



Meeting: Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel

Date/Time: Monday, 9 June 2014 at 2.00 pm

Location: Framland Committee Room, County Hall

Contact: Sam Weston (Tel: 0116 305 6226)

Email: sam.weston@leics.gov.uk

Membership

Cllr. R. B. Begy	Cllr. Trevor Pendleton
Cllr. David Bill MBE	Cllr. Byron Rhodes
Cllr. J. Boyce	Cllr. Sarah Russell
Cllr. A. V. Greenwood MBE	Cllr. Lynn Senior
Miss. H. Kynaston	Cllr. D. Slater
Cllr. William Liquorish	Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE
Col. R. Martin OBE, DL	Cllr. Paul Westley
Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC	

AGENDA

Item

Report by

1. Election of Chairman.

A Chairman will be elected for the period up to June 2015.

2. Election of Vice-Chairman.

A Vice-Chairman will be elected for the period up to June 2015.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2014.

(Pages 3 - 8)

4. To advise of any other items which the Chairman has decided to take as urgent elsewhere on the agenda.



5. Declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda.

6. Section 106/Lubbesthorpe. (Pages 9 - 32)

A copy of the Judicial Review high court judgement is attached for the consideration of members of the Panel.

7. Police and Crime Commissioner's Annual Report 2013/14.	Police and Crime Commissioner	(Pages 33 - 114)
8. Commissioning.	Police and Crime Commissioner	(Pages 115 - 146)
9. Performance Reporting Framework 2014/15.	Police and Crime Commissioner	(Pages 147 - 164)

10. Date of next meeting.

The next meeting of the Panel is scheduled to take place on 29 September at 2.00pm.

11. Any other items which the Chairman has decided to take as urgent.

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Monday, 17 March 2014.

PRESENT

Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC (in the Chair)

Cllr. David Bill MBE
 Cllr. J. Boyce
 Cllr. A. V. Greenwood MBE
 Miss. H. Kynaston
 Cllr. William Liquorish
 Col. R. Martin OBE, DL

Cllr. Trevor Pendleton
 Cllr. Byron Rhodes
 Cllr. Sarah Russell
 Cllr. Lynn Senior
 Cllr. D. Slater
 Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE

Apologies

Cllr. R. B. Begy and Cllr. Paul Westley

In attendance

Sir Clive Loader, Police and Crime Commissioner, Simon Cole, Chief Constable, Paul Stock, Chief Executive and Helen King, Chief Finance Officer

52. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 January were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

53. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

54. Declarations of Interest.

The Chairman invited members who wished to do so to declare any interest in respect of items on the agenda for the meeting.

No declarations were made.

55. Change to the Order of Business.

The Chairman sought and obtained the consent of the Panel to vary the order of business from that set out in the agenda.

56. Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Chairman read out the following statement in relation to this item:

“This is a matter of very serious concern to all of the authorities represented on this Panel and taxpayers and should properly be the subject of debate here. However, given that there are legal proceedings which are ongoing and, having taken advice from the County Solicitor, it is clear that in the present circumstances it would be difficult for the Panel to

have an informed discussion. I am therefore of the view that this item should be deferred for discussion at a later meeting of the Panel when it will be possible for a full debate to take place. That debate should include consideration of all of the implication of this case, including economic development and employment opportunities and working in partnership.”

RESOLVED:

That the item be deferred to a future meeting of the Panel.

57. PCC Question Procedure.

The Panel considered a report of the County Solicitor seeking its views as to whether a public questions procedure should be adopted at meetings of the Panel. A copy of the report, marked “Agenda Item 4”, is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the item, the Chairman referred to correspondence he had received from Col. Robert Martin recommending two changes to the Procedure, as follows:

- Questions should be allowed from members of the public at any time;
- In order to encourage questions from those members of the public without access to the internet, questions should be accepted by post.

Arising from a debate on the questions procedure, the following points were noted:

- It was felt that questions submitted were likely to fall into one of two categories: questions of a “general” nature - which were less likely to be time sensitive and questions of an “urgent” nature relating to items of business on the Panel agenda. Some felt that it would be worth having different time restrictions for submission to the Secretariat for each category. A suggestion was made for “general” questions to be submitted no less than 15 working days prior to the next Panel meeting and “urgent” agenda-related questions to be submitted no less than 3 working days prior to the meeting;
- There was support for allowing members of the public to address the Panel directly, however it was felt appropriate for the Panel to take “ownership” of the questions to be asked of the PCC. Questions would be allocated to the elected members of the Panel, if appropriate, on the basis of the area they represent;
- It would be important that, as part of any work to publicise the launch of a public questions procedure, public expectation was managed by making the key principles of the procedure clear;
- The Office for the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) already received many enquiries in relation to the Police and Crime Commissioner’s (PCC’s) role and attended a number of public sessions at which the public were encouraged to engage with him. It would be important to publicise these avenues as well as the Panel’s Public Question Procedure;
- A suggestion was made for the Panel to consider a six monthly report on the questions that had been submitted and their nature;

- The PCC welcomed the opportunity to engage the public in his and the Panel's work. Though the intention was to filter questions relating to operational policing matters to the Office of the Chief Constable, the PCC asked that he also be made aware of their nature in order that he could keep abreast of the sorts of issues raised by the public.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to amendment in light of the comments now made, the Procedure for Questions to be submitted to the Panel from members of the public be approved for further consultation with the OPCC.

58. Performance Report to 31 January 2014.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning an overview of the performance of Leicestershire Police towards achieving strategic priorities in the Police and Crime Plan. The report was deferred from the previous meeting of the Panel. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 6", is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the report, the Chief Constable reported that an audit programme of its data was due in May to be tested by Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Constabularies (HMIC). It was suggested that the Panel might be interested in the outcome of this work.

Arising from questions of the panel, the following points were noted:

- The performance figures presented were tied to the financial year though it was recognised that the performance figures for November 2012 onwards (the election of the PCC) would be more helpful to assess how the PCC and the Force were performing;
- The PCC stressed the importance of the commissioning work he was currently engaged in, which would hopefully address some of the rising crime figures and the Force's budget shortfall. It was expected that the Force would lose around 250-300 frontline officers in the coming years;
- Officers were engaged in cross-border work to tackle the rising rate of burglaries. It was noted that it was sometimes the case that these types of criminal targeted houses over a wide area in order to evade detection;
- It was questioned whether the overall crime reduction target of 5% was ever likely to be achievable, given the trends of rising crime across the country. It was stated that the 5% target was set by the HMIC;
- It was felt that it would be useful for the Panel to see some of the trends coming from the Force's peers in the Most Similar Group (MSG) however; Leicestershire had been put in an MSG with Forces to the south of the country. Whilst the Midlands and the North were areas of the country which were experiencing the highest rises in crime. It was felt that further data around the trends of the MSG would be helpful for the Panel to see in future as well as data on police satisfaction levels. The PCC had set a broad target around achieving the average crime rate of the MSG on an annual basis. One suggestion was made for comparative data in

relation to “stop and search”;

- Theft from vehicles, such as theft of catalytic converters and number plates, was a priority issue as part of efforts to tackle rural crime;
- The demography of the City was more complex than the County. It was felt that it would be helpful to have crime data broken down in future by Local Police Unit.

RESOLVED:

That the report and comments made be noted.

59. Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Bill.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Leicestershire County Council concerning an overview of aspects of the Anti-Social Behaviour and Policing Bill (ASB Bill) that may be of relevance to the PCC and broader overview of the ASB Bill. A copy of the report, marked “Agenda Item 7”, is filed with these minutes.

It was noted that the “Community Remedy” power which would sit with the PCC represented a good opportunity to simplify the tools available to deal with minor ASB issues. It would be necessary to seek the views of the voluntary sector as part of the consultation process on the changes put forward. It was felt that this issue would be of particular interest to the Community Safety Partnerships.

RESOLVED:

That the report and comments made be noted.

60. Victims and Witnesses - Police and Crime Plan Thematic Update.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning an overview of the work undertaken and planned in respect of the Victims and Witnesses theme of the Police and Crime Plan. A copy of the report, marked “Agenda Item 8”, is filed with these minutes.

The Chief Executive reported that a small team had been assembled within the OPCC in order to progress this area of work. Confirmation had been received from the Home Office that the funding for this work from 2013/14 could be carried forward into 2014/15.

- The Ministry of Justice wanted commissioners to improve the offer to victims and witnesses and remove what it saw as a “postcode lottery”. It was hoped that this would enable a more consistent offer across the country;
- Funding would continue to be allocated to Victim Support up to April 2015 in order that it could continue to provide victim support services. A full review would be taking place of the offer by a range of other agencies in order to consider how best in future to offer these services.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

61. Date of next meeting.

It was NOTED that the next meeting of the Panel would be held on 9 June at 2.00pm.

2.00 - 5.15 pm
17 March 2014

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank



Neutral Citation Number: [2014] EWHC 1719 (Admin)

Case No: CO/831/2014

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION
ADMINISTRATIVE COURT IN BIRMINGHAM

Birmingham Civil Justice Centre
Priory Courts
Birmingham

Date: 27/05/2014

Before :

MR JUSTICE FOSKETT

Between :

**The Queen (on the application of The Police and
 Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire)**

Claimant

- and -

Blaby District Council

Defendant

-and-

- (1) Hallam Land Management Limited**
- (2) David Wilson Homes Limited**
- (3) Davidsons Developments Limited**
- (4) BDW Trading Limited**
- (5) Leicestershire County Council**
- (6) Martin Frank Spokes**
- (7) Richard Thomas Spokes**
- (8) Helen Joans Jones**
- (9) Frances Alison Mark Hicks**
- (10) The Trustees of the Will Trusts of Eric
 Roderick Brook Drummond**

**Interested
 Parties**

**Jenny Wigley and Thea Osmund-Smith (instructed by East Midlands Police Legal Services)
 for the Claimant**

David Elvin QC (instructed by **Marrons Shakespeare LLP**) for the **Defendant**
Charles Banner (instructed by **King Wood & Mallesons SJ Berwin LLP**) for **Interested**
Parties 1-4 & 10

Alex Goodman (instructed by **Legal Services of Leicestershire County Council**) for
Interested Party (5)

Hearing date: 21 May 2014

Approved Judgment

Mr Justice Foskett:**Introduction**

1. This case concerns a substantial development called the “New Lubbesthorpe” scheme to the south west of Leicester for which the Defendant, as local planning authority for the district, resolved on 1 November 2012 to grant planning permission subject to certain conditions and to the conclusion of a suitable agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (“the 1990 Act”) between certain parties.
2. The section 106 agreement was concluded on 13 January 2014 and outline planning permission was granted on 14 January 2014.
3. The Claimant’s Claim Form seeking judicial review of the grant of planning permission was issued on 24 February 2014. The focus of the proposed challenge is upon the effect and implications of the section 106 agreement so far as the Claimant is concerned. The section 106 agreement provides for its own termination if the planning permission is quashed (see paragraph 17.7 of the agreement).
4. On 21 March 2014 Hickinbottom J ordered that the application for permission to apply for judicial review be heard on 21 May 2014 on a “rolled-up” basis and gave various directions. On 16 April he gave the Claimant permission to amend his grounds. He was of the view that the resolution of the claim required expedition. The urgency arises because the funding of £5 million from the Department of Transport (derived from what are known as “Pinch Point monies” under the Department’s scheme to assist funding highways infrastructure) for the M1 motorway bridge required to implement the scheme may be at risk if not spent before 31 March 2015. Plans are already in place for the temporary closure of the M1 on Christmas Day 2014 to lower the main bridge span into place (see paragraphs 6 and 7 below).
5. The hearing did indeed take place on 21 May and all Counsel completed their submissions within the day.
6. Because of the urgency, this judgment has been prepared in a little over 24 hours after the conclusion of the hearing, is inevitably shorter than might otherwise have been the case and has not received the refinement it might have received if there had been longer to prepare it. Inevitably, I have had to focus on those aspects of the argument that, in my view, represent the strongest grounds for claiming the relief sought rather than dealing with all matters raised.

The nature of the development

7. The outline planning application submitted in February 2011 was for -

“... 4,250 dwellings, a mixed use district centre and two mixed use local centres featuring a supermarket, retail, commercial, employment, leisure, health, community and residential uses, non-residential institutions including a secondary school, primary schools and nurseries, an employment site of 21 hectares, open spaces, woodlands, new access points and associated facilities and infrastructure, and detailed proposals

for two new road bridges over the M1 motorway and M69 motorway, and two road access points from Beggars Lane and new accesses from Meridian Way, Chapel Green/Baines Lane and Leicester Lane.”

8. The site for the development is open and undeveloped land stretching over 394 hectares and is separated from Leicester by the M1 motorway. This explains the need for one of the two road bridges referred to in the outline application and to which reference was made in paragraph 4 above. The bridge is undoubtedly a key component in making this development possible.
9. According to the witness statement dated 13 March 2014 of Ms Lynne Stinson, a Project Manager within the Environment and Transport Department of the 5th Interested Party (Leicestershire County Council), the development will generate £159 million of investment in new infrastructure, buildings and new parks and other open spaces and approximately 1530 full-time equivalent jobs. It will, according to her statement, provide a significant proportion of the new housing identified in the Defendant’s Core Strategy (as amended) as needed in the district in the period to 2029.
10. Whether those claims are justified is not a matter for the court, but the fact that they are made in those terms indicates the scale of the proposed development. The aerial photographs demonstrate the substantial area of land involved and Miss Jenny Wigley, who appeared with Miss Thea Osmund-Smith for the Claimant, described the development as a “new town” which seems an appropriate description. It will take many years to complete if it proceeds. The identities of some of the Interested Parties will give an indication of the commercial interests at stake.

The concerns of the Claimant

11. It is obvious that a development of the nature described would place additional and increased burdens on local health, education and other services including the police force. The focus of this case is upon the effect upon the local police force. If it sought to shoulder those additional and increased burdens without the necessary equipment (including vehicles and radio transmitters/receivers for emergency communications) and premises, it would plainly not be in the public interest and would not be consistent with a policy that encourages “sustainable development”: see, for example, paragraphs 17 of 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”). It is that that leads to the Claimant’s interest in these matters.
12. Needless to say, the Claimant does not challenge the principle of the proposed development, nor is the potential amount of the provision of funding for police services by the developers in issue, but the concerns that have led to this application derive from what Miss Wigley submits is (i) an alleged inadequate provision of certain aspects of such funding at appropriate times during the course of the development and (ii) a lack of a clear commitment in the section 106 agreement (to which the Claimant is not a party) that anything will in fact be paid by the developers for premises required by the police in order to serve the community created by the development.

13. The need to provide funding for police resources had, of course, been identified during the discussions leading to the grant of planning permission and, as I have indicated, agreement was reached on the amount that would be required and met by the developers. However, the Claimant contends that there were procedural deficiencies in the final stages of that process that left the police out of the relevant negotiations and ought to lead to the planning permission being quashed or that the result, so far as the funding of police resources is concerned, was irrational and should, accordingly, be quashed on that basis also. The focus, as I have said, is on when certain features of the funding should, in effect, come on-stream during the development and whether there is a sufficiently clear commitment as to funding for police premises.
14. When the resolution for the grant of planning permission was passed on 1 November 2012, the resolution contained the following provision:
- “That planning application 11/0100/1/OX be referred to the Secretary of State as a departure under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009 as the application proposal is a departure to the Blaby District Local Plan (1999).
- That consequent upon the Secretary of State deciding not to intervene planning permission be granted subject to:
- The applicants entering into an agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the following:
- ...
- All CIL compliant capital infrastructures for Policing necessitated by the development and including officer equipment, communications, CCTV, vehicles and premises, the precise terms of this contribution to be settled by further negotiation.”
15. The reference to “CIL compliant capital infrastructures” related to the funding of police requirements through a planning obligation under section 106 of the 1990 Act, which in order to be “CIL compliant” must meet the tests specified in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL') Regulations 2010. Those tests require that the sums are –
- “(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.”
16. The relevance of the CIL tests will be apparent in due course.

17. The parties to the section 106 agreement concluded on 13 January 2014 were the Defendant, the County Council (the highway and education authority for the area), the Second, Fourth and Sixth-Tenth Interested Parties (collectively known as “the owner”) and the First and Third Interested Parties (the beneficiaries of certain charges and options for the site). The agreement runs to over 170 pages including appendices and contains extremely detailed provisions concerning the way in which the development would proceed.
18. The provision that has given rise to the concerns of the Claimant is at paragraph 2 of Schedule 3 to the Agreement which reads as follows:
- “2.1 The Owner shall pay to the District Council the Police Service Equipment Contribution no later than Occupation of 2,600 Dwellings and shall not Occupy more than 2,600 Dwellings until it has paid the Police Service Equipment Contribution to the District Council.
- 2.2 (Subject to the Owner and the District Council at that time agreeing or it having been determined in accordance with clause 23 that the contribution is necessary and if so its appropriate level having regard to the progress of the Development and the availability of Police Service facilities within the area and the appropriate relevant policy guidance at the time) the Owner shall pay the Police Service Premises Contribution to the District Council no later than the Occupation of 3,750 Dwellings and shall not Occupy more than 3,750 Dwellings until it has paid the Police Service Premises Contribution.”
19. The Police Service Equipment Contribution referred to in paragraph 2.1 is defined elsewhere in the agreement as “the sum of £536,834 towards police equipment” and the Police Service Premises Contribution referred to in paragraph 2.2 is defined as “a sum not to exceed £1,089,660 towards the acquisition of premises or extension to existing premises such sum to be ascertained in accordance with [paragraph 2.2] of the Third Schedule. Those sums are, of course, to be paid by the “owner” (in effect, the developers) to the Defendant which would then be responsible for paying them over to the Claimant. Reference to Clause 23 is to a provision entitled “Dispute Provisions” that provide for reference to an independent expert in the event of disputes arising under the agreement. That procedure would, of course, only be available to a party to the agreement which the Claimant was not. It should also be noted that the possibility of the police (or any other non-party) relying on the Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999 was excluded by clause 17.2 of the agreement.
20. Whilst the figures referred to in relation to equipment and premises costs did reflect figures that had been discussed and agreed between the Claimant and the Defendant, the terms of paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 as to the circumstances in which those sums would be paid had not been the subject of express agreement and, the Claimant would argue, resulted from an inadequate process of engagement by the Defendant with the issues affecting the services that the Claimant would be required to provide and led to provisions that are irrational.

