

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

2 July 2026 – At a meeting of the Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

Cllr Lowe	Adur & Worthing District Council	Cllr Birch	Arun District Council
Cllr Amanda Grimshaw	Brighton and Hove Council	Cllr Charatan	Crawley Borough Council
Cllr Ballard	Eastbourne Borough Council	Cllr Woolley	East Sussex County Council
Cllr Horn	Hastings Borough Council	Cllr Baynham	Horsham District Council
Cllr Keene	Lewes District Council	Cllr Bayliss	Rother District Council
Cllr Williams	Wealden District Council	Cllr Gravely	West Sussex County Council
Cllr Ford	Adur & Worthing District Council	Mr Napthine	Independent Co-opted Member
Mrs Scholefield	Independent Co-opted Member	Cllr Weller	Chichester District Council
Cllr Wood	Mid Sussex District Council		

Substitutes:

Cllr Weller, Chichester District Council

Apologies were received from Cllr Cooke (Mid Sussex District Council) and Tiffany Taylor

Also in attendance: Mrs Katy Bourne, Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner, Mr Mark Streater, OSPCC, Mr Iain McCulloch, OSPCC, and Mr Mervin Dadd, OSPCC.

Part I

1. Appointment of Independent Members

1.1. Resolved – that the Panel:

1. Renewed the appointment of Mrs Susan Scholefield as an Independent Co-opted Member of the Panel, for a one-year term.
2. Renewed the appointment of Mr Keith Napthine as an Independent Co-Opted Member of the Panel, for a one-year term.

2. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

- 2.1. Cllr Gravely proposed Cllr Baynham as Chair of the Panel for the forthcoming year. Cllr Williams seconded the proposal.
- 2.2. Cllr Birch proposed Cllr Keene as Chair of the Panel for the forthcoming year. Cllr Bayliss seconded the proposal.
- 2.3. A secret ballot was then held, which was won by Cllr Keene by a majority of votes.
- 2.4. Resolved – that Cllr Keene was elected Chair of Sussex Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.
- 2.5. Cllr Bayliss proposed Cllr Grimshaw for the role of Vice-Chair of the Panel for the forthcoming year. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Lowe.
- 2.6. Cllr ? proposed Cllr Baynham for the role of Vice-Chair of the Panel for the forthcoming year. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Williams.
- 2.7. A secret ballot was then held, which was won by Cllr Baynham by a majority of votes.
- 2.8. Resolved – that Cllr Baynham was elected Vice-Chair of Sussex Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.

3. Annual Review of Membership and Proportionality

- 3.1. Resolved – that the Panel:
 1. Agreed that Brighton and Hove City Council be invited to appoint a Conservative second representative to the Panel, for a one-year period of office, to take effect immediately.
 2. Agreed that both East and West Sussex County Councils should each be invited to appoint an additional local authority member, for a one-year period of office.
 3. That the Panel agreed Option A as set out in the report:

‘That one of ESSC or WSCC appoints a Conservative additional member, and the other an additional Reform councillor.’
 4. Authorised the Clerk to amend the Panel’s decision in respect of recommendation 3 in the event Chichester District Council appoints either a Conservative or a Reform representative.

4. Declarations of Interest

- 4.1. In accordance with the Code of Conduct, members of the Panel declared the personal interests in the table below.

Panel Member	Personal Interest

Cllr Ballard	Cabinet Lead for Community Safety at Eastbourne Borough Council. East Sussex County Councillor.
Cllr Baynham	Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources at Horsham District Council. Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee Chair at West Sussex County Council.
Cllr Bayliss	Deputy Leader at Rother District Council.
Cllr Birch	Chair of Housing and Wellbeing Committee at Arun District Council.
Cllr Charatan	Cabinet Member for Public Protection at Crawley Borough Council.
Cllr Cooke	Cabinet Member for Communities at Mid-Sussex District Council.
Cllr Ford	Cabinet Member for Communities, Culture, & Leisure at Worthing Borough Council.
Cllr Gravely	Chair for Health and Adult Services Scrutiny Committee at West Sussex County Council.
Cllr Grimshaw	Cabinet Advisor for Community Safety and Brighton & Hove City Council.
Mrs Scholefield	A serving magistrate.
Cllr Becca Horn	Community Safety and Environmental Services Portfolio Holder at Hastings Borough Council.

