

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Friday, 3 February 2017.

PRESENT

Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC (in the Chair)

Cllr. John Boyce	Cllr. Abdul Osman
Cllr. Lee Breckon, JP	Cllr. Rosita Page
Mrs. Helen Carter	Cllr. Trevor Pendleton
Cllr. Malise Graham	Cllr. Lynn Senior
Col. Robert Martin OBE, DL	Cllr. David Slater
Cllr. Tony Mathias	Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE
Cllr. Ozzy O'Shea	

Apologies

Cllr. Ratilal Govind

In attendance

Lord Willy Bach, Police and Crime Commissioner
Cllr. Kirk Master, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner
Helen King, Chief Finance Officer
Simon Cole, Chief Constable (for Minutes 53 and 54)

46. Statement from the OPCC.

The Chairman invited the PCC to make a statement on the Chief Executive of the OPCC. The PCC stated the following:

“The Panel have asked for an update on Paul Stock, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Executive who has been on long term sick leave since October 2016. I have been closely linked in with the Force HR Team throughout Paul’s absence and HR processes have been followed. I will keep the Panel updated as appropriate and between meetings of the Panel, I will continue to keep the Chairman updated.”

The PCC also thanked staff at the OPCC for their contribution to the work of the team in Paul Stock’s absence.

The Panel expressed its best wishes to Paul Stock.

47. Minutes of Confirmatory Hearing held on 23 September 2016.

The minutes of the Confirmatory Hearing held on 23 September 2016 were taken as read, confirmed and signed subject to paragraph 6 of Minute 23 being amended to read that “The PCC was quoted in the Leicester Mercury prior to his election in May 2016...”

48. Minutes of the previous meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2016 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

49. Public Question Time.

There were no questions submitted.

50. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

51. Declarations of interest.

The Chairman invited members who wished to do so to declare any interest in respect of items on the agenda for the meeting.

Col. Robert Martin declared a personal interest in respect of all substantive items as the Trustee of "Warning Zone" which was in receipt of some funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Cllr. M. Sood declared a personal interest in respect of all substantive items as a member of the Police's Independent Advisory Panel, as the Chairman of the Leicester Council of Faiths and a member of the Bishop's Faith Forum.

52. Commissioning Framework 2017/18.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) concerning the Commissioning Framework. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 6" is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- The PCC intended to simplify contractual arrangements between the OPCC and those organisations that were granted funding so that there would be one contract with each organisation rather than individual contracts for each funding stream they were receiving.
- The Panel welcomed the intention of the PCC to provide funding for the Supporting Leicestershire Families and the Think Family schemes. It was noted that there had been criticism of Troubled Families schemes nationally however both the PCC and Panel members agreed that schemes in Leicester and Leicestershire had been successful as they had put a local slant on the scheme to maximise the benefits. It was noted that there was not a quantifiable financial return from investing in Troubled Families schemes however there were significant benefits to the Police, NHS and other organisations.
- The PCC intended to increase the amount of funding to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and stated that he looked forward to discussing with CSP Chairs how the extra funding what be utilised. The PCC did not intend to be prescriptive regarding how the funding was used as he was of the view that individual CSPs had the knowledge and expertise to understand what was required in their localities.
- The investment of over £70k in Out of Court Disposals would be spent on tackling domestic abuse and substance misuse.

- The Panel welcomed the proposed use of Performance Indicators to assess how well funding was being used, however it was noted that the Police and Crime Plan did not include any targets and the PCC had previously stated that he was not in favour of targets. The PCC explained that whilst he was not in favour of hard targets he did believe it was important to monitor how public money was being spent and therefore he was in favour of Key Performance Indicators being used. It was suggested by a Panel member that the level of monitoring should be proportionate to the level of funding provided so that organisations that had only received a small amount of funding were not spending a large amount of time filling out monitoring returns. The PCC agreed with this approach and stated that the process would be more streamlined with less monitoring for smaller grants and more monitoring for higher level grants.
- With regard to commissioning Youth Prevention and Diversion initiatives it was explained that originally the process was that funding was given to Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council and then the County Council would allocate its share to the District Councils. However, it had subsequently been agreed with the County Council that the funding for the Districts would go straight to the Districts and not via the County Council.

RESOLVED:

That the report and comments of the Panel, as outlined above, be noted.

53. Draft Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner which presented the draft Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021. The Panel also received an oral presentation from the PCC which provided further explanation of his Plan. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 7', is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed the Chief Constable to the meeting for this item. The PCC paid tribute to the Chief Constable and officers in the OPCC for the role they had played in developing the Plan.

