



SUSSEX POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Members are hereby requested to attend the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel, to be held at 10:30am on Friday 27 April 2018 at County Hall, Lewes.

Tony Kershaw

Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel

Webcasting Notice

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

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 - 8*)

To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting on 19 January 2018

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 Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy (*Pages 9 - 10*)

Report by the Police and Crime Commissioner

The report introduces the Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy and sets out how the Force will use the additional funding approved by the Police & Crime Commissioner.

The Panel is asked to comment on and note the report.

5 PCP Special Interest Group

The Chairman planned to attend to the inaugural meeting of the PCP Special Interest Group (SIG) on 19 April, and will provide a verbal report on proceedings.

6 Quarterly Report of Complaints (*Pages 11 - 14*)

Report by the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel

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 15 - 18*)

Report by the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel

Written questions may be submitted by members of the public up to two weeks in advance of a meeting. The Chairman of the Panel or the Commissioner will be invited to provide a response by noon of the day before the meeting. Questions, together with as many responses as possible will be tabled at the meeting.
Questions have been received from 6 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 together questions on the same topic.

9 Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel will take place on 29 June 2018 at County Hall, Lewes.

The Panel is asked to note the forthcoming meeting dates:

- **5 October 2018**
- **18 January 2019**
- **18 February 2019** (if required)

20 April 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

19 January 2018 – at a meeting of the Panel held at 10.30am, County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| George Barton ¹ | Adur DC | Eileen Lintill | Chichester DC |
| Bill Bentley | East Sussex CC | Christian Mitchell | West Sussex CC |
| Mike Clayden | Arun DC | Joe Miller | Brighton & Hove CC |
| Emma Daniel | Brighton & Hove CC | Nigel Morgan ² | Worthing BC |
| Claire Dowling | Wealden DC | Tony Nicholson | Lewes DC |
| Colin Fitzgerald | Hastings BC | Peter Nightingale | Independent |
| Michael Jones | Crawley BC | Susan Scholefield | Independent |
| Eleanor Kirby-Green | Rother DC | John Ungar | Eastbourne BC |
| Carolyn Lambert | East Sussex CC | Norman Webster | Mid Sussex DC |

¹Substitute for Dave Simmons (Adur DC), ²Substitute for Val Turner (Worthing BC)

Apologies for absence were received from Dave Simmons (Adur DC), Val Turner (Worthing BC) and Tricia Youtan (Horsham 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 Rob Castle (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

Chairman's Announcement

74. The Chairman asked the Panel to join him in congratulating PC Virginia 'Ginny' Jupp, a Sussex Police officer who has led on a ground-breaking partnership to tackle anti-social behaviour in Eastbourne and who had been awarded the Queen's Police Medal in the New Year's honours list.

Declarations of Interest

75. 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 |
| Mike Clayden | Chairman of Safer Arun Partnership |
| Emma Daniel | Member of Brighton and Hove Safe in the City Partnership Board |
| Claire Dowling | Chairman of Safer Wealden Partnership |
| Colin Fitzgerald | Co-ordinator of a domestic violence perpetrator programme in Southwark Employed by Solace Women's Aid Charity |
| Michael Jones | Chairman of Safer Crawley Partnership |
| Eleanor Kirby-Green | Chairman of Safer Rother Partnership |
| Carolyn Lambert | Member of East Sussex Fire Authority |
| Eileen Lintill | Member of Chichester Community Safety Partnership |
| Tony Nicholson | Co-Chairman of Eastbourne & Lewes Community Safety Partnership |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Susan Scholefield | A serving Magistrate Chair of the Competition Appeal Tribunal and Competition Service |
| John Ungar | Co-Chairman of Eastbourne & Lewes Community Safety Partnership |
| Norman Webster | Member of Mid Sussex Community Safety Partnership |

Minutes

76. Cllr Fitzgerald and Mrs Scholefield raised corrections concerning the accuracy of their declarations of interest and Mr Miller pointed out that his apologies had been sent, but not recorded. These changes were noted.

77. Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 6 October 2017 be confirmed as a correct record.

Urgent Matters

78. There were no urgent matters.

Final Report of the Precept Working Group

79. The Panel considered a report by the Chairman of the Precept Working Group (copy appended to the signed minutes) and concluded that acting as a critical friend to the Commissioner in developing the proposed policing precept for 2018/19 had been challenging due to the Government's late announcement that the precept cap could be removed. **ACTION:** Ninesh Edwards to liaise with the Precept Working Group and the Commissioner's office over a different approach

80. Resolved – that the Panel notes the report of the Precept Working Group, but felt that the way it operated should be revised.