	East Sussex County Councillor.
Cllr Lowe	Cabinet Member for Communities, Wellbeing, & Leisure at Adur District Council. West Sussex County Councillor.
Cllr Weller	Councillor for Selsey Town Council.
Cllr Williams	Cabinet Lead for Public Health and Asset Management at Wealden District Council. East Sussex County Councillor.
Cllr Woolley	East Sussex County Councillor. Board Member of the Sussex and Brighton Strategic Authority.

5. Urgent Matters

- 5.1. There were no urgent matters raised.

6. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 6.1. The Panel is asked to approve the draft minutes of the previous meeting on 13 March 2026 as an accurate record.
- 6.2. Resolved – that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 March 2026 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chair.

7. Panel Questions to the Commissioner

- 7.1. The Chair invited questions from the Panel to the Commissioner.
- 7.2. A summary of the main questions and responses were as follows:
- 7.3. The Commissioner wished it stated for the public record that she did not appreciate comments about her wardrobe and that she preferred the focus remain on her work.

1. Question: 'On the subject of the Commissioner's withdrawal of proposed legal action against the Panel, can the Commissioner confirm the

cost of any legal advice she received and whether any public funds were used to pay for part, or all, of that legal advice?’

Answer: The Commissioner invited a FOI request if the member wished to see a breakdown of legal costs as this is not discussed in public forums. Additionally, the Commissioner stated that the reason for her withdrawal of legal action was a reluctance to go to judicial review as this would incur an unnecessary expense for the public purse as mediation had been ruled out.

2. Question: ‘At the last meeting, the Commissioner was urgently seeking funds to support policing in East Sussex as a result of the marches in Crowborough. Has she been successful in securing some funding, and will it cover some or all of the extra costs incurred by the increased policing demand?’

Answer: The Commissioner clarified that the extra funding that they had requested from the Home Office had been for policing in general, not just for the marches. She then explained that they had agreed a figure of £800,000 with the Home Office to help offset the cost of extra policing on Sussex residents. Finally, she explained that the expectation was that they would be reapplying in the coming years due to the government’s decision to extend the use of Crowborough as housing for migrants until 2030. The Commissioner also extended her thanks to senior officers for their work in applying to the government for this funding on her behalf.

3. Question: ‘On the topic of the withdrawal of night marshals from urban centres in West Sussex, triggered by the Home Office, has there been any further funding identified for even a partial continuation of the initiative?’

Answer: The Commissioner stated that the initial withdrawal of funding from the initiative was not her decision, it was the Home Office, replacing it with a knife concentration scheme where it was very difficult to make the case for night marshals within that scheme’s boundaries. Further, she stated that with the pressures on the policing budget, there was no money or funding stream for the initiative and her own disappointment in the Home Office’s decision to withdraw the funding.

4. Question: ‘What are the differences that allowed the night marshals initiative to continue in Brighton, but not in Crawley or Eastbourne?’

Answer: The Commissioner explained it was due to the conditions set by the government when submitting bids for the knife concentration funding.

5. Question: ‘Is the Commissioner aware of the impact of the Fatal Five unit on the number of people killed or seriously injured on Sussex roads?’

Answer: The Commissioner explained that they were starting to see results from the unit’s work however she cautioned that the team had not been running for very long so final results were still unknown. However, she stated that they had, so far, seen an 11% reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured on Sussex roads compared to the same time period last year, despite an additional 1300 collisions reported, with a 42% reduction in fatalities when compared to the same period.

6. Question: ‘On the use of AI cameras to detect driving offences such as phone use, does the Commissioner feel that the first three months of using such devices have been a success, does their use represent good value for money, and are they likely to be rolled out further in future?’

Answer: The Commissioner clarified that the AI cameras were only introduced as a pilot for a set period and that it had largely been considered a success, and that she expected that the National Police Chiefs roads portfolio would be collating the information from the pilot and would produce a report in due course.

7. Question: 'Does that mean that the cameras are no longer in use or that they've been put on hold for the time being until a report is produced?'

Answer: The Commissioner confirmed that they had been put on hold due to the set timescale for the pilot.

8. Question: 'On the subject of unauthorised traveller encampments, are you happy that Sussex Police's current strategy and work is doing a good job in this area so far?'

