



Leicester
City Council

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

Held: WEDNESDAY, 26 JULY 2023 at 1:00 pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Taylor (Chair)
Councillor Russell (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Agath
Councillor Alnatt
Councillor Blackshaw
Councillor Clarke
Councillor Joannou
Councillor Loydall
Councillor Mullaney
Councillor Phillimore
Councillor Wise
Parisha Chavda – Independent Member
Salma Mansoor – Independent Member

In Attendance:

Mr Rupert Matthews – Police and Crime Commissioner
Mrs Rani Mahal – Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner
Mr Elizabeth Starr – Director of Performance and Governance

Also Present:

Mr Kamal Adatia – Monitoring Officer
Mr Jacob Mann – Senior Democratic Support Officer

* * * * *

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR 2023-24 MUNICIPAL YEAR

The Monitoring Officer opened the meeting and welcomed those present.

Nominations for the role of Chair of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel were invited.

It was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote carried that Deborah Taylor take the position of Chair for the municipal year 2023-24.

RESOLVED:

That Deborah Taylor be elected as Chair of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel for the municipal year 2023-24.

2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR FOR 2023-24 MUNICIPAL YEAR

Nominations for the role of Vice-Chair of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel were invited.

It was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote carried that Sarah Russell take the position of Vice-Chair for the municipal year 2023-24.

RESOLVED:

That Sarah Russell be elected as Vice-Chair of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel for the municipal year 2023-24.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Wyatt.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to disclose any pecuniary or other interest they may have in the business on the agenda.

There were no declarations.

5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meetings held on:

Confirmation Hearing for appointment to the role of Interim Chief Executive Officer 6th March 2023

Confirmation Hearing for appointment to the role of Interim Chief Finance Officer 6th March 2023

Ordinary meeting 6th March 2023

were confirmed as a correct record.

6. PANEL MEMBERSHIP 2023-24

The Monitoring Officer submitted a report to consider the Panel's membership

and any changes required to meet the balanced appointment objective as required by legislation.

It was noted that the 13 elected Panel Members needed to represent the political makeup of LLR and all the Councils of LLR. Following changes to political balance as a result of the 2023 local elections, negotiations had taken place to ensure appropriate political balance for the Panel. Following this a political balance was in place that was compliant with political balance requirements.

The Chair stated that she was happy to accept the membership and balance laid out in the report.

In response to a question on the political balance it was noted that given the political balance of the whole of LLR, there should proportionally be one independent elected member. However, it was felt that the balance in the Panel was still acceptable and more representative than in previous years.

It was noted that the representative from North West Leicestershire was currently Councillor Wyatt from the Liberal Democrats, however to give the Conservatives the five members they were entitled to it had been agreed that Councillor Woodman would take his place following the next North West Leicestershire Full Council meeting.

It was noted that the two independent members were appointed through a recruitment process.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None received for this meeting.

In response to a question on how the option to submit public questions to the Board was advertised, it was noted that there was a page on Leicester City Council's website outlining how to submit a question and the criteria for questions.

8. LLR POLICE AND CRIME PANEL'S ANNUAL REPORT (2022-23)

Panel members received the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel Annual Report highlighting the activities undertaken by the Panel during the 2022-23 municipal year.

In response to concerns raised that the report overly sanitised certain points of challenge between Panel members and the Police and Crime Commissioner it was noted that the report was primarily focused on recording the impartial facts of the Panel's work.

It was noted that a statement had previously been made at a meeting of the Panel by the Chair on the concerns around the multiple interim appointments by the PCC to OPCC offices. This had not been included in the report and it was suggested that the report be amended to include this.

RESOLVED:

That the Leicester, Leicestershire, and Rutland Police and Crime Panel Annual Report be approved subject to amendments based on the comments made above.

9. PREVENT STRATEGY AND HATE CRIME STRATEGY UPDATE REPORT

The Panel considered a report which provided an update on the work of Prevent and current processes on hate crime and hate incidents.

The PCC presented the report, commenting on the seriousness of hate crime and that Leicester as a diverse city needed to combat it. It was noted that the report included changes to the reporting process for hate crime. The PCC stated that he was very happy with how the force handled these issues.