21. So far as the Police Service Equipment Contribution is concerned, Miss Wigley contends that it is irrational that it should be paid only when 2,600 homes are occupied because the contribution sought and agreed was calculated on the basis of 4,250 homes being constructed (each of which would contribute rateably to costs of the additional demand on policing infrastructure) and yet 2,600 homes would have to be policed without any additional resources to do so before the payment was received. There would be several thousand residents *in situ* before the police received any contribution towards the equipment recognized as necessary to fulfill its tasks. In her Skeleton Argument she asserts that an analogous position in the education sphere would be asking hundreds of pupils generated by the development to wait a decade before providing them with somewhere to study.
22. In relation to the Police Service Premises Contribution, which is required to provide accommodation for the additional staff said to be required to deal with the policing issues of the development, the trigger provided in the agreement, subject to the terms set out in parentheses at the beginning of paragraph 2.2, is that it may be necessary to await the construction and occupation of 3,750 homes before any prospect of payment materializes. Miss Wigley submits that it cannot rationally be suggested that over £1 million towards additional police premises should be paid by the developers only when the final 500 homes in the development remain to be constructed. She says that an element of need for such services arises from the occupation of the first home, if not before, and she also raises the spectre of the real possibility that at that stage in the development no further homes will be built, the result being that the developers will avoid a liability to contribute to policing costs that will have been required from a much earlier stage and which the police, in order to fulfill their public role, will have to have met from other sources prior thereto. She also submits that the prefatory words in parentheses at the beginning of paragraph 2.2 mean (a) that the payment of any sum is contingent on agreement as to its necessity between the owner (as defined: see paragraph 17 above) and the Defendant and (b) that the level of any payment, even if agreed in principle, is uncertain and would be capped at the figure specified. In terms of the financing of premises pending receipt of such sum as may be paid under this provision, she says in view of the uncertainties that there would be no realistic prospect of borrowing against the commitment provided by the section 106 agreement.
23. She contrasts the provisions of the section 106 agreement relating to the police with the health care provision that affords an absolute commitment to pay the first of two sums agreed as necessary to expand an existing health centre on the occupation of no more than 150 houses and the second on the occupation of no more than 250 houses. Equally, funds for an onsite health centre are to be released on the occupation of 900 houses.
24. Those submissions are made by way of comment on the terms of paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 as they stand. I will return to those submissions after dealing with the history that led to their formulation in those terms. That history is of importance to the way it is contended that public law grounds exist for the court to interfere in the way Miss Wigley submits is appropriate.

The background to the terms of the section 106 agreement affecting the police

25. It is first necessary to re-trace steps briefly to the resolution passed on 1 November 2012 (see paragraph 14 above).
26. As indicated above, this development proposal had been in gestation for a number of years before the resolution was passed. The police were involved in the negotiations prior thereto. The background from the perspectives of the parties involved is set out in the various witness statements and I need not deal with that background in detail. During the period of two years or so prior to November 2012 the view was taken by those representing the development interests in the site (and supported, at least to some extent, by the Defendant) that the sums sought by the police to be included as sums for which the developers should be liable were not CIL compliant (see paragraph 15 above). Sums in excess of £3 million were being sought. It seems that the view of the developers was that “an on-site police facility within the local community building would be more appropriate, relevant and beneficial to future residents” than what the police had in mind that stage. I need not go into details for present purposes, but that position obtained throughout 2012 and was reflected in the viability report prepared by DTZ on 20 September 2012 which was submitted as evidence to the Examination in Public session on 10 October 2012. It contained no allowance for contributions to police funding, but merely contained reference to the provision of community buildings on site to include a police presence.
27. In the run up to the planning committee meeting on 1 November 2012 there was something of an impasse, the Claimant maintaining the position that something over £3 million was required as the police contribution and the developers and the Defendant maintaining the position that this was excessive and not CIL compliant. Against that background the Claimant maintained an objection to any resolution in favour of the grant of planning permission. That impasse was resolved on the day of the meeting in a flurry of e-mails between the Claimant’s Finance Director and the Deputy Chief Executive of the Defendant in which the formula that became reflected in the resolution (the material parts of which are set out in paragraph 14 above) was agreed. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Defendant acknowledged that the intention behind the words was that “this is all up for negotiation in the future”.
28. That then is how matters were resolved at that stage. There was then a period during which it was necessary for the application to be considered by the Secretary of State. Discussions between the various parties were not actively renewed until the Secretary of State had indicated that he did not intend to call in the application. By the time that further discussions commenced in about March/April 2013, the potential of Pinch Point funding for the M1 bridge was “on the cards” and an application for such funding had been submitted to the Department of Transport.
29. On 10 April 2013 Mr Andrew Senior, the Lubbethorpe project manager for the Defendant, told Mr Michael Lambert, the Growth and Design Officer employed by the Claimant, that “viability work” was continuing and that it would “inform the section 106 negotiations especially levels of affordable housing.” He told him that the section 106 agreement was being negotiated and that the level of affordable housing had been changed from that originally contemplated. He referred to the bid for Pinch Point funding and said that, if successful, it would “free up the developers’ funds” and help to deliver, amongst other things, the early completion of the “east-west spine road”. It is clear that there remained differences about the police funding. By an e-mail of 22 August 2013, following a meeting a few days earlier, Mr Senior offered

some thoughts on how the Claimant might set out its case for a police contribution. It reflected on the approach to deciding on the level of policing necessary and how the appropriate infrastructure was identified, particularly how it would “relate directly” to the development (cf. CIL requirement (b)). He cited as an example the issue of a police car that would spend some time at the development site and some time elsewhere and raised the question of apportionment. It was plainly designed to be (and I am sure was taken as) a helpful contribution to the discussions.

30. The e-mail contained this paragraph to which Mr David Elvin QC, for the Defendant, drew attention as part of his response to the Claimant’s arguments:

“The final element would be how any contribution was to be phased, for smaller developments this would not be much of an issue, given that Lubbethorpe would potentially have a 20 year delivery time the phasing of contributions would need to be established. I would suggest this was done, as with other services, on the basis of thresholds which identify when any existing capacity is used to trigger the extra resources, clearly once a trigger is reached a range of infrastructure would be required. There would be a range of triggers across the period of the building.”

31. Mr Lambert responded to that in a lengthy e-mail of 4 September 2013. I need not quote it all, but Miss Wigley referred to the following paragraph:

“**Viability.** We need to be guided by you on this however we remain concerned that policing attracts fair and reasonable consideration on a par with other services if the development cannot afford the infrastructure it will need. We have heard about your successes in attracting growth funds for road infrastructure and welcome these. We need to see please how this will reduce pressure on other necessary infrastructures and so we again ask for an up to date overview of this particularly if decisions have to be made about what will be delivered in relation to policing and other necessary infrastructures.”

32. Mr Senior acknowledged receipt of the lengthy e-mail and commented that the approach was “sound” but emphasised that his comments should not be taken to imply the support of the Defendant for any particular bid. Mr Lambert shortly afterwards asked for Mr Senior’s “guidance on viability” given the external funding for the road that was then on offer. Mr Senior’s reply was that it had not to-date been the claim of the applicants that “overall the scheme is unviable”, but he drew attention to the fact that they had pointed out that there is “a cost of up front infrastructure to be delivered which affects cash flow especially in Phase 1.” He said that over the life of the scheme “the additional funding will improve the overall viability of the scheme” and suggested that the Claimant prepare its bid and the issue of viability could be addressed if it was raised in due course.
33. Mr Lambert had been working up a new bid which was sent to the Defendant by means of a letter under cover of an e-mail of 27 September. I need not try to summarise it save to say that the total sum sought was just over £1.79 million, a

substantial reduction from the original bid. Notwithstanding that, Mr Senior challenged a number of the items comprising the list constituting the bid as not being CIL compliant. One such element was the element for “additional premises” which, he argued, had not been “fully justified”, but may be “capable of being supported” as the development proceeds. He suggested a review formula that would include discussions between the developers, the Defendant and the Claimant.

34. Mr Lambert responded to that in detail by an e-mail of 15 October 2013. Again, I need not deal with that in detail, but the paragraph dealing with the proposed review clause should be noted:

“We accept the need for review clauses but this cannot be to the extent that there is no commitment or quantum at the outset when [planning permission] is issued and we cannot accept that the owner or the [the local planning authority] will be determining what we need. Neither are responsible for delivering policing. We are, and know what we need. You are supposed to be planning at outline not putting it off. Imagine the response if this was the review mechanism for schools or health or anything else i.e. wait till schools are overcrowded or people can't access health to provide premises essential for delivery. That is not the approach of [the National Planning Policy Framework].”

35. A meeting took place on 23 October, attended *inter alia*, by Mr Rob Back, the Planning and Economic Development Group Manager of the Defendant. He wrote to Mr Lambert on 24 October in which he acknowledged that some of the items sought were now accepted as meeting the CIL tests, but still maintaining that some did not, or were not sufficiently evidenced for that purpose. The letter contained this paragraph towards its conclusion:

“You have also explained that the police would be happy to work with the developer to agree a phased contribution to the costs above in line with the rate of development on the site. This approach could be significant to assisting the developers cash flow and we will explore this with them in more detail. We would be grateful if you could confirm that this approach may be appropriate to all elements of the police infrastructure related to the site.”

36. Mr Lambert replied by letter of 28 October acknowledging that he appreciated that the Defendant was attempting to conclude the section 106 Agreement as soon as possible and that there was “a sense of urgency”. The paragraph dealing with the possible phasing of the police contribution reads as follows:

“There are two elements to phasing. First what we will need and when, and we have looked at this before for you. Indeed what I attach in relation to vehicles demonstrates this to an extent. As I said at our meeting we need to sit down and work through this. Second our willingness and goodwill to borrow against the Section 106 contract. The latter depends on the

contractual commitment, which we have asked for and haven't seen, and our goodwill. Our goodwill erodes the more our fully justified request is dismissed and changes offered without good reason."

37. There was a meeting on 31 October attended by Mr Back and others from the Defendant and Mr Lambert and the Finance Officer of the Claimant. Mr Back refers to it in his witness statement, but Mr Lambert does not. Mr Back says this about what was said:

"... we confirmed that the ... developers consortium was not claiming that the development was financially unviable and that the role of financial appraisal in relation to [the development] was limited to phasing and deliverability. In response it was explained by Mr Lambert that the police had the ability to borrow against a Section 106 obligation in order to enable the timely delivery of infrastructure."

38. The following day (1 November) Mr Senior sent an e-mail to Mr Lambert summarising the items that the Defendant considered should be included in the section 106 Agreement in relation to police funding. In fact a good deal of the bid previously made (see paragraph 33 above) was agreed, including the additional premises contribution in the sum previously claimed. There were some reductions in the bids for start up equipment, vehicles and Automatic Number Plate Recognition, but the list was as follows:

"Items for inclusion in the agreement

Start-up equipment	£71,388
Vehicles 3 off	£47,415
Additional radio transmitter	£350,000
Additional radio call capacity	£7,650
PND additions	£4,887
Additional call handling	£10,115
ANPR 4 off	£32,888
Mobile CCTV	£4,500
Hub equipment	£8,000
Total	£536,843

Trigger points for these items need to be agreed, usually based on number of occupations.”

39. That list was on a document attached to the e-mail and the balance of the document, which related to the premises element of the police contribution, read as follows:

“Extensions to existing premises to a maximum of £1,089,660

A review of the need for extensions to existing premises at the commencement of Phase 3 (or other agreed trigger point)

Agreed funds to be paid in the following stages

10% within 2 weeks of notice from the police confirming that are proceedings with extensions

10% within 2 weeks of agreed design stage

40% within 2 weeks of the issue of tender for the construction contract

40% within 3 months of commencement of construction.”

40. Mr Senior said that he had “included trigger points which you may wish to amend, but not for the equipment which I will need you to supply.”

41. Mr Lambert replied to this e-mail on 7 November 2013 stating the following at the outset:

“The main issue for us in this is the lack of developer commitment to premises I am afraid what is proposed virtually removes the covenant as far as our premises are concerned and having successfully made the case for this to your satisfaction, i.e. that what we seek will be necessary when this development is built, we can’t then move away from this and come back to the developer at future points to make the case afresh.”

42. The e-mail continued with various suggestions based upon the premise that the developers commit to funding part of what the police needed as a covenant in the section 106 agreement and the review mechanism to apply to the rest. The suggestion, on this basis, was that the Claimant would build to accommodate 14 staff to serve the development and would “aim to start the project at the 1200 trigger”.

43. This e-mail was forwarded by Mr Senior to Mr Paul Burton, a Director of the 1st Interested Party, on 11 November who replied in the following terms:

“We discussed on Friday the terms you believe to have some weight under the CIL requirements. We reached agreement on those contributions following our discussion about the payment timing and the review of the premises. It appears that this compromise to move matters forward is not being accepted by

Michael Lambert and there may still be a risk of him JR proceedings.

As you know, my view and the view of the other consortium members is that these requests are unreasonable and I find it amazing that the Lubbesthorpe scheme will generate the need for 14 staff. I would like to discuss tomorrow the possibility of the Police continuing to argue their case, potentially to the courts and whether we can secure an agreement from them that if they accept your proposals that they will agree to not to take the point any further. If not, I am not sure there is much advantage to the consortium to accept terms that they wholeheartedly disagree with. Something to discuss tomorrow with the solicitors.”

44. That e-mail referred to a meeting that had been held on 8 November and one to be held the following day which Mr Burton attended with a good number of others, including Mr Senior and Mr Back of the Defendant, at which the outstanding issues concerning the section 106 agreement were discussed and resolved.
45. I think I should record what each of those who attended says about those meetings because it would appear that it was the combined effect of those meetings that constituted the “decision” about the section 106 agreement that underlies the Claimant’s challenge in these proceedings.
46. Mr Senior said this:

“41. On 8 November 2013 a meeting was held between the Council and the development consortium the outcome of which was summarised in an email from Paul Burton of the consortium on 11 November The discussion referred to in the e-mail considered two issues; first the cash flow of the scheme and the cost of the infrastructure to be provided in phase 1 and secondly how the police request which the Council felt should be given some weight could be supported. It was proposed all the items except premises could come forward at the end of phase 2. The premises could then be subject to a review as part of a viability review at the beginning of phase 3. This review would consider whether the provision of affordable housing could be increased towards the Council’s aspiration of 25% across the whole site, the Council having accepted a reduction in affordable housing percentage to help facilitate the development. If the need for [police] premises was agreed at the time of the review, this would be funded.

42. On 12 November 2013, a meeting was held between the Council and solicitors representing the County Council, and development consortium respectively. At that meeting it was agreed to incorporate the above proposals into the Section 106 Agreement. The discussion at the meeting took into account the issues of viability, compliance by the requests with the CIL

Regulations and the decision to accept the proposal resulted from a balanced judgement as to how to deliver as much of the police request as possible, albeit not within the time scales that they had requested, and at the same time deliver a viable development.”

47. Mr Back said this:

“14. On 12th November 2013 the Council organised a meeting with representatives of the Lubbethorpe Consortium, Leicestershire County Council and legal representatives from each of the above. This meeting considered all elements of the ... S106 agreement including the proposed policing contribution. At the meeting Council officers explained that we accepted that some elements of the request made by [the police] were compliant with the relevant Community Infrastructure Regulations. At this time, the developer consortium did not agree with the Council’s position but Council officers were able to negotiate a favourable position for [the police] partly due to the need to achieve a completed agreement in order to realise the M1 bridge Pinch Point funding. The financial pressures on the early phases of the development and the overall priorities for Lubbethorpe were discussed as a result of which it was agreed that the policing contributions would need to be triggered from the end of the second phase of the development. At the end of this meeting all parties agreed that further substantive changes to the agreement would be minimised in order to commence the complex process of completing the agreement with all parties.

15. In the context of the meeting described above it became clear that we ought to communicate the end of the negotiation process, particularly as it was clear that some service providers would not be receiving everything that they had requested, and/or that monies would be provided at a date other than that requested. On this basis I wrote to [the police] on 18th November to confirm that the position we had communicated at an earlier stage of the process (1st November 2013) was the Council’s final position on this matter I note with some surprise that [the police] claim not to have received this letter. Whilst this is unfortunate, I take some comfort in the fact that the letter only reiterated the Council’s already communicated position in any event.