Proposed Precept 2018/19

81. The Panel considered a report by the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by Katy Bourne, Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner, who told the Panel that: -

- The proposal was to increase the precept by £12 a year on Band D properties, 75% of Sussex properties were Band D or less (a Band A property would pay an extra £6 a year)
- Although legislation only permitted the budget to be set for one financial year, it was prudent to look ahead four years
- The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) set out all the resources and options to deliver the Police & Crime Commissioner's plan, priorities and Sussex Police's strategic national requirements
- The MTFS was also part of the Commissioner's financial management and scrutiny
- The MTFS was regularly reviewed alongside the budget to ensure public money was appropriately allocated
- The MFTS provided the context and rationale behind running costs and capital investments and was one of the major considerations in deciding the precept
- Sussex Police had the fifth lowest precept in England and Wales, and received the seventh lowest amount of government funding per head

- Currently, 36% of Sussex Police funding came from the precept, the remainder from government grants – the percentage raised by the precept would increase to 38% under the proposals, in line with Government intentions that more policing costs should be met locally
- The Government grant remained the same as last year, although there was extra money for counter terrorism and national policing priorities
- If Sussex had a similar amount of funding after the fair funding formula was applied it would get nearly £38m more per year from general taxation than at present
- Of all the district/borough councils in Sussex, only two charged a lower precept for Band D than Sussex Police
- Police & crime commissioners worked with the Police Chiefs' Council for better funding nationally and had been frustrated by the Government's late announcement regarding the removal of the precept cap
- If the precept did not increase by the proposed amount, there would be a £26.5m funding gap leading to the loss of 476 jobs
- The increase would reduce the funding gap from £26.5m to £.8m
- £17m had been released from reserves to help mitigate the funding shortfall
- £88m had been saved since 2010 from an annual budget of £250m
- The increase in the precept was needed to cover the continued rise in demand for police services, more complex investigations and exacting prosecution thresholds
- People wanted more local policing, a crack down on burglaries and anti-social behaviour, to feel safe on the roads and in public places and improvements to the 101 and 999 services - consultation showed that most people were prepared to pay more to achieve this
- The Chief Constable had assured the Commissioner that he would present a revised Local Policing Plan as part of his Operational Plan for 2018-2022
- A report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate highlighted the importance of community intelligence, especially in matters of organised crime and terrorism – the Commissioner used this report to challenge Sussex Police

82. Summary of responses to the Panel's questions and comments: -

- 63% of more than 4,500 responses to the public consultation on the precept were in favour of an increase
- There was a commitment from the Chief Constable that more would be spent on local policing and that road policing and the 101 service would be looked at
- The Commissioner could not direct operational policing, but requested a focus on prevention and investigative support
- Resources were also required to cover digital beats
- A plan was being developed by the Chief Constable that would show how police funds would be spent over the 2018 to 2022 period – this plan would be made available at the Panel's April meeting
- The precept for the next four years was planned to be £12 each for the first and second years and £5 each for the third and fourth years
- Assumptions included tax base increases of 1.54%, 1.64% and 1.34% based on Office for Budget Responsibility estimates
- There had been consultation on the Sussex Police Local Policing Model which was recognised as a good plan and was scaleable – community investigating teams had been introduced and were making a difference e.g. to anti-social behaviour – further benefits would emerge as the model was fully implemented
- Local police officers and community support officers had input into the local policing model which included prevention, response and investigation teams
- The public's views were fed into the model which was regularly tested

- If the proposed precept was accepted, resources could be put into local policing to deal with burglaries, anti-social behaviour and road safety
- Crime reporting was increasing via both the 101 and 999 services, although incidents of stalking and harassment often went unreported
- Calls were graded as Grade 1 (999), Grade 2 (between 999 and 101) and Grade 3 (101) – **ACTION:** The Commissioner to provide a breakdown to the Panel of the numbers for each grade of call to the call centre
- An example of collaboration between blue light services was the co-location of Sussex Police and the East Sussex Fire Authority which also shared an integrated transport function – the Commissioner had also led on a report on how the Sussex fire services could save £7m by working together
- Meetings had been held between fire, police and ambulance authorities regarding ways to collaborate and make savings
- Sussex Police was always looking at ways to make savings e.g. introducing a tri-force resource planning system
- The Commissioner had lobbied for increased government funding
- Changes to the way crimes were reported were set by the Home Office leading to an increase in figures in some areas e.g. all structures at a property were now included in home burglaries, and injury without violence now included crimes via social media - a close look at figures was needed to get the full picture
- An increase in firearms officers (equipment and training) across Surrey and Sussex was necessary due to the high level of the threat of terrorism
- Ten extra officers had already been taken on and a further eight would be employed by the end of March – when not deployed or in training, these officers would support local police teams – three new armed police vehicles had also been supplied across Sussex and Surrey
- Accountability meetings were held regarding the extra £1m for the programme covering possible terrorist attacks in Sussex and Surrey
- Police pay was set nationally with police & crime commissioners on the decision-making body – if the pay rise had been larger, the precept would have been larger
- There was an eight-person team that worked on seizing assets from cyber crime – the team was funded from the money seized
- The commissioner explained about her “call for” a general power of competence for PCCs this was an explanation of what such a power could achieve however legislatively such a power does not exist
- The cost of running the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner was reviewed annually with savings made where possible – staff had had a 1% increase, but the Commissioner’s salary had remained fixed since 2012
- **ACTION:** The Panel should monitor how numbers of different police job roles are affected by the increase in precept and ensure that Sussex residents did not lose out in cross border funding of extra firearms officers compared to Surrey residents
- **ACTION:** The Panel requests that the commissioner arranges with the Chief Constable for Panel members to visit the Armed Response Team on an appropriate date to better understand how the investment in this Surrey / Sussex Police service is being delivered

