



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
LEICESTER, LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2022 at 1:00 pm at County Hall, Glenfield

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Taylor (Chair)

Councillor Whelband (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Clair

Councillor Cutkelvin

Councillor Graham

Councillor Harper-Davies

Councillor Loydall

Councillor March

Councillor Oxley

Councillor Phillimore

Councillor Russell (substitute)

Councillor Woodman

Salma Manzoor – Independent Member.

In Attendance:

Rupert Matthews – Police and Crime Commissioner

Also Present:

Michael Veale – Temporary CEO

Kira Hughes – Temporary CFO

Sajan Devshi – Performance and Assurance Officer

Charlotte Highcock – Temporary Commissioning Manager

Chief Inspector Streets – Strategic Lead People Zones

Kamal Adatia – City Barrister and Monitoring Officer

Anita James – Senior Democratic Support Officer

* * * * *

47. CHAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair announced that she had agreed to take an item of urgent business at the end of the meeting to receive a verbal update from the Police and Crime Commissioner on the settlement figures for the pre-cept.

48. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Parisha Chavda (Independent Member), Councillor Mullaney and Councillor Clarke.

It was noted that Councillor Russell was present as a substitute in place of Councillor Clarke.

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare any pecuniary or other interest they may have in the business to be discussed.

There were no such declarations.

50. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 26TH SEPTEMBER 2022

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26th September 2022 be confirmed as a correct record.

51. PROGRESS ON ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS - NOT ELSEWHERE ON THE AGENDA

No actions to take forward currently.

52. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None received in time for this meeting.

53. REVIEW OF COMMISSIONED SERVICES REPORT

The Police and Crime Panel received a report informing the findings of a review of the OPCC Commissioned Services.

The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) introduced the report and gave an outline of the background leading to the review of commissioned services, the review findings and steps taken to address the failings and the plans to introduce a Commissioning Strategy.

The PCC reported that he had inherited a situation regarding commissioned services that was failing to meet high standards; as well as clear systemic failures the review found a lack of due diligence, lack of record making, and a lack of accountability which the report showed along with the lessons learnt and steps put in place to tackle the issues uncovered.

Members of the panel noted the intention to deliver a proper commissioning service through the new strategy and that it included provision to clearly monitor performance, value for money and to give adequate assurance of

accountability.

The Chair commented that the review findings were a concern to read and seemed to show a mismanagement of public funds. The Chair was grateful this area had now been looked into and that there was a clear indication of what had been happening and the steps taken to address those matters.

Members queried whether the issues found were inherent in the system from the beginning or had occurred later and were informed that this appeared to be a systemic issue. The review had to cover a period of time with a cut-off date created and so it was probable there were earlier issues, although the review found issues with contracts and records management from 2015 onwards, with issues continuing to occur as recently as June 2022.

Members noted there had been a number of changes in staffing at the OPCC and suggested the impact of that and loss of “organisational knowledge” may have made a difference to processes being followed. There was also some confusion that the report suggested some details were not available, yet those were accessible on the OPCC website.

Members were also conscious that some elements of the failings might be Covid specific noting many organisations processes were altered to facilitate people working from home and it was queried whether that had led to some of the issues such as lack of record marking or failing to back up later.

Regarding record keeping, some of that was related to Covid but that was expected to be backed up later and it wasn't.

In relation to the criteria for contracts it was noted that the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) changed requirements some time ago, and a needs assessment was required as part of the process for bids however, as far as the specifications in contracts, whilst there was an MoJ element the requirements OPCC had were around core servicing and a specification in the contract between provider and OPCC contract so it was difficult to look back at what was funded and why, that had led on to the points about monitoring and moving to the future to make improvements.

Members also noted that the panel had previously received a full audit report which did not raise these issues and assurance was sought on the accuracy and robustness of this report and the audit report.

The PCC explained that for some time after he came to office, he was repeatedly assured that matters were ok, and it was only after several small but significant things came to light that he sought more assurance and a review.

Members still had concerns how matters would improve going forward and referred to challenges in contract performance such as the domestic abuse helpline and indicated it would be helpful to see how contracts were managed and performance measured in future.

The PCC stated that everything in the report was as presented, and he had gone over it very carefully with those responsible for bringing it together and assured the panel that future reports on monitoring and managing contracts could be provided to the panel.

The Chair mentioned a concern about awarded funds not being spent as agreed and welcomed the new commissioning strategy which it was hoped would also ensure instances of funds not being put to use were detected and funds returned.

RESOLVED:

1. That the contents of the report be noted,
2. That an update report on progress of the Commissioning Strategy, contract management and monitoring outcomes be brought to a panel meeting in 6 months.

54. LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE BOARD FOR LEICESTER, LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND

The Police and Crime Panel received a report informing about the creation of a Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report and explained that for some time a regional board had operated, however there was a consensus that the regional board was not delivering, and so Police and Crime Commissioner's across the midlands region had decided to introduce an individual LCJB for each force area.

The PCC stated that Force collaboration was important and that he was keen to do all he could to address the unsatisfactory situation of long court delays and see the process of justice speeded up.

Members were advised that the new LCJB would focus on mutual support, and whilst that was established the regional board would continue to co-exist for a year meeting less frequently before being dissolved.

Members understood the desire to do this at local level but enquired how confident the PCC was that other agencies with a wider footprint would give it time and attention, and how a local board would impact on matters such as regional specialist courts that were shared across region.

The PCC stated he was very confident that other agencies would engage with the LCJB, and that the system of local boards worked very well elsewhere. It was reiterated that the regional board was continuing for a time albeit in shadow form and could be resurrected if it was found to be necessary.

Members enquired about the new LCJB make-up and were informed that membership comprised representatives from institutions such as the Court Service (Crown and Magistrates Courts), Police, Crown Prosecutions Service (CPS), Probation and those organisations determined for themselves who to

send to meetings although it was envisaged there be continuity of individuals attending to maintain focus on issues and awareness.

Members referred to the issues in the criminal justice system, long backlogs of perpetrators being brought to justice and frustration within the probation service and welcomed the steps being taken to try to address that situation.

There remained some concern amongst members about losing the regional board and loss of opportunity that went with that such as sharing experiences, good practice, and ideas etc. Members felt it was essential to receive updates on the LCJB meetings along with outcomes and any comparator information to other LCJB that could be used to show success rates.

Members referred to the ongoing economic situation and serious cuts to budgets that had impacted severely on the criminal justice system and enquired if there was any move to support more funding into the system. The PCC responded that financing was not within his remit however he did meet and lobby ministers on behalf of LLR force budgets but also other bodies within the force area where things were needed.

The Chair thanked the PCC for the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the contents of the report be noted,
2. That regular updates on the LCJB meeting be provided to the panel,
3. That a more detailed report on progress of the LCJB, outcomes and benchmarking/comparator to other LCJB's be brought to a panel meeting in December 2023.

55. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS FUNDING UPDATE

The Police and Crime Panel received a report updating on the changes made by the OPCC to the funding allocations made to the Community Safety Partnerships (CSP's) across Leicester, Leicestershire, and Rutland.

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report outlining the background and reminding there was no statutory requirement for this funding and the rationale for division of monies was based on unknown parameters.

Members were also informed that through the current system there had been numerous underspends that were not reported in a timely manner and a significant lack of monitoring information provided.

The PCC advised that a key piece of work was undertaken to develop a new system in consultation with the CSP's across the area, who had engaged positively with officers, and the new system would improve accountability, monitoring, transparency, outcomes, value for money and provide certainty over the distribution criteria as well as hopefully reducing underspends.

The Chair noted that a conference had been held at the end of October 2022 for CSP's to attend, hear more detail about the formula and provide feedback which had been taken into account when deciding upon the new procedure.

Members were invited to comment which included the following points:

There was some concern that there would be a cut of £40k to the city community safety funding especially in context of recent issues in the city. Members enquired whether the metrics had been tested in terms of impact on the city and whether there was sufficient objectivity in the figures, and whether the outcomes be different if they were run in a different way. Assurance was also sought that those most vulnerable and at risk of the worst crimes were not at further risk with a pure data approach being taken to the funding formula.

The PCC asserted that the city would get a fair deal under the system, despite the reduction and reminded members of the opportunity given to all CSP's to attend the conference held in October 2022 where it was set out in very full detail how the formula was worked out. It was advised that an evidence based approach was being taken.

Members were informed that CSP's were consulted and given several opportunities to feedback, meetings were held across the force area and based upon feedback received the formula was created. The PCC commented that there was no statutory obligation to provide funding for this area of work, but he felt it was the right thing to do and it was important to have a proper system in place. It was also advised that after developing the formula it was presented to CSP's for further feedback and there were no criticisms in terms of the way it was worked out. It was reminded that the city had underspent its allocation in the past and the point was made again that the city indicated at its last CSP meeting they had a £45k underspend so this formula suggests it would be more accurate moving forward.

It was emphasised that the formula was sense checked and no major criticism raised in terms of process and framework. The 3 year period used provided a good snapshot of the environment covering the pre, during and post covid landscape.