Answer: The Commissioner explained she had discussed Sussex Police's strategy for dealing with unauthorised encampments during her Performance and Accountability meetings in May 2026 and stated that the Chief Constable had confirmed the legislation around unauthorised encampments had remained unchanged and recognised the importance of a locally-led, locally-driven multi-agency response within the boundaries set by human rights legislation. Further, she stated that she had been reassured that there was a robust approach and that the police work within the law in a proportionate way.

9. Question: 'The PCC is clearly committed to restorative justice. Is there any indication to suggest that the work has reduced reoffending rates?'

Answer: The Commissioner explained that there was often a positive impact on offenders participating in restorative justice programmes.

10. Question: 'Has mental health introduced challenges to the implementation of restorative justice?'

Answer: The Commissioner stressed that the restorative justice programme was very much victim-led and victim-based, so 25 partner agencies work to support the victim in whatever outcome they wish to see, whether that includes a criminal justice outcome or not; however there had been evidence of positive impacts on offender participants in the programmes as well.

11. Question: 'Out of the 25 partner agencies mentioned, are there any mental health specialists that could help facilitate that aspect of the programme?'

Answer: The Commissioner stressed that the restorative practice practitioners in Sussex are held up as examples of good practice across the country, including mental health care for participants, but explained she would need to provide further information outside of the meeting as she did not have the details to hand.

12. Question: 'On emergency resilience and preparedness, considering current international tensions, what is the precise detail of Sussex Police's preparedness? And is the Commissioner satisfied that our preparation for emergencies in Sussex is satisfactory?'

Answer: The Commissioner stressed that responsibility for local preparedness was in the hands of the local resilience partnership and the

strategic resilience partnership across Sussex, and the question might better directed to them specifically.

13. Question: 'Is it not concerning that the Commissioner's office is not leading on this, considering the role that Sussex Police would be expected to play in an emergency situation?'

Answer: The Commissioner explained that the Police did sit on local resilience forums which deal with issues such as response to water shortages, but she was not aware of any work being done on preparedness for an international conflict or strategic resilience as her office would not be involved.

14. Question: 'Is there any initial feedback from the local consultation launched by the PCC on government plans to regionally merge police forces?'

Answer: The Commissioner explained the government plans were not concrete at this moment in time, however a report was being produced by Lord Bernard Hogan Howe on force mergers, with an initial report expected in August 2026, but cautioned that with potential upcoming changes in government, the idea might get shelved altogether. Further, she updated members that the consultation had been started and was ongoing but added that in her conversations with the public, there was not much support for the idea of a merger with other police forces.

15. Question: 'Is there any relationship between the fact that Sussex Police scored a 'requires improvement' in crime resolution rates and the fact that it is one of the most underfunded forces in the country?'

Answer: The Commissioner stated that it was always difficult to work within the constraints of Sussex Police's budget and she had argued since her first term of office that Sussex Police is underfunded by central government and the police precept. She explained that the report had covered a period 18 months before it was published and that under new inspection rules, Sussex Police would've recorded better assessment scores, and would do so in future inspections, in part thanks to the work of the Chief Constable, her officers, and police personnel.

16. Question: 'Can the Commissioner give an indication of where she fought the Home Office on Sussex Police funding considering the high level of operational demand within the county?'

Answer: The Commissioner explained the funding formula used to determine police funding from central government, stressing that Sussex was disadvantaged in comparison to other forces. She affirmed that where they had managed to increase numbers of officers on the streets, they had seen reductions in crime and improvements in solve rates, but she had limited influence over central government policy around police funding.

17. Question: 'Community networks are reporting that some incidents reported through Operation Crackdown are being inappropriately redirected to local authorities. Is there sufficient clarity around responsibility in this area between police and local authorities?'

Answer: After clarification on which aspects of Operation Crackdown were specified in the question, the Commissioner explained that if the incidents referenced were around noise and noise abatement, the responsibility for those lies with the local authority, whereas other issues such as speeding

or antisocial behaviour on the roads would lie with the police. She invited members to submit further information on the specific incidents for her office to respond to outside of the meeting.

18. Question: 'What are the challenges faced by the Chief Constable in ensuring that officers deploy Body Worn Video (BWV) consistently? And do officers have discretion over when the devices are switched on?'