83. Cllr Ungar proposed that the Panel veto the proposed precept 2018/19. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Daniel. A recorded vote was taken with the following results: -

- Those in favour of a veto: Cllr Barton, Cllr Daniel, Cllr Fitzgerald, Cllr Jones, Cllr Kirby-Green, Cllr Lambert, Cllr Ungar

- Those against a veto: Cllr Bentley, Cllr Clayden, Cllr Dowling, Cllr Lintill, Cllr Miller, Cllr Mitchell, Cllr Morgan, Cllr Nicholson, Mr Nightingale, Mrs Scholefield, Cllr Webster
- The proposal was defeated by eleven votes to seven

84. Cllr Miller proposed that the Panel support the proposed precept 2018/19. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Webster. A recorded vote was taken with the following results: -

- Those in favour of supporting the proposed precept: Cllr Bentley, Cllr Clayden, Cllr Dowling, Cllr Lintill, Cllr Miller, Cllr Mitchell, Cllr Morgan, Cllr Nicholson, Mr Nightingale, Mrs Scholefield, Cllr Webster
- Those against supporting the proposed precept: Cllr Barton, Cllr Daniel, Cllr Fitzgerald, Cllr Jones, Cllr Kirby-Green, Cllr Lambert, Cllr Ungar
- The proposal was carried by eleven votes to seven

85. Resolved – that the Panel supports the proposed precept 2018/19.

Quarterly Report of Complaints

86. The Panel received a report from the Clerk to the Sussex Police and Crime Panel providing an update on complaints received in the last quarter (copy appended to the signed minutes). No complaints within the statutory remit of the Panel were received during the stated time period.

87. Resolved – that the Panel notes the report.

Written Questions

88. The Panel received responses provided to written questions received from members of the public prior to the meeting (copy appended to the signed minutes). The Chairman introduced the item and explained that the Panel encouraged 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.

89. Regarding question 11a on disorder in Langley Green shopping parade, Crawley, Cllr Jones was advised that CCTV footage should be requested from the Chief Constable.

90. Resolved - that the Panel notes the report.

Commissioner's Question Time

91. The following responses were given to questions: -

- There was no evidence that people were not calling 101 to report crimes and Her Majesty's Inspectorate rated Sussex Police as 'Good' for the accuracy of the way it recorded crimes
- Every crime reported was recorded accurately with the police deciding what action to take. Figures for calls to the contact centre that were rejected could be obtained from the police
- The increase in violent crime figures was a concern, but the way these were recorded had changed and now included, for example, online harassment, so it was important to see the breakdown of violent crime by category. Other

categories included serious crime with injury and serious crime with minor injury. The 12% increase in all crime in Sussex was in line with the regional and national position and West Sussex was still a safe place to live with the risk of being a victim of violent crime being low. There was a 14% increase in violent crime in Sussex compared to 18% nationally. This could be explained by more accurate reporting rather than an increase in offending. There had been no increase in public place crime and increases in sex crimes were due to more reporting.

