

SPECIAL OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE

23 January 2018 at 6.00 p.m.

Present: - Councillors Dingemans (Chairman), English (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Bence, Blampied, Edwards, Elkins, Hughes, Mrs Oakley, Oliver-Redgate, Oppler, Miss Rhodes, Mrs Rapnik, Warren, Dr Walsh and Wheal.

Councillors Ambler, Mrs Ayres, Ballard, Bence, Bicknell, Mrs Brown, Cates, Charles, Dendle, Haymes, Mrs Pendleton, Mrs Porter, Wells and Wensley were also present at the meeting.

The following guests were also present at the meeting:

The Deputy Mayor of Arundel – Councillor Mrs Ashmore
The Mayor of Bognor Regis – Councillor Woodall
The Mayor of Littlehampton – Councillor Blanchard-Cooper
The Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner – Mrs Katy Bourne
Chief Inspector [Arun & District Commander] – Kris Ottery
Acting Inspector [Arun & Chichester Prevention Team] - Danny West

384. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Members of the Committee, Councillors and Members of the public to this Special Meeting of the Committee.

He especially welcomed the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner Katy Bourne, Chief Inspector Kris Ottery [Arun & District Commander] and Acting Inspector Daniel West [Arun & Chichester Prevention Team] for attending and for agreeing to be asked a series of questions on policing in the Arun District.

The Chairman also extended a special welcome to:

- the Mayor of Bognor Regis, Councillor Phil Woodall;
- the Mayor of Littlehampton Town Council, Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper; and
- the Deputy Mayor of Arundel Town Council, Councillor Lucy Ashworth to the meeting.

Special Overview Select
Committee – 23.01.18

385. APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

An Apology for absence had been received from the Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, Councillor Clayden.

386. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Edwards declared a Personal Interest as he was an employee of Gatwick Airport Limited and should any discussion focus on his area of work.

387. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 November 2017 were approved by the Committee as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

389. COUNCIL MOTION - POLICING PRIORITIES

The Chairman referred Members to the covering report that outlined that at Full Council on 8 November 2017 a Motion had been submitted calling upon the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner to review its policing priorities and to urgently invest more human and financial resources in front-line policing.

The report provided the background to this Motion and that as a result of the debate at Full Council that the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) had been invited to attend this meeting to update the Committee on policing in Arun and the Police response to current and future challenges.

The agenda outlined the format for the discussion of this item which was:

- Welcome and introduction from the Chairman
- Presentation from the PCC
- Presentation from the Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, Councillor Clayden
- Questions from the Committee
- Questions from Arundel, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Town Councils; and
- General question and answer session

The Chairman invited the Sussex PCC to provide her presentation. The PCC thanked the Council for inviting her to attend this meeting and she explained that she planned to put facts into context. Firstly, she referred to the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel which had taken place on 19 January 2018 and explained the role and purpose of the Panel.

The main item considered on 19 January 2018 had been the proposed precept for 2018/19. The PCC outlined that the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 required her to notify the Panel of the proposed precept for the coming financial year. The Panel was then required to respond confirming if it supported any precept increase. The PCC confirmed that an increase in precept for 2018/19 from £153.91 to £165.91 an increase of £12 (7.8%) for a Band D property had been proposed and approved.

The Minister for Policing and the Fire Service had announced the provisional police financial settlement for 2018/19 on 19 December 2017. As part of this announcement, the Government made it clear that an increasing proportion of policing costs would have to be met by local taxpayers and so PCCs were allowed to raise the precept above the previous limit per household/dwelling.