There was discussion on the role of the OPCC in dealing with Prevent and hate crime. It was noted that the role of the PCC in this was to set overarching strategies and keep track of work through the Monitoring Office. It was requested that in future reports the work of the OPCC in areas reported on be more clearly shown, with actions and funding laid out.

In relation to the funding that the OPCC gave to the force for this work, it was noted that this work came under a higher-level heading for funding and that the OPCC needed to support the workstreams under each budget heading with that funding.

In response to a question on how gaps in service were identified it was noted that the OPCC regularly looked at figures to see trends and challenge the force on them through forums such as the Corporate Governance Board.

RESOLVED:

1. That the contents of the report be noted.
2. That OPCC Officers consider how future reports could include more detail of actions from the OPCC related to the work in question.

10. S106 FUNDING POST REVIEW UPDATE

The Panel received a report to provide an update on how the Force was implementing the recommendations that were provided as part of the Police and Crime Panel Tasking group S106 funding review.

The PCC introduced the report, it was noted that the report was not exhaustive and provided an update on the current situation. It was stated that the Police

were reliant on the relevant Local Authorities for this work.

The Chair requested that an update on this work be brought to every Panel meeting for the immediate future. Panel Members felt it was important to continue monitoring this work.

The Chair noted that now the funds assigned directly to the Police had been spent it was now time to collect the repurposed funds from Local Authorities and that someone would soon be coming in-post who would be dedicated to S106 work. The PCC stated that having a full-time officer on this work would bring consistency and avoid previous issues.

In response to a question about examples of Planning Authorities willingly looking at S106 categories it was noted that Oadby and Wigston had set an example in how much they had repurposed. The PCC stated that it would be helpful if Panel Members could intervene in their own Councils to stop S106 funding being blocked from the Police. Panel Members stated that Planning Authorities and developers should be broader in thought about how S106 funds could be spent in different ways.

In response to a point raised about cross-county project funding, it was noted that the main challenge with the current S106 funding was it was limited to mitigating the impact of new developments for the local area only and needed to be repurposed to fit current Police needs.

In response to a question, it was noted that the dedicated S106 officer would be employed by the force not the OPCC.

RESOLVED:

1. That the contents of the report be noted
2. That regular updates on S106 funding be brought to the Panel.

11. GENERAL UPDATE ON WORK OF THE OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

The Panel received a report to provide an update on the activities undertaken by the Commissioner, his deputy and OPCC in relation to the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan and the Commissioner's statutory duties covering the period March - June 2023. Also included was a report on People Zones.

The PCC presented the report, it was noted that:

- Several workshops had been held to help voluntary organizations with writing successful funding bids which didn't fall on technical grounds. These workshops had been very well subscribed, therefore further workshops would be held.
- The recently established Ethics and Transparency Panel had begun to

hold regular meetings and were now looking at a wide range of important issues within the Force with an aim to improve public trust.

- The Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) was now chaired by the Chief Constable. However, the OPCC was continuing to attend and administer the LCJB.

Members of the Panel were requested to give their views on the formatting and information included within the report so any changes could be made. Panel Members welcomed the concise information and headline views of the report. It was requested that the report also include data on PCC visits, including the specific location of the visits with a map and how they were initiated. It was noted that a map of visits would be included in the PCCs Annual Report.

There was extended discussion between Panel Members, OPCC Officers, and the PCC on the issue of the Chief Constable chairing the LCJB. The PCC stated that the Chief Constable had suggested that as he was Chair of the National Police Chiefs Council that it would be appropriate for him to Chair the local portfolio as national and local work could be linked together, this had been sounded out with partners within the organisation who had seen the logic for the change. The Chairing arrangements were subject to review, this would involve consulting with the other bodies on the LCJB.

It was noted that the majority of LCJBs across the country were Chaired by PCCs. Concerns were raised that this dual role of Chief Constable and Chair of the LCJB presented a conflict of interest. The PCC stated that this issue had been reviewed when the change was suggested and that no potential conflict of interest was found. It was noted that previously Chief Constables had Chaired LCJBs when there was a more regional structure and that this had only changed with the introduction of PCCs. It was noted that the OPCC still had independent oversight of the data going to the LCJB and that the work of the LCJB was scrutinised at the Corporate Governance Board.

