

LEICESTER, LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND POLICE AND CRIME PANEL COMMENTS ON POLICE AND CRIME PLAN

The Panel, having considered the draft Police and Crime Plan, the Commissioner's additional report on commissioning and draft budget proposals, would wish to draw the following views to the attention of the PCC and would ask the PCC to submit a written response addressing the specific issues highlighted below.

The Panel welcomes the emphasis on Partnership working within the Plan and in particular the additional theme that has been added to the Plan entitled 'Viable Partnerships'.

With regard to 'Value for Money' the PCC appears to be devolving more responsibility to partner agencies through existing structures whilst in contrast 1.2% of the police budget is being spent on the OPCC. The Panel would seek reassurance that this balance is correct.

The Panel notes with regard to the telephone and web based surveys which were carried out in connection with the Police and Crime Plan that there was an underrepresentation of respondents from certain demographics. This is disappointing and the Panel would welcome the PCC's thoughts on how this could be improved in future.

The Panel welcomes the intention in the Plan to increase the number of those from black and minority ethnic backgrounds in the Force. The Panel would welcome further details on how this will be achieved.

It is noted that there is no reference in the aims of the Plan to improving public confidence in the Police. This could be a stronger theme as public confidence in the Police can be enhanced by increased visibility, ease of access to Police services, or providing a sufficiently robust response to specific crime or problems in a specific locality. There is also no reference in the Plan to monitoring victim satisfaction and the Panel would ask that the PCC gives consideration to this.

The Panel welcomes the PCC's aim to broaden the scope of the 101 telephone service so that it can deal with issues wider than merely reporting crime. The 101 service is as much a part of visible policing as is officers on the street. However, it is noted that the effectiveness of the 101 service is dependent on the number and quality of staff in the control room and the Panel would be interested to hear the PCC's comments on how he intends to achieve the required improvements.

It is noted that at point 24 the Plan refers to diversity and the Panel suggests that that the threat vulnerable people can face from radicalisation could be included at this point in the Plan. It is notable that the threat of radicalisation of young people can frequently be linked to safeguarding issues, for example the threat can be linked to the young or vulnerable persons being exploited. Even if 'Prevent' as a strategy is not mentioned in the Plan, it is significant that the exploitation linked to many of those "at risk" is becoming a priority for partner agencies.

The Panel would ask that the PCC give consideration to making the tackling of cyber-crime a priority in the Plan. Whilst the Panel recognises that more needs to be done nationally to tackle this issue, it is felt that there is a role to be played locally in tackling cyber-crime, particularly with regard to raising awareness of the potential hazards of going online and of relevant services such as Action Fraud, the national Fraud and Cyber Crime Reporting Centre.

It is noted that the PCC intends to adopt a zero tolerance approach to the supply of Class A drugs and it is questioned whether in conjunction with this the PCC intends to adopt a zero tolerance approach to firearms.

It is noted that the 18 to 24 year age group have not been singled out as a priority in the draft Plan. This age group are more at risk of becoming first time entrants into the criminal justice system and are at risk of receiving less support from a modernised probation service under the new arrangements, and of receiving age appropriate sanctions from the courts. Therefore the Panel would suggest that the PCC includes a form of words in the Plan to highlight that this age group will receive attention. The Panel would also ask the PCC to give consideration to making more explicit reference to elderly people in the Plan as part of the 'Vulnerability' section.

It is noted that section 54 of the draft Plan is entitled 'Mental Health and Learning Disabilities' however it is the view of the Panel that learning disabilities should not be linked together with Mental Health in the Plan as they are different issues and not necessarily related. It is also noted that the section on Mental Health refers to suicide but suicide does not appear elsewhere in the document. It is suggested that cases of suicide are not always related to mental health issues but could be as a result of a crime that had been committed, therefore consideration could be given as to whether the issue of suicide merits a standalone section of the Plan. It is suggested that the Plan could contain more on the role of the community in tackling mental health issues and that the Police could play a role in facilitating training in this area.

The wording of paragraph 47.a needs to be clarified to make it clear that the new service provider for LLR is to *tackle* the problems of drugs and alcohol.

Clarification needs to be given in the Plan that the figure of 13,250 referrals given at point 49.b of the Plan relates to the number of occasions when police officers or staff attended a property and had concerns about children. Therefore there could be multiple referrals for each visit.

The Panel has reservations on how the performance of the PCC can be judged at the end of his 4 year term of office when no specific targets have been included in the Plan. The Panel asks the PCC to consider whether there are other ways to judge his performance such as crime figures or public satisfaction surveys. Alternatively if the PCC does not wish to set numerical targets then he could write a brief statement against which he could be scrutinised.