The PCC then outlined what the precept decision meant for the next financial year, the points made have been summarised below:

- A further £36.5 million had been taken out of the Police budget
- A draft four-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) had also been considered and set out the financial context for the PCCs draft revenue budget, capital programme for the next financial year as well as estimates leading up to 2020.
- Financial planning sat at the heart of good public financial management and so alongside budget preparation, performance management and reporting, the ability to look strategically beyond the current budget period was a crucial process to support long-term financial sustainability. The Sussex Police was no different to any other public sector service, the government settlement had not provided additional resources but it had enabled all PCCs to raise additional funds from local taxation.
- There had been a number of key considerations driving the decision to increase the precept.
- There had been an exceptional rise in public demand on police services

- Criminal investigations were becoming increasingly complicated with huge amounts of digital material to identify, secure and analyse
- The public wanted to see investment in more visible, local policing, focusing on crimes like burglary and anti-social behaviour and they rightly also wanted to feel safe on the roads, in public places and at night time.
- Crime was becoming increasingly trans-national with serious and organised crime groups committing crimes using the ‘dark web’. Such crime was increasing in volume and severity and was often being committed by criminals not even living in the UK.
- Crimes previously hidden were also increasing such as human trafficking, modern slavery and child pornography. The cost of such crimes was increasing annually to a level of around £1 billion nationally. This was putting an enormous strain on resources and presented an enduring challenge requiring a collaborated response from Government, law enforcement and business.
- International terrorism had become more fragmented and harder to combat – all of these facts helped to put the need for increasing the precept into context.
- The public also wanted to see improvements in the force’s approach to public contact and more support to the 101 service.
- Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) had acknowledged the public’s concerns about changes to neighbourhood policing and had stressed the importance of community intelligence
- Consultations and correspondence with the public had shown that a majority of Sussex residents were prepared to support their police services through increased precept contributions.
- Work would continue looking at making future efficiencies through partnership working. The joint change programme with Surrey had delivered efficiencies in many areas across both policing and the back office. Whilst these joint services would continue, a more regional focus would be adopted for future partnership working with Thames Valley, Hampshire and Surrey.
- Against a backdrop of tight financial resources, efficiencies would need to continue to be made in smarter policing and improving how the force could continue to improve its services.

The PCC explained that part of her responsibility for the maintenance of an efficient and effective police force was to hold the Chief Constable to account for the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.

- A new model for local policing had been implemented aiming to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour by working effectively with partners. Resources had been re-organised to address the changing nature of some of the crimes mentioned above. Continued investment would be used to maintain this model which planned to:
 - Continue to provide a 24/7 policing service 365 days per year
 - Prioritise those people at greatest risk of threat or harm meaning money given to the policing services would be used most effectively
 - Investigate lower level crimes over the phone whenever possible to free up response officers to deal with more urgent issues
 - Ensure a greater visible presence where there was a higher risk of crime
 - Working with partner agencies to resolve issues causing recurring problems and crime
 - Making it easier for citizens to contact the police in multiple ways using new technologies such as social media to report crime
 - Improve data sharing
- Members were advised that taxpayers in this area paid the fifth lowest precept of any PCC in England and Wales whilst at the same time the Sussex Police received the seventh lowest net revenue cost per head of population. If the same funding paid to others was received this would provide an additional £37 m annually and so this was why it was vital for the PCC to continue to prioritise the achievement of value for money and efficiency in establishing the framework for policing within Sussex whilst maintaining and delivering services that were fit for the 21st century.
- It was outlined that when other public services were withdrawn, the police remained ‘open for business and the service of last resort’. This involved accompanying mental health sufferers to A&E; dealing with the consequences of young people falling into crime in the absence of any funded outreach services; and caring for the drunk and drugged often by transporting individuals and the sick and injured.

The Chairman thanked the PCC for her presentation and then invited the Group Head of Community Wellbeing to provide a brief outline of the role of the Safer Arun Partnership, in the absence of the Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing.

The Group Head of Community Wellbeing provided some detail on the work of the Safer Arun Partnership and how this fitted into the excellent partnership working that took place between the Council and the Police.

The Chairman then referred to the questions that had been submitted by Members to the PCC in advance of the meeting and he stated that the questions relating to the lack of community policing; low level crime; and the lack of police reaction in the past 2/3 years had been covered, to a certain extent, by the PCC’s presentation.

The following questions were then asked by Members of the Committee:

- Councillor Mrs Bence – In June 2017, Sussex Police were consulted on a local planning application and asked if they would like to state their request for funding on the Section 106 agreement. They had indicated at that time that a request for funding through the Section 106 contribution might be forthcoming, however, no communication was received after that and despite numerous efforts by the Council’s officers to get a response from the Sussex Police, nothing was received and therefore the Section 106 agreement was drawn up without any police contribution. Councillor Mrs Bence outlined that she had felt the need to raise this question since recently becoming a Member of the Development Control Committee and that since that time; the Sussex Police had been invited to meetings and on both occasions had failed to do so. In light of the recently announced rise in precept costing residents more and at the same time residents receiving a reduced service, could the PCC explain why, when funds were so desperately needed, an opportunity like this had been lost.