- The Chief Constable had apologised for false reports that fans at the Brighton v Crystal Palace premier league football match had been carrying weapons and said that media reports had been misleading
- Any police uniforms sold on eBay would be de-badged
- The issue of response times to 101 and 999 calls was regularly raised by the Commissioner with the Chief Constable – some money from the precept increase would be invested in the call centre
- The Commissioner had challenged the Chief Constable on the monitoring of sex offenders and learned that there was a multi-agency public protection arrangement (MAPPER) system that managed registered sex offenders in Sussex. As at June 2017 there were 1,500 registered sex offenders in Sussex, 347 low risk, 12 medium risk and 2 high risk, the remainder were visited in line with national guidelines. The registration process and management of sex offenders was effective. There had been a 49% reduction in the backlog of visits to sex offenders since the report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate raised the issue. Inspection reports were based on six to eight month old data so as soon as they were published, the Commissioner met with the Chief Constable for an update. One third of all offenders engaged in integrated management programmes had convictions for domestic abuse – the risk and complexity of each individual was analysed so that the most appropriate agency was used to monitor them
- There was a multi-agency approach to tackling drug and alcohol abuse with the Commissioner's office making £327k available to the Brighton Community Safety Partnership annually
- Good work was going on in Hastings to combat modern slavery and cuckooing and a Modern Slavery Co-ordinator had been appointed for Sussex
- In matters of cross border collaboration, the costs were split thus: Sussex 55%, Surrey 45%

92. Resolved – that the Panel notes the Commissioner's responses

Date of Next Meeting

93. The next meeting date of 27 April 2018 was noted.

The meeting ended at 13.02

Chairman



Agenda item. 4

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| To: | The Sussex Police & Crime Panel |
| From: | The Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner |
| Subject: | Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy |
| Date: | 27 April 2018 |
| Recommendations: | That the Police & Crime Panel note and comment on the report. |

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This purpose of this report is to introduce the Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy and to set out how the Force will use the additional funding approved by the Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC).

2.0 Resources and the Medium Term Financial Strategy

- 2.1 The PCC's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) sets out the financial context for the PCC's 2018/19 revenue budget, capital programme and proposed precept decision, and estimates for a further three financial years. The MTFS was presented to the Police & Crime Panel at their meeting on 19 January 2018.
- 2.2 At the same meeting, the Commissioner recommended an increase in the precept of £12 per year for an average band D property to raise a further £8.9m. The decision was supported by and endorsed by the Panel at the meeting on 19 January 2018.
- 2.3 The precept increase combined with the use of part of the £17.0m reserves that was approved in September 2017 has enabled the PCC to provide the Chief Constable with substantially more resources than had been estimated previously, with a revenue budget of £267.2m, which is £13.5m (5.3%) more than the 2017/18 revenue budget.
- 2.4 The MTFS also sets out that further extra funding could be provided in future years enabling the Chief Constable to plan further ahead.

3.0 Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy

- 3.1 The PCC asked the Chief Constable to illustrate how this additional investment in local policing will ensure that local residents and those visiting Sussex can feel safe at home, in public spaces, at night time, and on the roads.
- 3.2 The Chief Constable has published his Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy which sets out how the Force will use the additional funding provided by the PCC to modernise and strengthen local policing.
- 3.3 The Strategy is aligned with the MTFS so that the Chief Constable is able to plan further ahead.

3.4 The Chief Constable's Strategy demonstrates that by 2022 Sussex Police will have 200 more officers than it currently has, in addition to recruiting officers to replace those due to leave. This will mean that people will see an increased visible policing presence throughout Sussex.

3.5 The Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy can be viewed in full in Appendix A.

4.0 Accountability

4.1 The PCC has supported the Chief Constable in the development of the Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy.

4.2 Now that the Strategy has been launched, the PCC will hold the Chief Constable to account for its delivery. This will include an expectation that this investment will enable Sussex Police to demonstrate:

- improvements in crime prevention and public engagement, as highlighted by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS);
- an increase in public awareness and understanding of police deployments and the revised local policing approach; and
- an increase in public confidence.

4.3 The PCC will monitor progress made against the delivery of the Strategy and challenge, where appropriate, through her schemes of corporate governance on behalf of the public including her public monthly webcast Performance & Accountability Meetings (PAMs).

4.4 Progress will also be monitored through the annual inspections into the Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy (PEEL) of Sussex Police carried out by HMICFRS, and the feedback received from the communities of Sussex through the Commissioner's new '2018/22 #Talk Sussex' campaign.

4.5 The Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy was specifically raised at the PAM on 20 April 2018. This session is archived and can be viewed on the Commissioner's website through the following link:
www.sussexpcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/

Recommended – That the Police & Crime Panel note and comment on the report.

Mark Streater
Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer
Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner

Iain McCulloch
Chief Finance Officer
Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner

Appendix A – Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

27 April 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 9 January 2018 to 3 April 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, four people contacted the Panel (either directly, or via the IPCC) to raise issues, and four 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 concerning the effectiveness and adequacy of speed monitoring measures put in place in the vicinity of the Rolls Royce factory in Westhampnett, West Sussex. This is an operational policing issue in which the Commissioner has no role, and the complainant was referred to the appropriate team within Sussex Police.