Arising from discussion the following points were made:

- Substantial changes had been made to the Plan since it was considered by the Panel at the previous meeting. Comments made by the Panel and other partners had been taken account of and incorporated into the latest draft. An additional theme had been added to the Plan which was entitled 'Viable Partnerships'. The PCC felt it was important to add this theme because the other four 'V's' did not demonstrate that effective partnership working was essential for the Plan to be implemented successfully. The Panel welcomed the additional focus on partnership working.
- The PCC acknowledged that more work needed to be done to broaden the demographics of those that responded to the survey for the Police and Crime Plan. The Panel agreed that this was an important issue to focus on.

- The Panel noted that there was no reference in the aims of the Plan to improving public confidence in the Police and it was felt that this could be a stronger theme as confidence can be increased by increased visibility, ease of access to police services, or providing a sufficiently robust response to specific crime or problems in a specific locality. The PCC agreed that it was important to improve public confidence in the Police. It was noted that public confidence in the Police was routinely measured by local surveys.
- It was suggested that the aims relating to victim services at point 40 of the Plan should include reference to monitoring victim satisfaction. The PCC acknowledged that this was a good point and agreed to give consideration to including victim satisfaction in the Plan.
- The PCC intended to focus on what was best for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and would bear this in mind when making decisions on whether to enter regional collaborations with other Forces. However, decisions not to take part in collaborations would be reviewed regularly to ascertain whether circumstances had changed and if it had become in the best interests of the Force to join the collaboration.
- One of the PCC's aims was to broaden the scope of the 101 telephone service so that it could deal with wider issues than just reporting crime. The PCC further explained that he did not want the 101 service to merely give out phone numbers for other services but wanted it to be able to make referrals to other agencies without the caller having to put the phone down. However, the PCC made it clear that he would not continue to invest in the 101 service if it became apparent that the investment was not producing results and improvements were not being made. The Panel welcomed the aim to improve the 101 service.
- The Chairman noted that at point 24 the Plan referred to diversity and he suggested that the threat vulnerable people can face from radicalisation could be included at this point in the Plan. The PCC accepted this point and agreed to give it further consideration.
- The Panel welcomed the intention in the Plan to increase the number of black and minority ethnic people in the Force and asked for further details on how this would be achieved. The PCC stated that further consideration needed to be given to the matter and the details could not be announced yet. It was noted that as there had been a freeze in recruitment over the previous few years this had negatively impacted on the Force's ability to diversify its staff.
- In response to a request from a Panel Member that the PCC make tackling cyber-crime a priority when commissioning, the PCC acknowledged that more could be done locally but stated that in his view the government placed too much responsibility on individual Police Forces to tackle the problem and more should be done at a national level. It was noted that Action Fraud, the national Fraud and Cyber Crime Reporting Centre, had been set up to deal with these issues however more needed to be done to publicise the service.
- It was noted that the Plan intended to adopt a zero tolerance approach to the supply of Class A drugs and it was questioned whether in conjunction with this the PCC intended to adopt a zero tolerance approach to firearms. The PCC agreed to give this further consideration.

- It was noted that whilst tackling crime in the 18 to 24 year age group had been a priority for the previous PCC, this age group was not prioritised in the current PCC's draft Plan. It was noted that the 18 to 24 year old age group were more at risk of becoming first time entrants into the criminal justice system and were at risk of receiving less support from a modernised probation service under the new arrangements, and of receiving age appropriate sanctions from the courts. The PCC stated that he did not underestimate the vulnerability of 18-24 year olds however all age groups could be vulnerable and therefore he had not singled out a particular age group. It was noted that Integrated Offender Management engaged with 18-24 year olds.
- In response to a suggestion the PCC agreed to separate those with Mental Health problems and those with learning disabilities in the Plan as they were not necessarily related. It was also noted that the section on Mental Health referred to suicide but suicide did not appear elsewhere in the document and it was pointed out that suicide was not just related to mental health issues but could be a consequence of a crime that had been committed.
- It was 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 PCC accepted that the Police had a role to play in dealing with mental health but was of the view that the Police already spent too much time on it and that other statutory bodies should take a lead role. It was noted that the Police were represented on the Health and Wellbeing Boards; the PCC attended the Leicester City Board and the Deputy PCC attended the County Board.
- It was agreed that the wording of paragraph 47.a would be amended to make it clear that there would be a new service to *tackle* the problems of drugs and alcohol.
- Clarification was given that the figure of 13,250 referrals given at point 49.b of the Plan related 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.
- With regard to Value for Money it was suggested that the PCC appeared to be devolving more responsibility to partner agencies through existing structures whilst in contrast spending 1.2% of the police budget on his office. In response it was noted that the cost of Leicestershire's OPCC was 20 pence below the average per head of population. By way of comparison Northamptonshire spent 1.4% of its budget on its OPCC.
- In response to a question regarding how the performance of the PCC could be judged given the lack of targets in the Plan the PCC stated that he did not think crime figures or public satisfaction surveys were a good way of measuring the performance of a PCC and that a broader view would need to be taken. The PCC did state that he wished to raise awareness amongst the public of the role of the PCC. It was noted that the PCC was only doing one term of office so he would not be able to be measured by voting at the next PCC election.