The PCC responded outlining that she would continue to seek additional sources of external funding for policing and to maximise income through developer contributions such as the Community Infrastructure Levy and/or Section 106 monies. A Community Planning Manager was in post working on a full-time basis across both Surrey and Sussex focusing on seeking appropriate funds to support new policing capital infrastructure relating to housing development. At the present time this post had secured agreements totalling over £0.5 million which would be invested into new communities to fund infrastructure to support policing. These included various

estate projects to improve existing police station relocations and automatic number plate recognition sites to support new buildings, up-front costs associated with employing new officers through the Local Policing Programme and contributions towards increasing the vehicle fleet capacity. The PCC then outlined how the Community Planning Manager was seeking new opportunities through developments around the District and these developments were named, some examples given were Summer Lane, Pagham, Hook Lane, Pagham, and elsewhere around the District. It was confirmed that work was only undertaken for development that had over 100 houses/dwellings per application.

- Councillor Dr Walsh outlined why he had presented the Motion to Full Council on 8 November 2017. This had been because residents and traders in Littlehampton were becoming increasingly frustrated over the lack of police and PSCO presence in and around the Town. This was coupled with the fact that there was a very poor level of response to increasing reports of alcohol related crime and anti-social behaviour. Councillor Dr Walsh stated that the PCC was failing to comply with her promises that there would be effective neighbourhood policing and support provided to the victims of crime. This was not the case instead crimes were increasing and the amount of reoffending was too. This was because of the lack of investment in front line policing. Over the years, over 1,000 police officers and PCSOs had been culled as part of the £88 million pounds of cuts. Councillor Dr Walsh asked if the PCC could confirm when the Police would respond to the concerns of the public and traders and when front line policing would return to the streets of local Town Centres and villages, especially as this was the overwhelming demand from the public in the Arun District?

The PCC responded stating that she had been more than comprehensive in terms of outlining the police and crime objectives for the next 4 years. In terms of the problems being experienced by traders, she stated that she was very familiar with issues being experienced and so this had been why the Business Warden Scheme had been introduced. Danny West confirmed that Business Wardens had attended weekly meetings so as to ensure that they had a good idea of the problems that needed to be refocused. Regular meetings had been held with the Town Centre Regeneration Manager in Littlehampton to make sure that the concerns traders had about anti-social behaviour from youths were fully understood and in terms of exactly what the traders were experiencing. Danny West outlined the importance of needing to know exactly what the issues were so that the Police could then respond effectively. It was outlined that the Police were working in partnership with the Council’s Community Safety Team; anti- social behaviour

Special Overview Select
Committee – 23.01.18

case workers; and the Business Wardens and that as a result of this work better results were being achieved.

- Councillor Dr Walsh asked if he could receive a response to the remaining elements of his question which was how could the PCC justify now increasing the precept to this new level when increases had not been made before – why was she playing “catch up”.

The PCC outlined that she had been lobbying hard to secure the best possible funding arrangements for policing. The Government had made it clear that an increasing proportion of policing cuts would have to be met by local council tax payers and so PCCs had been allowed to raise the police precept above the previous limit.

- The Chairman, Councillor Dingemans, asked how much expenditure was spent on Policies from Central Government rather than on local needs?

The PCC asked if Councillor Dingemans was asking how did the PCC decide how funding was spent. She outlined that her role was to ensure that the Sussex Police also met its strategic policing requirements, including a co-ordinated response to serious and organised crime and terrorism. There was also the need to have money set aside as there were also national bodies like The National Crime Agency who could instruct the Chief Constables in her force if they wanted certain things – this would be classed as an unexpected budget pressure. It was also confirmed that the PCC had to keep a general reserve of a minimum of 4% of Net Revenue Expenditure to cover any major unforeseen expenditure or loss of funding.