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 (three received).
- 1.6.4 An individual contacted the Panel regarding allegations which were investigated in 2016/17 via the statutory/independent process. No new evidence was presented to merit a fresh enquiry.
- 1.6.5 Correspondence originally sent to the IPCC was referred to the Panel. The correspondent alleged that the PCC had failed to acknowledge, or reply to, a letter sent previously. Enquiries with the Office of Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner revealed this to be the case, due to an administrative oversight. The preparation of a response was prioritised, and then dispatched.
- 1.6.6 An individual contacted the Panel, to complain about the PCC's actions in respect of a Sussex Police investigation into an operational policing complaint. Although having no legal role in such complaints, the PCC has a duty to "monitor all complaints made against (Sussex Police) officers and staff". The Panel has no investigatory powers, but basic enquiries can be made when a complaint about the PCC is received, to help determine how it should be handled, and the Clerk contacted the Commissioner's office to establish how her responsibilities were discharged in relation to the operational policing complaint. The Clerk was satisfied by the level of monitoring undertaken by the Commissioner and could establish no grounds for pursuing the complaint about the Commissioner further.

Serious Complaints

- 1.6.7 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

This page is intentionally left blank

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

27 April 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.

| Question | Response |
|--|----------|
| <p>1) I would Like to know what the Commissioner's stance is on enforcing the Law regarding Cyclists riding on public pavements.</p> <p>It would appear that more cyclists use pavements rather than the provided "cycle" routes. The cost of which needs no enlighten from me.</p> <p>I have seen, in the past, only one Community Officer stop a cyclist who rode around her on the pavement. I have noted a number of police officers who disregard the problem and blatantly turn a blind eye.</p> <p>It would appear that motorists can be fined for driving in "cycle lanes" but cyclists can endanger people walking on pavements.</p> <p>I live off a main road that has to contend with school and work, nose to tail traffic, children walking and adults and children speeding on cycles along the pavement. Exiting the front gate can be like playing "Russian Roulette" if</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>one is not knocked down it makes the day. If the worst happens the cyclist involved just rides off !!!</p> <p>I might add that vehicles, cars, lorries, parked on the pavements exacerbate the problems'.</p> <p>It would appear that the police decide what Laws to enforce and those to ignore. Perhaps the Commissioner would clarify.</p> <p>A Worthing Resident.</p> | |
| <p>2) The PCC will be aware that W. Sussex is a national poor performer on road deaths and injuries. Cycle injuries are high and rising. Most are the driver's fault. In the first year after introducing Operation Close Pass in its area, West Midlands Police reported a 20% reduction in cyclists killed or seriously injured.</p> <p>Does the Commissioner therefore have a view on whether Operation Close Pass should be introduced in Sussex, given this proven effectiveness?</p> <p>Morwen Millson, West Sussex County Councillor for Horsham Riverside.</p> | |
| <p>3) What is the Commissioner's view on the degree to which Sussex Police addresses the welfare of animals? Is this an area of focus within her Police and Crime Plan? Is she satisfied by the extent of partnership working with animal welfare charities? Can she point to any evidence of the success of this approach?</p> <p>Mr Hammond of Hassocks</p> | |
| <p>4) What is the Commissioner's view on Operation Close Pass, which has been implemented with great success in the West Midlands? Does the Commissioner feel such an initiative should be adopted by Sussex Police?</p> <p>Mr Smallman of Amberley, West Sussex</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>5) The West Midlands Police have been carrying out an award winning, hugely successful initiative called the "Close Pass Operation", based on the philosophy that "if poor driving makes people too scared to cycle, it's a police matter", and that "people who drive poorly around cyclists are likely to do so around other road users so it benefits all". Since the operation has been implemented the WMP have reported a 50% drop in poor overtaking, and a 20% reduction in the number of cyclists killed or injured, this confirms it is a hugely effective use of limited resources, representing excellent value for taxpayers.</p> <p>In November 2017 it was reported that Sussex police were evaluating the initiative, however there has been no further action regarding the implementation of such an operation.</p> <p>Does the Commissioner have a view about Close Pass Operation? Is she satisfied that Sussex Police are moving quickly enough to adopt best practice from other forces in respect of protecting our cyclists?</p> <p>Mr Tweed of East Grinstead</p> | |
| <p>6) An operational question regarding Sussex Police's response to drug dealing in Bognor Regis was received, and forwarded to Acting Chief Inspector Kris Ottery, Arun and Chichester District Commander for a response.</p> | |

This page is intentionally left blank