16. It is entirely understood and appreciated that the ... S106 agreement is not a facsimile of the contribution request submitted on behalf of [the police]; it is worth emphasising that the Council was fully aware of this situation when the application was reported to the Development Control Committee for determination and remained the case at the point the agreement was completed. ... the Report to Committee ...

states “It will noted that the request for funding from the Police has only been agreed to in part”. This report and the associated recommendation and resolution should have clearly set the expectations of [the police] in this matter. As the detail of the [the police] request was examined over the course of the following months there were multiple communications ... between the Council and [the police] that made it abundantly clear that the Council did not accept the full extent of the [police] request. There could have been no expectation on the part of [the police] of any other conclusion.”

48. Mr Burton said this:

“26. The meeting on 12 November ... was called to finalise the outstanding issues in the s.106 agreement and it was critical to the delivery of the M1 bridge. The structure and timing of at least two highways contributions were discussed and resolved at this meeting Both contributions were pushed back in the programme of delivery works to secure a contribution. There has been no suggestion by the local highways authority that this was inappropriate

27. I recall at the November 12th meeting that there was specific discussion about the outstanding requests for contributions on the part of the Leicester City Council and the Claimant. These two issues, in my mind, were very similar in nature in that I did not see a clear link between the requests and the acceptability in planning terms of the Scheme.

28. In relation to the contributions sought by the Claimant, the key points of the discussion were the relevance of these contributions to the Scheme, their negative effect on the precarious cash-flow position of the project in the early phases and on the overall viability, and the now urgent need to bring s.106 negotiations to a conclusion so as to secure planning permission in the light of the funding position in relation to the M1 bridge There was debate as to the level and timing of the various contributions leading to the provisions that were ultimately documented in the s.106 agreement.

29. The outcome of this discussion was that significant contribution would be made to the Police (notwithstanding my significant reservations as to their CIL compliance) on the proviso that it did not add to the existing very heavy burden of the already agreed financial contributions and infrastructure obligations to be undertaken at the early stage of the development, so as not to risk the viability or deliverability of the scheme. This was entirely consistent with other decisions taken that day, on both highways and the bus station

30. I recall the Defendant's officers being comfortable with the eventual position reached on not just the Claimants' obligations but also the overall package of planning obligations that were discussed."
49. On 15 November 2013, Mr Lambert e-mailed Mr Senior saying that he had not heard from him and expressing concern about the "premises commitment and whether what we suggest will be included in the agreement." If it was to be included then he would, he said, "come back on vehicles and training and triggers", but if not he would need to take advice on the next steps. He emphasised that the issue was "fundamental" for the Claimant.
50. Mr Senior replied later that day saying that "[we] have not finished the final wording but there is provision for premises and I will get back to you early next week with the wording." Mr Lambert replied shortly afterwards and again stressing the importance of the premises element of the contribution being "triggered and paid for in Phase 1" of the development. He said he could provide the triggers for the other items "pretty quickly".
51. The reality, of course, is that the decisions had been made by then.
52. An odd feature of this case is that the letter written by Mr Back to the Claimant's Finance Director dated 18 November 2013 (to which he referred in his witness statement) explaining the position was never received by the Claimant. Everyone accepts that was so and so do I: indeed there are communications from Mr Lambert to Mr Senior and others thereafter that would, in the ordinary course, have referred to the letter had it been received. The letter does, however, reflect a relatively contemporaneous justification for the decision reached and it is worth quoting the substantive paragraphs:

"As you will be aware from our e-mail of 1 November, we set out the contributions which we support and when these will be triggered. Following negotiations with the applicant, it has been agreed that the £536,834 will be paid at the end of the second phase of development. The agreement will contain a commitment towards premises and a payment up to a maximum of £1,089,660 towards the premises that are agreed following a review of the needs of the police at the time.

I am aware that these contributions and the associated triggers do not match those requested by your organisation however please be assured that we have sought to achieve the best result for Lubbethorpe and the wider community. The trigger points have been agreed with the applicants in the light of the full range of contributions that have been sought and the Council have sought to balance all of the infrastructure and funding requirements associated with this complex development.

We have previously explained the urgency and timescales involved with this matter and we have today agreed with the developer that no further changes to agreement will be sought.

To make further changes would potentially jeopardise the funding of the M1 bridge and would potentially impact the viability and deliverability of the whole development.”

53. Because this was not received, so far as the Claimant as concerned, there were no further communications from the Defendant on the section 106 agreement until it was sent in its concluded form under cover of an e-mail dated 29 January 2014.

The legal arguments

54. Before turning to the legal arguments, I should highlight a fact that Miss Wigley emphasises, namely, that there had never been any suggestion that the scheme was not viable, even before the £5 million of Department of Transport money became available. Mr Elvin and Mr Alex Goodman (for the 5th Interested Party) do not dispute that, but emphasise that it has always been the position of the development consortium that cash flow, particularly in the early stages of the development was a major issue.
55. I will address each of the Grounds advanced by Miss Wigley.

Ground 1

56. This is formulated as follows:

“The Council erred in failing to include provisions with the section 106 agreement to secure adequate and timely contributions towards policing so as to properly mitigate the adverse impact of the development. The Council also erred in failing to have regard to whether the section 106 agreement was adequate to achieve the necessary and required mitigation when it granted planning permission; the Agreement is fundamentally flawed and fails to achieve what is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. No reasons have been given for the actions taken by the Council in respect of the Police contribution and why it has been dealt with differently to other contributions, and accordingly, the Council have acted irrationally.”

57. Miss Wigley says that the Defendant having agreed the principle of the police contribution, the legitimacy of the contributions vis-à-vis the CIL tests and the figures referred to in paragraphs 38 and 39 above, its task as planning authority, in accordance with the resolution of 1 November 2012, was to enter into a section 106 agreement “to secure” the provisions identified in the resolution which, of course, included the provisions concerning the police contribution. For the reasons summarised in paragraphs 20-24 above, she submits that, irrationally, this has not been achieved in relation to the premises contribution (because of the lack of commitment and the uncertainties) and neither has it been achieved in relation to the equipment contribution because rationally-derived trigger-points have not been identified. As to the latter (whilst it might also go to Ground 3), the submission is that the Defendant needed information from the police to enable it to define those trigger-points and failed to obtain it. She also submits, on the basis of what has been revealed

of the decision-making process leading to the section 106 agreement, that the necessary balancing exercise was neither rational nor fair.

58. Whilst she put the matter in a number of ways, the summary I have given above reflects the substance of this argument. She recognises the high threshold there is in this context for establishing such a ground of challenge: see, e.g., *R (Newsmith Stainless Ltd) v Secretary of State for the Environment* [2001] EWHC Admin 74, Sullivan J, as he then was, at [8].
59. Mr Elvin contends that the argument comes perilously close to a simple submission that the Defendant should have accepted the Claimant's approach and that no other rational course existed. That, he submits, is not sufficient and amounts to nothing more than a challenge to the planning merits of the considerations leading to the section 106 Agreement. He says that the evidence of those present at the meeting of 12 November 2013 demonstrates that those participating were aware of the Claimant's position, that it was taken into account along with the position of others and an assessment made of what was reasonable in the light of the cash flow issues that faced those endeavouring to put together the final, effective package of provisions to be incorporated in the section 106 Agreement. A planning judgment was reached that earlier trigger points for the financial contributions were not required to make the development acceptable and a material consideration was also not risking the timely delivery of the development itself.
60. Mr Goodman supports this approach and, in his Skeleton Argument, sought to characterise the argument that the decision was *Wednesbury* unreasonable and "hopelessly unarguable" and amounted to nothing more than "an impermissible quibble" about the merits of one relatively small factor within a very complex and far reaching decision."
61. I do not, with respect, agree that the challenge mounted by the Claimant in this case can be characterised as a quibble about a minor factor. Those who, in due course, purchase properties on this development, who bring up children there and who wish to go about their daily life in a safe environment, will want to know that the police service can operate efficiently and effectively in the area. That would plainly be the "consumer view" of the issue. The providers of the service (namely, the Claimant) have statutory responsibilities to carry out and, as the witness statement of the Chief Constable makes clear, that itself can be a difficult objective to achieve in these financially difficult times. Although the sums at stake for the police contributions will be small in comparison to the huge sums that will be required to complete the development, the sums are large from the point of view of the police.
62. I am inclined to the view that if a survey of local opinion was taken, concerns would be expressed if it were thought that the developers were not going to provide the police with a sufficient contribution to its funding requirements to meet the demands of policing the new area: lawlessness in one area can have effects in another nearby area. Miss Wigley, in my judgment, makes some entirely fair points about the actual terms of the section 106 Agreement so far as they affect the Claimant.
63. However, the issue is whether the strength of the argument to that effect surmounts the very high threshold for establishing irrationality in the sense required for the challenge to be successful. I am unable to accept that they do cross this threshold.

Whilst I can understand that the Claimant may feel that its approach has simply been rejected by the developers because it is inconvenient and that its persistence has been an irritant, the evidence does suggest that the Defendant has considered the matter properly and has reached a rational and sustainable conclusion even if it is not one with which everyone would agree.

Ground 2

64. This is formulated thus:

“In all circumstances, given the size and significance of the development, and the failure to secure appropriate mitigation of the impact of the development, it was incumbent upon the Officers to either return to matter to Committee for determination or articulate their reasons for accepting the Agreement in the terms they did. In the absence of any reasons, the inference is that the Council have acted irrationally.”

65. As articulated orally by Miss Wigley, this was effectively a restatement of the proposition that the planning committee had directed the officers to negotiate a section 106 agreement that secured CIL compliant police contributions (see paragraph 57 above) and that they had not done so. This should, she submits, have resulted in the matter being referred back to the planning committee. As she put it in the Skeleton Argument, having regard to the wording of the committee resolution and, in particular, the way in which the “premises contribution” was to be dealt with under the section 106 agreement, it was incumbent on the officers to report back to the members their inability to act in accordance with the resolution and to explain their proposed alternative course. She submits that it cannot be said with any certainty that the members would have been satisfied with the proposed course of action.
66. The well-known case of *R (Kides) v South Cambridgeshire District Council* [2002] EWCA Civ 1370 was referred to in this context as was the observation of the Court of Appeal in *R. (Dry) v West Oxfordshire DC* [2011] 1 P. & C.R. 16 at [16].
67. I do not really feel that this ground adds anything in real terms to the first ground (or indeed to Ground 3 that I will consider below). It does seem to me that Mr Elvin was right to submit that the resolution required the section 106 agreement to embrace “all CIL Compliant capital infrastructures for Policing”, that “the precise terms of this contribution [are] to be settled by further negotiation” and that this makes it clear that the committee envisaged that the further negotiations on this matter would be undertaken by the officers.
68. That, as it seems to me, is sufficient to dispose of this argument. In any event, in the particular circumstances of this case, whilst some questions might have been raised by members about the terms concerning the police contributions, it is fanciful to suggest that a scheme such as this would have foundered on such an issue. Given the new funding stream constituted by the Pinch Point funding, a resolution to defer the grant of permission pending further negotiations would, to my mind, have been so unlikely as to be a consideration that can safely be disregarded.

Ground 3

69. This is formulated thus:

“Furthermore, arising out of the correspondence, contact and agreement with the Council in this matter, the Police had a legitimate expectation that the Council would consult them on the level of and timing of the delivery of the contribution and that the outcome of those discussions would be represented in the Agreement.”

70. The foundation for this argument is the sequence of correspondence, meetings and other communications in the period running up to November 2013 to which I have referred above (see paragraphs 28-43 above).

71. There is, of course, a good deal of authority on the issue of legitimate expectation. I am quite prepared to accept for present purposes that a course of dealing between two parties in the kind of context with which this case is concerned can in some circumstances give rise to a legitimate expectation that some particular process will be followed by the public authority the subject of the challenged decision before the decision is taken. The course of dealing can be on such a basis that the necessarily “clear and unambiguous” representation upon which such an expectation is based may arise.

72. Did anything of that nature arise in this case? I do not think so. What one can see from the communications to which I have referred is a pattern of negotiation, in effect between the Claimant and the developers with the Defendant as the intermediary, where no unequivocal representation was made by the Defendant that could have led to an expectation that it would be consulted “on the level of and timing of the delivery of the contribution”. That having been said, however, there can be little doubt that the Defendant was aware of the Claimant’s view on the timing of the premises contribution which, in one sense, was the most significant part of what was required by way of infrastructure funding. The equipment contribution was discussed and the police could have given “chapter and verse” on that if they had chosen to do so prior to the final discussions between the Defendant and the developers. However, I do not see any basis for a specific obligation on the Defendant’s part to inquire about that.

73. There is no evidence to suggest that the way in which the Claimant’s position was handled during the prolonged negotiations towards the section 106 agreement was markedly different from that of the other parties who also engaged in the process whatever the ultimate outcome may have been. It seems to me that the accommodating approach of Mr Senior from August 2013 onwards was simply born of a desire to facilitate a smoothing of the passage towards a resolution of the impasse that otherwise existed and that it would be wrong to read it in any other way.

74. It seems to me that there was, at least initially, a difference of view about the approach to how the police contribution should be calculated (one apparently shared by others around the country at the time). That there was a revision of the approach during the negotiations is plain. That may have been aided by the decision in the Jelsoy Homes appeal to which Miss Wigley drew my attention. At all events, as it seems to me, there was nothing in what occurred during the various communications

that could reasonably have led the police to believe that it would be consulted on the specific terms of the section 106 agreement. As Mr Elvin submitted, the Claimant did make representations which the evidence suggests were considered. That, in my judgment, is as far as any legitimate expectation could take the Claimant.

Ground 4

75. This was added by a late amendment for which leave was granted by Hickinbottom J. As formulated it is as follows:

“The Council has breached Article 36 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010.”

76. The acronym ‘DMPO’ is applied to this order.
77. The contention is that that Article 36(3)(b) required the “travelling draft” of the section 106 agreement to be placed on the local planning register and that the Defendant’s failure to do so invalidates the planning permission.
78. Article 36(3) is as follows:

(3) Part 1 of the register shall contain in respect of each such application and any application for approval of reserved matters made in respect of an outline planning permission granted on such an application, made or sent to the local planning register authority and not finally disposed of—

(a) a copy (which may be photographic or in electronic form) of the application together with any accompanying plans and drawings;

(b) a copy (which may be photographic or in electronic form) of any planning obligation or section 278 agreement proposed or entered into in connection with the application;

(c) a copy (which may be photographic or in electronic form) of any other planning obligation or section 278 agreement entered into in respect of the land the subject of the application which the applicant considers relevant; and

(d) particulars of any modification to any planning obligation or section 278 agreement.

79. This follows Article 36(2) which provides that “each local planning register authority shall keep, in [two] parts, a register of every application for planning permission relating to their area”.
80. Whilst I have had very little opportunity to give this issue mature consideration, I find it difficult to find within Article 36(3)(b) an obligation that “travelling drafts” of a section 106 agreement should be placed on the register. Mr Goodman submitted that Article 36 is not intended to require that every iteration of a document “under

construction” by negotiation must be put on the planning register and I am inclined to agree that that is so.

81. At all events, Mr Elvin and Mr Goodman seem to me to have the complete answer to this allegation in this case, namely, that there is no evidence or even a claim that the Claimant checked the local planning register before the planning permission was granted and accordingly no prejudice could have arisen. If there was any failure to comply with Article 36(3)(b), it could have had no impact on the outcome of this case.
82. The evidential basis for the contention about the lack of material on the register is a witness statement of Rebecca Philips, a solicitor with the Derbyshire Constabulary, who made certain requests and enquiries of the Defendant’s planning office. However, there is a factual issue joined by virtue of Mr Senior’s second witness statement when he says that the various drafts of the section 106 agreements in question were available for inspection in hard form in the Council’s files on request. I cannot resolve any issues of fact on this application and, in any event for the reasons I have given, it is unnecessary to do so.

Conclusion

83. I have not been able to cover every nuance of the arguments advanced. However, I am of the view that the grounds of challenge to the grant of planning permission do not succeed.
84. I repeat that, looked at objectively, there are features of the way the police contribution in this case was dealt with in the section 106 agreement that are not very satisfactory and, as I have said, some legitimate criticisms seem to me to be open to the formulation of the trigger mechanism. I rather suspect that, irrespective of the outcome of this case, the issue of the timing of the police contributions will have to be re-visited before the development proceeds too far to ensure that those who are considering purchasing properties on the development will have the reassurance that it will be properly and efficiently policed. However, that does not amount to, or evidence the need for, a conclusion at this stage that what was agreed between the Defendant and the developers was irrational or that there was anything unfair about the way the Defendant dealt with the issue.
85. The case was dealt with as a “rolled up” hearing. Mr Elvin is quite right to say that a claimant in such a situation should not be given permission to apply for judicial review “just because everyone is present at the hearing”. A “rolled up” hearing is often directed when there is a need for expedition and that is plainly why Hickinbottom J directed such a hearing in this case. The other aspect to the position advanced by Mr Elvin is that merely because a claimant loses at a “rolled up” hearing does not mean that permission to apply for judicial review should not be granted.
86. If this case had not been as urgent as it is and a judge had applied his or her mind to the usual considerations at the permission stage, I believe the Claimant would probably have overcome the relatively low threshold of “arguability” on Grounds 1 and 3, but not on grounds 2 and 4. Accordingly, I grant permission on Grounds 1 and 3, although I dismiss the substantive claims, but I refuse permission to apply for judicial review on Grounds 2 and 4.