- Councillor Dr Walsh asked further questions on PCSOs and when would they and Police Constables return to the streets of Arun?

The PCC explained that the current 200 PCSOs would continue to work in crime prevention teams which made them more flexible in terms of responding to requests and this method was proving to be successful. Kris Ottery explained that some PCSOs had been removed from some geographical areas. This allowed PCSOs to respond to what was happening so if there was a spate of vehicle crime, for example, the PCSOs would have an overall awareness covering the whole area. Rather than PCSOs patrolling and responding to each incident in isolation, they were working collectively to prevent criminal activity and associated problems re-emerging.

- Councillor Edwards outlined that he had noticed that crime figures throughout the District were increasing and that he was staggered to learn that in his village of Felpham there had been an increase of 42% in reported crime. What did the PCC propose to do about this?

The PCC outlined that more people were reporting crimes and that crime comparison tables could provide misleading information. It was important for Members to understand the context behind why and how crime was reported. The reporting of crime had risen by 18% nationally and 11% in Sussex. There had been a general increase in the reporting of hate crime and domestic abuse and this was down to the fact that victims were more confident in coming forward to report incidents.

The PCC confirmed that Sussex Police had recently been independently inspected by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabularies Fire and Rescue (HMICFRS) and had been rated as ‘good’ stating that the plans Sussex Police had for the future were realistic and practical and that the force’s financial plans were well integrated with its workforce. It had also received a ‘good’ rating for how it kept people safe and reduced crime. The PCC stated that HMICFRS had published its findings on line in November 2017 and she urged Members to view the results on the Sussex Police’s website. Returning to the way in which crime was recorded, the PCC stated that Sussex Police had been rated as one of the top forces in the country in terms of how accurately it recorded crime. In terms of explaining the increase in the recording of violent crime, it was explained that the crime being recorded was dictated by the Home Office who recorded it differently showing it as violent crime when in fact it could be crime without injury such as harassment and/or social media crimes. Members needed to look at the strands underneath.

- Councillor Edwards asked about the rates of vehicle crime in his Ward, Felpham.

The PCC explained that the increases recorded could often be just one person committing numerous or mass crimes in a very close area overnight. With no evidence, CCTV footage or witnesses, it took longer for the Police to resolve these crimes. More work was now being undertaken using social media to resolve these types of crimes.

- Councillor Elkins asked a question relating to the HMICFRS review in that the overall judgement of the Sussex Police had been measured as ‘good’, however, there were areas that had been identified as requiring improvement. Councillor Elkins focused on upon a study on the taking of 101 calls stating that over the period of 2016/17 - 6,100 calls per month were being lost, i.e., people were aborting attempting to make a call as they could not wait for their call to be answered. Councillor Elkins stated that to him this highlighted that a number of the 101 operators were under great pressure due to the huge number of calls that they could see were waiting to be answered. He asked if this was impacting the measure of those crimes not seen as being reported? If they were not reported, were resources not being focused in the correct area such as call centre staff? He also had concern that call centre staff were not receiving the appropriate level of training and so how could they assess the urgency of the calls made. Councillor Elkins asked what was being done to address the high number of calls being received?

The PCC stated that the HMICFRS provided comparative data on a wide range of policing activities and completed a range of inspections as part of their PEEL Assessment (Police Efficiency, Effectiveness and Legitimacy). This was designed to give the public information about how their local police force was performing in several important areas. The inspections examined how well forces understood the demand for their service and how they were planning to meet future demand. The PCC stated that she and the Chief Constable had established a Joint Audit Committee which provided an independent and high level focus on the adequacy of the audit, assurance and reporting arrangements that underpinned good governance. These meetings could be viewed on line. In responding to the findings on non-emergency call handling times, Members were again referred to the PCC website. In the last rolling period the PCC confirmed that 74% non-emergency calls were answered in 5 minutes, 87% in 10 minutes, with 19% being abandoned, the PCC did not know why these calls had been abandoned. Members were reminded that crime could be reported on line and that this was being encouraged. Members also had to remember that all of these facts had to be set against the context of an ever increasing demand – an additional 6,000 calls had been made compared to last year. The types of calls in terms of complexity and the time it took to respond to were explained. On-going work was taking place to understand what could be classed as good and bad abandoned rates as this was an area she continued to monitor.

