



SUSSEX POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

FRIDAY, 19 JANUARY 2018

10.30 am COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, LEWES

AGENDA

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 6 October 2017 (*Pages 3 - 10*)

To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting on 6 October 2017

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 Final report of the Precept Working Group (*Pages 11 - 14*)

This report sets out the work of the Precept Working Group as it worked as a critical friend to the Commissioner in developing the proposed policing precept for 2018/18.

5 Proposed Precept 2018/19 (*Pages 15 - 16*)

The Police and Crime Commissioner will update the Panel to the proposed precept and draft budget for 2018/19. The Panel is asked to consider the proposed precept of £165.91 (on a Band D property), an increase of £12.00, equivalent to 7.8%, and make recommendations.

Under schedule 5 of The Police and Crime Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 the Panel is responsible for reviewing the Commissioner's proposed precept and making reports and recommendations. If the Panel does not accept the proposed precept the power of veto is provided under this Schedule. The power of veto can only be exercised with a two thirds , a least, of the current Panel membership, i.e. 13 members of more, voting in favour of a veto.

In the event of a veto the Commissioner must produce a revised precept by 22 February. A provisional meeting date of Monday 19 February 2018 has been arranged for the Panel to meeting to consider a revised precept and make reports to the Commissioner if required. The Panel does not have the power of veto over the revised precept.

6 Quarterly Report of Complaints (*Pages 17 - 18*)

The report provides details of the correspondence received and the action taken. The

Panel is asked to consider the report and raise any issues or concerns.

7 Written Questions (*Pages 19 - 34*)

Written questions may be submitted by the 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, together with as many responses as possible, will be tabled at the meeting.

Questions have been received from 12 correspondents prior to this meeting of the Panel.

8 Commissioner's Question Time

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

There will be one question per member only and one supplementary question; further supplementary questions allowable only where time permits. The Chairman will seek to group questions on the same topic.

9 Date of next meeting and future meeting dates

In the event the Panel veto's the proposed precept under item 5 the meeting of the Panel will take place on 19 February 2018, 10:30am at County Hall, Lewes (if required).

Otherwise, the next meeting of the Panel will take place on 27 April 2018, 10:30am at County Hall, Lewes.

Future meeting dates:

29 June 2018

5 October 2018

18 January 2019

18 February 2019 (if required)

15 January 2018

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

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

6 October 2017 – at a meeting of the Panel held at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

Dave Simmons	Adur DC
Mike Clayden	Arun DC
Jackie O'Quinn (1)	Brighton and Hove CC
Eileen Lintill	Chichester DC
Michael Jones	Crawley BC
John Ungar	Eastbourne BC
Bill Bentley	East Sussex CC
Carolyn Lambert	East Sussex CC
Colin Fitzgerald	Hastings BC
Tricia Youtan	Horsham DC
Tony Nicholson	Lewes DC
Norman Webster	Mid Sussex DC
Claire Dowling	Wealden DC
Christian Mitchell	West Sussex CC
Val Turner	Worthing BC
Peter Nightingale	Independent
Susan Scholefield	Independent

(1) Substitute for Emma Daniel

Apologies for absence were received from Emma Daniel (Brighton and Hove CC) and Eleanor Kirby-Green (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); Iain McCulloch, Chief Finance Officer of OSPCC; Mervin Dadd Head of Public Engagement and Communications of OSPCC and Ninesh Edwards and Rosemary Pugh (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

Chairman's Welcome

39. The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting.

Declarations of Interest

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

Panel Member	Personal Interest
Bill Bentley	Chairman of East Sussex Safer Community Board Member of LGA Safer and Stronger Communities Board and LGA National Member Champion for domestic abuse
Eileen Lintill	Member of Chichester Community Safety Partnership
Tony Nicholson	Co-Chairman of Eastbourne & Lewes Community Safety

	Partnership
John Ungar	Co-Chairman of Eastbourne & Lewes Community Safety Partnership
Michael Jones	Chairman of Safer Crawley Partnership
Claire Dowling	Chairman of Safer Wealden Partnership
Val Turner	Member of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing
Susan Scholefield	A serving Magistrate Chair of the Competition Appeal Tribunal Service
Tricia Youtan	Member of Horsham Community Safety Partnership Cabinet Member for Community Safety at Horsham District Council
Norman Webster	Member of Mid Sussex Community Safety Partnership
Mike Clayden	Chairman of Safer Arun Partnership

41. Dave Simmons declared a personal interest as a member of the Adur and Worthing Community Safety Partnership and a member of West Sussex County Council. Colin Fitzgerald declared a personal interest as the co-ordinator of a domestic violence perpetrator programme in Hastings.

Minutes

42. Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 30 June 2017 be confirmed as a correct record.

Urgent Matters

43. There were no urgent matters.

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/21 – Revision September 2017

44. The Panel considered the Commissioner’s report on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2017/21 – Revision September 2017 (copy appended to the signed minutes).

45. Iain McCulloch, CFO of OSPCC, introduced the report and advised that a significant review had been conducted of reserves which have been earmarked for specific projects. Reallocation of £15m funding from reserves and re-profiling savings together with a £2m underspend has provided an additional £17m to be set aside for the Chief Constable to draw down. This is one-off funding with control checks in place in case the position changes and the money is urgently needed elsewhere. Mr McCulloch was pleased to report on good progress with the precept investment in four areas including Community Priority Teams, Special Firearms Officers, Public Protection Investigators and Prevention Youth Officers.

46. The Panel asked the Commissioner a range of questions about the relationship between the reduction in grant funding from the government and the precept. In particular what activities are being taken to lobby the government about police funding and about public engagement with local taxpayers around budget setting. The Panel also asked for re-assurance that opportunities for joint working and collaboration with the many and diverse local authorities in Sussex are considered by the Commissioner in her endeavours to lobby the Government for increased funding. The Panel asked for an explanation for a 13% increase in 'historic crime' in the Wealden District, despite new strategies to reduce crime. The Commissioner described the closer working with the Community Safety Partnerships and the work to ensure that funding is targeted more effectively in particular areas. Different areas have different requirements, the Commissioner emphasised the need to be agile on the ground and the important work with the Community Safety Partnerships.

47. Resolved – that the following points are brought to the next meeting of the Precept and Budget Working Group: -

- (1) That there is collaboration regarding the grant between local authorities and Sussex Police in terms of lobbying the Government in relation to sharing best practice;
- (2) That the precept is looked at in relation to the grant;
- (3) That the Group explores whether sufficient funding is provided to support rural policing.

Budget Timetable 2018/19

48. Mr McCulloch updated the Panel on the timetable for preparation of the budget on police funding in 2018/19. The recommended precept figure will be reported to the Panel at its next meeting on 19 January 2018.

49. Mr McCulloch advised that a key pressure particularly for the next financial year would be a 1% unconsolidated pay rise, part of the 2% pay increase for police officers. Sussex Police will be able to contain the increase in this financial year but it may be an emerging pressure for MTFs assumptions in the future. He advised that he would adjust the risk assessments accordingly. The Panel asked questions about the likelihood of the £5 increase per household in the Sussex Police precept and whether there was any danger of the budget announcement being delayed. The Chairman requested that information about the government's settlement is shared with the Panel as soon as it is available to Sussex Police.

