

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

11 January 2013 – at a meeting of the Panel held at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

David Simmons	Adur DC
Len Brown (1)	Arun DC
Ben Duncan	Brighton and Hove CC
Warren Morgan	Brighton and Hove CC
Tony Dignum	Chichester 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

(1)Substitute for Paul Wotherspoon

Apologies for absence were received from Paul Wotherspoon (Arun DC).

In attendance: Katy Bourne, Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner; Dan Steadman and John Eagles (Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner); and Ninesh Edwards and Matthew Evans (Host Authority - West Sussex CC).

Declarations of Interest

33. 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
David Simmons	Member of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur
Ben Duncan	Chairman of Brighton and Hove Community Safety Partnership Member of Safe in the City CDRP
Brad Watson	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership
Robin Patten	Member of Rother Safety Partnership
Graham Hill	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership Senior Service Delivery Manager for Victim Support charity
Tom Wye	Member of Adur and Worthing Safety Partnership

Christopher Snowling	Member of Mid Sussex Partnership
Brian Donnelly	Member of Horsham Safety Partnership
Trevor Webb	Member of East Sussex County Council
Claire Dowling	Chairman of Safer Wealden
David Elkin	East Sussex Safety Partnership

34. It was requested that a listing of standing personal interests, particularly in relation to membership of Community Safety Partnerships, be circulated in advance of meetings of the Panel. It was intended that the listing of personal interests would be agreed at meetings to avoid repetitive and time-consuming declarations at future meetings.

Minutes

35. Andy Smith corrected the declaration of personal interest recorded in the minutes of the last meeting to remove the word Kings from the title of the Lewes Community Safety Partnership. Ben Duncan corrected the declaration of personal interest recorded in the minutes of the last meeting to confirm the title of Brighton and Hove Community Safety Partnership.

36. John Ungar referred to a request made at the previous meeting relating to the Treasury's Green Book and whether adherence to guidance contained in the Green Book was required in compiling the draft budget. John Eagles, interim Chief Finance Officer, confirmed he would provide this information.

37. Resolved – That subject to the corrections outlined in paragraph 35 above the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 26 November 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

Police and Crime Plan and Proposed Precept

38. The Panel considered a report by the Police and Crime Commissioner which set out the draft Police and Crime Plan for 2013/14 and the proposed precept for 2013/14 (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The Commissioner introduced the report and advised the Panel of changes to the section of the Plan relating to Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) priorities as contained on an addendum report. The addendum report provided the priorities of CSPs for 2013/14 in place of the priorities for 2012/13 printed on the agenda report received by members previously. Copies of the addendum report were circulated to the Panel (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes).

39. The Commissioner explained that the development of the Plan was an iterative process and outlined the changes below to the local priorities:

- An amendment to the third bullet point under Crime and Community Safety to state that Sussex Police would tackle priority crime types including hate crimes;
- Under Victim Focus the first bullet point would be amended to: Improve the experience of victims and witnesses of the Criminal Justice System; and
- An additional bullet point to the section entitled Public Confidence to provide a local priority of building trust in the Police.

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

- Under the Crime and Community Safety priority the third bullet point appeared to equate domestic abuse with anti-social behaviour including anti-social driving. *This was not the intention of the Plan and the Commissioner confirmed that domestic abuse was a key priority – an amendment to the bullet point would be undertaken which would include reference to the Think Family and Troubled Family initiatives.*
- It was noted that the priorities did not contain mention of a focus on racial crime. *The bullet points for the priorities would be expanded in the final version of the Plan to include meaningful reference to racial crime.*
- A reference to Environmental Crime in the priorities was requested; the incidence of such crime in Sussex had increased. A definition of Environmental Crime was problematic, Lewes CSP categorised Environmental Crime as a priority under anti-social behaviour. The table of CSP priorities circulated at the meeting did not indicate that Environmental Crime was a priority for Lewes CSP. Consideration should be given to including the policing of the Hunting Act within a priority for Environmental Crime.
- Clarification was sought concerning what consultation would be undertaken with CSPs in setting the priorities in the Plan. It was felt that clear criteria would be required to define an underperforming CSP. The on-going role of the Countywide CSPs was also queried. *It was explained that the timeframe for producing the Plan was tight and that CSPs should contact the Office of the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner (OSPCC) as soon as possible with agreed priorities to feed into the Plan. A more structured process would be in place in future years to involve the CSPs in the production of the Plan. Targets would be set for CSPs against which it would be possible to assess performance and the Commissioner's Office would be closely involved in the work of the Partnerships. Under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 the Commissioner was responsible for agreeing funding to the CSPs and holding failing CSPs to account. The Act did not define a failing CSP but the merger of CSPs could not be permitted without local agreement.*
- The Panel encouraged the Commissioner to expand the range of businesses to be consulted in the plan to include engagement with local chamber of commerce and not focus solely on the Federation of Small Business. Reference should also be made to other partners, such as the Fire and Rescue Service. The fundamental partnership that existed between the police and the public should also be emphasised to encourage community involvement in policing. *The Commissioner explained that she would seek to encourage local communities to take greater responsibility for policing.*
- The Panel was divided in its support for the proposed precept. Support was expressed for the 0% increase in the precept for 2013/14 but it was felt that the Commissioner should consider future increases in the precept as a 0% increase would not be sustainable on an on-going basis. Opposition to the proposed 0% increase was also expressed with the proposal representing a voluntary cut in funding. It was explained that the public would be positive about paying more tax for the police if a good service was provided. *It was confirmed that financial projections were already being undertaken to investigate increases of 1, 2 and 3 % in future years.*
- The proposed 0% precept increase was understood as a manifesto pledge but without sight of medium and long term financial planning and an understanding of the current state of reserves and balances it was impossible to assess whether the proposed precept was sustainable.