87. I would express my appreciation to all Counsel for their assistance, both in their oral submissions and in writing.

Permission to appeal

88. Because of the urgency and because of my non-availability in the next few weeks, it was agreed at the conclusion of the hearing that I should assume that any losing party would wish me to consider the issue of permission to appeal. It would be convenient for me to do so here.
89. This arises in relation to grounds 1 and 3 (because I have refused permission on grounds 2 and 4 and the normal route is a direct application to the Court of Appeal in relation to such grounds). Whilst I have treated grounds 1 and 3 as having crossed the arguability threshold for the purposes of permission to apply for judicial review, having heard the full argument I was satisfied that the grounds should not succeed. I am of the view that there is no realistic prospect of success on an appeal if pursued and, accordingly, I refuse permission to appeal.
90. Again, it was agreed by all parties that I should exercise my power effectively to foreshorten any period for seeking permission to appeal from the Court of Appeal. I will direct that any Appeal Notice seeking permission to appeal must be lodged within 7 days of the hand down of this judgment, that the notice must be served on all other parties and that an application in writing for an expedited consideration of the issue of permission to appeal must be made by the Claimant. It would, of course, be open to the other parties to make representations on this issue if so advised.
91. Arrangements will have been made for the final form of this judgment to be handed down on my behalf by a judge sitting in Birmingham during the week beginning 26 May and the 7-day period will commence on that day.

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE POLICE & CRIME PANEL

PAPER MARKED

Report of	POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER
Date	MONDAY 9 JUNE 2014 – 2.00 PM
Subject	ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14
Author	CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Purpose of Report

1. To present to the Police and Crime Panel the Annual Report of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire covering the period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014. A copy of the Annual Report is attached as Appendix A to this report.

Recommendation

2. It is recommended that the Police and Crime Panel reviews the content of the Annual Report in line with paragraph 79 of the Leicestershire Police and Crime Panel's Rules of Procedure approved at their meeting of 23 November 2012.

Background

3. Under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 Section 12, a Police and Crime Commissioner is required to report how they have exercised the functions of their office during each financial year, or part of a financial year, that they hold office.
4. The report being presented covers the period that the Police and Crime Commissioner held office during the 2013/14 financial year.
5. The primary purpose of a PCC's Annual Report is to cover the progress made towards achievement of any police and crime objectives set out in the Police and Crime Plan which, in line with the legislation, covers the period 1 April 2013 and 31 March 2017. This report covers all such progress made up to 31 March 2014.
6. A Police and Crime Commissioner is required under Local Policing Bodies Specified Information Orders SI 2011/3050, SI 2012/2479 and SI 2013/1816 to publish certain details on an annual basis. Guidance issued by the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners recommends that these details are included in addition to the reporting of how the Police and Crime Commissioner

has fulfilled his statutory functions. In line with this Guidance these have been incorporated into the Annual Report being presented.

7. As part of the preparation of the report, I invited all relevant partner agencies (the Chairs of Community Safety Partnerships and additionally the Chairs of those agencies who have agreed to make contributions towards specific Strategic Priorities within the Police and Crime Plan) to comment on the activities that they have completed in support of the achievement of the objectives that I have set out in my Plan. All of these contributions have been incorporated into the Annual Report.
8. The report attached shows the members of the Panel the text of the Annual Report. This text will be formatted into a form that can be both placed onto a website and well as printed in the form of a booklet.

Implications

Financial :	n/a
Legal :	The production of an Annual Report for every financial year is a statutory responsibility for a PCC under Section 12 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.
Equality Impact Assessment :	n/a
Risks and Impact :	n/a
Link to Police and Crime Plan :	Section 12 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 designates that the Annual Report must include the progress during the reporting period towards the achievement of Police and Crime Objectives.

List of Appendices

Appendix: A – Annual Report of Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire – 2013/14

Background Papers

Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011
 The Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specified Information) Order 2011 (SI 2011/3050)
 The Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specified Information) (Amendment) Order 2012 (SI 2012/2479)
 The Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specified Information) (Amendment) Order 2013 (SI 2013/1816)
 APCC guidance - Interim model information scheme

Person to Contact

Mr P Stock, Chief Executive – Tel 0116 229 8980
 Email: paul.stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire
Annual Report 2013/2014

May 2014

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire

Annual Report 2013/2014

Contents

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire Annual Report	4
Foreword	4
The Police and Crime Plan	5
Section 1) Statutory Functions	6
The Commissioner's Responsibilities	7
Setting the Police Precept and Budget	7
Commissioning	9
Value for money	10
The Police and Crime Plan	10
Responsible Authorities	11
Publication of Information	11
Consultation and Engagement	12
Victim Survey data	12
Business Survey	12
Community Based Survey	13
Access to the PCC	13
Youth Commission on Police and Crime	14
The Youth Commission Conference	14
Comparing Police and Crime Commissioners (CoPaCC) Award for Youth Engagement	16
The Police and Crime Panel	17
Compliance	18
Financial Codes of Practice	18
Policing Protocol	18
Strategic Policing Requirement	18
Delegations of functions made by the PCC	19
Collaboration	19
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) Inspections	21
Independent Custody Visiting Scheme	22
Complaints	25
Subsequent Transfer Scheme	25
Register of Interests	25
Section 2) Performance against the Strategic Priorities of the Police and Crime Plan	26
Theme: Reducing Offending and Re-offending	27
Strategic Priority 1: Preventing and diverting young people from offending	28
PCC Funded Diversionary Activities	28
Focus: Community Remedy passed to PCCs	30
Strategic Priority 2: Reducing re-offending among young people and adults	31
The Young Adults Project (YAP)	32
Strategic Priority 3: Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and re-offending	34
Focus: A BID to address alcohol-related anti-social behaviour	37
Strategic Priority 4: Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled Families Programme	39

Theme: Supporting Victims and Witnesses.....	40
Strategic Priority 5: To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse.....	41
Strategic Priority 6: To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences.....	42
Strategic Priority 7: To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences.....	44
Funded training for Hate Crime-related incidents treated by the Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust.....	45
Stop and Tell Campaign by Leicestershire County Council.....	45
Focus: PCC and MENCAP reach out to deliver the facts about Mate Crime.....	46
Strategic Priority 8: To prevent anti-social behaviour and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour.....	47
Focus: Designated police cars to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour.....	48
Strategic Priority 9: To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime.....	49
Theme: Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer.....	50
Strategic Priority 10: To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.....	51
Strategic Priority 11: To reduce all crime.....	52
Strategic Priority 12: To reduce Domestic Burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of Domestic Burglary.....	53
Partnership Locality Fund grants for City target hardening.....	53
Strategic Priority 13: To reduce Violence against the Person with Injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims.....	55
Strategic Priority 14: To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims of vehicle crime.....	57
Theme: Protecting the Vulnerable.....	59
Strategic Priority 15: To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses.....	60
Focus: Safeguarding.....	60
Strategic Priority 16: Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs.....	62
Mental Health Concordat.....	63
Focus: PCC praises work of NHS arts engagement.....	64
Strategic Priority 17: To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports.....	66
Child sexual exploitation (CSE) research project in conjunction with the University of Leicester.....	66
Theme: The Financial Challenge.....	68
Strategic Priority 18: With staff and partners, transform the way we protect our communities and deliver over £20m in revenue savings by 2016.....	69
Focus: Changes to Leicestershire Police's front enquiry service.....	70
Section 3) Contributions from Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs).....	71
Blaby and Hinckley.....	72
Charnwood.....	73
Harborough.....	74
Leicester City.....	75
Melton.....	76
North West Leicestershire.....	77
Oadby & Wigston.....	78
Rutland.....	79

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire Annual Report

Foreword

It is my role as Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to act in the public interest and hold the Chief Constable to account for the delivery of local policing.

As PCC for Leicestershire, I believe that everyone in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland has the right to live free from the fear of crime, and that every person should have the opportunity to shape the future of policing in their local area. In my revised Police and Crime Plan, which was informed by what local people said mattered most, I laid out how Leicestershire Police and partner agencies were to work together to reduce offending and re-offending, support victims and witnesses, make communities and neighbourhoods safer, and protect the vulnerable.

Leicestershire Police is an organisation with a good reputation for effective local policing, and has a solid foundation on which to deliver what local people tell us they need most from the public services that deliver a safer society. I wish to thank our local police officers and staff, members of the public, partners, community safety partnerships, and the many and varied outcome providers we commission for their contributions to delivering the objectives set out in the Plan.

I have always said that I commission outcomes, not services; I have been very clear about that. I want to see and hear that local people have felt the effects of the improved outcomes of such projects. Over the past year, I have visited many of our commissioned partners to see how we are making a difference to the lives of local people.

This Annual Report details my statutory functions, the progress made by police and partners against the Plan, my commissioning work, and the narratives from the community safety partnerships.

I hope that you will enjoy reading this, our first complete annual report.

Sir Clive Loader
Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire

The Police and Crime Plan

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire has made the Police and Crime Plan available to the public on its website in original full text, executive summary, and Easy Read versions. The webpage also displays a video introduction [visit http://youtu.be/w3yfn_Qnt_Q] to the Plan complete with British Sign Language interpretation by Action Deafness. To access the Plan, go to <http://ow.ly/qld74> or visit www.leics.pcc.police.uk and click the *Police and Crime Plan* tab.

Section 1) Statutory Functions

Section 1) Statutory Functions

This is the first full year's annual report for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire and relates to the period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.

During 2013/2014, the Police and Crime Commissioner Sir Clive Loader attended 132 engagements and visits and his office responded to 3,271 items of correspondence, eighty times the number received by the former Police Authority in a comparative period. This demonstrates the degree to which the people and communities are able to make contact with a single, directly elected person.

The Commissioner's Responsibilities

The primary role of the PCC is to hold the Chief Constable to account. There has not been a requirement to appoint a new Chief Constable in the past year. The PCC has not utilised the other powers available to him in relation to the post of Chief Constable.

One of the ways in which the PCC has held the Chief Constable to account is by meeting with him on a regular basis. One-to-one meetings between them have been held frequently (once per week) since the Commissioner's first day in office. There have also been monthly Strategic Assurance Board meetings held at Police Headquarters where the PCC meets with the Chief Constable and his Chief Officer team, to discuss matters of strategic importance.

During the year, the PCC appointed a Chief Finance Officer, Helen King, the role having been covered on an interim basis since the election of Sir Clive to the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire in November 2012.

Setting the Police Precept and Budget

During the year, the Commissioner was required to set the precept for 2014/15 and the budget for the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire. The precept is the amount of money which is collected via Council Tax and used for policing. Sir Clive has approved a budget for 2014/15 of £172.607m. This is a reduction compared to the budget for 2013/14 and includes the ongoing effect of £27m of savings achieved since 2009.

There has been an increase of 1.5% in Council Tax for police purposes for the 2014/15 year. It will cost the average local taxpayer approximately 5p more a week than in 2013/14 (the precept for a Band D property calculates at £176.4831 for 2014/15 compared to £173.8750 last year). More information can be found at <http://bit.ly/1kbKs2x>

The increase in precept was not a decision taken lightly but was necessary to build a sustainable base budget and to safeguard services and frontline policing where possible. The budget decision included an investment over the next three years to increase Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) numbers by an additional 28 to support the Force in prioritising community and neighbourhood safety, targeted to sustaining and developing levels of neighbourhood policing, and particularly concentrating on anti-social behaviour (ASB) hotspots.

As part of the budget, the PCC also received a commitment from the Force to deliver an approved Volunteer Strategy which will increase the number of volunteers to 1,000 over the next three years.

Commissioning

As a result of the introduction of PCCs there were significant changes to Home Office funding streams with many being removed or merged. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 (Section 9) enables PCCs to award monies (described in the legislation as Crime and Disorder Reduction Grants) to organisations for them to support the achievement of priorities in the Police and Crime Plan. For 2013/14, each PCC was awarded their own Community Safety Fund by the Home Office to commission according to local need. The total commissioning budget for Leicestershire for 2013/14 was £3.8m.

The PCC decided to transfer six month's funding between April and September 2013 at the same base level as for 2012/2013, to all those previously in receipt of the former Home Office funding. This enabled his Office to work with partners to determine how best to commission his outcomes from October 2013 while maintaining services. A Commissioning Intentions document was published in June 2013. This set out how the PCC intended to structure his commissioning budget to achieve outcomes to support the delivery of his Police and Crime Plan.

The Commissioning Intentions led to numerous initiatives being funded including:

- Integrated Offender Management (IOM) targeting the highest risk offenders.
- Targeting adult offenders with a substance misuse problem, specifically those tested and identified at point of arrest.
- Support for victims of rape and sexual assault, as well as the investigative process, by funding the Sexual Assault Referral Centres.
- Woodland based work experience, vocational qualifications with employability skills and life coaching training for 16-24-year-olds who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET).
- Emergency out-of-hours safe temporary accommodation for women and children who are victims of domestic abuse in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.
- A six month pilot project to investigate the feasibility and cost effectiveness of alternate models of health and social support for the street drinking population in Leicester city.

The Police and Crime Plan was revised in October 2013. The original Commissioning Intentions document was therefore also refreshed and developed into a Commissioning Framework for 2014/15 onwards.

Value for money

In June 2013, the PCC approved a change plan which included transactional reductions in earlier years (i.e. efficiencies against, broadly speaking, similar activities), followed by transformational changes (i.e. changes in Force structure, delivery methods etc.) in the later years of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). During 2013/14, the change programme developed and/or implemented firm plans for reductions which have already been incorporated into the above budget requirement.

In 2013/14, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire's budget was managed and monitored tightly in conjunction with the Force and this reflects the very tight financial environment and reducing funding year-on-year. As a result of this, the final outturn for the year resulted in a very small underspend of £57k, which when compared to a budget of over £173.5 million equated to a variance of only 0.03%. The full detail will be included in the 2013/14 Statement of Accounts which are compiled, audited and published separately by the end of September 2014.

The PCC will continue to strive to secure more efficiencies within the areas under his direct management, in order to keep the budget to the minimum required to support him in carrying out his duties; the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire's budget for 2014/15 reduced by £15k when compared to 2013/14.

The Police and Crime Plan

The Commissioner published his Police and Crime Plan for 2013-2017 on 31 March 2013. This Plan sets out his policing and crime reduction priorities for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland over the next four years.

The Plan was refreshed during the year and an updated version was developed following consultation with public and partners.

A full copy of the Plan can be found on the website at <http://bit.ly/TQgrAr>

Responsible Authorities

In determining the strategic priorities within the Police and Crime Plan, the PCC has taken regard of the strategic priorities of the community safety partnerships.

The strategic priorities set out in the Plan are based on comprehensive research and analysis commissioned on behalf of the PCC. This included a partnership needs assessment which looked at the wider needs assessment based around the known causal and risk factors of crime and disorder.

The support and knowledge of the Community Safety Partnerships in this process has been invaluable. We have found, for example, that alcohol and drug misuse and dependency, mental ill health, employment and training all feature as strategic priorities across a number of partners within the community safety arena. These factors all impact on crime and disorder and confirm the links and interplay between the strategic objectives of the police and those of our partners. The relationships between partners and the police is key in the commissioning process and will help ensure the monies are allocated against our shared priorities in a controlled, accountable and focussed way.

Publication of Information

The PCC publishes information in order that the public can assess how he is fulfilling his legal obligations. This information can be found on the PCC's website within the Publication Scheme <http://bit.ly/1jWYqK2>

Consultation and Engagement

Under the Police Act 1996, the PCC has an obligation to ensure that the views of the public are being collected and taken account of in the Police and Crime Plan.

Leicestershire Police has over many years developed numerous ways to engage and consult with its diverse communities. There are many examples from operational/neighbourhood, to tactical and strategic level.

In listening to the views of local people and organisations, Sir Clive has completed 132 engagements during 2013/14. These are broken down as: 52 community, 36 strategic, 26 operational, 15 tactical, 1 political, and 2 civic engagements.

Leicestershire Police has a suite of surveys which, together with more traditional consultation and engagement methods, provide a comprehensive insight into performance, public confidence and satisfaction as well as helping determine policing priorities.

The surveys range from those who have had direct contact with the police as victims, witnesses or complainants, to broader, more subjective enquiries regarding service delivery. This process by necessity has to reflect the diverse nature of the policing function and, just like policing, is evolving and dynamic.

In the development of the Police and Crime Plan, comprehensive research and analysis was commissioned on behalf of the PCC. This included:

Victim Survey data

This looks at the post-crime views of those who have need of our service as victims. The PCC has used this data to determine satisfaction and confidence targets.

Business Survey

A business survey was commissioned to understand more fully the perceptions of business owners about the impact of crime on their business. This information has been collated and analysed and will improve our planning and response to crimes related to the business community.

Community Based Survey

A perception-based survey as to the views on local policing is undertaken each month, which over a period of twelve months provides a detailed profile of people's opinions on and levels of satisfaction with policing services.