50. Resolved – that the Panel continues to monitor the emerging financial pressures and keeps a watching brief on them.

Video Enabled Justice

51. The Panel received a set of slides on Video Enabled Justice – delivering for victims and witnesses, (copy appended to the sign minutes).

52. The Commissioner advised that that she is leading on a significant project, with £11m of funding from the Police Transformation Fund, to deliver the Video Enabled Justice project in London, Sussex, Kent and Surrey. The project involves all criminal justice partners to bring improvements to victims and witnesses through the justice process as well as reduce costs and save police time. The project also works within the partners' national change programmes, and is therefore not being

delivered in isolation. At this early stage the project is being kept small and agile, it can be grown in time to be delivered on a larger scale.

53. The Commissioner reassured the Panel that the judiciary would always have discretion on the use of video links and virtual courts. The Commissioner invited the Panel to see how the programme will work as it broadens out across different areas. She also confirmed that defence lawyers are able to request that a witness is cross examined in court. The Panel sought assurance that the victim support service was involved, in particular around transportation to the vulnerable victim suites. The Commissioner advised that there is an ambition to set up more victim suites across the county to avoid the need for victims and witnesses having to travel long distances. The project is being kept small initially, used at first hearings and in the trialling of live links in police stations. The project will eventually be integrated into the wider courts reform programme to include all trials and extended to the crown and civil courts.

54. Resolved that the Panel

- (1) Takes up the offer by the Commissioner of a demonstration for a group of Panel members to see how the programme is working in the short and medium term as it broadens out across locations;
- (2) Requests that as funding and opportunity allows, consideration will be given to issues of transportation and the situation for victims and witnesses living in rural areas.
- (3) Receives a further report at some time in the future once the project has become embedded.

The role of the Commissioner in ensuring Sussex Police provides an effective response to schools and other educational establishments

55. The Panel received and noted a report by the Commissioner (copy appended to the signed minutes).

56. Mark Streater, Chief Executive of Sussex Police introduced the report. Sussex Police has created 20 Prevention Youth Officers (PYOs), part of the new prevention team. Its main objective is to identify those children who are vulnerable to becoming a victim in school/education and in their outside lives and those children who are likely to be perpetrators of crime. PYOs will build relationships with head teachers and safeguarding leads to ensure that the situation is avoided where these vulnerable children are pushed at a young age into criminality. PYOs will have the support of up to 100 specially trained youth ambassadors. Key areas of work for PYOs and schools include ensuring that schools have the tools to address the problems of harassment via social media and the risks of sexting. He advised that the report also explains the role of Commissioner around investment of the precept in the new PYOs and the focus on work with schools and secondly the work of the Community Safety Partnerships which is crucial to the continued funding for initiatives for young people.

57. The Panel was very supportive of strategy and welcomed the report. The Chief Executive agreed to clarify the extent to which police staff, other than police officers, will be utilised as youth ambassadors and the extent of their investigative capacity. The Panel felt that if youth ambassadors were able to help to bridge the gap in the process for investigating the source of supply of drugs and the use of weapons in schools then this would be an important development. The

Commissioner agreed to highlight the Panel's concerns about drug supply and use of weapons in schools to the Chief Constable. The Panel welcomed the extended role of the PYOs in terms of time, i.e. beyond normal school hours; their role within the new partnership approach using statutory and voluntary agencies; the opportunity to build close relationships with head teachers and to disseminate good practice amongst colleagues. This Panel felt that the strategy demonstrated a real investment in young people. The Panel also suggested that parents, carers and foster carers need to be included in the partnership working; that the closer working with schools and head teachers is extended to colleges and universities and that consideration is given to using retired officers as part of the youth ambassador part of the programme.

58. Resolved – that

- (1) Clarification is provided about the extent to which police staff are involved in the work of the youth ambassador, as opposed to serving or uniformed officers and the extent of their investigative capacity;
- (2) That the concerns of the Panel regarding the supply of drugs, and the presence of weapons in schools is highlighted to the Chief Constable;
- (3) Panel members share the report with appropriate officers and members in their areas at city, district, borough and county level;
- (4) The continued progress and success of the work will be reviewed by the Panel in twelve months;
- (5) In the meantime Panel members can be updated through the Community Safety Partnerships or members can raise issues if anything of particular relevance to this strategy is occurring in their area.

The Police and Crime Commissioner's work forthcoming under the provisions of the Policing and Crime Act

59. Mark Streater provided an update on the new duties for the Commissioner under the Policing and Crime Act. He advised that the Commissioner will have a wider role in dealing with less serious complaints about the police and will have a more interventionist role to give the public assurance about how the Commissioner is discharging her role particularly around reviewing appeals. It is important for the Panel to be aware of this legislation in its scrutiny of the Commissioner role. Mr Streater advised that the new model is not likely to be implemented until the Autumn of 2018 and that he would bring a further paper to the Panel in the new year.

60. Resolved – that

- (1) A paper is provided for the Panel at its meeting in January on how the new model will operate and what the Commissioner's new duties will be regarding review of low level complaints to the police;
- (2) Thought is given by the Commissioner to public engagement about the new process.

Chairman's feedback on the first meeting of the Precept and Budget Working Group

61. The Chairman thanked Mr McCulloch and Sussex Police for the report to the Working Group. The Panel had been interested to hear about cross-border working and how the use of technology can lead to improved services. The Chairman stated that the Group wished to receive the broad range of information available in order to act as critical friend to the Commissioner in the development of the Precept. The next meeting will be on 28 November, timed to following the Chancellor of Exchequer's Autumn Statement.

62. Resolved – that the Working Group works through the detail of the Precept proposals at its next meeting on 28 November and will then advise the Commissioner of its views.

Quarterly Report of Complaints

63. The Panel received a report from the Clerk to the Panel providing an update on complaints received in the last quarter (copy appended to the signed minutes).

64. The Clerk highlighted Paragraph 2.3.1 which sets the record straight regarding a discussion at the previous meeting. He also advised that it was appropriate to draw attention to the gratitude expressed by a member of public to the Commissioner and her officers, set out in Paragraph 2.6.

65. Resolved – that the Panel notes the report.

Written Questions

66. The Panel received a report on responses provided to written questions received from members of the public prior to the meeting, (copy appended to the signed minutes).

67. The Chairman introduced the item and explained that the Panel encourages questions from the public on matters of strategy and policy for response by the Commissioner, questions about operational matters should be addressed to the Chief Constable.

68. In a follow-up question to the response by Commissioner on the numbers of police officers on duty in the Horsham area and the rising rate of rural crime in the area, the Commissioner advised that she did not have decision-making powers on numbers of police officers deployed in any particular area. She has asked the local District Commander to respond and provide re-assurance to the Panel member on this matter. The Commissioner advised that she does have flexibility through the local Precept to improve the budget situation and has lobbied government on removing the cap on precepts and allow her the general power of competence which other organisations have. Discussions on funding and the local Precept will be taken forward by the Working Group at its meeting in November.

