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

[1]Substitute for Dave Simmons (Adur DC), [2]Substitute 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 loose 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