This allows the PCC and the Chief Constable to understand, from over 2,200 responses, the level of confidence or otherwise that local people have in their police.

Access to the PCC

The PCC was elected by the people of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and is committed to maintaining an open door for communication about issues that matter most to individuals and groups across the Force area. The quantity of communications received by the office has increased dramatically compared to that received by the previous Police Authority. The Commissioner is keen to listen hard to help him develop and sustain a more realistic picture of the issues that affect local people. The PCC has developed a strategic consultation and engagement plan which will give people the opportunity to tell him their views and concerns.

Youth Commission on Police and Crime

In May 2013, Sir Clive welcomed his Youth Commission on Police and Crime, a group of young people from backgrounds representative of the diverse communities in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. The first of its kind in the country, his Youth Commission model has since been adopted by PCCs in Hampshire and Sussex.

The 30 young members of the Youth Commission, selected and supported by the charitable organisation SHM Foundation, have been central in gaining a deeper understanding of the issues which they consider to be a priority and, crucially, in rebuilding trust between young people and the police.

“During the election, I said I would be a PCC for all. I stand true to that statement. The young people in our communities are our future, and we have a moral obligation to ensure that fewer of them are entering the criminal justice system for the first-time. Their views will be heard, and the Youth Commission is the cornerstone of that dialogue.” -- Sir Clive Loader

The Youth Commission toured colleges, youth clubs, universities and young offenders institutions to reach out to young people and gathered the views of over 1,600 young people, highlighting the following six areas as priority issues:

- Relationships with the police and stereotyping
- Offending and re-offending
- Anti-social behaviour
- Hate crime and cyberbullying
- Knife crime
- Drugs and alcohol

The Youth Commission Conference

In December 2013, 30 Youth Commission members aged 16 to 25 unveiled their recommendations at the Youth Commission Conference 2013 (see the YouTube video <http://bit.ly/1kkqbNb>). They addressed the urgent issues raised by young people before an audience of more than 100 decision makers and practitioners in the criminal justice arena and young people’s services, including Police and Crime Commissioner Sir Clive Loader and Leicestershire Police Chief Constable Simon Cole.

“Young people’s relationships with the police are not what we’d want them to be. The work of the Youth Commission is crucial to increasing warmth and rebuilding trust.” -- Sir Clive Loader

At the Youth Commission Conference 2013, hundreds of feedback cards completed by young people were on show for delegates and the media to view. The feedback from young people informed the dozen recommendations which include: building better and stronger relationships between the police and young people; providing all young people with information about their stop and search rights; and developing a reformed character qualification and programme for young offenders which enables them to prove their worth as employees, breaking the cycle of re-offending.

“Peer pressure; a lack of confidence; and poor job prospects when young offenders leave prison, are some of the things that can lead to re-offending. Asking companies to employ offenders and having a reformed character qualification with a portfolio of references from employers would motivate young offenders to make fresh start.” -- Youth Commission member Alex, then (23), after visiting inmates in HMP Glen Parva to discuss reducing offending and re-offending.

The Youth Commission published a 100-page report of its findings (click <http://bit.ly/1logNcF> to read the report and <http://bit.ly/1ksdwVG> to read the executive summary). The dozen recommendations in the Youth Commission report are now providing a catalyst for changes to the way the police and local partners work with young people.

Sir Clive has now extended the remit of the Youth Commission to include commissioning, the shaping of policy, and the development of the outreach role with young people for the second stage of the Youth Commission in 2014/15.

Comparing Police and Crime Commissioners (CoPaCC) Award for Youth Engagement

Police and Crime Commissioner Sir Clive Loader received an award for his engagement with young people across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland during 2013/2014. The Comparing Police and Crime Commissioners (CoPaCC) Public Engagement Award 2014 recognised the work of the Youth Commission and was presented to the PCC at Leicestershire Police Force Headquarters by Bernard Rix, international police advisor and chief executive officer of CoPaCC, an organisation which monitors the work of PCCs and promotes best practice.

The award followed CoPaCC's publication of the "PCCs and Public Engagement" Thematic Report, which provided a detailed examination of PCCs' work in this area. Bernard Rix, chief executive officer of CoPaCC, was impressed by the Leicestershire PCC's approach to engagement with young people stating publicly that 'youth engagement is a key PCC responsibility. The Leicestershire PCC and his Office have an impressive track record in this area, setting an excellent example for other PCCs.'

"Youth engagement is a key PCC responsibility. The Leicestershire PCC and his Office have an impressive track record in this area, setting an excellent example that many other PCCs could certainly learn from." -- Bernard Rix, Chief Executive Officer of CoPaCC

The Police and Crime Panel

The Police and Crime Panel (PCP), which is totally independent of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, oversees the work of the PCC.

Its role includes:

- Reviewing the PCC's proposals for the amount of council tax local people pay towards policing. It has the power to veto these proposals if it considers the amount is inappropriate.
- Considering the PCC's Police and Crime plan and Annual Report.
- Considering the PCC's proposals for the appointment of a new Chief Constable, with the power to veto.
- Investigating complaints about the PCC.

The role of the PCP is not to scrutinise the performance of the Force as a whole or the Chief Constable individually as this is the responsibility of the PCC.

The Panel can request reports from the PCC and, if it wishes, call the PCC to attend its meetings. In addition the Panel can require any employee of the PCC to attend a meeting of the Panel to answer questions in relation to their roles.

The Police and Crime Panel made useful recommendations regarding the contents of the Police and Crime Plan and these recommendations were reflected in the final plan published by the PCC. When that plan was presented to the Panel, it was resolved that "the Panel accepts and supports in full the Police and Crime Plan, as amended in the light of the comments submitted".

At the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel meeting on 27 January 2014, the Police and Crime Commissioner submitted his proposal to increase the Band D council tax for police purposes by 1.5% from £173.8750, to £176.4831 and following the meeting, has set the Band D council tax for police purposes at that level. This implies a council tax requirement of £51.083m for 2014/15 across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

Compliance

Financial Codes of Practice

The PCC has operated in compliance with the Financial Codes of Practice issued by Parliament. Further details of this can be found in the Corporate Governance Framework <http://bit.ly/1mzkPxd>

Policing Protocol

As the elected PCC for the Leicestershire Force area, the PCC's responsibilities are set out in legislation. The Policing Protocol Order 2011 is issued in accordance with the requirements of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 through which the role of PCC was enacted. The PCC has operated in compliance with the Policing Protocol as follows.

He is responsible for the totality of policing within Leicestershire and he holds the Chief Constable to account for the operational delivery of policing, including the Strategic Policing Requirement (see below).

The Commissioner is responsible for setting the strategic direction and objectives through the Police and Crime Plan ("the Plan") and to decide both the budget and the allocation of funds to support the Plan.

He expects the Chief Constable to demonstrate how he will deliver this vision and strategic priorities as set out in this Plan, within his own delivery plan.

Strategic Policing Requirement

The Home Secretary's Strategic Policing Requirement (SPR) recognises that police forces need to work cooperatively across force boundaries to plan for, and deliver, effective capabilities to tackle threats that stretch from local to national but which require a response that is rooted in local policing. These threats (such as terrorism, organised crime, public disorder, and civil emergencies) can spread across the country quickly and dynamically (witness the disturbances of summer 2011). The Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan sets out how Leicestershire Police will deliver the SPR.

Delegations of functions made by the PCC

The Scheme of Corporate Governance was issued in May 2013, was reviewed during the year and, following the Stage 2 transfers on the 1st April 2014, incorporates the Scheme of Consent <http://bit.ly/1mzkPxd>

This sets out the delegations by the Police and Crime Commissioner to a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (Deputy PCC) (if appointed), the Chief Executive, the Police Force via senior officers such as the Chief Constable's Chief Finance Officer and the Force Solicitor.

Collaboration

At a time when resources are shrinking in all sectors and across agencies, it is essential that these issues are tackled in the most joined up way possible. Through the Strategic Partnership Board and associated delivery groups, the PCC continues to work with partners to identify strategic approaches that will result in measurable, positive changes that benefit our communities and which help all agencies work effectively and efficiently together. The police contribute both in time and resource to the shared agenda and the PCC does all that he can to support and encourage partners to do likewise based on their own responsibilities and priorities.

There is an extensive network of partnerships across the Force area and the wider East Midlands, including the Strategic Partnership Board which has been developed to drive and manage whole-system thinking. The Board is supported by an Executive group designed to translate strategy into practice and to report progress to the Board at regular intervals.

The PCC plans to use the resources available to him to understand better the dynamic relationship between prevention, intervention and reduction of crime and non-crime incidents. Then he can commission (in collaboration with partners) for outcomes that will have a measureable impact at all three levels. In a time of reducing budgets, there is clearly a need to maximise the resources we all have through increasing intelligence-led commissioning.

The PCC is confident that the existing partnership landscape, with its current joint commissioning arrangements, will help facilitate this. It is his intention to work with existing and emerging joint/partnership commissioning bodies when commissioning outcomes.

His vision involves looking creatively at the provider landscape too, and is committed to ensuring that the most effective interventions and ideas, whether large or very small, have their value recognised and considered. He is particularly keen that the third sector, charities, social enterprises, voluntary organisations and also small business initiatives remain and grow as part of our provider landscape.

By working together to tackle these themes, using the existing and emerging partnership structures in place, we aim to prevent, intervene and reduce those behaviours and situations which have an impact across all communities and which require extensive police and partnership resourcing to manage. This will entail intervening early, as well as targeting those who cause the most harm or who are at the greatest risk of harm.

The Commissioner seeks to support existing effective partnerships such as the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), and the associated Multi-Agency Prolific and Priority Offender Management (MAPPOM) teams which all rely on collaboration to target those who cause most harm, or who are at greatest risk of harm. Likewise, he recognises the value of the existing Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and works with them so that our priorities are understood and aligned and the impact of our collective actions can be maximised.

The Commissioner intends to continue to contribute to, and support going forward, the many partnership structures currently in place within the Force area.

Police forces in the East Midlands have worked together formally and informally for many years and recognise that joint working is a sustainable way of delivering a wide range of policing services to the people of the East Midlands and at a national level. Considerable momentum and progress has been made in relation to East Midlands Collaboration with commitment from all chief officers in the five forces making up the region (Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, and Nottinghamshire).

The Commissioner fully supports this approach and sees it as being essential to the provision of an effective and efficient police service able to meet the challenges of the Century. He works with the other Police and Crime Commissioners in the region to maintain or increase this momentum and to seek innovative and effective solutions which will bring down the cost of policing our streets. He also meets with his PCC peers through the East Midlands PCC Board (EMPCCB) where they seek a common understanding and way forward in collaboration, thus ensuring that the interests of Leicester, Leicestershire and

Rutland are balanced with the regional and national needs of the broader area. Having chaired this Board for 16 months, Sir Clive has now handed that duty to Paddy Tipping (PCC for Nottinghamshire).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) Inspections

Under Section 54 of the Police Act 1996 a PCC is empowered to commission Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary to carry out inspections of specific matters of policing within their policing area.

During 2013/14 the five PCCs in the East Midlands jointly commissioned HMIC to conduct a review of the arrangements for collaboration between the five forces in the region. The purpose of the commission was "to provide [the PCCs] with high-level assurance on the overall approach to collaboration between, and by, forces within the East Midlands policing region; by assessing current arrangements; by assessing what is being developed and by considering future possibilities."

HMIC published the report of their findings in November 2013 <http://bit.ly/1jXEsqF>

Independent Custody Visiting Scheme

Having an Independent Custody Visiting Scheme is a statutory responsibility for a Police and Crime Commissioner. Schemes exist to provide assurance to local communities that they can have confidence in how the police treat people who are held in their custody.

Independent Custody Visitors (ICVs) are volunteers who visit police stations, in pairs, and speak to individuals who are being held in police custody. Visits are unannounced and ICVs arrange between themselves when it is convenient for them to visit. They arrive at the police station and on production of their identity card, are given immediate access to the custody suite. They enter police cells and speak to individuals being held. Conversations with detainees focus on their welfare needs and any issues raised are taken forward on their behalf with the custody sergeant. ICVs also inspect other areas of the custody suite for health and safety purposes. ICVs look, listen, observe and report back on their findings.

ICVs come from a variety of backgrounds and sections of the community. They must be over 18 years of age and have no direct or indirect involvement in the criminal justice system. A comprehensive training programme is provided along with support from other ICVs and the PCC. At the current time the Police and Crime Commissioner has 42 volunteers undertaking this role.

Each custody suite has its own team of ICVs with a team leader, known as a co-ordinator, who is responsible for organising a visit rota and arranging quarterly team meetings. Each pair of ICVs is provided with a 'window' of seven days in which to make a visit. It is left to the ICVs themselves to arrange the time and date the visit will take place and this information is disclosed to no other person ensuring, that the ICVs will be unexpected when they arrive at the custody suite.

The current visiting target is one visit per week to each primary custody suite. During 2013/14, a total of 161 visits were undertaken throughout the Force area which is an increase of seven visits compared to the previous year. Detailed below is the number of visits per custody suite:

- Beaumont Leys/Wigston 48
- Euston Street 62
- Keyham Lane 51

Throughout the year the visiting target was achieved at all custody suites. However one visit could not be recorded at Keyham Lane as no visit form was received by the PCC (although it is understood the visit did go ahead). Beaumont Leys custody suite was closed between August and November for essential maintenance work so no visits were undertaken to the suite during that time. During the closure, Wigston custody suite was opened and the Beaumont Leys team undertook visits to Wigston during this time.

During a custody visit a member of the custody staff will accompany the visitors around the suite but are not present during conversations with the detained person. At the end of the visit a report form is completed by ICVs and forwarded to the PCC. All issues raised by ICVs are reported and monitored by the PCC.

At the time of the visits undertaken in 2013/14, a total of 1,305 people were in police custody. Of these, 579 were offered a visit from ICVs and 561 (97%) were spoken to.

No major issues of concern have been reported from visits undertaken throughout the past year. From conversations with detainees the following requests were made:

- 63 for a doctor/nurse or medication
- 43 for refreshments
- 42 for phone calls
- 39 for reading material
- 30 for blankets
- 24 for an update on their position
- 17 to see a solicitor
- 15 for exercise
- 6 for cell to be cleaned
- 5 for personal washing facilities.

All requests were reported to the custody sergeant with the majority being dealt with at the time.

Other issues highlighted during visits were as follows:

- On checking a custody record, information on 30 minute observations for one detainee was not easily available

Outcome – the observations had been undertaken but were recorded in the custody sergeant's handover screen of the custody record. Staff were advised and ICVs were informed for future reference to ensure they can ask staff to find the relevant information in the custody record. Issues identified were :

- Ligature points in the exercise yard. Outcome – repair and preventative work undertaken.
- A detainee was unhappy with their treatment regarding the provision of medication and basic rights. Outcome – ICVs brought the issue to the attention of the PACE Inspector who spoke with the detainee and explained the complaints procedure. The detainee later declined to make a complaint.

During the year visits were undertaken across all days of the week and at all times of the day and, occasionally, night. This is crucial in ensuring visits do not become predictable and occur at set times. If ICVs visit at times when detainees are sleeping, they can inspect the general cleanliness and safety of the custody suite including kitchens, medical rooms, showers and interview rooms (unless they are in use). A number of health and safety issues including the lack of cleanliness of kitchen areas on occasions, a lack of antibacterial wipes for food temperature probes, cutlery being left in cells and fridge/freezer temperatures not being recorded were recorded during the year. All issues were resolved promptly.

Many of the visit forms received from ICVs contain positive comments regarding their visit including:

- Detainees were very positive in their comments of officers; and
- Prompt admission to custody suite and received courteously by staff.

Complaints

The PCC is scrutinising and monitoring how complaints made by members of the public about policing are being handled. He receives data on complaints received on a quarterly basis at business meetings held with the Force. Between meetings the PCC undertakes his own dip sampling of complaint files. The outcome of the dip sampling is discussed at the Strategic Assurance Board.

The Force is now publishing the results of misconduct hearings on its website

<http://bit.ly/1h9gW2Z>

There have been three complaints received by the Police and Crime Panel relating to the senior posts within the Office of the PCC (as defined earlier in this report) between 01/04/13 and 31/3/14.

Subsequent Transfer Scheme

The subsequent transfer scheme was supported by the Home Office and took place with effect from 1 April 2014.

Register of Interests

A register of Sir Clive's disclosable interests can be found on the PCC's website at

<http://bit.ly/1nvf8S0>

**Section 2) Performance against the Strategic Priorities of
the Police and Crime Plan**

Theme: Reducing Offending and Re-offending

Strategic Priority 1: Preventing and diverting young people from offending

Measure:

- **Reduction in the number of 10-17 year olds entering the criminal justice system for the first time and receiving community resolutions, youth cautions and youth conditional cautions.**

During the year 2013/14 Leicestershire and Rutland saw a reduction in First Time Entrants (FTEs) of approximately 46% from 407 (2012/13) to 221 (2013/14). For the city there was a reduction of approximately 18% from 260 in (2012/13) to 214 in (2013/14).

Since April 2013, all criminal justice disposals (other than charges) go to a Youth Panel which is made up of representatives from City and County Youth Offending Services and the Police. Each case is considered at the Panel and the appropriate disposal is determined.