69. Resolved - that the report is noted.

Commissioner's Question Time

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

- General security and safety of rail passengers in relation to the proposal for driver-only trains and previous comments by Commissioner on female-only

carriages: The Commissioner advised that security on the railway network is the responsibility of the British Transport Police but if the Panel had any specific issue or incident to report she would look into it. The suggestion for female-only carriages amounts to victim blaming and it must be the perpetrators of harassment of women on trains who are stopped.

- Steps that are being taken to drive down incidents of domestic violence and address the lack of perpetrator provision in Sussex: The Commissioner recognised the good work that is being done in Hastings on domestic abuse and emphasised that work in this area must have an all-organisation approach. She also referred to a three-year programme called Drive, working with perpetrators to change behaviours and habits. Evidence from this programme will assist the Commissioner in directing funding to assist victims. Funding has become available to tackle low to medium perpetrator issues and this will be pan-Sussex.
- Work being done to deal with and to eradicate anti-social behaviour particularly in the Eastbourne area: The Commission reported on the good performance of Sussex Police in reducing anti-social behaviour particularly in terms of the funding per 1000 people. In respect of Eastbourne, the Commissioner advised that she had recently carried out walkabouts with the teams who are working on and achieving good results tackling anti-social behaviour. She also referred to business wardens who are working with the police to deal with this issue too.
- Activities which the Commissioner undertakes to ensure that what she is being told by the Chief Constable is happening on the ground: The Commissioner described the wide variety of meetings she holds with police officers and the public to check the temperature from top to bottom on a range of issues. She would welcome the Panel's views on how she might improve her tactics. Information on Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) Peel Inspections could be provided for the Panel.
- The justification for changes to arrangements for the security and safety of the public at the Lewes Bonfire celebrations: The Commissioner assured the Panel that decisions are taken to ensure the safety of the public by the Sussex Police and the British Transport Police in collaboration with the Bonfire Societies. One of the reasons for the recent change would be the severe terror threat which is made more difficult to manage with large crowds in small spaces. She agreed to question the Chief Constable to ensure that the decisions were fair and proportionate.
- Feedback on progress with improvements to the 101 Contact and Command Centre service: The Commissioner advised that this had been discussed at the Police Performance Accountability Meeting (PAM) in September. She advised that some technical issues for the call handlers had been addressed and that the Chief Constable had agreed to promote the best time of day or night for the public to make 101 calls. Full details of the Chief Constable's responses on the matter at the PAM will be provided for the Panel.
- Concerning the safety of the public in relation to the taxi company Uber, specifically that information provided to the licencing committee at Brighton and Hove City Council is evidential and not anecdotal: The Commissioner agreed to contact the City Council to check that this was in order.

- Clarification about the views of the Chief Constable and the Commissioner on the value of visits by the police to victims of crime: The Commissioner explained that the Chief Constable had been misquoted in a recent press article. She advised that the police do a huge amount of work with the victims of crime and that the service was currently under review to understand how best to resource this complex area of work for the police.

71. Resolved – that

- (1) Information relating the HMIC's Peel Inspections is provided for the Panel within the next year;
- (2) The Chief Constable is asked about arrangements for security and safety at the Lewes Bonfire celebrations and that it is fair and proportionate;
- (3) The Panel is provided with the Chief Constable's responses at the September PAM regarding the 101 Contact and Command Centre service;
- (4) Brighton and Hove City Council is contacted regarding public concern raised about safety in relation to the Uber taxi company. In particular that information provided to the licencing committee is evidentially supported.

Commissioner's Response to Panel Recommendations from 30 June 2017 meeting

72. The Panel received and noted the Commissioner's response to its recommendations from the 30 June 2017 meeting.

Date of Next Meeting

73. The next meeting date of 19 January 2018 was noted.

The meeting ended at 1.10 p.m.

Chairman

Report from the Police and Crime Panel Working Group

19 January 2018

Precept Working Group – Final Report

Report by the Chairman of the Working Group

Summary

This report is intended to inform the Panel of the work of the Working Group looking at the process undertaken by the Commissioner in determining the proposed policing precept for 2018/19. It sets out the issues considered by the Group, and its recommendations.

Recommendation

That the Panel notes the areas the Working Group was able to scrutinise, and considers these in conjunction with the Commissioner's policing precept proposal, presented under agenda item 5.

1. Background and Methodology

- 1.1 This Working Group was established by Sussex Police and Crime Panel at its meeting of 28 June 2013, to act as critical friend to the development of the Police and Crime Plan 2014/17, and report its findings back to the Panel. At the January 2014 meeting, it was agreed that the Group would meet at the appropriate point during each year's cycle (while always reporting back to the January Panel meeting), and that the Group's terms of reference would expand to include consideration of budget and precept development.
- 1.2 During 2017 the Group met twice, on 25 September and 28 November 2017. The Group heard evidence from Mark Streater and Iain McCulloch (Commissioner's Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer, respectively), and from Miranda Kadwell (Corporate Finance Manager, Sussex Police).
- 1.3 The Panel has a statutory duty to review the proposed precept and make a report to the Commissioner on the proposed precept. The report may include recommendations.
- 1.4 In support of the Panel's statutory duty, the Group acted as a critical friend to the Commissioner as the medium term financial strategy (MTFS) developed, questioning and testing the underpinning assumptions. The Group then scrutinised the budget "build process". The Group's deliberations and recommendations are intended to inform and provide greater assurance for the Panel's statutory scrutiny of the proposed policing precept, at its formal meeting on 19 January 2018.
- 1.5 The Group was briefed virtually on the provisions of the draft policing grant settlement announcement on 19 December, but not on whether/how the Commissioner planned to take advantage of the increased cap, on any

modelling to support such a proposal, or on how any additional funds so raised might be spent.

2. Discussion and Recommendations

On behalf of the Panel, the Group was able to scrutinise a number of matters in detail, including those which follow:

2.1 Budget Pressures:

The Group considered the variety of budget pressures and the implications thereof, including year-on-year reductions in the Government's grant funding, technical obsolescence, pay increases, the Apprenticeship Levy and inflation.

2.2 Maximising Revenue

The Group questioned whether sufficient use had been made of potential revenue sources. Particular areas of focus included charges for the policing of Gatwick Airport, for music festivals and other large public gatherings, and developer contributions. As well as the staff resources dedicated to these efforts, the Group considered the available sanctions in the event of non-payment and the reputational implications for Sussex Police when policing support was denied for events lacking a statutory requirement for such. The Group also questioned about lobbying efforts to secure a general power of competence for police & crime commissioners (PCCs), as was currently enjoyed by local authorities.

2.3 Collaborative Working

The MTFS set out a programme of collaborative workstreams with neighbouring police forces. The Group was keen to understand how the PCC ensured Sussex residents paid the correct share of any investment required, and, equally, realised the correct share of any savings. The Chairman and Vice Chairman had established an ongoing dialogue with their counterparts in Hampshire, Surrey, and Thames Valley, and were also working closely with the PCC to ensure appropriate scrutiny of the Commissioner's role.