- It was noted that where Step 3 of the Equality Impact Assessment Form referred to ethnicity this was a self-assessment of ethnicity by the people who had completed the telephone survey.

RESOLVED:

That the Panel accepts and supports in full the Police and Crime Plan subject to the comments now made and amendments proposed.

54. Proposed Precept 2017/18 and Medium Term Financial Strategy.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning the Proposed Precept for 2017/18 and the Medium Term Financial Strategy. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 8", is filed with these minutes.

The PCC and his Chief Finance Officer in introducing the item made the following points:

- The provisional Police Grant Settlement referred to in the report had now been confirmed and it was considered to be less positive for Leicestershire than expected. The amount of 'topslicing' was more than predicted. Consequently more savings were required to be made by the Force;
- Despite the challenging funding position the budget was balanced and would prioritise frontline policing as had been pledged in the PCC's manifesto;
- The intended 1.99% precept increase would enable the Force to maintain cash levels but the following years of the MTFs would be particularly challenging. It was noted that the Government might change its 2% precept increase trigger point for a referendum and the PCC would be alive to precepting for a higher rise if he was able to do so without triggering a referendum.
- It was announced that the PCC would be adding an extra 8 frontline officers with 1 allocated to each of the neighbourhood policing areas. It was noted that there was currently a Police Officer for every 599 citizens in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland whereas a decade ago it was one Officer for every 430 citizens.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- It was noted that in previous years the Force had been able to bid successfully for funding for specific projects where the funding had been taken from 'topslicing' which had resulted in a net gain in the overall budget for Leicestershire Police. Confirmation was given that for the current year every effort was being made to again bid for additional funding for specific projects. There had thus far been two successful transformation bids relating to NICHE and other ICT projects. However, it was emphasised that the Force would not bid for all available funding as some schemes might not be appropriate for Leicestershire.
- It was explained that the "flat cash" pledge (referred to in paragraph 9 of the report) referred to statements by Government ministers in 2016 in which they submitted that whilst the Police Grant Settlement would be less for 2017/18, taking into account the ability of PCC's to raise the Precept by 1.99% this resulted in the same level of funding overall for the Police.

- With regard to the Funding Formula Review the PCC stated that he and the Chief Constable would be meeting with the Minister on 21 February 2017 to present the case that the current funding formula was not fair to Leicestershire. After this meeting the PCC would meet with 10 MPs from the region to ask them to canvas on behalf of Leicestershire with regard to the Funding Formula. The PCC asked Panel members to help by raising the issue with MPs themselves. It was believed that the new funding formula would run from 2018/19.
- It was noted that a future financial risk was that auto-enrolment on the pension scheme could increase the amount of people in the pension scheme and therefore the amount of employer's contributions that would have to be paid. It was confirmed that whilst the amount of Police Officers already in the pension scheme was a very high percentage, the amount of police staff currently in the pension scheme was much lower so there was the potential for many more police staff to join which would significantly affect the level of employer's contributions.
- With regard to the possibility of significant structural changes for the OPCC (referred to in paragraph 79 of the report) and the need to fund these changes from the reserve it was noted that the Policing and Crime Bill currently going through Parliament required PCC's to take on more responsibilities such as dealing with complaints and therefore this may require more funding.

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by the Vice-Chairman that:-

- a) The information presented in this report, including the total 2017/18 net budget requirement of £171.639m including a council tax requirement for 2017/18 of £58.089m. be noted.
- b) The proposal to increase the 2017/18 Precept by 1.99% (£3.65 per annum) for police purposes to £187.2302 for a Band D property be supported.
- c) The future risks, challenges, uncertainties and opportunities included in the precept proposal, together with the financial and operational mitigations and additional considerations identified be noted.
- d) It be noted that any changes required, either by Government grant alterations notified through the final settlement or through amended council tax base and surplus/deficit notifications received from the collecting authorities, may be balanced either through Force Efficiency Savings or through a transfer to or from the Budget Equalisation Reserve (BER).
- e. The current MTFs, the anticipated savings required and plans to identify further solutions alongside the requirements of the Police and Crime Plan be noted.

The motion was carried unanimously.

55. Date of next meeting.

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Panel would be held on 29 March 2017 at 1:00pm.

1.00 - 4.15 pm
03 February 2017

CHAIRMAN