For the year April 2013 to March 2014 there have been 798 cases put before the Panel and the main disposals were as follows:

- Youth Cautions 499
- Youth Conditional Cautions 65
- Restorative Justice /Community Disposal 119

The New Youth Police Decision panels have contributed to further diversion of young people from youth courts. Through the New Youth Police Decision young people have received targeted and tailored intervention to tackle criminogenic and welfare needs in order to prevent re-offending.

PCC Funded Diversionary Activities

Leicester Warriors To The Hoop – The project harnesses the attraction of sport and in particular the reputation of Karl Brown, the Leicester-born former US college, Leicester Riders and GB basketball player, to engage young people in positive activities. In addition it uses other sporting role models including Rendall '2 tone' Monroe, (the ex WBA International Super Bantamweight champion and former holder of the EBU and Commonwealth Super Bantamweight titles), who is also Leicester-born and who will join the positive activities

session, share his inspiring life story, and deliver 'boxercise' fitness sessions. The project consists of two elements: basketball -led taster sessions and positive activities sessions.

Catch 22 – The Catch 22 Community Action Against Crime (CAAC) project is an early intervention project that tackles anti-social behaviour (ASB) associated with 'hotspots' in the Eyres Monsell ward by engaging children and young people at risk of offending; and by reducing the number of first-time entrants to the criminal youth justice system. It aims to positively engage these young people in activities outside of the school week – especially at weekends and during school breaks. CAAC engages children in sporting activities , through involvement in athletics and other clubs, such as Leicester Tigers Rugby Club and Leicester City Football Club. Sports clubs have facilitated some training and engagement opportunities, and players acted as role models for these young people. This work is about changing the current mind-sets of these young people through interaction with positive role models to change and influence their outlooks for their future life and well being.

Community Projects Plus – Community Projects Plus (CPP) delivered five weekly targeted positive activity sessions using sport as a tool in five deprived communities of Leicester. The areas, venues and open spaces are targeted using intelligence from Local Policing Units (LPUs) and local partner agencies to engage with 8-19 year-olds at-risk or already involved in risky lifestyles. Coaches engage with young people within these communities and encourage them to attend CPP sessions. While sport is the 'hook' for the young people, the coaches also use the opportunity to have conversations and understand the young people in order to encourage them to make positive lifestyle changes.

The Safer Leicester Partnership completed targeted diversionary activities employing street-based teams and additional summer activities targeted at those who are at risk of criminality in Spinney Hills Park and Keyham Lane Local Policing Units.

Harborough CSP completed half-term ASB prevention activities to divert young people away from negative behaviour, and engage them in more positive recreational and community activities.

Focus: Community Remedy passed to PCCs

During 2013/2014, PCCs became aware of new legislation regarding out-of-court settlements. Under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, which became law in March 2014, Restorative Justice (RJ) was officially renamed Community Remedy and the process set to fall under the remit of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Sir Clive Loader sought the views of people across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland on the new process whereby so-called 'low level' or 'local' crime such as minor criminal damage are settled out-of-court with the agreement of the person affected, the perpetrator and the police. As of 28th May, I had received 1,230 replies to my request for public views on community resolution remedies.

The new Community Remedy processes are proven to increase satisfaction among those who opt for them when compared with those who the criminal justice system-centred approaches, such as taking low level offences to court. The process is also proven to reduce bureaucracy thereby increasing the amount of time officers are able to spend on the beat in our communities or on other investigations. Restorative Justice approaches are particularly effective in reducing the number of first-time entrants in to the criminal justice system and in reducing subsequent re-offending among children and young adults.

Community Remedy changes will not affect day-to-day business but will change how police officers record outcomes. Officers will need to categorise any 'Remedy' that they arrange between the victim and offender, and state which Community Remedy category it fits.

For example, instead of going to court to address their vandalism of a fence, the perpetrator would, under a Community Remedy outcome, fix or repair the fence or complete some other remedial action to redress the balance. Community Remedy is set to be implemented in October 2014 following consultation with public, partners and police.

Strategic Priority 2: Reducing re-offending among young people and adults

Measures:

- **Reduction in offending by 18-24 year olds**
- **Reduction in re-offending by 18-24 years olds.**

In 2013/14 there were 221 first time entrants (FTEs), which was a reduction of 186 (47.5%) when compared with the previous year 2012/13 (407 FTEs).

Performance figures from April 2013 to March 2014 show the re-offending rate for those aged 18-24 fell by 62%; the cohort was responsible for 141 crimes as compared to 372 during the previous year.

In 2013/14 there were 66 out of 70 young people (94.3%) who had successful drug and alcohol treatment completions when compared with the previous year, 78 out of 79 (98.7%).

From 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014 there were five out of 149 (3.4%) young people re-entering structured treatment within six months of a successful completion.

In recent months, the Force has taken the decision to support a research student from the University of Leicester to conduct research into this area. The student will focus on the effectiveness of Out Of Court Disposals (OOC) for low-risk young offenders in terms of their future re-offending. This work will also link to the new Crime Reduction Strategy, helping to demonstrate 'what works' in policing.

Integrated Offender Management (IOM) is a multi-agency team formed primarily from police, probation and drugs workers. This team works with a cohort of the most prolific or high risk offenders and so its contribution is key to overall success.

Leicestershire Youth Offending Services (LYOS) conducts assessment and individualised intervention to those young people presenting the highest risk of re-offending via the Integrated Rehabilitation and Intensive Support provision. This delivers high intensity, individualised and targeted intervention to persistent offenders and additionally offers voluntary support to custody leavers and young people deemed as requiring additional support.

The Young Adults Project (YAP)

The Young Adults Project (YAP) was established by the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Reducing Re-offending Board (RRB) in October 2013. This was in response to Sir Clive identifying young adults as a priority group within the Police and Crime Plan based on the evidence that they are involved in a disproportionately high amount of crime. This long-standing issue was also a concern shared by partners. With this in mind, the RRB agreed the first phase of the project, an exploratory phase aimed at gaining a deeper understanding of the offending and needs of 16-24 year olds locally and examining the evidence as to what is effective in reducing their offending and re-offending.

Chaired by the chief executive of the Y (a charity based in Leicester), a multi-agency Project Board first met in November 2013. A senior probation officer seconded to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner was assigned as project manager and managers from County Youth Offending Service, the Police, the PCC and the Y-Pod were identified as leads for the work outlined below.

It was agreed that Phase 1 would focus on:

1. The gathering and analysis of relevant local data provided by partner organisations
2. The involvement of young adults and the analysis and incorporation of their feedback, ideas and views
3. An exploration of the available research and literature (including good practice guides and site visits to innovative pilot projects) to obtain evidence over what matters and what works with this group
4. Mapping the current system, practices and services to identify strengths of the collective approach, any gaps and areas for improvement.
5. Starting the engagement phase and developing a communications strategy

The YAP project team will present its recommendations to a group of senior managers, representative of the whole criminal justice sector, at the YAP launch event at The Y in Leicester in July 2014.

“Critically, for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland to improve outcomes for young adult offenders, a change in thinking across partner agencies will be required, away from a generic ‘all adult’ approach to one that recognises young adulthood as a distinct stage in life,

where a bespoke and tailored approach is needed to support transitions and desistance from crime.” – Grace Strong, Probation Manager and YAP Project Manager

Strategic Priority 3: Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and re-offending

Measures:

- Increase in the number of successful of drug and alcohol treatment completions
- Reduction in the number of re-entries into structured treatment within six months of successful completion
- Reduction in re-offending rates among those offenders within criminal justice treatment
- Reduction in the number of incidents recorded in or near licensed premises during the night-time economy hours of 7pm to 7am
- An assessment and evaluation of the use of late night levy options through partners with a view to implementation.

This performance is measured as a percentage of successful completions as it is relative to the number of clients engaged. Performance is split by the type of substance used and cannot be meaningfully aggregated as there are significant differentials in potential performance between Opiate / Non-Opiate / Alcohol.

Increase in the number of successful drug and alcohol treatment completions

	2012/13	2013/14*	
	Published	Published	Un-validated
Opiates	42	26	38
Non-Opiates	14	17	24
Alcohol	82	82	90

* Published data covers 12 months ended January 2014 rather than the actual Financial Year (i.e. 12 months ended March 2014).

Reduction in the number of re-entries into structured treatment within six months of successful treatment

	2012/13	2013/14
Opiates	5	2
Non-Opiates	2	2
Alcohol	Not Available	Not Available

Information is not yet available about the extent offenders under treatment continued to re-offend in the time period covered by the Annual Report is not yet available.

The Police & and Crime Plan recognises that in order to reduce offending and re-offending it is integral that effective, specialist drug and alcohol treatment is available. The Force Substance Misuse Delivery Plan 2013-2014 has built on existing partnerships with commissioned services in order to increase the number of successful drug and alcohol treatment completions, reduce re-presentations and reduce re-offending of those engaging in the Criminal Justice Drugs Treatment programme. One of the Force's primary structures for ensuring an increase in referrals to treatment is the Drug Intervention Programme.

Young people who score 2+ following an asset substance misuse assessment are referred to Leicestershire Youth Offending Service Drug Workers. Where appropriate, they are assessed and are provided with care plans and receive substance misuse programmes from drug workers or are 'sign posted' to other services. A minority of high risk young people are referred for outpatient treatment.

The Drug Intervention Programme has carried out 2,384 tests this year compared with 3,677 last year; this is a reduction of 35%. However, the rate of those who tested positively for drugs has risen from 28% to 37%, confirming that custody suite staff are targeting the right detainees and facilitating the right drugs treatment.

A Force Licensing Strategic Group has been formed in order to identify changes in legislation, track progress of the Late Night Levy and Early Morning Alcohol Restriction Orders (EMROs), and make recommendations regarding their use. The evaluations concluded that economic benefits accrued from the night time economy outweighed any costs that might be incurred and that it is felt that the utilisation of night time levies would potentially be seen as punitive risking the constructive working relationships local authorities have with businesses. In addition, the conclusion was that measures designed to address alcohol harm should be used across whole areas. It was felt that councils might be under a moral obligation to spend monies raised through night time levies on measures specifically benefiting just the areas where the levies were being applied.

There are no current plans at a local partnership level to pursue the Late Night Levy or EMROs. However Leicester City Council – with the engagement and support of the PCC - is at an advanced stage in progressing a Business Improvement District (BID). BIDs are business-led partnerships focused on improving and enhancing commercial areas including

town and city centres, commercial locations and industrial estates. By charging businesses a levy of 1% of the rateable value of their property each year it is believed that funds of between £1 million and £6 million could be raised for city centre investment. This work will be further developed in 2014/15.

The Force has also implemented an Alcohol Waiver Scheme this year. It has enabled nearly 400 people to be diverted on to the Alcohol Awareness Scheme. Alcohol Awareness provides early education on alcohol and its effects together with advice on how to drink responsibly instead of a prosecution for a more minor alcohol-related offence. It links well with the Force's new Crime Reduction Strategy.

A comprehensive data collection process has been designed and implemented, recording the number of incidents in and near to licensed premises between 7pm and 7am. This data has supported the Force in highlighting night time economy hotspots in order to support local policing more effectively. This data informs the 2014/15 Substance Misuse Delivery Plan.

Partnership working has been strengthened since the appointment of the Force Substance Misuse Officer in September 2013. This role has enhanced police knowledge in relation to substance misuse services and has increased the opportunities for multi-agency working to solve local issues.

Significant work has been undertaken in relation to Novel Psychoactive Substances (NPS) – sometimes know as 'legal highs' - which present a new challenge to policing as they are not covered by the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. Partnership work continues to identify the threat to the Force and also to develop a Local Needs Analysis. NPS briefings have been delivered widely to officers and partners.

The Probation Trust continues to chair the Local Reducing Re-offending Board which brings together partners to tackle issues which lie behind the re-offending of young people and adults. This area continues to have one of the lowest re-offending rates in the country, which is a tribute to the work of partners through services such as Integrated Offender Management, where priority offenders are identified, closely monitored and offered support to address issues of unemployment, debt, homelessness or drug and alcohol misuse. These services are offered to offenders on community services or on release from prison. In particular the REACH employment service has demonstrated that getting offenders into work has a significant impact on reducing re-offending. To this end, the PCC is sponsoring on, a project called '9+1' where he is working with partners to provide greater job opportunities for

ex-offenders / ex drug users. The Reducing Re-offending Board has commissioned the Young Adults Project (YAP) to consider how to address better re-offending by 16 – 24 year olds, a group of offenders who commit a third of crime. The initial report and proposals will be launched on 5 July 2014.

The Probation Trust also delivers alcohol and drug treatment services in partnership with Inclusion Healthcare, identifying problematic offenders in police stations, the courts and providing treatment in the community, HM Prison Leicester and following release. This unique end-to-end treatment pathway is commissioned by a range of partners and has been effective in reducing re-offending over several years. While not all offenders are immediately 'cured' by providing effective treatment, prolific offending is significantly reduced.

The Probation Trust itself comes to an end on 31 May 2014, and its business will transfer to a National Probation Service (NPS) dealing with higher risk offenders and a community rehabilitation company for Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland, dealing with lower risk offenders and the alcohol and drug treatment services. The PCC is looking forward to an equally close working relationship with the new NPS.

Focus: A BID to address alcohol-related anti-social behaviour

In November 2013, Sir Clive Loader visited the city to listen to the views of local people. In the meeting held in the home of Mr and Mrs Allum in New Walk, Leicester, Sir Clive heard the views of local residents, bar managers, City councillors and the police in the relation to noise and alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in the city centre.

“Together, with support of the City Council and local police, we will energise the debate about what, in addition, can be done at a strategic level to maintain a safer city centre which is family-friendly after the hours of darkness.” -- Sir Clive Loader

This discussion was revisited in April 2014 when Sir Clive and City Mayor Sir Peter Soulsby announced they were backing plans for a business improvement district (BID) in the city, where businesses pay an extra levy, collected through business rates, to fund specific improvements and services within that area.

In Leicester, the BID is intended to bring leisure and retail businesses together, acknowledging the importance of all our city centre businesses in creating a vibrant city

centre, day and night. There will be a focus on the evening and night time economy, to create opportunities for further growth.

The extra levy could be used for more marketing of the city, to make sure more people know about the diverse range of retail, leisure, heritage and cultural activities on offer in the city centre.

Ideas include introducing services such as taxi marshalling in the evening to help make the night-time environment safe and welcoming. The value of the BID will depend on the size of the BID area, which has yet to be determined, but it is thought that it will be at least £1m. Businesses in the city centre will be asked to vote on whether they want a BID.

“BIDs in other towns and cities have been a great way of giving local companies a stake in the future success of their areas. I welcome these moves to establish one in the city centre and will give all the help I can to see a successful BID set up in Leicester.” -- City Mayor Sir Peter Soulsby

“A BID represents an excellent opportunity to build on successful established partnership initiatives to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour in the city, enhancing the safe and welcoming visitor experience Leicester provides.” -- Sir Clive Loader

Strategic Priority 4: Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled Families Programme

Measures:

- **Reduction in re-offending within families engaged in a troubled/supported family programme**
- **Reduction in recorded ASB committed by families engaged in a troubled/supported families programme**

The Troubled/Supporting Families programmes seek to change repeating generational patterns such as anti-social behaviour, crime, worklessness and poor parenting in the most troubled families in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, with both national government and local partners investing money and other resources.

These families are often characterised by there being no adult in the family working, children not being in school and family members being involved in crime and anti-social behaviour. These families almost always have other long-standing problems which can lead to their children repeating the cycle of disadvantage. If a family meets the relevant criteria for the programme, a support worker is assigned or they are referred to a service provider for additional support.

The main aims of the programmes are to:

- get children back into school
- reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour
- put adults on a path back to work
- reduce the high costs these families place on public services.

Troubled/Supporting Family Boards provide strategic oversight and take place in each programme area within Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. The programmes were launched in 2012. As at March 2014, nearly 1,000 families who were involved in ASB, had a young person involved in crime and/or were affected by truancy/exclusion from school have been supported. This includes 330 families in Leicester city, 589 in Leicestershire and 10 in Rutland.

There were small numbers (7) of offenders from troubled/supported families in the IOM cohort. These 7 offenders committed a total of 18 offences.

Theme: Supporting Victims and Witnesses

Strategic Priority 5: To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse

Measures:

- **50% Domestic Abuse with Injury crime outcome rate**
- **90% Satisfaction rate**

Recorded crime for domestic related violence has increased from 3,911 to 4,194 (7.2%) when compared to 2012/13. The crime outcome rate for domestic related violence with injury is 52.1%. The victim satisfaction was approximately 86.0%.

A recent report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) commended Leicestershire Police on being the only Force to specifically survey victims of domestic abuse. A national satisfaction survey is now being developed, based on the Leicestershire model with the input of Leicestershire Police.

The Force has developed a local agreement with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) that any matter listed in a Specialist Domestic Violence Court (SDVC) send its result on the same day directly to the Witness Care Unit (WCU). This update includes information about bail conditions, restraining orders, and sentencing. The key point is that it allows the Witness Care Officers to update the victim almost immediately, hence increasing victim satisfaction.

The Force has also set up bi-monthly meetings with the Crown Prosecution Service to develop best practice around "victimless" prosecutions.

