Of those calls transferred, 74% were answered within 60 seconds, with an average wait time of 59 seconds.</p> <p>2013/2014</p> <p>Sussex Police received 753,535 calls to the non-emergency number across the performance plan year 2013/2014. 96% of these calls were answered initially within 30 seconds by the switchboard team, of which 563,297 were transferred to the contact centre. Of those calls transferred, 57% were answered within 60 seconds, with an average wait time of 2 minutes and 15 seconds.</p> <p>2014/2015 (to the end of January 2015)</p> <p>Sussex Police has received 609,406 calls to the non-emergency number across the performance plan year to date. 91% of these calls were answered initially within 30 seconds by the switchboard team, of which 419,300 were transferred to the contact centre. Of those calls transferred, 59%% were answered within 60 seconds, with an average wait time of 2 minutes and 20 seconds.</p>
--	---	---

<p>26 March 2015</p>	<p>How has the effectiveness and efficiency of the Sussex Police been improved as the result of the appointment of Ms Bourne as Police & Crime Commissioner?</p> <p>Questioner – Mr Taylor, Lewes</p>	<p>My achievements, in terms of improving the effectiveness and efficiencies of Sussex Police, can be viewed in the “Two Years On” section at the front of my Police & Crime Plan (pages 4-6). These are presented under each of the four priority areas.</p> <p>Achievements have also been presented to the Panel in the Half-Year Monitoring Reports for 2013/2014 (11 October 2013) and 2014/2015 (10 October 2014) and in the Annual Report for 2013/2014 (27 June 2014).</p> <p>The Annual Report for 2014/2015 will be presented to the Panel at the meeting on 3 July 2015.</p> <p>I would also be happy to add you to the distribution list for my weekly newsletter which provides further detail regarding achievements as and when they are realised.</p>
<p>30 March 2015</p>	<p>Although aware of the budgetary pressures we are all under what is the justification for the decision to reduce the number of PCSOs so dramatically - 39% meaning a drop from 347 to 210 - when the original reason for their placement particularly in rural villages, and elsewhere, was to give the police a 'face' in the countryside whilst at the same time making a real contribution in reducing the serious fear of crime? This surely cannot be the signal we should be sending out to the public?</p> <p>Questioner – Mr Patten, Hastings</p>	<p>In order to facilitate the provision of effective local policing services to the public, within reduced budgets, the Chief Constable has developed the Sussex Local Policing Model.</p> <p>This model is an innovative approach and will enable Sussex Police to operate more efficiently in the future by responding to incidents based on threat, risk and harm.</p> <p>I will not comment on the operational detail of the Local Policing Plan. However, it is important to remember what the police are actually here for and to recognise where their physical presence makes a difference.</p> <p>Neighbourhood policing in Sussex has remained broadly the same for the last 15 years and we now need a model that meets the demands of modern-day policing and the policing challenges of the 21st century.</p> <p>Demands on the frontline are changing and policing needs to adapt accordingly. It is not only uniformed police officers on the beat but skilled staff who can investigate complex crimes online, seize</p>

		<p>criminal assets through financial investigations and solve crimes through high-tech or forensic research. These often unseen areas are a crucial part of our “frontline” and where the Chief Constable and I have sought further investment to strengthen the Force’s capability and capacity.</p> <p>There will be changes that I know some residents may not feel comfortable with straight away. That is why I will be watching closely – and continuing to engage directly with members of the public – to ensure these changes are clearly communicated and understood. This is a long-term, five-year plan. The new Sussex Local Policing Model – and the changes within it – will not be rolled out overnight. I will be asking partners and the public to feedback their comments and concerns to me at every stage.</p> <p>We all recognise that the police funding challenge is not unique. Every part of the public sector is making fundamental changes to the way services are delivered and this, in turn, is driving reform. Police forces are having to improve and change in order to continue to provide an effective service for local people. They have to make better use of their resources, reduce demand by intervening earlier and work in a more efficient way with other services and the public.</p> <p>Since 2010, Sussex Police has already reduced spending by £50 million and over the next four years it needs to reduce spending by a further £57 million. With around 80% of policing funding going towards officer and staff costs it is inevitable that we will, over time, see people leave and not be replaced.</p> <p>My on-going challenge to the Chief Constable will be that his new model must maintain public confidence and reassurance. This is a long term plan and my commitment to residents in Sussex is that I will continue to provide constructive challenge, representing their interests and concerns throughout.</p>
--	--	--

<p>7 April 2015</p>	<p>A question was received from Mr Hughes of East Grinstead. It concerned details of a particular operational incident in East Grinstead, and has been passed to Sussex Police for their response.</p> <p>Questioner – Mr Hughes, East Grinstead</p>	<p>Sussex Police will provide a response to Mr Hughes which will be published along with the full question with the minutes of the meeting.</p>
---------------------	---	---

No Background Papers

This page is intentionally left blank