2.4 Implications for Partners

The Group explored the extent to which Sussex Police worked with partners to explore the collective impact of funding reductions, including with local authorities and the voluntary sector.

2.5 Value for Money and Efficiency

The Group felt slightly more could have been done to report in-year progress in implementing measures funded through the 2017/18 precept increase, (and the Commissioner's role in addressing any performance issues) albeit mention had been made in the MTFS reported to the Panel's October 2017 meeting.

2.6 Precept Consultation

The Commissioner held a consultation on whether Sussex residents would be willing to pay more to sustain police service levels. The Commissioner has a statutory duty, before proposing the policing precept, to seek the views of local residents. The Group noted that the practice of undertaking a public consultation to fulfil this duty was widespread among PCCs, and that the outcome is advisory, not binding.

2.7 Precept

The Group did not review the proposed precept. However, the Group learned that the MTFS assumed the maximum allowed £5 rise per Band D household, in line with the flexibility offered by the Government's approach to the diminishing policing grant existing prior to 19 December. The Group questioned the underlying reasons for the inclusion of a £5 rise within the MTFS, including the impact of not increasing the policing precept.

The settlement announcement on 19 December allowed for far greater increases than the planning assumption of a £5/band D household rise. The Group did not have the opportunity to consider these possibilities.

3. Working Group Resource Implications and Value for Money

- 3.1 The cost associated with the Working Group has been met from within the funding received by Sussex Police and Crime Panel from the Home Office.

4. Risk Management Implications

- 4.1 Reviewing the proposed policing precept is core statutory duty of the Panel. A failure to adequately undertake this duty risks breaching the applicable sections of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.

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

- 5.1 There are no implications which compromise human rights. The recommendations treat all members of the community equally.

TFG membership

Bill Bentley, East Sussex County Council
Eileen Lintill, Chichester District Council
Christian Mitchell, West Sussex County Council
Tony Nicholson, Lewes District Council
Peter Nightingale, Independent Member
Susan Scholefield, Independent Member
Dave Simmons, Adur District Council
Norman Webster, Mid Sussex District Council

Contact:

Ninesh Edwards - 0330 222 2542
ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

To:	The Sussex Police & Crime Panel
From:	The Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner
Subject:	Precept Option 2018/19
Date:	19 January 2018
Recommendation:	That the Police & Crime Panel – i) review the precept proposal; and ii) report to the Commissioner on the proposed precept.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 requires the Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) to notify the Police & Crime Panel of the proposed precept for the coming financial year. The Panel is required to respond with a report to the PCC on the proposed precept including, if appropriate, recommendations as to the precept for the financial year.
- 1.2 Financial planning sits at the heart of good public financial management. Alongside budget preparation, performance management and reporting, the ability to look strategically beyond the current budget period is a crucial process to support the PCC's resilience and long-term financial sustainability.
- 1.3 Last year the Panel received two reports in support of the precept decision, one relating to the proposed budget and the other setting out the details of the public consultation undertaken regarding the proposal.
- 1.4 This year the report presents the PCC's revised and extended draft four-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) that sets out the financial context for the PCC's draft revenue budget, capital programme and proposed precept decision for the next financial year 2018/19, and estimates for a further three financial years.

2.0 Draft Financial Settlement 2018/19

- 2.1 The Minister for Policing and the Fire Service announced the provisional police financial settlement for 2018/19 on 19 December 2017. It confirmed the freezing of the Home Office grants at 2017/18 level and the lifting of the precept cap, which the PCC had requested via a Home Office consultation, to £12.
- 2.2 Although funds for counter-terrorism and national policing priorities were increased the settlement has not provided any additional core grant resources but it has enabled all PCCs to raise additional funds from local taxation.

3.0 Precept Proposal

- 3.1 The draft four-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) attached sets out the financial context for the PCC's draft revenue budget, capital programme and proposed precept decision for the next financial year 2018/19, and

estimates for a further three financial years.

- 3.2 The PCC proposes to increase the Band D precept by £12 (7.8%) for 2018/19 from £153.91 to £165.91, and is seeking the support of the Police and Crime Panel.

Mark Streater
Chief Executive, Office of the PCC

Giles York
Chief Constable

Iain McCulloch
Chief Finance Officer, Office of the PCC

Peter Gillett
Director of Finance

Contact: Iain McCulloch, Chief Finance Officer
Email: Iain.McCulloch@sussex-pcc.gov
Tel: 01273 481582

Contact: Peter Gillett, Director of Finance
Email: Peter.Gillett@sussex.pnn.police.uk
Tel: 01273 404008

Appendix

Appendix – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19 – 2021/22

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

19 January 2018

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, and any action that the Panel might take in respect of these.

No complaints within the statutory remit of the Panel were received during the stated time period.

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 28 September 2017 to 8 January 2018

1.4 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.

1.5 During the subject period, three people contacted the Panel to raise issues, and three were recorded. The Clerk to the Panel considered this correspondence to determine if any matters raised fell within the remit of the Panel.

Complaints

1.6 During the subject period no correspondents raised issues which constituted a 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:

- 1.6.1 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:
- 1.6.2 An individual contacted the Panel alleging that Sussex Police officers were allowed continue in their role after being convicted of crimes, and also questioning Sussex Police's policy towards those suffering from mental health issues. Despite pertaining to operational policing matters (and therefore not within the PCC's remit) the Clerk established that the Commissioner's officers had nonetheless corresponded with the individual to a significant degree to explain the statutory basis for the matters raised and processes followed.

Correspondence Recorded, and Considered by the Clerk to be a Complaint within the Panel's Remit:

- 1.6.3 Concerning correspondence received and determined by the Clerk to the Panel to be (within the terms of the Regulations) a complaint within the Panel's remit (none received).

Serious Complaints

- 1.6.4 None have been received, or are in process.

2 Resource Implications and Value for Money

- 2.1 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.

3 Risk Management Implications

- 3.1 It is important that residents can have confidence in the integrity of the system for handling complaints against the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner and their Deputy (where one has been appointed).

4 Other Considerations – Equality – Crime Reduction – Human Rights

- 4.1 Not applicable

Tony Kershaw

Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel

Contact:

Ninesh Edwards

(T) 0330 222 2542

(E) ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

19 January 2018

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 3 questions have been received for a response by the Commissioner.