Further enhancements to the service provided for those who suffer domestic abuse are likely to be realised through the implementation of body worn video. Wearing video cameras by operational officers can increase opportunities to obtain initial accounts from witnesses and improve evidence gathering at scenes of crime. This is especially relevant with domestic abuse cases and assists in providing support for victims and opportunities to seek earlier guilty pleas. The benefits of this programme include a likely reduction in offending and re-offending.

Strategic Priority 6: To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences

Measures:

- **Under review in line with IPCC and HMIC guidance**
- **Recorded crime for serious sexual offences has increased from 742 to 877 offences, an increase of 18.2%.**

Reports of rape have increased by 46.8%. This is largely due to a change in recording practices, whereby an allegation of rape is immediately recorded as such, pending investigation and confirmation of the offence (previously it was only recorded as rape once the offence had been confirmed). The crime outcome rate for serious sexual offences at the end of the year stands at 23.4%.

There is a training programme under way for specialist police staff who deal with sexual offences; this improves their interviewing skills and provides professional development. In addition, no allegation of rape is filed as “No Crime” without authority from the Force Crime Registrar.

PCC Funded Projects

New Futures completed a mentoring project to support young people who are being abused through Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE). Its aims were to:

- Continue to safeguard the young people while they are still involved in sexual exploitation, supporting them to utilise their strengths and resilience while focusing on issues such as positive relationships, recognising violent relationships, risk taking behaviours such as going missing or using drugs and/or alcohol as well as immediate and future consequences for involvement in criminal activity.
- Help young people to reintegrate back into mainstream support systems such as education, health and drugs and alcohol treatment where there is a need.
- Support young people to plan future aspirations such as education, careers and employment, thus preventing them from involvement in adult prostitution, drug and alcohol misuse and other associated criminal activities such as shoplifting.

- To assist the police to pursue criminal interventions by collating intelligence from the young people (with their consent) on those who perpetrate sexual crimes against them.

Rutland CSP completed the Child Sexual Exploitation and E-Safety Prevention Project, a proactive programme targeting vulnerable young people who are potentially at risk of online abuse, grooming and Child Sexual Exploitation. It provided:

- Dedicated e-safety training in secondary schools
- Targeted group support to young people who have been victim of CSE and/or have been identified as vulnerable and at risk. The Love for Life Programme is a six-week project with a focus on self-esteem, sex and relationships guidance, sexting, body image and the media
- Staff training

Strategic Priority 7: To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences

Measures:

- **55% Crime outcome rate**
- **88% Satisfaction rate**

For the year 2013/14:

- Recorded hate crime has decreased from 971 to 862 (11.2%)
- The crime outcome rate for hate crime offences was 45.8%
- The victim satisfaction rate for service relating to hate crimes was approximately 83.7%.

During the year, over 50 community engagement events have received contributions by police staff in relation to hate crime promoting the *Stamp It Out!* anti-hate crime project, including educational venues, sporting venues and health service venues.

The Force hate crime officer is working with University of Leicester's Centre for Hate Studies on a funded project to understand the impact of hate crime; this work is likely to be of national significance.

"The University of Leicester's Centre for Hate Studies' work highlights the degree to which we need to explore victim-focused ways of supporting those who have experienced hate crime. The victim experience or 'journey' will play an important part in informing how the PCC will commission organisations to deliver positive outcomes for victims and witnesses when funding passes from the Ministry of Justice to Police and Crime Commissioners in October 2014." -- Paul Stock Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire

The past year has also seen the introduction of Hate Crime Scrutiny Panels; they review and monitor the investigation of hate crime offences in an objective way.

Funded training for Hate Crime-related incidents treated by the Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust

The PCC provided funding to the Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust in order that they can enhance the knowledge of the implications of Hate Crime among both their staff (by use of new training aids) and people with whom they are dealing. It is hoped that this will help to improve the reporting of hate crime and hence the ability of the police and other agencies to provide a better service to victims.

Stop and Tell Campaign by Leicestershire County Council

Promotion took place across Leicestershire in March 2014 during the *Stop and Tell Campaign* week, an initiative co-ordinated by Leicestershire County Council's Hate Incident Monitoring Project (HIMP). The partnership agreed to promote the campaign using the strap line: 'Respect difference, say **NO** to hate'. Partners also agreed to use this strap line for the campaigns during 2015 and 2016.

Multi-agency planning meetings took place to plan the programme for the 2014 campaign. A programme of work and events was co-ordinated with partners to ensure that the campaign message was represented across the county and that relevant information and advice was offered throughout the week. Five training events were delivered by the HIMP for front line staff within the Adult and Communities Department.

The www.leics.gov.uk/repothate link received 507 visits during the campaign week, a slight decrease in comparison to 600 visits during last year's campaign. The information below also details the number of visits to the website the month prior to and the month of the campaign week last year in comparison to this year.

January 2013 – 182 visits

February 2013 – 892 visits

February 2014 – 170 visits

March 2014 – 574 visits.

Focus: PCC and MENCAP reach out to deliver the facts about Mate Crime

In March 2014, Sir Clive met with the MENCAP We Think group, supporting people with learning disabilities, to discuss hate crime, 'mate crime' and the additional services provided by the police to support learning disabled people in giving evidence.

'*Mate Crime*' is a term that is used by some communities to describe when a person is befriended by someone or a group of people who then abuses them or commits crimes against them. The victim of these types of incidents are normally people with learning disabilities and have on occasions resulted in the person being murdered - for example, Gemma Hayter who was tortured and murdered by people she classed as her friends (<http://bbc.in/1pf7Nlv>).

"It is important that the MENCAP We Think group and the people they represent know that the police are there for them and will support them in making a stand against those who bully and abuse them." -- Police and Crime Commissioner Sir Clive Loader

"I've been bullied before. I'll never forget about it. The police take it serious – they come and talk to you and take it further if it needs to be taken further." -- Zoe Goodwin co-chair of the MENCAP We Think Partnership Board.

Strategic Priority 8: To prevent anti-social behaviour and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour

Measures:

- **85% Satisfaction rate**

Between April 2013 and March 2014 the victim satisfaction rate for service in relation to anti-social behaviour (ASB) was approximately 79%.

The Force has undertaken a detailed analysis of this decline and is keen to reverse the trend. As a result, all Local Policing Unit Commanders have contributed to a self-inspection programme relating to ASB and Neighbourhood Policing; this work is governed through an associated strategic group.

The Force is keen to implement the forthcoming national ASB legislation and is providing significant training on new policy and procedures for all staff involved. The Force is also leading for the region in the development of a mobile phone “app” and manager briefing guides. These initiatives will also feed in to the Force Crime Reduction Strategy.

The partnership database for recording and assessing ASB, the Sentinel System, continues to develop in line with partners’ needs and recording practices.

For the forthcoming year, the Force will implement the Greater Leicester Area ASB Cars service. This has been enabled through the ASB precept agreement. The enterprise will work to deliver solutions to ASB between 3.30pm and midnight, 7 days a week, with the cars being crewed by Police Officers and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs).

Linking in with this initiative is the Force commitment to implement body worn video for operational officers. The organisation was successful in its bid to the Home Office Innovation Fund during 2013 and has bought a further 500 cameras.

Focus: Designated police cars to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour

Discussions began in 2013/2014 to shape a dedicated service to tackle ASB. Leicestershire Police launched three new police cars in May 2014 dedicated to tackling anti-social behaviour. The Police and Crime Commissioner has continually stated his commitment to dealing with anti-social behaviour (ASB). The new service, which will see three cars dedicated to patrolling designated areas seven days a week from 3.30pm to midnight, reflects a more robust approach to tackling ASB as outlined in Sir Clive's Police and Crime Plan. The new service will be funded from a portion of the additional revenue collected via the 1.5 per cent increase in the 2014/2015 precept, which is the element of the council tax that goes towards policing.

The cars, along with an additional 28 police community support officers (PCSOs), are additional resources and will be targeting areas where analysis shows anti-social behaviour can be a problem. The areas that have been identified are: Leicester city, and parts of Oadby, Wigston, Blaby, Market Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth, and Charnwood.

There are a number of principles that officers work to when dealing with ASB. These include: offering victims advice, telling the victim/caller what has been done, and keeping them informed as to what is being done next. One of the ways they will be kept updated is via a short messaging service (SMS) that will allow officers to keep the victim informed on the progress of the incident.

"The new service underlines my commitment to tackling anti-social behaviour. I am keen to ensure local people receive something demonstrable for the increase in the precept."

-- Police and Crime Commissioner Sir Clive Loader

Strategic Priority 9: To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime

Measures:

- **85% 'all user' Satisfaction rate**
- **1% increase to this target, year on year, to achieve an overall satisfaction rate of 88% by the end of 2016.**

Between April 2013 and March 2014 results showed that approximately 85.8% of respondents were satisfied with the service they received from Leicestershire Police.

The Witness Care Unit continues to provide support and information to victims and witnesses once a suspect has been charged with an offence. Support is prioritised towards those victims and witnesses in greatest need, for example, those who are vulnerable or intimidated, involved in cases of hate crime, or those who have particular support needs. Body worn video is a further initiative designed to improve quality of service to the public. Initial trials have demonstrated that videoing crime and ASB-related incidents increase confidence in the police and improve the chances of prosecution.

Theme: Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer

Strategic Priority 10: To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland

Measure:

- **75% Confidence rate in the Community Based Survey that the 'police are doing a good job'**

Between April 2013 and March 2014 results showed that approximately 79.5% of respondents said that the police in their area were doing a good job.

The progress made under each area of service delivery has put Leicestershire in a good position to make continuous improvements to the service it provides for victims and witnesses.

Since October 2013 an Out of Court Scrutiny Panel has been in place to review criminal cases that were concluded by way of an 'out of court disposal'. The intention is to provide scrutiny of these decisions, increase public understanding and trust in these methods, and to identify areas for policy and practice development.

The purpose of the Panel is not to re-judge the cases but to assess the process and identify any appropriate learning to assist with improvement.

Of the 30 cases scrutinised by the Panel in October/December 2013, 26 (87%) were deemed to have been dealt with appropriately.

Out of Court Disposals include cautions, conditional cautions, fixed penalty notices, cannabis warnings and community resolutions.

Strategic Priority 11: To reduce all crime

Measure:

- **5% Reduction in all crime**

During the year 2013/14 the total number of crimes reported rose by 3.3%, from 58,805 offences to 60,752 offences.

Crime reduction activity reflects the priorities of the Police and Crime Plan, using an evidence-based problem solving approach. Structured control strategies are in place addressing key areas of risk and threat as identified through the Force Strategic Assessment. Each control strategy has an identified lead, with strands dealing with prevention, intelligence, enforcement and reassurance (satisfaction). These strands include communities and partners in solving locally identified issues through the community safety partnerships.

Daily activity is directed through the well-established intelligence, briefing and patrol arrangements to prevent crime and anti-social activity, with effective links between the local daily intelligence review and Basic Command Unit, Force and regional daily management meetings. Repeat victims are identified through assessment and problem solving by specialist support teams within the Delivering Justice Directorate, for example, the Domestic Abuse Investigation Unit ensures that intelligence and information underpin the investigative process. The Intelligence Research Centre also provides quick time review of intelligence and trends, with all ASB reports searched, using a police search engine named Genie 2, as part of the investigation process and subject to an eleven point risk assessment. If this identifies a repeat victim, location or offender, action is automatically taken.

The Force has an effective Integrated Offender Management (IOM) structure, collocated in Leicester city centre, with an IOM hub information sharing between agencies.

The Force is currently developing “evidence-based policing”, building on the success of a conference held at Loughborough University. This is developing the links with academic establishments, other police forces and the College of Policing, and is using Randomised Control Trials (RCTs) to ensure better understanding of what works in policing, where and why.

Strategic Priority 12: To reduce Domestic Burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of Domestic Burglary

Measures:

- **13% Reduction in burglary**
- **25% Crime outcome rate**
- **90% Satisfaction**

During 2013/14 offences of domestic burglary rose by 6.7% from 3,935 offences to 4,199 offences.

The positive outcome rate reduced from 23.2% to 13.4% and the victim satisfaction rate for 2013/14 was approximately 89.1%.

The Force has made sustained efforts in its fight against burglaries, the most high profile initiative being Operation Tiger.

Operation Tiger used officers and staff throughout the organisation, including all officers up to and including the Chief Constable, with the Police and Crime Commissioner witnessing at first hand the activity to target prolific offenders and warrant enforcement. A sustained media campaign emphasised the outcomes, with effective use of the Force's social media accounts supporting the internal and external elements of the campaign. The operation continues at the present time. Thus far, almost 600 arrests have been made under Operation Tiger – many of these being those who cause most harm (eg drug dealers, burglars etc.).

Partnership Locality Fund grants for City target hardening

The Leicester City CSP completed the installation of alley gates in high burglary areas, sensor lighting, dimmer switches for communities vulnerable to burglary and other target hardening and measures and crime prevention campaigns. Issues are those known to occur at certain times of year.

Blaby and Hinckley CSP completed a *Dark Nights* campaign for burglary prevention and

a security and lock target hardening scheme to support people at risk of harm, victims of crime and those most vulnerable. The scheme also supported victims of domestic abuse where it allowed the victim to return and remain in their own property, following an incident.

Strategic Priority 13: To reduce Violence against the Person with Injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims

Measures:

- **2% Reduction in violence against the person with injury offences**
- **50% Crime outcome rate**
- **82% Satisfaction with service for victims of violent crime with injury**

For the year 2013/14 Leicestershire Police crime statistics show that Violence against the Person with Injury increased by 15.7%, from 4,365 offences to 5,052 offences.

The associated crime outcome rate for Violence against the Person with injury offences was 51%, a rise from the previous year's figure of 49.6%.

As a further measure of the view of victims, the customer satisfaction rate for violence against the person with Injury offences was approximately 78.1%.

The Youth Knife Crime Awareness Programme has worked with schools to discuss the dangers of carrying a knife or bladed weapon. This programme is set to continue.

School workshops have been delivered in partnership with HM Prison Manchester to over 10,000 young people in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. There has been a more targeted approach around serious and violent crime to those schools shown to be in more need of this information.

The Force ran a successful gun amnesty in 2013. A total of 131 weapons and over 2,000 rounds of ammunition were handed over to the police during this, the first firearms amnesty in ten years.

Throughout the amnesty, people of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland had the opportunity to rid themselves of any unwanted or unlawfully held firearms and ammunition. A variety of weapons were handed into local policing units across the city and county:

- 7 real revolvers/pistols/handguns
- 6 real rifles
- 49 shotguns

- 3 stun guns
- 23 imitation/blank firing/flare guns
- 43 air weapons

While gun crime within Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland is statistically low, Leicestershire Police uses measures such as the amnesty to ensure it doesn't become a problem in the future.

The City Basic Command Unit has a dedicated violent crime team; its members manage all violent crime prisoners for the City ensuring that violent crime investigations are dealt as quickly as possible.

The Counties Basic Command Unit runs Operation Positive Outcome to drive outcome performance.

The Force decision to introduce body worn video will also increase opportunities to gather witnesses' first hand accounts and evidence gathering at scenes of crime. It has been shown that where video evidence is available it can lead to earlier guilty pleas, a reduction in bureaucracy and to reduced re-offending. By way of example, trials in the US have shown that using body worn video decreases the length of time it takes to record a statement and decreases the number of complaints against the police.

Strategic Priority 14: To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims of vehicle crime

Measures:

Theft from Motor Vehicle

- **14% Reduction in theft from motor vehicle**
- **9% Crime outcome rate**
- **85% Satisfaction rate**

Theft of Motor Vehicle

- **10% Reduction in theft of motor vehicle**
- **23% Crime outcome rate**
- **85% Satisfaction rate**

Force figures show that theft from motor vehicle offences rose by 3.1% during the year 2013/14. The total number of vehicle crime offences was 5,396.

Positive outcomes reduced to 7.7% from 12.3% the previous year. The victim satisfaction for theft from motor vehicles was approximately 87.2%.

For the offence of theft of motor vehicle, the number of crimes recorded increased by 6% to a total of 1,114.

The positive outcome rate decreased from 32.6% to 20.3%. The victim satisfaction for theft of motor vehicles was approximately 82.8%.

The Force has spent £150,000 to place Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras at strategically placed sites across the roads network; these increase cross-border intelligence with other forces and assist in the identification of travelling criminals. The ANPR function helps to underpin the Force Crime Reduction Strategy.

Within the Force, the Operation Dynamo Auto team reviews and manages vehicle crime, looking for trends to enhance detection opportunities.

The Force has also increased its partnership approach through Business Watch, Farm Watch, and a Vehicle Crime initiative involving motoring retailers and local garages.

Targeted crime-related messages sent out to subscribers via the Force Neighbourhood Link system have captured the imagination of farmers across the Melton and Rutland area and have increased the amount of intelligence submitted to the police.

Theme: Protecting the Vulnerable

Strategic Priority 15: To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses

Partners have agreed to work together to agree the most robust and focused support to these victims and witnesses.

The chair of the Leicestershire Safeguarding Children's Board has been tasked with developing measures to ensure a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses of child abuse and sexual exploitation.

The Force is pleased to say that the Child Sexual Exploitation team has been introduced and developed over the past year.