- A lack of detail in the plan and budget and the absence of measurable outcomes were raised as impediments to meaningful scrutiny. In order to agree the objectives of the Plan it was necessary to conduct discussion around what could be delivered and how the success of the objectives would be measured. A cost-benefit analysis of the budget to assess the aims of the Plan was required together with an assessment of the environmental and social impacts. In future the Panel requested that data be provided from previous years to provide historic context to the budget and precept. *It was confirmed that in future comparative figures would be provided. The preparation of the budget for 2013/14 had relied on provisional figures but the proposed precept had not changed throughout the process. It was emphasised that the Plan was a strategic document and that Sussex Police would provide operational delivery of the Plan. The Panel was assured that the Plan would contain greater detail and be a more complete document by the time it was signed off.*
- Assurance was sought that the requirements of the Treasury's Green Book had been met. *It was confirmed that during the preparation of the Budget the Green Book and financial code of practice from CIPFA had been adhered to.*
- The draft revenue budget contained a sum of money dedicated to Special Constables which indicated an intention to increase their number. However there was no reference in the Plan to Special Constables. Further information about the role of Special Constables was sought. *The Commissioner confirmed that the £154,000 had been dedicated to the recruitment of Special Constables with the intention to appoint 300 initially, rising to 400 in the medium term with the eventual aim of appointing 500. Special Constables were seen as a method of achieving more effective policing in local communities by providing a more visible police presence. Consultation over the role of Special Constables had been conducted with the public and had been a manifesto pledge of the Commissioner.*
- There was very little mention in the Plan of collaborative work undertaken with Surrey. It was noted that collaboration with other partners was a key element of the Plan that required greater detail. The Panel supported the investigation of opportunities for co-location and joint working with local authorities. *The Commissioner had set out in the Plan under the section entitled Future Commissioning and Collaboration the clear intention to continue to work with Surrey Police to explore further possible opportunities for joint working.*
- The role of the Panel following the incorporation of greater detail into the Plan was queried. The Panel was divided over the need for an extra meeting to assess an updated version of the Plan. *It was confirmed that the Panel could express its support of the principles at the current meeting and request the further detail be circulated by email. Alternatively the Panel could decide to meet again in February to consider an updated version of the Plan. The Commissioner confirmed that she would welcome another meeting to outline a further iteration of the Plan.*
- It was felt that a precise definition of hate crime would be a useful addition to the Plan.
- The reduction in Basic Command Unit funding to divisions as listed in the draft revenue budget was queried. *It was confirmed that the Home Office had reduced the funding which had been anticipated and addressed in budget planning.*

- The disproportionate level of resources required for policing in Brighton was raised and it was felt that this should be mentioned in the Plan.
- The Panel queried whether savings of £9.6m outlined in the Budget were achievable. *It was explained that the Chief Constable had devised a plan to accomplish the savings, which should be achievable due to the better than expected financial settlement for the forthcoming financial year.*

41. The Panel voted to approve the proposed precept of £138.42 (for a Band D property) for 2013/14 which represented a 0% increase.

42. Resolved – That the Panel approves the proposed precept of £138.42 (for a Band D property) for 2013/14.

43. Ninesh Edwards, Office of the Clerk to the Panel, provided clarification and summarised the topics that the Panel had discussed whilst considering the Plan. The Panel was required to make a report to the Commissioner on the draft Plan and the issues to be included in the report to include:

- The importance of providing a clear distinction in the priorities between domestic abuse and anti-social behaviour;
- The incorporation of Environmental Crime into the priorities contained in the Plan and a clearer definition of Environmental Crime;
- A removal of the reference to the Federation of Small Business in the Plan to encourage broader engagement with other local business interest groups such as Chambers of Commerce;
- A comment on the draft nature of the Plan and a lack of sufficient detail;
- The importance of assessing the Plan and Budget in the context of financial data and performance frameworks/outcomes from earlier years and a cost benefit analysis;
- The need to provide a clearer definition of hate crime;
- An emphasis upon the importance of community involvement in supporting and delivering the Plan;
- The need for clear criteria to define an underperforming CSP; and
- The need for clarification of the deadline for the submission of CSP comments and a means to provide this information to the Commissioner.