Question	Response
<p>1. I was recently in a long queue at the Portfield roundabout in Chichester joining from the A27 Tangmere direction, I could see the queue a long long way ahead. I slowed down stopped and joined the queue. I was working as a support worker and had 2 clients in the car with me who both had an acquired brain injury.</p> <p>Well the car behind me rear ended me at 70mph without even breaking, causing massive distress to my clients, writing off my car and causing me thousands in loses and major disruptions.</p> <p>When I asked the officers at the scene to check if he was using his mobile phone while driving, I was told they could only do this if there is a fatality. This queue could be seen a long way back so something was distracting the driver, is this correct there must be a fatality because I'm sure I have seen police documentaries on TV were they have checked</p>	<p>The Chief Constable has responsibility for operational policing matters, including the examination of communication devices. I have shared your question with Chief Inspector Phil Nicholas, Operations Command within Sussex Police, and he has confirmed the following in respect of the concerns you raise.</p> <p>There is no national or local policy which prevents the examination of a mobile phone as suggested, this is governed by legislation.</p> <p>If it is justifiable, necessary and proportionate to examine a mobile phone or request communication data in connection with a criminal investigation, then the investigating officer would be at liberty to do so if they felt it was required.</p> <p>The legislation that regulates the police in respect of the examination of communication devices is the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA) 2000.</p> <p>The RIPA codes of practice also state that "should it be determined there are insufficient grounds to continue the investigation or</p>

<p>mobile usage without fatalities at a RTA.</p> <p>Is this a Sussex policy of not checking phones unless a fatality occurs or is it National and if Sussex only, do you support changing so mobiles can be checked in any crash of negligent driving. Can you please clarify the policy and if you think it needs looking into.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Simon Holland Bognor Regis</p>	<p>insufficient evidence to initiate a prosecution within a criminal court, it will, with immediate effect, no longer be appropriate to obtain communications data under RIPA.”</p> <p>Chief Inspector Nicholas has looked into the circumstances of your collision and confirmed that there does not appear to have been any justification for this to occur. The officer ascertained that the driver of the other vehicle had an existing medical condition and duly notified the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) to this effect.</p> <p>In summary, there is no such policy in place and any phone subject of criminal investigation (including a damage only road traffic collision) could, in theory, be examined provided that the conditions sought by RIPA are made out.</p>
<p>2. What is the PCC's position regarding enforcement of 20mph speed limits within West Sussex? I have seen repeated reports across England that police forces will not enforce these.</p> <p>Specifically, I would be grateful for clarification on how these are enforced/monitored in Chichester.</p> <p>Steve Blighton-Sande Bosham, West Sussex</p>	<p>Sussex Police is able to enforce any legally established speed limit. The Force would not, however, routinely expect to enforce 20 mph limits because there is an expectation that there would be sufficient traffic calming measures in place, including speed bumps and traffic islands designed to slow traffic, to ensure that average speeds are kept low.</p> <p>The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) guidelines include thresholds for enforcement across all speed limits to underpin a consistent approach. It is, however, for local police forces to apply a proportionate approach to the enforcement of 20mph limits based on risk to individuals, property and the seriousness of any breach. Sussex Police has confirmed that where drivers exceed 20mph speed limits through wilful offending, there is an expectation that officers enforce the limit and prosecute offenders accordingly.</p> <p>Operation Crackdown is a joint initiative run by Sussex Police and the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) which provides the communities of Sussex with an opportunity to report specific instances of anti-social driving and enables Sussex Police to develop intelligence regarding repeat offenders, vehicles, times and locations which can then be used to plan, target and deploy police resources.</p>

	<p>If you have any specific information about anti-social driving in and around Chichester, please visit the Operation Crackdown website (www.operationcrackdown.org) to report this. Alternatively, you can call 01243 642222 during office hours to speak to an operator.</p> <p>I understand the importance that the residents of Sussex place on road safety and am fully supportive of the work carried out by Sussex Police and the SSRP to tackle and prevent the main causes of serious injuries and deaths on the county's roads. I also acknowledge that safer roads and communities can be created by working together and sharing the roads responsibly.</p> <p>I meet regularly with the Chief Constable to improve local policing issues which includes scrutinising the performance of the Road Policing Unit. Road safety and 20mph enforcement, in particular, is also a theme that I have challenged the Chief Constable about during monthly webcast Performance & Accountability Meetings.</p> <p>These sessions are archived and can be viewed on my website using the following link: www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/</p>
<p>3. North Horsham Parish Council has worked proactively over the years with Sussex Police and has appreciated the positive working relationship that has been established between the two organisations. As a member of the Sussex Association of Local Councils, the Parish Council also appreciates the listening ear given by Sussex Police to the CEO of SALC, the measures put in place to try to keep the positive lines of engagement with Town and Parish Councils and the opportunity to put forward questions to the Police Crime Commissioner and other senior Police officials throughout the year.</p> <p>Sussex Police 2020 working for a Safer Sussex, sets out the challenges faced by Sussex Police and offers a strategic framework on which the three key aims of maintaining the delivery of local policing outcomes and meeting national policing</p>	<p>3a. The Chief Constable is responsible for the deployment of police officers to meet the various demands on Sussex Police. I have shared your email with Chief Inspector Miles Ockwell, Horsham, Worthing and Adur District Commander, and asked him to look into your specific concerns and to give you some reassurance about the Force's prevention, response and investigation capabilities.</p> <p>Chief Inspector Ockwell has confirmed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sussex Police discuss those people and incidents that are causing the most harm at Weekly Intelligence Meetings to determine the local priorities each week. This allows the Force to ensure that resources are placed where there is the greatest threat, risk and harm to the communities of Sussex. • To ensure the best outcome for the victim and community, the Force works collaboratively with partners and other agencies to tackle local issues. An example of this was through Operation Blackout which was a dedicated response to vehicle crime in

requirements; improving accountability and transparency and maximising the use of available resources to reduce cost whilst protecting frontline policing can be delivered.

The Parish Council appreciates that North Horsham is a relatively safe place to live. It also understands the need to prioritise responding to those crimes where life has been threatened or well being challenged. It is right and proper to have strategic aims to maximise resources because it is recognised that policing in the twenty first century is a very different beast to policing even five years ago.

North Horsham has Littlehaven Railway Station within its borders and that the down side of enjoying good transport links with London, is that this allows those focused on criminal behaviour to widen their net. North Horsham has seen a rise in petty car crime and anti social behaviour over recent months. Whilst there have been arrests in relation to the car crime, there is a swell of feeling from local residents that by adopting the new model of Policing there is an open door for the opportunist, petty criminal or groups of people who prey on communities and raise the fear of being a victim to a crime. Most people will not challenge criminal or anti social behaviour for fear of escalating a situation and fear of being harmed. Therefore, petty crime has the most significant effect on local people because it is happening in local communities to real, known, people. Most residents would like to see a more visible presence from the Police to give reassurance to local communities who may feel vulnerable when there is a spate of particular criminal behaviour and more community engagement at a local level.

Question 3a): How do the Police intend to reduce the fear of crime and anti social behaviour in

North Horsham in the latter part of last year where the Force worked closely with Horsham District Council and the Community Safety Partnership to increase awareness of the crimes being committed, increase the physical reporting of incidents but to also provide valuable crime prevention advice. Operation Blackout was successful in reducing the level of vehicle crime in the area and two significant arrests were made in relation to people who were identified as committing a lot of the offences.