Members were informed that the Crime Harm index was used as this was the best way to weight each crime. Officers briefly explained how the index had been used and reminded that this had been fully set out and discussed at the conference held. It was indicated that this was a fairer way of capturing more serious crimes, and whilst it might not be everyone's preference it was better than having no formula at all.

There remained some dissatisfaction about the formula put forward and criticism of the use of the Crime Harm index and it was suggested that figures should be run using a different scenario. The PCC reiterated the new formula was the result of a long process where CSP's were consulted extensively, and he was not prepared to have staff spend more time now to run different ways of doing things as it was necessary to implement a formula because the old

system was not fit for purpose.

Members were advised that this funding was only in relation to CSP's and that was just a part of the funding that the OPCC put into the city and other areas across the force. The OPCC funded many services, and the PCC was confident that total funding from the OPCC to the city was around 50-53% of total funding available.

As regards reference to violence that has taken place across the city, the PCC assured the public of his previous comments, and that it had been agreed there would be an internal review of the policing of that and results of that would come to panel and be in the public domain.

Members enquired whether there were any long term indications of support to initiatives such as the Youth Diversion project. Officers responded that contracts had been amalgamated so there was more flexibility for CSP's to use the money how they wanted to rather than have sections sliced off to specific activity.

Members acknowledged the complex process undertaken and recognised the competing interests of different areas to secure funding. There was a general consensus that having this formula was clearer and there was gratitude for the funding to CSP's which was not statutory.

Members noted that when presented details at the October conference it was progressive and new and basing funding on a weighting mechanism made sense. It was suggested that some of the conversations with CSP's were with officers rather than with members.

Members queried whether the 20% mechanism for calculating the amount of funding provided opportunity to vary as things evolved. Officers confirmed that it was designed so it could be adapted to priorities, data could also be pulled from Niche. It was noted that in future housing distribution would be greater in the county and Rutland than the city so by default the weighting mechanism would need to shift with that.

The Chair brought discussions to a close, commenting that it was not the time to ask the PCC to re-run figures for the formula as suggested earlier. The Chair also noted there had been very full discussion at the conference and it was unfortunate that representatives from the city were not present however others did feed in to the process.

The Chair brought discussions to a close and thanked the PCC and officers for the information provided.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted.

56. PEOPLE ZONES REPORT

The Police and Crime Panel received a report providing an update on the People Zone's initiative.

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report advising that this was an initiative led by the project team at the OPCC and that People Zones had been in place since 2018 under the previous PCC. There were currently 3 people zones: Bell Foundry (Charnwood), New Parks (city) and Thringstone & Whitwick (North West Leicestershire).

The PCC advised that the initiative had potential to develop great benefits to more deprived areas of LLR, however it had been under resourced in the past with just one member staff. As a result, more resources were being made available and proper leadership had been introduced into the scheme.

Chief Inspector Streets, Strategic Lead People Zones, provided more details of the work undertaken in recent months to progress the initiative and drew attention to the following points:

- The Mapping For Change project had produced a full research report for the Bell Foundry people zone which would be brought to the people zone steering group before sharing a summary with partners.
- Similar reports were due to be available in relation to the New Parks people zone (by Christmas) and Thringstone & Whitwick people zone (by New Year).
- The Community Leadership Programme had recruited a new cohort of 3 and an induction was taking place shortly; previous participants of the programme had done on to join the wider Community Leaders Network which worked in partnership to support communities, with People Zones being one of their focuses.
- Appendix B provided a screen shot of a community asset map which provides links to services, information and events in the People Zone and was accessible at all times.

The Chair thanked officers for the report and was pleased to see the people zones initiative receiving more funding and being progressed.

Members expressed strong support for the people zones initiative and the projects being undertaken within those areas.

It was suggested that these areas would benefit from more frontline policing to build resilience in the community as too would other areas across the force and it was enquired how officers were being utilised in communities.

The PCC stated that community policing was essential, and he believed in that, he had written the police and crime plan to include it and provided funding to make it happen. Important work was also undertaken by PCSO's across the community and especially in the 3 people zones. Chief Inspector Streets

replied that the people zones and local policing teams were all linked in with the projects and there was a representative from each area on the steering groups.

The Chair suggested that Members could pursue the conversation about community policing outside this meeting with Neighbourhood Policing/Local Policing teams.

Clarity was sought on the funding given to projects in people zones and the resources in terms of staffing. It was advised that there was no funding of individuals or wages for people on projects. Any staff working on projects were funded through local authorities. The funds referred to in the report were asset based; research had been taken from that and it was intended to launch a grants process in the new year providing grants for things like community safety.