The PCC explained that as part of the uplift in the police precept she would be looking at putting resources into local policing and part of this would cover contact too.

- Councillor Elkins responded with a supplementary stating that he was pleased that the PCC was putting resources into the contact centre but he wanted to know if this would involve training?

The PCC stated that having a happy customer at the end of the day was a positive outcome. She assured Members that training was in place but wanted to remind Members that 40% of calls that were received as 101 calls actually had nothing to do with policing at all. The calls were received because other public services were closed. Again, on-line reporting was being encouraged.

- The Deputy Mayor of Arundel Town Council stated that she wished to publicly thank Danny West for increasing public confidence in the police by spending time in Arundel talking with and reassuring disturbed residents who were feeling worried and vulnerable about anti-social behaviour. This showed that working in partnership and directing people to report crime in the right way did work. She focused on the effective commercial and business partnership working underway in which a relaunch with the prevention team was being looked at to report crime not just via Facebook but between businesses and through to the right resources.

- The Mayor of Littlehampton spoke about Business Wardens and he asked if an indication could be given about funding for the future in terms of the Littlehampton scheme which was due to run out in March of this year. He also asked if there was a target in place for response times when the 101 number had been used as he felt that a 5-10 minute response time was not good and he wanted this progressed forward.

Danny West confirmed that funding for the Warden Scheme would continue until March 2019. From that point onwards, the expectation was that the Police would work with businesses to then make it self-funding as there was the need for local businesses to take responsibility too. The Police would work with them to find a sustainable solution.

- Councillor Wheal outlined his concern at the time it was taking to respond to 101 calls - 5 minutes was far too long.

Special Overview Select
Committee – 23.01.18

The PCC stated that although she sensed Members’ frustration they had to accept that 101 calls were non-emergency calls. The response times for 999 calls were a different matter as such calls were being made when there was a matter of clear and present danger to deal with. She stated that the call handling centre was keen for people to come and spend some time with them to see first-hand the type and nature of call received and she invited Members to take up her offer of a visit.

- Councillor Bence referred to his written questions that had been submitted in advance of the meeting, these were questions 3 to 6 from non-Committee Members and referred to the health and safety and vulnerability of single police officers on patrol. He stated that no comment had yet been made about the response team and lack of staff resource to deal with an immediate response to a 999 call. He stated that he had recently experienced the 101 system and that his attempts to report crime and submit CCTV evidence to the police had been difficult – he felt that there was a very serious lack of training and understanding emanating from some of the civilian operators, however, he praised the work of Danny West in dealing with the personal matter this surrounded and confirmed that a successful outcome had been achieved. He also asked questions about the neighbourhood policing team and the role of PCSOs as they could not arrest or investigate cases.

The PCC confirmed that the PCSOs had never warranted powers since their introduction but recently their powers had been extended in the last 18 months making them more useful – they could now take name and addresses down; undertake basic investigations; and could support investigation teams. There were 200 across the force and these levels would not reduce as it was recognised how important their role was.

The PCC then responded to Councillor Mrs Bence’s question which was question 3 from the questions submitted in advance by the Committee. The PCC stated that she was committed to achieving compliance with health and safety law and training and risk management. The PCC again referred to the Joint Audit Committee which scrutinised the governance of the organisation and included the consideration and adequacy of health and safety arrangements. The Sussex Police was fully compliant with the demands of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 (HASAWA) and a safety management system had been implemented across Sussex and Surrey. A joint audit had also been undertaken through the Joint Audit Committee by Sussex Police through their Strategic Health and Safety Board on lone working and a safety risk profile showed where safety risk was within organisation and how this was managed. Work was ongoing at looking at safety hazards and how these could be prevented using video cameras and hand held devices.

- Councillor Bence asked how many police officers had been provided with a policy in terms of lone working? This was important as there were increasing numbers of single manned vehicles; black spots on radios so giving no protection for these individuals in critical situations. Councillor Bence asked the PCC if she could please provide a written response to all of his questions.

