

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

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

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

Present:

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

- (1) Substitute for Paul Wotherspoon
- (2) Substitute for Robin Patten

Apologies for absence were received from Paul Wotherspoon (Arun DC), Liz Wakefield (Brighton and Hove CC) and Robin Patten (Rother DC),

In attendance: Katy Bourne, Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner; Mark Streater, Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer of the Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner (OSPCC); Carl Rushbridge, Chief Finance Officer of the OSPCC; Mark Baker, Finance Director, Sussex Police and Ninesh Edwards and Matthew Evans (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

Declarations of Interest

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

Panel Member	Personal Interest
Brad Watson	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership
Graham Hill	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership Senior Service Delivery Manager for Victim Support charity Member of Crawley Community Safety Partnership Board
Dave Simmons	Chairman of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing

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

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

Minutes

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

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

Revenue and Capital Budget 2015/16

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Police and Crime Commissioner's Proposed Precept

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Police and Crime Plan Working Group – Final Report

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

115. Resolved – That the Panel notes the report.

Police and Crime Plan Refresh and Update

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

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

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

Commissioning of Services for Victims of Crime

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

Crime Reporting Data

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

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

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

Future Model of Policing Working Group

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

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

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

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

Quarterly Report of Complaints

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

Commissioner's Question Time

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The meeting ended at 12.40 p.m.

Chairman