There was a brief discussion about wider community assets being incorporated and communicated about. It was suggested that local councillors and local authority staff would be good sources of information in terms of wider assets in the community and information gathering.

Chief Inspector Streets responded that the apps being used in the Mapping for Change project were developing and they were trying to generate a one stop shop to include the many different groups across communities. The asset maps were not just one place, although there was a boundary to focus on in terms of the people zone but there were resources outside that focus, and it continued to grow.

Members were impressed with the mini police project and commented that taking steps to ensure a positive image of police with young people at an early age was good.

Members felt there were a lot of people who were unaware of people zones or what they were about and asked what was being done to promote that awareness. The PCC accepted that point, noting that some projects were still quite new, and efforts would be put in to ensure awareness was increased.

Members noted that an animation video had been created to explain what they were trying to achieve. There was also a lot of discussion with community groups to spread the word and once projects started to be more active that would increase understanding.

Members hoped that the people zones initiative would be expanded to other areas and asked whether there were any criteria being used to determine the next people zones and whether there was potential to spread to the wider community using media platforms.

The PCC confirmed ambitions to create another people zone, in terms of initial criteria it would be an area where there was social deprivation as well as the presence of institutions that could be worked with, however that work was not

far advanced yet and he wanted to get the model right before rolling out elsewhere. The PCC commented that longer term there was an aim to set out which parts were working well and how that could be delivered to wider areas. The PCC advised that any proposal for another people zone was still some way off and would be brought to panel before a final decision made.

The Chair thanked officers for the update and asked that an update be brought to the panel in 6 months along with any update on re-evaluation of the People Zones initiative in due course.

RESOLVED:

1. That the contents of the report be noted,
2. That the People Zones animated video be shared to Members outside this meeting,
3. That an update report on the People Zones Initiative and progress with projects be brought to a panel meeting in 6 months,
4. That an update on any re-evaluation of the People Zones Initiative be brought to panel in due course.

57. COMPLAINTS AGAINST PCC ANNUAL REPORT

The Police and Crime Panel received a report providing an update on complaints relating to the Police and Crime Commissioner over the last 12 months.

The City Barrister and Monitoring Officer introduced the report reminding members of the regime for complaints and the primary purpose to satisfy the panel there was a process and that they were satisfied it was compliant with the law.

It was noted that previously Members had asked whether more granular details could be included in complaints reports. The City Barrister and Monitoring Officer advised that would need to be dealt with sensitively as the PCC and complainants had a right to a confidential process.

It was noted that since the last report in December 2021, two complaints had been referred to the City Barrister and Monitoring Officer, the outcome of the 1st was noted in the report at paragraph 6; the 2nd was still pending whilst the report was being written but since then it had been decided that complaint was not a conduct matter.

The City Barrister and Monitoring Officer advised that there had always been full engagement and clarity with the PCC.

Members were satisfied the regime was compliant, worked well and provided the level of accountability required.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted.

58. PANEL CONSTITUTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE ANNUAL REVIEW - VERBAL UPDATE

The City Barrister and Monitoring Officer provided a brief update following his review of the Constitution and Terms of Reference of the Panel in accordance with the duty under Part 3 paragraph 115 to do so once a year.

Members were advised there were no amendments proposed to the constitution.

Members were also reminded that there were opportunities to seek clarity about any aspect of the Constitution or Terms of Reference of the panel throughout the year and the City Barrister and Monitoring Officer would give advice on that either individually or collectively, noting that such enquiries do not necessarily require amendment to the Constitution.

RESOLVED:

That the update be noted.

59. TASK GROUP REPORT S106 FUNDING REVIEW

The Police and Crime Panel received the Task Group report with outcomes from the section 106 Funding Review.

The Chair introduced the report and thanked the panel members who were involved noting that membership was representative of the city, county, and Rutland. The Chair also thanked officers for their involvement and support with this piece of work.

The Chair explained that the review was prompted by a range of factors and concern that s106 money was not included within the force budget. Once the review started it found there were huge sums across LLR sitting in accounts and not being spent for the benefit of the community. The task group undertook a deep dive and found bids had been made so far in advance that by the time a trigger was reached the original proposals were no-longer relevant to the present time.

The task group considered that the benefits of re-purposing existing bids would lead to more certainty in future budgets for capital programming and a better understanding of plans for the future.

It was proposed that the Police and Crime Panel support the task group findings and endorse the recommendations to the Police and Crime Commissioner/Force as follows:

1. The Force to take steps to repurpose s106 agreements that are no longer viable through liaison with local authority planning officers and developers to ensure that funding is secured.

