



**POLICE & CRIME
COMMISSIONER**
for Leicester,
Leicestershire & Rutland
Your Communities - Your Commissioner

Police and Crime Panel

24th February 2026

Precept Acceptance Response for 2026/27

Report Date	24 th February 2026
Report Of	Rupert Matthews, Police and Crime Commissioner
Security Classification	Official

Purpose of Report

1. In my role as the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), I am required to secure efficient and effective policing for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and set the budget and precept.
2. I send this report to the Police and Crime Panel noting their support for the revised precept presented on the 12th February and the report sent to me following that meeting.

Request of the Panel

3. The Panel is asked to:
 - 3.1 Note the information presented in this report.

Background.

- 4.1 I notified the Police and Crime Panel (PCP) on the 28th of January 2026 of my Budget Requirement and Council Tax Precept Proposal for 2026/27. This was then considered at their meeting on the 4th February 2026.
- 4.2 Following a full debate regarding the proposed increase, considering both the impact on the residents and communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and the needs for Leicestershire Police to maintain current levels of service, the PCP unanimously resolved to veto an increase of 3.66% (£11).
- 4.3 That veto was passed on the view that the precept position, as set out in my original papers, was too low and should be increased. On the 6th of February 2026, I received the formal veto report from the PCP, requesting me to consider the recommendation to increase the Council Tax Precept Proposal for 2026/27.
- 4.4 The arguments and challenges put forward by the Panel did not lead me to question my original decision-making process. However, I recognised the Panel's role to scrutinise my decision making and represent the views of their relevant organisations and electorates by extension. The Panel made it clear that, despite 31% of the survey respondents indicating they wished for no precept rise, the residents of their communities are willing to pay more.
- 4.5 Therefore, having considered the PCP's veto report and recommendation against the considerations outlined above, I intend to issue my revised Council Tax Precept of £15 for the 2026/27 financial year for a Band D property.
- 4.6 I made this decision under the rationale that:
 - 4.6.1 The Panel have provided their recommendation that the maximum precept be levied.
 - 4.6.2 The increased income closes the Force's remaining deficit position. The remainder of the residual £1.2m is being closed with the increased income from the Council Tax Collection Fund, which I have also allocated to the Temporary Chief Constable.
 - 4.6.3 The balance of the increased income will be put into reserves, increasing the reserves position and making available funding for demand-reducing prevention

activity. This activity will aim to reduce demand to the call centre and also to front line officers and staff.

Supported Precept.

4.7 I was grateful for the Panel's consideration of the new precept proposal and for their unanimous support of it. There were a number of questions and resolutions within their report that the Panel requested that I consider and provide advice. They are as below:

4.8 Request from Panel to recognise the fact that Leicestershire Police continue to be one of the lowest funded Forces in the Country.

4.8.1 I am in complete agreement and will continue to campaign central government for a police funding reform that benefits the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

4.9 Request from Panel to recognise their concern from the Panel about the reserves remaining in balance at the end of the PCC's term in May 2028 (when the position of PCC is due to be abolished).

4.9.1 We are not yet in a position to be able to comment on any transfer arrangements in relation to the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner. When that detail is known, I will ensure there is robust decision making around location of funds, where we have the freedom to do so.

4.10 Request from Panel to provide the calculation methodology for the weighted average detailed within my last report that had not been included.

4.10.1 The calculation we have used is to multiply the proportion of the response options by the value of the annual increase of a Band D property, then added all these values together - we are able to use this method as our sum adds up to one whole (i.e 100%).

4.10.2 (proportion (%) column 4 x £value of increase indicated column 3) + (proportion (%) column 4 x £value of increase indicated column 3) + (proportion (%) column 4 x £value of increase indicated column 3) = weighted average.

4.10.3 More simply – Sum (Column 4*Column 3 for each option) = weighted average

4.10.4 The actual calculations are shown in the table below;

Increase Option	Number of respondents	Increase per year (Band D)	Proportion	Weighted Average
No increase	465	0	31%	0.00
Option 1	558	15.6	38%	5.89
Option 2	260	14	18%	2.46
Option 3	57	12.61	4%	0.49
Option 4	137	11.41	9%	1.06
	1477		100%	9.90

4.11 Request from Panel that the position towards partnership funding for community safety and youth justice should be clarified.

4.11.1 I welcome the panels commitment to crime prevention; I share their view that funding should be allocated to activity that aims to cut crime and reduce demand on Leicestershire Police. That is why I have asked that Community Safety Partnerships

(CSPs) now focus their grant allocation on evidence-based problem profiles, bespoke to their area.

