

**Leicester Leicestershire & Rutland Police and
Crime Panel**

Scrutiny Review

Scoping Document: Title of Review: s106 Funding

Date: 29 July 2021

To be completed with the Member proposing the review

| | | |
|-----------|--|---|
| 1. | Title of the proposed scrutiny review | <u>Section 106 Funding Scrutiny Review</u> |
| 2. | Proposed by | Deborah Taylor, Chair of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel |
| 3. | Rationale Why do you want to undertake this review? | As funding pressures continue to grow on all aspects of the police's work there will continue to be an impact on the funding available and annual pressure to increase the pre-cept. Therefore, it is important to maximise developer funding contributions that can be used by the Force to fund infrastructure costs linked to new housing and commercial developments. |
| 4. | Purpose and aims of the review What question(s) do you want to answer and what do you want to achieve? (Outcomes?) | <p>The purpose of the review is to scrutinise the effectiveness of arrangements to obtain and use funding from developers to meet community policing needs resulting from new developments (referred to as s106. Funding).</p> <p>The intended outcome is to ensure that the funding obtained from this source is maximised. If necessary, the review will identify recommendations intended to contribute to achieving this.</p> <p>It is hoped the following will be achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To understand the management of s106 funding. • To find ways of increasing the proportion of entitlement that is recovered. • To identify practices that may disadvantage OPCC in drawing down funds and find ways to overcome that. • To improve how officers from OPCC and local authorities work together to secure and draw down funds. |
| 5. | Links with corporate aims / priorities How does the review link to corporate aims and priorities? | <p>This review topic links into the Panel's commitment to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support and challenge the Police and Crime Commissioner in respect of his budget and medium term financial plan. • support further discussions between the Force and local authorities with planning powers to optimise the use of s106 funds for operational policing purposes. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 6. | <p>Scope Set out what is included in the scope of the review and what is not. For example which services it does and does not cover.</p> | <p>The review will include: How the process is working at the moment to examine the mechanics of the existing process and the channels of communication between the OPCC/Police and its key partners. Whether it is resulting in the best value for LLR Police and if that is not the case how barriers to that objective can be overcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the police have the information to ensure they do not miss out on s106 monies? Are there knowledge gaps? • Is there opportunity for early engagement with Police to ensure they know what larger developments are coming and time left to spend monies? • Financial aspects and impacts • Resource implications • Risks and benefits to the OPCC/Police Force and communities across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland |
| 7. | <p>Methodology Describe the methods you will use to undertake the review.</p> <p>How will you undertake the review, what evidence will need to be gathered from members, officers and key stakeholders, including partners and external organisations and experts?</p> | <p>The review will be carried out by a small working group reporting to the LLR Police and Crime Panel with the following members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Deborah Taylor (Chair) • Councillor Les Phillimore • Councillor Kevin Loydall • Councillor Piara Singh Clair • <i>Any other volunteer members?</i> <p>The review will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence gathering of current practice and process, and analysis and any best practice from elsewhere. • relevant supporting research reports and documents. • views of officers/members through round table discussions. |
| | <p>Witnesses Set out who you want to gather evidence from and how you will plan to do this.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority s106 officers • Finance officers from OPCC • Anyone else with appropriate knowledge/information |
| 8. | <p>Timescales How long is the review expected to take to complete?</p> | 6 months |

| | | |
|------------|--|---|
| | Proposed start date | 29 July 2021 |
| | Proposed completion date | 29 January 2022 |
| 9. | <p>Resources / staffing requirements</p> <p>The Scrutiny reviews will be facilitated by the Senior Democratic Support Officer and it is important to estimate the amount of their time, in weeks, that will be required in order to manage the review Project Plan effectively.</p> | <p>The review can be conducted within the resources of the democratic support team. It is estimated a total of 6-8 weeks of collective time over the proposed period will be required to support the review and prepare the report. There is also potential support from the scrutiny team as and when required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisation and support for working group meetings and evidence gathering process; • Engagement with and provision of evidence to Members at working group meetings or outside, • Preparation of the final scrutiny report <p>It is recognised there may be some resource implications from other local authority (or partner) service areas in terms of officer time to attend round table discussion, call to evidence or working group meetings.</p> |
| | Do you anticipate any further resources will be required e.g. site visits or independent technical advice? If so, please provide details. | No outside technical advice is envisaged to be needed. |
| 10. | <p>Review recommendations and findings</p> <p>To whom will the recommendations be addressed? E.g. OPCC/ Local Authority/ Executive / External Partner?</p> | <p>All recommendations will be directed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Police and Crime Commissioner • <i>Local Authority executives (if necessary?)</i> |
| 11. | <p>Likely publicity arising from the review - Is this topic likely to be of high interest to the media? Please explain.</p> | <p>It is expected that the review will generate medium media interest and relevant Lead Directors, Executive and council's communication team will be kept aware of any issues that may arise of public interest.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 12. | Publicising the review and its findings and recommendations How will these be published / advertised? | A review report will be prepared and published as part of the panel's papers on the council's website. |
| 13. | How will this review add value to policy development or service improvement? | The review hopes to set out ways to maximise developer funding contributions to meet community policing needs in new developments and to provide suggestions how the office for the police and crime commissioner might ensure that it raises the correct level of funding from s106 agreements |
| Comments from the relevant Director | | |
| 15. | Observations and comments on the proposed review | This isn't solely an LCC review although it will examine the mechanics of a process that is central to Council Policy and appropriate officers will be sighted on the review. |
| | Name | Miranda Cannon |
| | Role | Director of Political Governance and Communications |
| | Date | 19 July 2021 |
| To be completed by the Democratic Support Manager | | |
| 16. | Will the proposed scrutiny review / timescales negatively impact on other work within the Team? | It is anticipated that there will be no adverse impact on the team's work, to support this review but it must be anticipated that there may need to be some prioritising of work done during the time of this review. |
| | Do you have available staffing resources to facilitate this scrutiny review? If not, please provide details. | The review can be adequately supported from resources within the Democratic Support team and there is potential support available from the scrutiny team as and when required. |
| | Name | Matthew Reeves |
| | Date | 16/7/21 |