- Adur, Worthing and Horsham Prevention teams also chair and lead Anti-Social Behaviour Action Groups, which again allow Sussex Police to work with partners to ensure the most appropriate agency has ownership of the problem being presented.
- The Force is also in the process of launching Operation Sentinel which is Adur, Worthing and Horsham's response to improving Police visibility across the hub, whilst also ensuring that proactivity is increased across the priority areas. This will include prevention and response officers conducting high visibility patrols in areas that are sometimes harder to reach.
- Neighbourhood Wardens – Council Neighbourhood Wardens have enforcement powers and do carry out high visibility patrols in their respective areas to deter crime and anti-social behaviour. Horsham District Council is accredited by Sussex Police and the Wardens can utilise certain police powers aimed at low-level anti-social behaviour. They can also exercise powers available to them as employees of the District Council in relation to environmental offences and again anti-social behaviour.
- Street Briefings – Where Sussex Police is aware of issues within the community, an option available to the Force is to conduct street briefings with partners and other agencies as a way of engaging with the community and developing the information and intelligence already known. An example of this was the successful street briefing that was conducted at Billingshurst in November. **Sussex Police would be happy to deliver something similar in North Horsham.**
- Since the launch of the Prevention teams there are several ways communities can now contact the local team who support Horsham, Worthing and Adur district. This contact can be made

<p>communities where there has been targeted criminal activity and the performance of the Police could be in question, encourage better relationships/community engagement with the Police and maintain a local presence in communities in the future?</p> <p>Police Visibility</p> <p>In addition to the above, it has been noticeable that Police no longer appear to be proactively involved in campaigns such as those to reduce speeding on the highway. The sight of Police on the roadside was a positive deterrent to motorists but also a very effective way of making the Police visible.</p> <p>Question 3b): How does the Police Crime Commissioner intend to increase Police visibility?</p> <p>North Horsham Parish Council</p>	<p>through 101, a local contact number: 01273 404935 or by email to: horsham@sussex.pnn.police.uk</p> <p>3b. I have been lobbying hard to secure the best possible funding arrangements for policing. As part of the Policing Grant announcement in December, all PCCs will be able to raise the police precept above the previous limit for 2018/19.</p> <p>I have, therefore, decided to recommend an increase in the police precept of £12. Combined with the £17m I have already authorised from our reserves, I will be able to provide the CC with resources to sustain policing and invest in more visible local policing focussing on crimes like burglary and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>I have presented this recommendation to the Police & Crime Panel for discussion at their meeting on 19 January 2018.</p>
<p>4. Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council would like to ask how the police intend to enforce speed limits in Sussex villages. Increasing speed and traffic volume is making many Sussex villages unsafe for residents and pedestrians.</p> <p>Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council</p>	<p>I am fully supportive of the work carried out by Sussex Police and the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) to tackle and prevent the main causes of serious injuries and deaths on the roads in Sussex. This includes targeting excessive or inappropriate speed, driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, driver distractions, such as using mobile devices, and not wearing a seat belt – known as the fatal four.</p> <p>Speed limits are set by the Local Authority and should reflect local needs, taking into account all local considerations. Local speed limits are not set in isolation but as part of a package with other measures to manage vehicle speeds and improve road safety. Mrs Bourne understands the importance that the residents of Sussex place on road safety and this remains a key feature in my Police & Crime Plan.</p> <p>Operation Crackdown is a joint initiative run by Sussex Police and the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) which provides the communities of Sussex with an opportunity to report specific instances of anti-social driving and enables Sussex Police to develop</p>

	<p>intelligence regarding repeat offenders, vehicles, times and locations which can then be used to plan, target and deploy police resources.</p> <p>If you have any specific information about anti-social driving in and around Ansty and Staplefield, please visit the Operation Crackdown website (www.operationcrackdown.org) to report this. Alternatively, you can call 01243 642222 during office hours to speak to an operator.</p> <p>I understand the importance that the residents of Sussex place on road safety and am fully supportive of the work carried out by Sussex Police and the SSRP to tackle and prevent the main causes of serious injuries and deaths on the county's roads. The Commissioner also acknowledges that safer roads and communities can be created by working together and sharing the roads responsibly.</p> <p>I meet regularly with the Chief Constable to improve local policing issues which includes scrutinising the performance of the Road Policing Unit. Road safety and 20mph enforcement, in particular, is also a theme that I have challenged the Chief Constable about during monthly webcast Performance & Accountability Meetings. These sessions are archived and can be viewed on my website using the following link: www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/</p>
<p>5. If I were to have 20+ guests, with really loud music playing until 4:30am on a weekday (starting at around 6pm...) and my neighbours called the police to shut me down... under the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan, would Sussex Police actually send a car or two to do so?</p> <p>Amanda Tait Southbourne, West Sussex</p>	<p>Local Authorities have legal powers to investigate issues that could be considered a nuisance or antisocial behaviour, including noise from a premises. Further information about nuisance and anti-social behaviour in Southbourne is available on the Chichester District Council website and can be viewed through the following link: http://www.chichester.gov.uk/nuisance</p> <p>The Chief Constable is responsible for the deployment of police officers to meet the various demands on Sussex Police. I have shared your question with Acting Chief Inspector Kris Ottery, Chichester District Commander, and asked him to look into your specific concerns and to give you some reassurance about the Force's prevention, response and investigation capabilities.</p>

<p>6. Does the Commissioner think Sussex Police should act more proactively by telling hunts there is no place for terrier-men on a trail hunts and no place for surrounding small wooded areas in Autumn at dawn and banging saddles and clapping in what used to be called cub-hunting before the Hunting Act?</p> <p>Does the Commissioner agree that when police do attend hunts (as they do for public order reasons every Saturday) they should show they are concerned about potential illegal hunting, rather than just sitting idle?</p> <p>Simon Wild West Sussex Wildlife Protection</p>	<p>The Chief Constable has responsibility for operational policing matters, including the policing of hunts. Operation Rush is the dedicated Sussex Police response and has been in place for a number of years now.</p> <p>I discussed the policing of hunts with the Chief Constable at our webcast monthly Performance & Accountability Meeting on 15 December 2017.</p> <p>The Chief Constable acknowledged that the policing of artificially laid trails remains a difficult balancing act for the police between managing the rights of the hunting community to hunt within the confines of the legislation with the rights of those against hunting to protest peacefully.</p> <p>It was highlighted that Sussex Police has improved its overall response through increased and more effective engagement with the hunting communities, monitors and protestors, including proactive engagement with all parties before the hunt season commenced. The Force has introduced two new tactics to assist them with the policing of hunts, including dedicated Hunt Liaison Officers and Protest Liaison Teams to build and develop relationships and single points of contact with all parties concerned.</p> <p>I also recognise that Sussex Police has become much more effective in terms of capturing evidence and then assessing this evidence in terms of taking this forward to charges.</p> <p>I am reassured that Sussex Police carry out debriefs after each individual hunt to look at how the National Decision Model has been utilised in respect of threat assessments. The policing Operation Rush is also reviewed annually, with amendments made to both the planning and policing operation, as appropriate.</p> <p>This session is archived and can be viewed on my website using the</p>

