



Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017

Report of the Strategic Director (City Development & Neighbourhoods)

1. Background

- 1.1 The Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Leicestershire Force area (which includes Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland) set the strategic direction and objectives for policing through the first Police and Crime Plan (the Plan). The draft Plan was duly considered and agreed at the Police and Crime Panel on 13 March.
- 1.2 As part of the Council's response to the initial consultation, the Plan was subject to discussions at both the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Commission on the 25th February 2013 and the Overview Select Committee's meeting on the 12th March 2013.
- 1.3 It was always intended that the Plan would be reviewed and reissued in September 2013 to take account of the consultation responses and impacts on budgets and commissioning plans for the services affected. A new reissued Plan is currently out for consultation, once agreed the Plan will cover the direction for crime and policing for the period 2013-2017.

2. Report

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to identify whether the initial issues/ concerns raised by the council (as part of the initial Plan) together with an assessment as to whether these issues have been addressed in the new Plan or not. If the comments have not been adequately addressed then the council is able to resubmit these as part of the current consultation process.

3. Police and Crime Plan

- 3.1 Some concerns about the content of the Plan were raised, with particular attention being drawn to the following:-
- a. The draft Plan contained no reference to local authorities' statutory functions in relation to crime prevention, the Council's leading role in terrorism prevention, or the fact that the Council was a Category 1 responder in emergency situations;

Some references made within the context of partnership work

The draft Plan focussed on young offenders, but did not mention young people as victims. This was an important omission, as young people were more likely to be victims of crime than offenders;

Plan identifies young people as being problematic (in terms of offending or likely to experience issues around substance misuse) and does not at any point state that young people are or can be victims of crime

- b. A key omission was the anticipated impact of the Plan on the crime reduction agenda;

The PCC states that “I will not set a crime reduction target that leads to adverse effects on the confidence of victims to report their crime nor on the proactive work of officers to find and detect certain types of crime” but that “I will scrutinise this performance and the regional Chief Constables will be held to account for delivering local crime reduction, increases in community safety and value for money”.

- c. No mention was made in the draft Plan of the possible impact of the forthcoming welfare reforms on crime;

No mention in the current Plan

- d. Anti-social behaviour appeared to have been given a very low level of priority in the draft Plan. However, the majority of concerns brought to Councillors by residents related to anti-social behaviour;

There is greater emphasis on this in the Plan

- e. Clarity was needed on how the commissioning of services for the Police would be undertaken, to help minimise the risks associated with a situation developing where providers with no experience in providing these services were commissioned;

The PCC, since the formation of the last Plan, has announced his commissioning intentions and to a degree this issue has been covered through bidding rounds and assessment panels. This issue has been dealt with outside of the Plan.

- f. Partnership working should be a higher priority and a clear indication given of who the partners would be;

There is greater emphasis on this in the Plan and the Strategic Partnership Board has established new arrangements to develop partnership working at all levels between the Police, City Council and other agencies.

- g. The use of the phrase a “suite of change options” was of concern, as there appeared to be no clear explanation given of the meaning or implications of this.

The phrase has now been taken out of the Plan

- h. The duty placed on the local authority to prevent crime and disorder in the City as outlined in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

No mention in the current Plan, the Plan could be strengthened, if within the partnership section this was included.

- i. The vast array of legislation linked to many of the Council's regulatory functions e.g. Trading Standards, Licensing and Planning etc.

No mention in the current Plan, the Plan could be strengthened, if within the partnership section this was included.

- j. The Safeguarding and Child Protection responsibilities placed on the Lead Member, Director of Children Services and Local Safeguarding Board.

No mention in the current Plan, although lists working with Children's Safeguarding Board

- k. The Safeguarding responsibilities placed on the Lead Member, Director of Adult Services and Local Safeguarding Board in relation to vulnerable adults.

No mention in the current Plan, although lists working with Adults Safeguarding Board.

- l. The leadership role the City Council provides in co-ordinating and managing the local community safety partnership.

No mention in the current Plan, lists working with the City Partnership and Safer Leicester Partnership

- m. The statutory responsibilities of the local authority in the relation to the management and reduction of anti-social behaviour, hate incidents and hate crime.

No mention in the current Plan, the Plan could be strengthened, if within the partnership section this was included.

- n. Furthermore, the Plan does not acknowledge the direct contribution made by the Council in supporting the Police in achieving the reduction of overall crime in the City. For example, the Council has contributed its own resources to a number of initiatives aimed at reducing burglary, vehicle crime and retail crime.

No direct mention in the current Plan, but states "I have seen, across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland evidence of a long standing history of efforts made to combine the expertise, intelligence and resources of a wide range of disciplines and services".

- o. The Plan also outlines the potential to reduce costs through the rationalisation of the estate. This is something that the Council can assist with as it holds a significant amount of assets in all communities in the City and collaborative working could provide opportunities to not only provide improvements to front line service delivery but also to reduce the operating costs of both organisations.

The new Plan does not cover this aspect of the PCC's intentions, but this issue could be due to discussions being held outside of the Plan.

- p. The Plan does not differentiate between various issues associated with mental health. For example the issues associated with vulnerable young people are somewhat different to those associated with older people and will require different strategies and responses from the local authority and the Police.

There is an improved assessment of this in the Plan and the needs associated with different groups of people.

- q. The Plan does not have a particular focus on equalities issues, and an Equalities Impact Assessment of the proposals in the Plan would have been a useful addition to the consultation process.

Issue not mentioned in this Plan but the last Plan was subject to an EIA, so this could be an omission.

- r. The Plan does not indicate the intended measures that will be used to recruit additional Special Police Constables outlined in the Plan and makes no mention of how many Police Officers are envisaged by 2016.

Issue not addressed in the Plan, but would be subject to separate discussions.

- s. More information should be included on how often the Police and Crime Panel will meet, where these meetings will be held, membership of the Panel and other governance mechanisms, so that external scrutiny can focus on monitoring performance.

Whilst this issue is not addressed in the Plan, it is understood that there will be separate terms of reference etc. and therefore dealt with outside of the information contained in the Plan.

- t. Whilst recognising that the Police and Crime Plan is in an interim period of review, there are concerns that some services and personnel could shortly be subjected to statutory redundancy notices, as a result of funding only being confirmed until September 2013 whilst the review is in place. This could have detrimental effects on morale and efficiencies.

See response to "s"

- u. The Plan refers to increasing the user satisfaction rate for 85% to 88% over the next three years but has does not define specific measures on how this will be achieved.

Issue not addressed in the Plan, but this Plan is intended to be an overview of the PCC's intentions, and details will be dealt with elsewhere.

- v. Action Plans are required on how the initiatives and improved performance levels will be achieved during the life of the Plan.

Issue not addressed in the Plan, but these will be contained in a separate document

- w. More information is required on the future privatisation of current services particularly in relation to services which are previously commissioned by the Council.

Issue not addressed in the Plan

- x. Further clarification on whether the saving of £20.3m identified in the Plan on page 36 is a headline budget figure or not.

Issue has been addressed in the Plan, with details of how the savings will be realised.

- y. Clarification over the number of Police Community Support Officers that are to be recruited in the future and whether the Police and Crime Commissioner intends to apply for a change in their powers as a result would be welcomed.

Issue not addressed in the Plan, but will be dealt with elsewhere.

4. Officer to contact

Daxa Pancholi
Head of Community safety
29 8634