At this point, a number of Committee Members queried when they would have the opportunity to ask their questions and when these would be responded to.

- Councillor Wells referred to the increase in precept and the extra £12 and where would this be spent? He had understood that this would be used to safeguard the existing police force yet he had not heard that there would be any additional police. He wanted to know how the appalling crime figures in the District could be turned around and he referred to his own business in Bognor Regis and the amount of theft and shoplifting that took place daily. He was not impressed with the service provided by Business Wardens in Bognor Regis and he was not impressed with the service being provided to date which was ineffective. If the future plan was for businesses to fund this, this would be difficult as businesses would not be willing to fund a service that did not provide an acceptable level of service. This needed drastic improvement to make it workable. The issue was that Business Wardens had no pocket cameras and so were vulnerable when dealing with individuals. Using their powers to detain a suspect often then led to them having to wait for up to 2 hours for police presence – this was where the whole situation had crumbled down. Councillor Wells confirmed that when shopkeepers had reported an incident, the result was that it was not in the public interest to pursue or follow up that part of the crime.

Danny West responded stating that he would look into this further and offered to meet with Councillor Wells and other traders to pursue. He outlined that the Police did not put a limit onto what they investigated and that he would work with the traders to turn the negatives around. The problems with shoplifting were not new – the Police did respond, would weigh up the facts and would come to a decision as to how to deal with each individual case.

- Councillor Wells talked about an incident that had occurred earlier on in the day and that evidence could be provided. When reported there was no response. A police car had driven past the area some hours later - this was the common problem for the town centre areas who felt that they had just been abandoned by local policing teams.

Special Overview Select
Committee – 23.01.18

Danny West stated that without looking into what else might have been happening at that time, they had to judge incidents in terms of harm and risk. It could also have been that Officers had had to be elsewhere.

- Councillor Dendle referred to his question which was Question 7 from non- committee Members, this referred to the roll out of body cameras and what percentage of front line Officers had body cameras.

The PCC stated that 2,500 body cameras had been rolled out across the force to front line officers. All uniformed response teams had them as well as PCSOs and dog handlers. There were also pool cameras for road policing units to use.

- Councillor Dendle then referred to front and back office staffing and asked how much had been invested into systems thinking? He also asked if a PC had to make an arrest in Bognor Regis or Littlehampton on a Saturday night, why the prisoner had to be transferred to a custody suite in Chichester by 2 police officers leaving a deficit of Officers to protect the towns?

The PCC pointed out that custody provisions had been located in Chichester and Worthing for over 20 years and so were well established. Resources were divided to provide the ability to move officers to different areas. The Duty Sergeant could redeploy where necessary to provide resilience.

- Councillor Dendle asked what the difference in cost was in terms of funding a PCSO and full police officer? The PCC stated that this very much depended upon what stage that Officer was in their career.

- Councillor Mrs Oakley referred to her written questions – 5 and 6 - stating that she was interested in the comments made about the number of PCSOs – this was because she had not seen one for months and months in her ward area of Middleton-on-Sea.

The PCC confirmed that the policing Members saw was not all of the policing that was received, also, PCSOs were no longer assigned to geographical areas - they were deployed as they were needed. Responding to the issue of speeding on roads, the PCC stated that the uplift in precept would allow her to look at road safety and she confirmed that this was an area that would be covered. The PCC stated that she had a dedicated Officer who would be happy to set up and train local communities on the issue of speeding. There were also community groups who voluntary clocked speeding with offenders receiving a warning letter via an on-line system. This had been proven to

deter speeding behaviour in other areas. The PCC stated that a 2018-2022 plan was being drawn up on this issue and that she was looking forward to seeing recommendations from Community Speed Watch supporting the concerns raised by Councillor Mrs Oakley. The PCC also referred to the work of the Sussex Safer Roads who worked in partnership with the Police; Fire Service; highways and Local authorities on this issue and illegal parking. This partnership came together on a regular basis looking at work across Sussex and what could be done by launching campaigns. The PCC stated that she would be looking at how to target the offending areas as the public needed to know that if they did break the law they would have to pay.