	<p>following link: www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/</p>
<p>7. I would like to ask why the quality of policing on local fox hunts has deteriorated over the last year. I am 72 years old and have monitored the Crawley & Horsham Hunt together with others for many years and in the past we have had a fairly positive relationship with the police. We had a hunt liaison officer who would come out and look at our evidence of breaches of the Hunting Act and this has even led to convictions of the hunt.</p> <p>We now find that the police are often hostile at worst and indifferent or sarcastic at best. As an example: On New Year's Day after pointing out that hounds were running dangerously all over the main road I was told by the sergeant that "they love their dogs". Officers then smiled at and fraternised with the hunt as they entered a farm, ignoring the hunt quad bike driving up the road with a man sitting on the back rack with his legs dangling down to the road. This despite police at our meetings saying that they are dealing with illegally driven quad bikes.</p> <p>A few years back officers would leave the comfort of their vehicles to investigate incidents when we contacted them. Now they tell us to call 101 or bring the filmed evidence to their vehicle.</p> <p>The hunt breaks the law with impunity every week. If we report an assault the police want video evidence before acting. However, the hunt's counter accusations are immediately believed by the police and may lead to one of our number being arrested. This is neither fair nor unbiased policing.</p> <p>We are being treated as though WE are the illegal</p>	<p>The Chief Constable has responsibility for operational policing matters, including the policing of hunts. Operation Rush is the dedicated Sussex Police response and has been in place for a number of years now.</p> <p>I discussed the policing of hunts with the Chief Constable at our webcast monthly Performance & Accountability Meeting on 15 December 2017.</p> <p>The Chief Constable acknowledged that the policing of artificially laid trails remains a difficult balancing act for the police between managing the rights of the hunting community to hunt within the confines of the legislation with the rights of those against hunting to protest peacefully.</p> <p>It was highlighted that Sussex Police has improved its overall response through increased and more effective engagement with the hunting communities, monitors and protestors, including proactive engagement with all parties before the hunt season commenced. The Force has introduced two new tactics to assist them with the policing of hunts, including dedicated Hunt Liaison Officers and Protest Liaison Teams to build and develop relationships and single points of contact with all parties concerned.</p> <p>I also recognise that Sussex Police has become much more effective in terms of capturing evidence and then assessing this evidence in terms of taking this forward to charges.</p> <p>I am reassured that Sussex Police carry out debriefs after each individual hunt to look at how the National Decision Model has been utilised in respect of threat assessments. The policing Operation Rush is also reviewed annually, with amendments made to both the planning and policing operation, as appropriate.</p> <p>This session is archived and can be viewed on my website using the</p>

<p>party when it is quite clear that it's the hunt who are breaking the law. Even a judge at one of the trials said that the alleged trail laying was a "piece of theatre".</p> <p>I realise that police resources are short but when two 4x4 vehicles are sent out each week to police the hunt we should expect something more positive from their presence.</p> <p>Sue</p>	<p>following link: www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/</p>
<p>8. Can there be a more visible police presence in rural areas, and a review of the neighbourhood policing policy so that each area is represented by a specific officer (as it was in the past).</p> <p>Rusper Parish Council</p>	<p>The Chief Constable is responsible for the deployment of police officers to meet the various demands on Sussex Police.</p> <p>I supported the Chief Constable whilst the Force developed the Local Policing Model (LPM). Now that the LPM is fully implemented, I continue to hold the Chief Constable to account for its delivery. This will include closely scrutinising the Post Implementation Review of the LPM which is scheduled to take place in May 2018.</p> <p>I carry out this challenge of the Chief Constable at both my informal weekly meetings, and my formal monthly Performance & Accountability Meetings (PAMs).</p> <p>The LPM was a theme at four PAMs in 2015 (18 March, 22 May, 31 July and 20 November), three PAMs in 2016 (15 April, 22 July and 21 October) and two PAMs in 2017 (27 January and 15 September). These sessions are archived and can be viewed on my webcast through the following link: www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/</p> <p>I also have a seat on the Local Policing Programme Board to monitor progress and challenge, where appropriate, on behalf of the public.</p> <p>Further information about the LPM is available on the Sussex Police website through the following link: https://sussex.police.uk/about-us/priorities-and-direction/local-policing-model/</p>

<p>9.</p> <p>Question 9a) Would the PCC explain why she last year raised £5 on the precept, stating that it was to be used for more police officers, then subsequently reduced the budget for police officers and PCSOs while increasing the budget for admin?</p> <p>Question 9b) In the light of the scandal surrounding the disclosure of evidence by Metropolitan Police officers, is the PCC satisfied that such a situation cannot have arisen in Sussex?</p> <p>Mr Gray East Grinstead</p>	<p>9a. The Chief Constable and I identified four areas of local policing to be strengthened through further investment supported in part by the £3m 2017/18 precept increase and the reinvestment of efficiencies of £1.2m. The monies were ring-fenced to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Investigation Teams (£1.03m) – 24 posts dedicated to intervene proactively to prevent and disrupt local crime gangs and take offenders off the streets; • Specialist Firearms Officers (£1m) – 52 posts across Sussex and Surrey to uplift the counter terrorism and firearms capabilities; • Public Protection Investigators (£1.25m) – 30 posts to provide additional capacity for public protection, within the Safeguarding Investigation Units; and • Prevention Youth Officers (£0.92m) – 20 posts to work directly with schools, colleges and universities to provide community policing that focuses on prevention advice and interventions, supporting the vulnerable and those most at risk, and dealing firmly and quickly with incidents. <p>This investment was made against an overall reduction in core funding and a requirement to make £26.5m of reductions over the planning period.</p> <p>The '2017/18 – 2020/21 Medium Term Financial Plan' includes further details of the financial resources and plans.</p> <p>9b. I am reassured that police officers and staff in Sussex disclose all evidence and information in an appropriate and timely manner.</p> <p>I hold the Chief Constable and Sussex Police to account for all matters relating to governance and integrity, through a quarterly Governance & Integrity meeting with the Head of the Professional Standards Department and a representative from Human Resources.</p> <p>This includes the review of decisions and reports on: complaints against Sussex Police, recording of gifts and hospitality, reporting of business interests, integrity and use of the 'Break the Silence' scheme, and civil claims</p>
---	---

	<p>The next Governance & Integrity meeting will take place on 23 January 2018.</p>
<p>10. What is the Commissioner's view on the support current level of information provided by Sussex Police to Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinators?</p> <p>At present, weekly bulletins sent to Co-ordinators in the Littlehampton area only include a selection of crimes and even that information can be delayed by as much as up to two weeks. By not receiving adequate information in a timely manner, the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch is greatly impaired. Talking to other Co-ordinators elsewhere in Sussex the problem is not confined to the Littlehampton area.</p> <p>Mr Richards of Littlehampton</p>	<p>I have shared your question with Sussex Police because the Chief Constable has responsibility for operational policing matters, including the provision of information to Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinators.</p> <p>I continue to remain a strong supporter of Neighbourhood Watch (NHW) and have raised your concerns to the Local Policing Support Team at Sussex Police, regarding the information supplied to NHW.</p> <p>I understand that Sussex NHW Federation is currently seeking approval for a drafted 'Memorandum of Understanding' (MOU) between NHW and Sussex Police.</p> <p>The MOU explains that NHW will be supported by a Prevention Support and Engagement Officer (PSEO) on each of the policing districts.</p> <p>The PSEOs are new roles within the Prevention teams and some of the posts are still waiting for the recruitment process/vetting to be completed. I am aware that Arun and Chichester are waiting for a second PSEO to join their team.</p> <p>At the last Sussex NHW Federation meeting, it was recommended that each of the NHW Area Co-ordinators should meet up with their PSEO's, once in post, to understand better the expectations of both parties in respect of the preferred levels of information and communication sought on each of the policing districts.</p> <p>I would, therefore, encourage you to make contact with the Area Co-ordinator for Arun in order to positively influence the discussions and decisions made regarding the information that is shared to members of NHW in the most effective and timely way.</p>

11.

