

## Sussex Police and Crime Panel

7 February 2013 – at a meeting of the Panel held at 11.15 a.m. at County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

Paul Wotherspoon	Arun DC
Nigel Boxall	Crawley BC
John Ungar	Eastbourne BC
David Elkin (Vice-Chairman)	East Sussex CC
Rosalyn St Pierre	East Sussex CC
Trevor Webb	Hastings BC
Brian Donnelly	Horsham DC
Andy Smith	Lewes DC
Christopher Snowling	Mid Sussex DC
Robin Patten	Rother DC
Claire Dowling	Wealden DC
Andrew Smith	West Sussex CC
Brad Watson (Chairman)	West Sussex CC
Tom Wye	Worthing BC
Graham Hill	Independent
Sandra Prail	Independent

Apologies for absence were received from David Simmons (Adur DC), Pat Beresford (Adur DC), Warren Morgan (Brighton and Hove CC), Tony Dignum (Chichester DC) and Eileen Lintill (Chichester DC).

In attendance: Katy Bourne, Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner; Steve Waight, Candidate for Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner; Dan Steadman (Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner); and Diane Henshaw, Ninesh Edwards and Matthew Evans (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

### Declarations of Interest

61. In accordance with the code of conduct, the following personal interests were declared:

Nigel Boxall	Chairman of Crawley CDRP
Andy Smith	Member of Lewes Community Safety Partnership
Brad Watson	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership Political Colleague of the candidate for Deputy Commissioner at West Sussex CC
Robin Patten	Member of Rother Safety Partnership
Graham Hill	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership Senior Service Delivery Manager for Victim Support charity Member of Crawley Community Safety Partnership Board
Tom Wye	Member of Adur and Worthing Safety Partnership Cabinet Colleague at Worthing BC of the candidate for Deputy Commissioner
Christopher Snowling	Member of Mid Sussex Partnership

Brian Donnelly	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership
Trevor Webb	Member of Hastings Safer Partnership
Claire Dowling	Chairman of Safer Wealden
David Elkin	Member East Sussex Safety Partnership
Paul Wotherspoon	Member of Safer Arun Partnersip

## Minutes

62. Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 11 January 2013 be confirmed as a correct record.

## Procedure to be followed at Confirmation Hearings

63. The Panel received and noted the procedure to be followed at confirmation hearings of the Police and Crime Panel (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The Panel was informed that prior to the confirmation hearing and questioning of the candidate there would be a brief question time for the Commissioner. The Commissioner would receive questions regarding the proposed appointment of a Deputy Commissioner.

## Commissioners Question Time

64. The Panel asked the Commissioner the following questions:

- Why did the Commissioner need a Deputy? *The Commissioner had reviewed her commitments over her first 12 weeks in office and had determined that she required a deputy.*
- Why was the Panel not informed of the proposed appointment for a Deputy Commissioner at the meeting in January 2013? *The proposed appointment had not been finalised by the time of the meeting in January.*
- How did the skills of the candidate complement those of the Commissioner? *The Commissioner had a private sector background and the candidate had broad experience of public sector finance. The Commissioner had experience at District and Parish tiers of local government, the candidate had experience of upper tier local authorities.*
- What resources would be required for the role and how had the salary been set? *Central government had determined that the salary of a Deputy should not exceed 75% of the salary of the Commissioner. The proposed candidate's salary had been set below this threshold. No expenses for travel within Sussex would be claimed by the Deputy Commissioner.*
- National press reports had made allegations of cronyism in the case of some Deputy Commissioner appointments; how would the Commissioner address any allegations of cronyism? *The candidate had not been a member of the Commissioner's campaign team during the elections and the candidate's broad qualifications demonstrated his suitability for the role.*
- The proposed appointment concerned the previous Chairman of the Sussex Police Authority (SPA). Such elements from the past conflicted with the legislative objectives of establishing new ways of working.

*The candidate would bring useful experience to the role and provide the Office of the Commissioner with a fresh perspective.*

### **Confirmation Hearing**

65. The Chairman introduced the candidate and explained that the Panel would be asked to agree to go into closed session at the end of questioning of the candidate to determine its recommendations to the Commissioner.

66. The Panel asked the proposed candidate for Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner the following questions:

- The Panel queried how the candidate was initially made aware of the role. *The candidate was informed of the position by the Commissioner in a telephone call at 7.00 p.m. on a Friday night late in January.*
- The position of Deputy was a full time role, how would the candidate balance his existing commitments with the role of Deputy Commissioner? *It was possible for a County Councillor to also hold a full-time job but the candidate would review pressures on his time in due course and make adjustments to his commitments. The Candidate confirmed that it was most likely that he would stand down as a Worthing Borough Councillor if the pressures on his time were excessive.*
- The Commissioner had asked the candidate to remain a County Councillor but the Panel queried what would be the benefit of such a dual role? *By remaining a County Councillor the candidate would retain an important link with a key strategic partner of Sussex Police.*
- Did the candidate feel that there was a conflict of interest relating to the allocation of the Community Safety budget which was ported to the County Council for distribution? *Community Safety budgets for 2013/14 had already been announced and it was not felt that a conflict of interest existed.*
- The Candidate was questioned on his involvement with minority groups and if he could interact effectively with all faith groups? *The candidate's religious beliefs would not prevent him working with other faith groups. The candidate had encountered and worked with a wide range of diverse groups across Sussex.*
- It was recognised that the candidate had extensive experience in West Sussex but he was questioned on his work in East Sussex. *The candidate confirmed that he had worked across Sussex with a range of local leaders and authorities. The rural/urban split was similar in East and West Sussex and the candidate explained that he had an understanding of issues across these areas. The coastal strip in West and East Sussex was comparable and the candidate had experience of working in Brighton and Hove and in Worthing.*
- The candidate was asked how he would seek to engage with communities, in particular, hard-to-reach groups. *The Candidate felt it was important to work closely with local authorities and engage with communities on the ground.*
- As the Chairman of the SPA the candidate had occupied a position that to all intents and purposes was the Commissioner. The candidate was asked if he supported the strategic approach of the Commissioner and if he agreed with the work undertaken to streamline the management

of the Office of Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner? *The candidate had been aware of the proposals in the Commissioner's election manifesto and had supported her approach during her time in office. The Office of the Commissioner was a very different body to the SPA and required a smaller officer structure.*

- The candidate was asked about potential accusations of cronyism and the allocation of police resources for events such as political party conferences. *The candidate was unsure if there was a public perception of cronyism and confirmed that the role of Deputy Commissioner was not outwardly political. Resources for policing were considered objectively without political bias.*
- The Panel referred to the candidate's CV circulated prior to the confirmation hearing (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) and queried why the document only provided detail from 1992. *The candidate provided a verbal summary of his full CV.*

### **Exclusion of Press and Public**

67. Resolved – That under Section 100(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I, of Schedule 12A, of the Act by virtue of the paragraph specified under the item and that, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information

### **Determination of recommendations to the Police and Crime Commissioner**

Exempt: paragraph 1, Information about individuals

68. Paul Wotherspoon left the meeting at 12.20 p.m.

69. The Panel considered the appointment of the proposed Deputy Commissioner and agreed to recommend that the proposed candidate is not appointed to the post. The Panel was concerned that the other duties of the candidate as a County and Borough Councillor would impact on his ability to undertake the role. In addition the Panel did not feel that the Commissioner had provided sufficient detail relating to the role and functions of the Deputy Commissioner.

Chairman