Answer: The Commissioner explained that was an operational question and that would be better directed to the Chief Constable, however she stated that she had been a big proponent for the introduction of BWV into policing, and that they had been a good implementation since they came into use ten years ago.

8. The Commissioner's Annual Report and Financial Outturn Report 2025/26

8.1. The Panel considered a report by the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner, introduced by Commissioner Bourne.

8.2. The Chair invited the Panel to ask questions. A summary of questions and responses were as follows:

8.3. Members inquired if the Commissioner was considering any strategic partnerships for education and prevention work focussed on young people and their access to potentially harmful online content.

8.4. The Commissioner acknowledged the benefits and downsides of social media, especially for young people, and explained to members that she had partnered with the Breck Foundation, whose aim is to educate young people in online safety and peer support, and further informed the Panel about their funded youth ambassadorship scheme, and their success in raising awareness and educating their fellow young people. The Commissioner then informed the Panel that they were going to extend the scheme for another year, and further across Sussex.

8.5. Members asked further questions around the scope of the work, including whether it extended to online misogyny and toxic masculinity targeting young men.

8.6. The Commissioner explained the Breck Foundation's focus was around cyber-bullying but she had previously funded schools-based education on toxic masculinity and misogynistic online content, and she affirmed she was open to continued funding for such initiatives in the future.

8.7. Members raised concerns that the report was inconsistent in showing the impacts of various data outlined in the report and that more clarity could be provided on how this information is affecting stated objectives in a practical sense. Members suggested a traffic light-style system could be implemented against objectives to show progress.

- 8.8. Members further asked if the use of AI beyond its initial trial by Sussex Police in policing traffic offences had been considered.
- 8.9. The Commissioner stated she had noted members' concerns and suggestions around the report. She further explained that AI use by police currently sat with the College of Policing and was likely to sit within the national police service being explored by the government and the Home Office, and they would set the direction for AI use in policing going forward. Finally the Commissioner reiterated that she had been committed to the use of new technologies from the beginning of her tenure in office and remained so.
- 8.10. In the interests of time, the Chair invited members to write to the Commissioner if they required further information on the subjects raised.
- 8.11. Members acknowledged the work of volunteers in police custody suites. Further, they asked if there were any statistics on deaths in custody and if these should be included in the report. Finally, members raised concerns around the strategic allocation of resources such as custody suites and asked if the south-west of the county had not been disadvantaged when their custody suite was shut down.
- 8.12. The Commissioner explained that the report would not show such statistics because it is based on work her office has done in the past year, and further, that any deaths in custody cases would be referred to the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) for investigation rather than her office. However, she assured members that she regularly held the police to account on this matter. On the closure of custody suites, the Commissioner explained that the operational decision to close custody suites had been brought in before her time in office and that it was ultimately the Chief Constable's decision whether the suites are utilised operationally. Finally, she informed members that there had not been any deaths in police custody in Sussex within the last year.
- 8.13. In reference to topics raised in the previous agenda item, members asked if the Commissioner's office had been engaged by Lord Hogan Howe's review on potential merger of police forces.
- 8.14. The Commissioner explained that she had spoken with Lord Howe very recently and firmly expressed her views on police force mergers. When asked what those views were, she stated that she was very against any merger of Sussex Police with any other police force or similar proposals, as she feared that local issues and concerns would become lost if the force's jurisdiction was widened to include other counties.
- 8.15. On the topic of BWV and the proposed future rollout of BWV to all frontline officers, members asked if that meant there were currently officers deployed without BWV.