44. A motion was proposed and seconded to agree the principles of the Plan and that the comments of the Panel be provided to the Commissioner. A majority of members on the Panel voted to agree the motion. It was requested that an updated version of the Plan containing greater detail be circulated to the Panel when available.

45. Resolved – That the Panel agrees the principles of the draft Police and Crime Plan and agrees to provide comments to the Commissioner.

Appointments to the OSPCC

46. The Panel received a report from the Police and Crime Commissioner relating to senior appointments to the OSPCC (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The Commissioner outlined the report and informed the Panel of the extension to the Chief Constable's contract of one year. The Chief Executive and the Chief Financial Officer of the OSPCC were currently interim appointments and work

would be on-going in the forthcoming months to undertake a selection procedure and make permanent appointments to the roles.

47. The Panel queried the process for the extension of the Chief Constable's contract and the senior interim appointments. It was confirmed that new, permanent appointments would be subject to confirmation hearings of the Panel and that the arrangements that had been put in place were to ensure a continuity of leadership.

48. Rosalyn St Pierre and John Ungar left the meeting at 12.12 p.m.

49. Resolved – That the Panel:

- a) notes the interim appointments of the Chief Executive and Chief Financial Officer; and
- b) notes the extension of the contract Chief Constable by one year to 30 September 2014.

Commissioner's Question Time

50. The Chairman asked members of the Panel to put questions to the Commissioner and confirmed that the question time would be limited to 20 minutes.

51. Robin Patten asked the Commissioner; whether CSP funding would be passported to District and Boroughs in a similar arrangement to the provision of funding to the County Council; what system would be used to provide analytical data to CSPs; and what financial planning was being undertaken to address any shortfall arising from the loss of the Council Tax Support Scheme by 2014/15? *It was confirmed that funding of the CSPs during 2013/14 would remain the same as in 2012/13 with the allocation of funding from the County Council; it was confirmed that the Caddy System was no longer used for data and a revised system would be introduced; and the loss of the Council Tax Support Scheme was factored into financial projections for forthcoming years.*

52. Warren Morgan asked the Commissioner about recent press reports relating to the role of the Commissioner and whether it was appropriate to lobby for a review of domestic violence sentencing policy? *The Commissioner confirmed that she had raised the issue with Criminal Justice partners and was keen to lead on methods to address domestic violence.*

53. Andrew Smith asked for an update on meetings between the Commissioner and her counterpart in Surrey. *The Commissioner confirmed that she had met with the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner and further meeting dates were scheduled.*

54. Trevor Webb sought reassurance from the Commissioner that she had a focus on addressing crime committed against disabled people. *The Commissioner confirmed that she was concerned about disabled crime which was incorporated in her priority on hate crime.*

Quarterly report of complaints

55. The Panel received a verbal update from Mr Edwards of two pieces of correspondence purporting to be complaints against the Commissioner that had been received by the Clerk to the Panel since the publication of the papers for the current meeting. It was confirmed that the Clerk to the Panel had reviewed the correspondence and determined that the complaints did not allege criminal activity and therefore it was appropriate that the correspondence be considered under the informal complaints procedure of the Panel.

56. The Chairman called for members of the Panel to form the Complaints Subcommittee to meet following the meeting to consider the correspondence received. The Panel was reminded that a subgroup of members would consist of three to five members and would strive to include a minority member and an independent member. It was agreed that Brian Donnelly, Sandra Prail, David Simmons, Andrew Smith and Brad Watson would form the membership of the subgroup to consider the two pieces of correspondences received.

57. Resolved – that Brian Donnelly, Sandra Prail, David Simmons, Andrew Smith and Brad Watson convene the Complaints Subcommittee to consider the two complaints received under the informal complaints procedure.

Written Questions

58. The Panel received and noted an update from the Chairman that no Written Questions from the public had been received in advance of the meeting. The Chairman confirmed that work was being undertaken to publicise the facility for members of the public to submit questions to the Panel ahead of the meeting in June.

Meeting Dates 2013/14 and Date of next meeting

59. The Panel received and noted the dates below for meetings of the Panel in 2013/14:

- Friday 28 June 2013
- Friday 11 October 2013
- Friday 24 January 2014

60. The next meeting of the Panel was scheduled for Friday 28 June 2013 at County Hall, Lewes.

The meeting ended at 12.35 p.m.

Chairman