4.11.2 Now the budget has been set I can confirm that the funding allocations for Community Safety Partnerships have been set at the same level as last year.

4.11.3 Statutory contributions to the City and County Youth Justice Management Boards will remain at the same level as last year. Discretionary funding for youth justice, from the Integrated Offender Management Fund, will cease following a review of IOM. Leicestershire Police will continue to second officers to the Youth Justice teams.

4.11.4 It is worth noting, at this stage, that funding allocated from the PCC to Community Safety Partnerships for crime prevention initiatives is not provided everywhere. In many areas of England CSPs operate with no funding from their PCC. I will be asking CSPs to start thinking about sustainability of their programmes given the abolition of PCCs in 2028 and the uncertainty that brings for their funding.

4.12 Request from Panel that the PCC reconsider the proposed Crime Prevention Fund, with a view to directing £1.2m from the Commissioning reserve and £2.5m from the Budget Equalisation reserve towards policing and established prevention partnerships.

4.12.1 As the Temporary Chief Constable has informed the Panel, demand on Leicestershire Police continues to increase. I intend to commission services, over the next two years, that are aimed at reducing that demand, mainly through reducing calls to service.

4.12.2 I will be looking at the evidence, not just from Leicestershire, but also nationally, as to what works where. It is based on that information that decisions about investment will be made.

4.12.3 I will, in due course, bring information and data on that decision making to the Panel for scrutiny.

4.13 Request from the Panel that the future risks, challenges, uncertainties, and opportunities included in the precept proposal, together with the financial and operational considerations identified be noted.

4.13.1 I drew attention to exactly this in my report to Panel on the 4th February. There are huge uncertainties for the future. I am pleased that the Temporary Chief Constable has already launched a proactive approach for 2026 and beyond, given the level of deficit that it looks like we will be facing. I will be discussing with him, throughout this year, what a new operating model for Leicestershire Police looks like and why that is the right model for the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

Additional Queries.

4.14 Since the meeting there have been two additional questions received from the Panel:

4.15 Can the PCC confirm that the revised budget position means that partnerships, such as community safety and youth justice, retain their funding and are able to make decisions about preventative activity, crime reduction and offender management?

4.15.1 I believe this question has been answered in part in paragraph 4.11 and the sub bullets above. Offender management is a statutory deliverable of Leicestershire Police and remains under the operational control of the Temporary Chief Constable. It is however delivered from within the Prevention Directorate and is covered in our Joint Prevention Strategy, funding for that directorate has been allocated.

4.16 Can the Commissioner confirm that every penny of the increased Precept (+£4.00) will be allocated wholly to the Police Force?

4.16.1 I believe this was answered in my report of the 12th February: Precept Reconsideration Report for 2026/27. At paragraph 6.5. For the Panel's ease I have quoted below:

6.5 I make this decision under the rationale that:

6.5.1 The Panel have provided their recommendation that the maximum precept be levied.

6.5.2 The increased income closes the Force's remaining deficit position. The remainder of the residual £1.2m is being closed with the increased income from the Council Tax Collection Fund, which I have also allocated to the Temporary Chief Constable.

6.5.3 The balance of the increased income will be put into reserves, increasing the reserves position and making available funding for demand-reducing prevention activity. This activity will aim to reduce demand to the call centre and also to front line officers and staff.

Final Remarks

4.17 I note that the Panel have chosen to unanimously support the increased precept. I stand by my intention to minimise the impact of any council tax rises for our communities, many of which are already struggling.

4.18 Going to the maximum precept rise should never be automatically levied and I will only propose a maximum rise where I feel I have the evidence and the rationale to do so. I will continue to take that approach, and a new decision on precept amount, every year until I am no longer in office.

4.19 I look forward to working with the Temporary Chief Constable this year to ensure that we have another robust budget setting process for 2026/27.

4.20 I believe that as the Government continues to centralise policing powers, potentially disrupting or even abolishing regional forces such as Leicestershire Police; while failing to update a funding formula that clearly penalises Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, it is disproportionate and unfair to expect local taxpayers to foot the bill for these changes.

4.21 Local residents should not be asked to pay more while losing local services as Whitehall restructures policing from the centre. I feel that the Panel's argument that "all tax is local tax" avoids the real issue. The purpose of central government funding is to ensure fairness across the country and to share costs equitably.

4.22 It cannot be right that our residents are asked to pay more while their local police force is weakened or taken away altogether. Local taxpayers have already faced steep increases. Continuing to raise their burden while stripping away local accountability and services is unacceptable.

- 4.23 I will continue working to oppose these proposals and to secure a fairer funding formula for our area.