- 8.16. The Commissioner explained that BWV had to be consistently activated by wearers and this was due to the huge influx of new officers that required training on its use. She stressed that this was an operational issue and would be better directed to the Chief Constable.
- 8.17. On the topic of Safe Space Sussex, members asked the Commissioner if there had been any evidence, anecdotal or otherwise, to suggest the scheme had created a positive impact. Members also raised the prospect of safe spaces being established in Sussex for the LGBTQIA+ community.
- 8.18. The Commissioner confirmed she did not know at that moment but she would rather have the safe spaces in place than not, if needed. She acknowledged that there was more work to be done to raise awareness of the scheme for the general public.
- 8.19. The panel requested more information on how the impact of the Commissioner's perpetrator intervention programmes were being measured, both currently, and in the longer-term.
- 8.20. The Commissioner explained the parameters of the programmes under Drive Project and directed members to the Drive Project website for further information.
- 8.21. Members raised concerns that the notifiable rural crime solve rate remained at 4% despite an increase in police officers and resources being directed at the issue and asked what measures were being considered to improve this.
- 8.22. The Commissioner explained that that specific statistic refers to crimes that have been sent to court and that a positive outcome is not necessarily one that results in criminal justice proceedings, such as an agreement between victim and offender. She stressed that they tended to see a lot more of rural crimes with positive outcomes that have not gone to court. She stressed the difficulty in proving many rural crimes due to the necessity to catch offenders in the act, in often isolated locations, but that she was assured that things were improving.
- 8.23. Members raised the concerns from local farmers that some of the rural crime happening in their areas that had an organised crime element to them that had led to repeated incidents.
- 8.24. The Commissioner explained the difficulties involved in cross-border organised crime that members had described but assured the Panel that the regional organised crime unit would become involved in such cases, with cooperation from multiple police forces, and further that a lot of work was being done by the National Rural Crime Unit team on identifying and analysing patterns in rural crime. Finally, she reassured the Panel that they would continue to maintain the local rural crime unit.

- 8.25. Members asked for more information on how the police planned to continue improving solve rates for burglary in 26/27.
- 8.26. The Commissioner assured members she regularly covered burglary solve rates in her performance and accountability meetings with the Chief Constable, and further that the Chief Constable constantly reassured her that the police response to burglaries was consistent and had been met with positive feedback from victims.
- 8.27. Members raised the prospect of meeting with the Commissioner to discuss extending the amnesty bin scheme for knives to other locations than police stations, due to this being a potential deterrent for those wishing to surrender blades.
- 8.28. The Commissioner explained that would be an operational decision, not within her remit, and reminded the Panel that there was a potential security risk with sharp bladed objects being stored, however temporarily, at public locations other than a police station however, she assured members she was open to discussions with any interested parties around potential improvements to the scheme, or through the community safety partnerships, on which the Chief Executive Officer, OSPCC, also sits.
- 8.29. Members asked if the pilot of Operation STOP across East Sussex, with a proposed rollout of ten more tags to support the operation's objectives, was limited by the cost of the tags themselves, and if there was any scope for partnership with outside bodies, such as the Chamber of Commerce to fund more.
- 8.30. The Commissioner reminded the Panel that this was an initial pilot, with limited scope for the time being, but they had received some interest from other police forces, and assured members this limit was not due to cost, but to ensure the scheme works before potentially investing further, and stressed the holistic nature of the scheme in supporting offenders to break the cycle of offending. Finally, the Commissioner explained some of the difficulties involved with the scheme and that the scheme would be evaluated at its end and assured members that if it had been found to have had a positive impact, more funding for an extended rollout could be considered, and she was happy to bring the evaluation results to the Panel next year.
- 8.31. Members raised concerns around cuckooing and the effects on the victims, and requested more information around how this issue was being handled by the police and the Commissioner's office.
- 8.32. The Commissioner assured members that Sussex Police took cuckooing extremely seriously and had done so for some time, stating her delight that cuckooing had been made a specific criminal offence, expressing her hope that the new legislation might be usable in many elder abuse cases as well.
- 8.33. Members cited links between temporary accommodation, houses of multiple occupation, and cuckooing in densely occupied

residential areas, before asking the Commissioner how residents can report suspected cuckooing incidents to help Sussex Police target their resources and if she planned to review residents' views on this.

- 8.34. The Commissioner stressed that she always encouraged residents to report suspected criminal activity and had been working to drive down response times on 101 calls as a result, which they had seen success in doing. She also stated that anonymous reporting was possible through Crimestoppers. Finally, she explained that there were no current plans to review this process and that it was set nationally.
- 8.35. Members raised concerns around the cost of the net zero targets in the report and questioned if there would be scrutiny around how the spending was being allocated.
- 8.36. The Chief Finance Officer assured members that any decision on transport strategy and net zero targets was not being rushed due to restrictions on the funding and assessing the operational capabilities of the vehicles, and confirmed that they scrutinised those decisions through the OSPCC and took guidance from the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC).
- 8.37. Members stated their pleasure in the opening of the Old Police Cells Museum under the custodianship of the OSPCC, preserving the history and heritage of Sussex, and Sussex Police. The Commissioner iterated her own sentiments in being able to preserve the museum and suggested it might be worth organising a visit for the Panel if there was interest.
- 8.38. Members reiterated their desire for a clearer picture of the PCC's objectives and the progress against them, preferably in the form of a RAG rating document, to better guide the Panel's own scrutiny.