It was noted that national guidance suggested that an amendment would soon be made to give LCJBs a statutory footing and mandate that the PCC acted as Chair. The PCC stated that if that was mandated then the LCJB would comply.

It was noted that the Assistant Chief Constable was the Deputy-Chair of the LCJB, suggesting that this was more just than about the individual regarding Chairing arrangements.

In response to these concerns certain Panel Members spoke in favor of the change noting that national expertise being brought into the LCJB was positive.

An update on People Zones was requested, it was noted that these Zones were put in place in specific areas of high deprivation and high crime rates, representatives from different agencies and groups in the area would be brought together to cooperate to improve the area. Some funding was available as part of this for voluntary groups. There were currently 3 active Zones and these were working well. The next steps were to scale back OPCC support to allow the Zones to be run independently and use the resources to establish

new Zones. Work was now ongoing to identify areas which fit the profile for a Zone. Quantitative data on the impact of these Zones would be reported on in future however a lot of this work was focused on a longer-term impact.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Panel notes the report.
2. That the Panel requests that Members comments be noted by OPCC staff.
3. That the Panel requests that the potential conflict of interest from the Chief Constable Chairing the LCJB be investigated.
4. That the Panel requests that future reporting provide details of the location and reason for PCC visits.

12. DOMESTIC ABUSE PERPETRATOR PROGRAMME HOME OFFICE FUNDING

The Panel received a report to provide an update regarding the Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Programme located at the Jenkins Centre in Leicester, the funding acquired and the internal evaluation of the previous service.

The PCC presented the report, it was noted that all names included in the report were anonymised. This work sought to change the perspective of domestic abuse work to have more of a focus on rehabilitating perpetrators. This work would not be cheap however it was considered to be worth it if it broke the cycle. The City Council provided separate funding to the Jenkins Centre however there was no duplication in the funding.

The Chair expressed disappointment in the delay in receiving funding from the Home Office.

The Chair expressed concerns around the value for money calculation in the report. The concern was that many additional factors were not taken into account such as the impact on wider families and the cost for Local Authorities and Health in dealing with issues related to that impact. The PCC stated that he was willing to consider this however it would be hard to put a definite figure on the costs of some of those factors. In response to this it was noted that there was national evidence of the wider cost benefit of perpetrator services.

It was requested that information be provided into how the OPCC had been working with Commissioners to look into a range of different domestic abuse services.

Clarity over the issue of who was providing match funding was sought. It was requested that details of match funding be provided in future reports.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Panel notes the report.
2. That the Panel requests that the value for money evaluation be

amended to include potential savings from wider factors.

3. That the Panel requests that details be provided as to how the OPCC had been working with Commissioners to look into a range of different domestic abuse services.
4. That the Panel requests that details of match funding be provided and be included in future reports.

13. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE BOARD REPORT

The Panel received a report to provide an update of the Corporate Governance Board and the oversight of Leicestershire Police performance by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and his Office.

The PCC presented the report, it was noted that this was an ongoing process with the PCC and Chief Constable regularly meeting. The Corporate Governance Board was the formal means of doing this work where the Chief Constable could bring reports and the PCC could ask for reports on areas of concern.

In response to questions from Panel Members it was noted that, with regard to figures on burglaries, there had been an issue in Oadby and Wigston, a special operation on this had resulted in several arrests and it was hoped that the issue would now tail off.

It was also noted that in future, reports from all previous meetings would be included in the report. Future reporting would also include follow-ups on actions arising from the meetings.

In response to a question on Transit Camps it was noted that conversations with the Districts were ongoing.

RESOLVED:

That the Panel notes the report.

14. WORK PROGRAMME

It was requested that the slavery report scheduled for October include considerations of asylum seekers including details of Operation Tacit.

It was suggested that the Panel in future consider how the PCC would overview reforms to the Police's approach to mental health.

It was requested that to help new Panel Members, whenever a term was first used that it be used in full with the acronym in brackets, and then referred to with the acronym instead of the acronym being used all the way through with no explanation.

15. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There being no other business the meeting closed at 1.46pm.