2. The Force to produce a defined list of items to be linked to its Investment Strategy and which can be used for repurposing agreements.
3. The Force to progress work in partnership with planners and/or Community Safety Partnerships to align timescales and awareness of new larger developments and to co-ordinate needs with other infrastructure projects.
4. The Police and Crime Commissioner to provide for resources to enable establishment of sufficient officer support to the s106 area of work and to facilitate the spend of s106 monies and pursuit of new bids.
5. The Police and Crime Commissioner/Force to develop and introduce a monitoring system to enable oversight and management of all s106 agreements and to monitor use of monies received.
6. The Police and Crime Commissioner/Force to liaise with planning officers in determining any new method for future bids.

The Police and Crime Commissioner put on record his thanks to the task group and officers for the huge amount of work undertaken during the review and for highlighting this area. The Police and Crime Commissioner agreed it was important to take this forward and to do so as quickly as possible and to adopt the recommendations, which he noted most were now being done and the rest would be implemented. The PCC recognised that securing monies from s106 funding was in the interests of the local authorities, police and importantly residents of Leicester, Leicestershire, and Rutland.

Members commented that it was also important moving forward to ensure that any new bids were agreed in an enabling format rather than constraining format and that was a fundamental change needed.

Members also commented that this was a valuable piece of work which should serve the residents of Leicester, Leicestershire, and Rutland well and it would be interesting to see how developers reacted to requests to repurpose and members hoped that developers would fully engage as this was about mitigating the impact of their developments.

Members noted that moving forward it was the force intention to look at a set formula for future bids, although that would need to be developed in conjunction with planning officers across the local authorities in the force area.

Members were pleased that this work had highlighted across the whole provision of s106 to the LLR the importance of monitoring the funds and that funds are spent in a timely fashion for benefit of wider communities.

The Chair requested that the PCC report back to the panel at a future meeting

on what had been done to progress re-purposing of outstanding s106 bids and secure s106 funds.

RESOLVED:

1. That the contents of the report be noted,
2. That the panel endorses the recommendations of the Task Group to the Police and Crime Commissioner/Force as follows:
 - The Force to take steps to repurpose s106 agreements that are no longer viable through liaison with local authority planning officers and developers to ensure that funding is secured.
 - The Force to produce a defined list of items to be linked to its Investment Strategy and which can be used for repurposing agreements.
 - The Force to progress work in partnership with planners and/or Community Safety Partnerships to align timescales and awareness of new larger developments and to co-ordinate needs with other infrastructure projects.
 - The Police and Crime Commissioner to provide for resources to enable establishment of sufficient officer support to the s106 area of work and to facilitate the spend of s106 monies and pursuit of new bids.
 - The Police and Crime Commissioner/Force to develop and introduce a monitoring system to enable oversight and management of all s106 agreements and to monitor use of monies received.
 - The Police and Crime Commissioner/Force to liaise with planning officers in determining any new method for future bids.
3. That an update report be brought to the panel at a future meeting to inform progress on implementing the recommendations above and progress on re-purposing bids and securing s106 funds.

60. WORK PROGRAMME

Members considered possible items for future inclusion.

Members referred to recent media reports about fraud and scams however it was noted that a large amount of that did not necessarily fall under the police and involved trading standards. The PCC indicated that he would seek a report from the Chief Constable to the Corporate Governance Board on frauds that fall under the police remit and provide an update around that in a future meeting.

Members asked that an item be added to a future meeting to show the updated structure of the OPCC.

Members referred to the topical issue of crime on women and suggested an

item with a broader view on that be brought to a future meeting. The PCC acknowledged this was an enormously important subject that touched on several areas and such a report could be linked to commissioning services.

RESOLVED:

That the work programme be received, noted and updated accordingly with items suggested for future inclusion.

61. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced members of his team present at the meeting today: Sajan Devshi, Performance and Assurance Officer; Kira Hughes, Temporary Chief Finance Officer, Michael Veale Temporary Chief Executive Officer; Chief Inspector Nicola Streets, Strategic Lead for People Zones; Charlotte Highcock, Temporary Head of Commissioning.

AOUB 1

The Police and Crime Commissioner informed members that shortly before this meeting he had received an email providing early detail of the settlement likely to be received for purpose of setting budget, although full detail was still awaited the government had indicated that the pre-cept could be increased up to £15 per band D property, this was a significant change which would need to be worked through.

The Chair thanked the PCC for this preliminary announcement.

There being no further business the meeting closed 14.55pm.