Question 11a) On Halloween Night 31st Oct 2017 there was serious public disorder in the Langley Green Shopping Parade with local youth letting off fireworks with 2 occasions the fireworks let off just missed hitting young children. I witness the disturbance and made a series of five 999 calls (19.49, 20.12, 20.32, 20.51, 20.55) with the last call after being targeted by the youths with a green lazer pointer, but response police officers only arrived at 21.09 by which time the youth had left the area. The 2 police officers who attended apologised for the delayed response by saying there were only 7 response police officers on duty in the whole of Crawley and East Grinstead to deal with incidents that evening, I made a complaint to PSD about the delayed response and the excuse given was that police control in Lewes had looked at CCTV and could not see any disturbance in the parade other than some youth being on a roof however that pictures that I took of the disorder has the youth on ground.

I submitted an FOI request for data on the number response officers on duty that evening and the data given to me has 34 in Brighton & Hove division, 38 in East Sussex division and 102 in West Sussex division while the Gatwick Airport division does not have specific response officers. When I have asked for a more detailed breakdown of the data on a borough by borough basis it has been refused under section 31 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 on grounds that disclosure of number of response officers on duty in Crawley area that night would prejudice the prevention or detection of crime and the apprehension or prosecution of offenders. Can the Sussex PPC please advise the Police and Crime Panel meeting how many response officers were on duty that night in Crawley and reassure me and the meeting that on

11a. The Chief Constable is responsible for the deployment of police officers to meet the various demands on Sussex Police.

The information you requested in respect of the number of response officers on duty in Crawley on 31 October 2017 is not held by me or my office.

If you are unhappy with the service you have received from Sussex Police in relation to your previous request for information and wish to make a complaint or request a review of this decision, this should be made in writing to: foi@sussex.pnn.police.uk

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint or review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner's Office for a decision. Further information can be found using the following link: https://ico.org.uk/Global/contact_us

Halloween Night 31st Oct 2018, that more response officers will be on duty in the Crawley area.

Question 11b) Over the last 4 years I have completed 6 DASH (domestic abuse, stalking and harassment) risk assessments as a victim of domestic violence with Sussex police officers. On 2 occasions on 21/8/13 and 3/9/13, police officers falsified the DASH completed with 27 No answers and had no record in their police pocket books that I had given 27 No answers so I was not referred to Crawley MARAC (multi agency risk assessment conference) meeting. On 3 occasions on 18/11/13, 15/2/14 and 28/9/16, police officers completed a DASH by recording my answers in their pocket books but when they have transferred my answers to the police computer they have downgraded the risk assessment on 2 occasions from high to standard so again I have not be referred to Crawley MARAC.

Recently I did a DASH with an IDVA from Families Need Fathers on 1/11/17 and a DASH with a police officer on 8/11/17. The IDVA graded me as high risk victim of domestic violence and referred me to Crawley MARAC meeting on 28/11/17 whereas the police officer has graded me as standard and not referred me to Crawley MARAC. What this raises is fundamental concern about the way Sussex police officers complete DASHs and the make referrals to MARACs. It has also come to my attention that Sussex Police does not have systems in place when a DASH is completed to make checks that the person being assessed is telling truth.

Can the Sussex PCC please advise the Sussex Police and Crime Panel meeting what changes she will bring to the whole DASH process to require police officers to formally record a victims answers in their police pocket books and to have appropriate systems in

11b. I have shared your question with Sussex Police because the Chief Constable has responsibility for operational policing matters, including Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Harassment (DASH) risk assessments.

I will ensure that an answer to your question is provided to you in due course.

<p>place to check that people completing a DASH are telling the truth.</p> <p>Mr Nixon of Crawley</p>	
<p>12. What is the long term plan in West Sussex to counteract speeding, most notably that of motorbikes and super cars travelling through the National Park and to Goodwood. Some of these cars travel extremely quickly on roads like Station Road in Petworth.</p> <p>Clare Wiggs of Petworth</p>	<p>Mrs Bourne is fully supportive of the work carried out by Sussex Police and the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) to tackle and prevent the main causes of serious injuries and deaths on the roads in Sussex. This includes targeting excessive or inappropriate speed, driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, driver distractions, such as using mobile devices, and not wearing a seat belt – known as the fatal four.</p> <p>Speed limits are set by the Local Authority and should reflect local needs, taking into account all local considerations. Local speed limits are not set in isolation but as part of a package with other measures to manage vehicle speeds and improve road safety. Mrs Bourne understands the importance that the residents of Sussex place on road safety and this remains a key feature in her Police & Crime Plan.</p> <p>Mrs Bourne also recognises that illegally fitted exhaust systems and the inappropriate use of super cars and Powered Two Wheelers (PTWs) not only affects road safety but also the quality of life in local communities across Sussex. In order to combat this problem the Road Policing Unit (RPU) within Sussex Police conduct an enforcement operation, Operation Ride, throughout the summer months, because the use of super cars and PTWs predominantly increases as the weather improves.</p> <p>Marked and unmarked units, including plain police motorcycles equipped with recording capabilities, patrol roads used frequently by super cars and PTWs. Offending drivers and riders are stopped and their vehicles and bikes are examined for illegally fitted equipment, including exhaust systems. Any offences discovered are subject to prosecution through the courts. The RPU Casualty Reduction Teams also provide educational material and seminars to drivers and riders throughout the year, in order to influence their behaviour and attitudes.</p>

Operation Crackdown is a joint initiative run by Sussex Police and the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) which provides the communities of Sussex with an opportunity to report specific instances of anti-social driving and enables Sussex Police to develop intelligence regarding repeat offenders, vehicles, times and locations which can then be used to plan, target and deploy police resources.

If you have any specific information about anti-social driving in West Sussex, please visit the Operation Crackdown website (www.operationcrackdown.org) to report this. Alternatively, you can call 01243 642222 during office hours to speak to an operator.

Mrs Bourne meets regularly with the Chief Constable to improve local policing issues which includes scrutinising the performance of the Road Policing Unit. Road safety and 20mph enforcement, in particular, is also a theme that the Commissioner has challenged the Chief Constable about during monthly webcast Performance & Accountability Meetings. These sessions are archived and can be viewed on the Commissioner's website using the following link: www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/

This page is intentionally left blank