- Councillor Mrs Oakley outlined that a number of authorities, including Arun, were proposing to create unisex public conveniences. Could the PCC provide any evidence to support that by changing to unisex facilities, this would reduce anti-social behaviour?

The PCC confirmed that this was not her area of responsibility but that Councillor Mrs Oakley should approach the British Toilet Association who could provide advice on buildings and development to see how this could cut out crime.

- Councillor Ballard referred to his written question - Q (2) from non-Committee Members. He asked what the public were actually paying for. Several Parish Councils were now looking to pay for Neighbourhood Wardens at their own vast expense due to the lack of police presence in villages.

The PCC referred to her Annual Report which detailed what had been achieved during the year and she confirmed that this work was scrutinised by the Sussex Police and Crime Panel. As PCC, as well as holding the Chief Constable to account and the force to account for local policing issues, one of her key duties was to ensure that Sussex Police met its strategic policing requirements and provided a co-ordinated response to serious and organised crime. As PCC she had focused on improvements for performance in areas that had seen high rises in domestic abuse; burglary; hate crime and providing a better quality of service to victims. She had appointed a Modern Slavery Co-ordinator, due to the increase in reported crimes, and continued with the new scheme of providing Business Wardens which were independent to the Police and in most areas were now sustainable. Sainsbury's had taken and developed a business warden model providing reassurance to local businesses in the area. The Community Safety Partnership – she had maintained funding for this at the same level as it was 6 years ago, this was not the case elsewhere in the country. Looking at Estates and Facilities, no police stations had closed unless something else had been put into place.

Special Overview Select
Committee – 23.01.18

A huge improvement programme had been launched and the Sussex Police had received an acknowledgement from the Home Affairs Select Committee, who had undertaken a review of PCCs, and had held her role in high regard. The PCC again referred to her Joint Audit Committee meetings which were web cast live on the Sussex Police web site. Finally, the PCC referred to the Safer Sussex Fund which had given out thousands to local organisations to tackle crime. Other major projects had been launched being the Video Enabled Justice Programme and the Sussex and Surrey Criminal Justice Partnerships.

- Councillor English asked if it was the Chief Constable who agreed the powers to be given to PCSOs and was there a list of powers that could be granted to PCSOs for Arun or any area.

The PCC stated that these were determined by the Chief Constable. PCSOs were now uniformly enabled across West Sussex. The increase in the precept would protect 476 officers and staff posts. The PCC had asked the Chief Constable for a renewed focus on community policing and she awaited his plan. She provided a further response in that examples in this area with vehicle crime and low value theft – PCSO had been out and taken statements from victims and had looked at CCTV; had patrolled areas; knocked on doors and had recorded incidents themselves and so they did deliver a whole package of services.

- Councillor Mrs Porter referred to 101 calls and asked with modern technology why the contact centre could not recall calls that had hung up due to long waiting times?

The PCC stated that national work on digital contact was in the process of looking at this and a national programme was in place looking at how the public contact police. This was work that was ongoing.

- Councillor Gammon referred to his question which was question (1) submitted in writing from non-members of the Committee. The PCC confirmed that the problems surrounding irresponsible on-street parking had been passed to local authorities to deal with as this was not a criminal matter anymore. This was the responsibility of West Sussex County Council as highways authority and local councils who had responsibility for local civil enforcement officers

- Councillor Mrs Pendleton stated that she had real concerns over policing in the District and she asked the PCC if she could agree that policing in Arun had not been sufficient to address local needs and concerns and that this was down to cutting costs. Councillor Mrs Pendleton asked if the increased precept would confirm no further cuts which then meant that the District would not actually see any increase in front line staff.

The PCC repeated that she had asked the Chief Constable to focus on crime that mattered and she referred to the areas that she had mentioned earlier in responding to other questions.

- The Mayor of Littlehampton referred to public expectation which he saw as being a key priority as he had spoken to many people who sadly had in common one key concern which was that they had lost their confidence in the town. He felt that a decent response to 101 and 999 calls could change this feeling and he put it to the Chief Constable to address this in forming his operational delivery plan.

The Chairman then drew the debate to a close and he thanked the PCC and her team for attending the meeting and answering the questions put.

(The meeting concluded 8. 00 pm)