9. The Role of the PCC in Sussex Police's Work to Tackle Knife Crime

- 9.1. The Panel considered a report by the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner, introduced by Commissioner Bourne, and presented by the Chief Executive Officer, Mark Streater.
- 9.2. The Chair invited the Panel to ask questions. A summary of the discussion was as follows:
- 9.3. Members requested more information on the use of 'knife arches' and their role in tackling knife crime, particularly in schools or colleges.
- 9.4. The Commissioner explained that she was not aware that the knife arches had been used in schools however she said she would be happy to continue the conversation with members further outside of the meeting.

- 9.5. Mr Streater also added that he would raise the issue at the Violence Reduction Executive Board next week to help facilitate further discussion.
- 9.6. Members asked for more information on what circumstances would prompt the use of a knife arch in a school setting.
- 9.7. Mr Streater explained that the use of any policing tool was intelligence-led and this could come from concerns raised in the local area, or initiatives in those areas, which the police would use to target the use of such tools.
- 9.8. Members asked how the statistics on reported knife crime related to the overall crime statistics and whether it was known how much knife crime is non-reported. Members also raised concerns around how to encourage victims to report and the barriers they may face in reporting.
- 9.9. Mr Streater assured members that there was a wide suite of measures on what constitutes knife, and knife-related crime, and that the Violence Reduction Partnership employs dedicated analysts to assess this issue. He acknowledged that knife crime is often underreported, from both victims and offenders, and that the Partnership was working with the NHS and local councils to get a clear picture of what was going on. Further, he added that the report does not label the reduction in knife crime as satisfactory and that the police were not resting on their laurels in their work to continue driving knife and knife-related crime down.
- 9.10. In response to members' interest in further information, Mr Streater encouraged the Panel to inquire of their councils' representatives on the Partnership Board.
- 9.11. Members raised concerns around online knife crime and asked if there were any further statistics available on the use of indirect knife crime, such as online use of a knife to threaten or intimidate.
- 9.12. Mr Streater clarified to members that knife-related crime required the in-person element to be considered such, and that indirect 'online' knife crime might be considered under other legislation as a threat to cause bodily harm or death and would be recorded elsewhere.
- 9.13. Members asked what the OSPCC is doing to improve public confidence and reassure communities while ensuring transparency around the risks of knife crime.
- 9.14. The Commissioner referred members to the information in the report, citing her work with the Community Safety Partnerships, and suggested that it might be worth asking them to put it on their agenda to discuss further.

9.15. Members inquired if the Commissioner was using media or similar publications to target communities to raise awareness of these issues.

9.16. The Commissioner explained that there will be national policing operations running campaigns to raise awareness, as well as partner campaigns and schools' officers whose role is raise awareness in educational environments where there is a particular concern.

10. Annual Report from the Host Authority

10.1. Resolved – that the Panel agreed to note the report.

11. Quarterly Report of Complaints

11.1. Members noted the Quarterly report and cited concerns about the lack of detail on the complaints made. They requested that more detail be included about the nature of the complaints in future.

11.2. The Clerk of the Panel explained to members that due to the complaints being ruled as not within the remit of the Panel, it was deemed inappropriate to include the nature of the complaints in the report, however a supplemental report could be circulated to members outside of the Panel meeting.

11.3. The Chief Executive Officer, OSPCC, respectfully requested that, in light of new members joining the Panel, awareness being raised on members' adherence to the elected local policing bodies complaints and misconduct regulations and their responsibilities as Panel members.

11.4. The Clerk noted the request.

11.5. Resolved – that the Panel noted the report and the Chief Executive Officer's request.

12. Date of Next Meeting and Future Meeting Dates

12.1 The Chair noted the next meeting of the Panel will take place on Friday 9 October 2026, at 10:30am at County Hall, Lewes.

12.2 Future meeting dates have been proposed as:

- 29th January 2027
- 22nd February 2027 (Provisional)
- 12th March 2027

The meeting ended at 1.06 pm

Chair