Additionally, social workers now join the police Missing Person Teams, working together to improve the identification and management of missing children who are deemed at risk of exploitation.

Focus: Safeguarding

The Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children and Safeguarding Adults Boards receive funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner. During 2013/14, there have been a wide range of safeguarding activities carried out under the authority and guidance of the Boards. For Leicester City Council, there is a separate Safeguarding Children's Board and a Safeguarding Adults' Board with supporting board offices. Leicestershire and Rutland Councils have a combined board office that supports a Safeguarding Children's Board and a Safeguarding Adults' Board across the two authorities. There is much joint working in order to maximise the impact of their efforts, improve partnership working and reduce duplication.

The main purpose of the Boards is to ensure the effectiveness and impact of safeguarding services across the areas and to carry out reviews (such as serious case reviews) when things go wrong.

The Safeguarding Boards seek assurance that the help and protection services for children, young people and vulnerable adults, offered across the partnership of agencies within the area, are increasingly effective. This includes services for early help such as the Families

First programme in Rutland, the Supporting Leicestershire Families programme and the Think Family programme in Leicester. The focus of this work is that more is done at an earlier stage, (early intervention) stopping people progressing into more acute services.

Leicester Safeguarding Adults Board Annual reports <http://bit.ly/1io8Zl6>

Leicester Safeguarding Children Board Annual reports <http://bit.ly/1h979tQ>

Leicestershire and Rutland Adult and Children Safeguarding Board Annual report (combined) <http://bit.ly/1nQi8qm>

Strategic Priority 16: Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs

Measures:

By December 2013:

- **Key stakeholders to complete a review of the identified partnership priority areas so to facilitate evidence based planning.**
- **To develop a programme of joint working between key stakeholders further to the above review and findings around the partnership priority areas.**
- **Agree a broader set of specific outcomes and measures for all key stakeholders.**

The Strategic Partnership Board identified the need for a senior level Mental Health Partnership Group which is chaired by a representative from the West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). To date the Partnership Group has:

- identified the key stakeholders and local programmes and strategies which impact on mental health;
- mapped the various boards, groups, and meetings whose terms of reference, or where un-constituted, agendas cover aspects of mental health and well-being;
- contributed data and information which have been collated to develop a snapshot partnership landscape picture around mental health and well-being; and
- agreed to support the funding of a Mental Health Partnership Development Manager Post to help shape the strategy going forward and coordinate partner actions and engagement.

The work completed so far has enabled the partnership group to recognise the complex arrangements and resource deployment associated with all types of mental health incidents, for example, detentions under Section 136 of the Mental Health Act. Work is under way to:

- Develop partnership data to analyse partnership activity; and
- map the patient/client/citizen's journey from mental health incident to final handover.

The Criminal Justice Liaison and Diversion service is a provision delivered in partnership by Leicestershire Partnership Trust (LPT), Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust and

Leicestershire Police. The service provides access to mental health professionals at all levels of the Criminal Justice System within Leicestershire and Rutland. The Leicestershire scheme is one of just ten pilot areas being funded by the Department for Health to guide the future national provision of Liaison and Diversion services. The key aspects to this service are that it provides a service to all age groups 24 hours a day. The Liaison and Diversion team operates within police custody suites, the court system and within the Probation Service. In police stations the nurses' duties include helping officers to respond to calls and identify those with problems.

Since January 2013, the scheme has operated a mental health triage car which is driven by a police officer and an accompanying mental health nurse from the crisis service operated by the LPT. It aims to improve the service provided to people who are experiencing difficulties with their mental health or learning disabilities, and who find themselves in crisis or part of a police encounter. The scheme has been nationally commended.

This triage car approach appears to have led to a reduction by 33% in detentions under Section 136 of the Mental Health Act. The car deals with 120 cases per month and the average length of detention for those involved is now approximately five hours (these having previously averaged eight hours).

Mental Health Concordat

In February 2014, Leicestershire Police pledged to share the way it works with people with mental health issues with Forces around the country. Throughout 2013/2014 the Force has pioneered a number of initiatives to improve the way people with mental health are treated. This work is to be shared further with other forces, other agencies and their workers, under a Mental Health Concordat.

The Concordat core principles and outcomes are:

- access to support before crisis point;
- urgent and emergency access to crisis care with the explicit recognition that police officers should not have to consider using police custody as an alternative just because there is a lack of local mental health provision (or availability) at certain times of the day or night;
- the right quality of treatment and care when in crisis; and

- recovery and staying well, and preventing future crises.

The agreement has been set up by the College of Policing and the Association of Chief Police Officers at a national level. As part of the Concordat, the College of Policing has agreed to review all the training that new police officers receive so that they are following best practice.

“As PCC for Leicestershire, I am pleased to say that Leicestershire Police is ahead of the curve nationally with regard to establishing an effective multi-agency response for individuals in mental health crisis. The Mental Health Concordat agrees a similar level of commitment nationwide and presents an opportunity in Leicestershire to deepen further our partnership working, ensuring local people receive the most appropriate care and support, delivered at the right time and in the right place.” -- Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire Sir Clive Loader

Recent Leicestershire Police initiatives include:

- the mental health triage car – a joint initiative with Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust, where a nurse and police officer attend incidents together to find the best way of resolving them;
- the Stamp It Out campaign, which encourages people to report hate crime if they have been victimised for their mental health problems or anything else that makes them appear different;
- the custody project – where those detained for crimes are offered a mental health assessment, which may point them to support from other services; and
- a booklet describing what powers officers have and when they should use them was issued to all operational officers and staff.

To read the Mental Health Concordat report click here <http://bit.ly/1jXqjIO>

Focus: PCC praises work of NHS arts engagement

Police and Crime Commissioner Sir Clive Loader has praised the work of NHS arts engagement staff in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland who have provided outreach programmes throughout 2013/2014 to meet the needs of those living with diagnosed mental health conditions who can often feel disengaged or excluded from mainstream social activities.

Sir Clive visited the project held at the Embrace Arts Centre in Leicester to speak with service users and discuss how the project makes a difference to their lives. The ArtSpace arts engagement drop-in project, led by the Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust, supports the creative aspirations of dozens of people, curating and exhibiting their work in public buildings and art studios across the city.

The partnership working between Leicestershire Police and Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust ensures local people living with diagnosed mental health conditions receive the support and care most appropriate to their situation and need.

“It is important that police and NHS staff are able to offer the best support to people in the right places at the right times. Successful arts projects like ArtSpace mean more people are actively engaged in supported community activity and less likely to be isolated and disengaged, sometimes accessing emergency services at the point of crisis,” -- Sir Clive Loader

Strategic Priority 17: To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports

Measures:

- **Reduction in number of missing person reports**
- **Reduction in police time and cost spent dealing with missing people**
- **Reduction in reports received from the nine key locations**

It should be noted that Leicestershire Police is complying with a new national definition of a “missing person” which has significantly reduced the number of recorded reports.

Nonetheless, the following statistics are included for completeness:

During the year the number of “missing person” reports has decreased by 73.1%.

The numbers of persons reported to the police as “missing people” fell by 42.0% in 2013/14 as compared to the previous year, likewise those reported as “absent people” fell by 52.4%.

Over the same period, the percentage of repeat missing people has decreased from 23.65% in 2012/13 to 21.26%.

The identified nine key locations accounted for 1,240 reports in 2012/13 and less than 400 in 2013/14.

Child sexual exploitation (CSE) research project in conjunction with the University of Leicester

Children from care homes make up the greatest percentage of missing people reports in Leicestershire. An undergraduate criminology student from the University of Leicester, completing a three- to six-month internship for the PCC, is designing a research project which focusses on children and young people living in residential care homes, who repeatedly go missing and are more likely to be victims of child sexual exploitation (CSE). The project will use a preventative approach, whereby the children and young people will be educated, through various workshops, on the risks of going missing and being sexually exploited. Another aspect of the research will focus on return interviews and ‘safe and well’ checks, in an attempt to gain a better understanding concerning those who repeatedly go missing. Through this research project, the Force - alongside key partners - will be able to

understand the best approaches to reduce the number of children and young people who repeatedly go missing, and reduce the numbers of children who are sexually exploited.

Theme: The Financial Challenge

Strategic Priority 18: With staff and partners, transform the way we protect our communities and deliver over £20m in revenue savings by 2016

- **A vision for Leicestershire Police that is radical, challenging and will deliver the policing priorities set out in this Plan within the resources available.**
- **Evidence based business cases for change, developed from and based on current project mandates and options under consideration.**
- **Implementation of options approved through the Leicestershire Police Change Board.**

The 2014/15 plan, produced as an appendix to the Change Plan 2013-17 which was released in June 2013, set out recommendations for meeting the funding gap expected during the 2014/15 financial year. The projected funding gap at that time for the 2014/15 financial year was £4.4m.

There were a number of options proposed, each assessed in terms of delivery in 2014/15 against the following two risks:

- The impact on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan
- The dependence on building the foundation for further transformative change towards our stated strategic objective:

'With our staff and partners, transform the way we protect our communities and deliver over £20m in revenue savings by 2016'.

While the options proposed were those that were believed to be achievable at the time of writing (June 2013), some required more development than others to determine their feasibility for implementation during the 2014/15 financial year, and subsequently some changes have been necessary.

It was intended that the savings delivered in the 2014/15 financial year were going to be largely transactional in nature, to ensure that where appropriate non-staff efficiency savings could be maximised, police officer posts modernised where warranted powers were not required, and (where appropriate) vacant posts removed from the establishment.

What this would mean is that the Force would not look or feel very different to staff or the public through this period; the major transformational change would come later.

In 2013/14, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire's budget was managed and monitored tightly during the year in conjunction with the Force and this reflects the very tight financial environment and reducing funding year-on-year. As a result of this, the final outturn for the year resulted in a very small underspend of £57k which, when compared to a budget of over £173.5 million, equated to a variance of only 0.03%. The full detail will be included in the 2013/14 Statement of Accounts which are compiled, audited and published separately by the end of September 2014.

Focus: Changes to Leicestershire Police's front enquiry service

Changes to Leicestershire Police's front enquiry service were approved by the Leicestershire Police Change Board on Tuesday 29 October 2013 following a review of the service to ensure that police station opening times better matched demand. Leicestershire Police had 17 front enquiry desks and footfall data revealed that at some stations there was one person an hour on average walking through the door. These numbers are a result of the changes in custody provision and the increase in other methods of contacting the police (such as email, beat surgeries, web chats, booking an appointment and social media). There are yellow telephones on the outside of all police stations that connect straight through to the Contact Management Department.

It was agreed to reduce the opening hours of 14 of the Force's 17 front enquiry desks and remove the service at three locations – Syston, Lutterworth and Belgrave. The changes will realise savings of £500,000.

During 2013/2014 plans were enacted for a shared enquiry service run with Charnwood Borough Council with police front enquiry desk staff moving into the reception at the council offices from May 2014. A similar service is planned with Rutland County Council, to start at the end of July 2014.

Due to voluntary redundancy and redeployment there were no compulsory redundancies. Two new supervisor posts have also been created.

Section 3) Contributions from Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs)

Blaby and Hinckley

The joint Community Safety Partnership for Blaby District and the Borough of Hinckley and Bosworth has published its new Community Safety Strategy for 2014-17. The strategy outlines the Partnership's priorities for tackling crime and community safety issues. These priorities have been agreed as a result of the crime and disorder figures from the recent strategic assessment for Blaby District and through consultation with the public earlier in the year.

Councillor Sheila Scott, portfolio holder for Policy, Partnerships and Health Improvement, said: 'The police and other public bodies have faced a number of changes in recent years including a reduction in resources. However, the Community Safety Partnership remains committed to making Blaby District a safe place to live, work and visit. The new strategy builds on the previous successes of the joint partnership as well as setting out how we will tackle those crime and disorder issues that are of most concern to local people. It is vitally important that people feel safe in their own neighbourhoods, particularly those most vulnerable in our communities. It is also important that people have both confidence in reporting any concerns they have and in the response they will receive from our community safety services.'

The Community Safety Partnership is made up of a range of agencies including: Blaby District Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, Leicestershire Police, Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service, the Probation and Youth Offending Services as well as non-statutory organisations such as voluntary sector and housing services.

Cllr David Bill and Cllr Shelia Scott, Joint Chairs, Blaby and Hinckley CSP

Charnwood

“The Charnwood Community Safety Partnership (CSP) brings together a number of agencies and organisations concerned with tackling and reducing crime and anti-social behaviour in the Borough of Charnwood. The CSP each year undertakes a strategic assessment to review performance and reconsider its priorities and targets which include the Police and Crime Plan.

During the year the CSP has focused its energy and resource on two major areas acquisitive crime, including domestic burglary and theft from a vehicle and anti-social behaviour. This has taken the form of better communication on ways to protect property especially around domestic burglary, where the CSP has contributed to positive outcomes in this area. The CSP has been at the forefront of providing a single repository for all anti-social behaviour complaints, this means endeavouring to ensure that every single complaint made by the public is logged on to one single system, making it easier to respond to complaints, especially repeat incidents. This I believe is already contributing to higher satisfaction levels within communities.”

Cllr David Snartt, Chair, Charnwood CSP

Harborough

“In Harborough District, organisations from the public and voluntary sector continue to focus on the crime and anti-social behaviour that impacts the most; and where local partnership working can make the difference.

“Nationally and locally many crimes are up. It is clear from longer term trends and a comparison for Harborough to similar areas, that Harborough remains a very safe place to live and work.

“The Community Safety Partnership remains as a vehicle to pull together local authorities, police, fire service and others – as crimes often straddle these partners and cannot be tackled in isolation. It is essential in this time of austerity that public services work together and any duplication or unnecessary bureaucracy is removed.

“Key to building resilience and capacity has been the support and critical challenge of the Police and Crime Commissioner, which has made us all look closely at activities the CSP has traditionally funded to ensure they remain effective and value for money.

“Some key achievements this year, gained with the support of the PCC have included putting on diversionary activities that engaged 113 young people during half term, supporting 53 older residents to improve their home security and supporting 51 individuals and families suffering the effects of domestic abuse.

“Indeed, the Journey Away from Domestic Abuse (JADA) service is an example of a robust service funded by pulling together reducing budgets in Harborough and Melton from community safety, the County Council and the children’s centre programme – and contributes to our aim that no one falls through the net.”

Cllr Bill Liquorish JP CC, Chair, Harborough CSP

Leicester City

“The Safer Leicester Partnership (SLP), Leicester City’s Community Safety Partnership, deals with a number of complex and inter-related crime, ASB and substance misuse issues.

Our vision for the city is:

‘To ensure that all citizens of Leicester feel safe within their communities and benefit from an improved quality of life and well-being as a result of partnership action to reduce crime and substance misuse.’

“The SLP focusses partnership effort on a number of areas such as the reduction in ASB, Overall Crime, Alcohol Harm, Domestic Violence, repeat offending and the improvement in safeguarding.

“During the period 2013-14 we have seen many successes in performance such as victim satisfaction in resolving ASB of 81.3% (over a rolling 12 month period). This is attributed to the roll out of a number of multi-agency initiatives in order to reduce the level of ASB within the city. We have also seen a 12.7% reduction in other burglary types and 6.7% reduction in robbery. We have seen positive results for victims of domestic violence and abuse as a result of commissioning an integrated support service focussed on both victims and perpetrators of domestic violence. We have implemented an innovative and successful programme which provides outreach support services to street drinkers. This project saw an increase in the number of clients accessing the Anchor Centre and a decrease in the number of police call outs. Also in 2013, we ensured that reporting of issues relating to adult safeguarding was updated and we continued our ‘worried’ poster campaign distributing to partner agencies to display in public facing areas, this included GP surgeries, colleges & higher education institutions and libraries.

“The Safer Leicester Partnership works to its strength; which is the positive engagement and contribution made by a range of partners in a multi-agency setting.”

Cllr Sarah Russell, Chair, Leicester City CSP

Melton

The Safer Melton Partnership prioritises the sustainable reduction of crime, we are focused on understanding the causes of crime as a way to reduce crime that is measureable and sustainable. This is reflected in some of our priorities that include:

- To demonstrate how trigger issues associated with offending behaviour and understanding the causes of re-offending and ways to mitigate it.
- Developing effective early intervention and diversionary programmes to target those at risk.
- To provide robust intervention and support services to effectively tackle domestic abuse and support victims.

We work very effectively with our partners and the achievements we have made in regards to Supporting Leicestershire Families is a clear example, that not only include those which are statutory, but also those who we feel can assist and help us in reducing crime i.e. housing, economic development, voluntary sector.

The current initiatives we are leading on include:

1. Intervention projects for young people i.e. Sport and Leisure
2. Helping tackling the cycle of reliance on worklessness benefits
3. Supporting schemes that are designed to allow people to live more independent lives, though social, financial and digital independence

This approach has been demonstrated in our performance, where against challenging targets we are achieving in most of the areas, have clear plans to tackle areas like burglary, which is often influenced by a small number of people, performance is very comparable to other parts of the county and around that the approach we have taken has for the last number of years shown a significant reduction in crime. Partnership working and sharing information has been the key based on a common goal of turning around lives, encouraging people to live independent lives, that is social, digital and economic independence and tackling root causes.”

CIr Malise Graham, Chair, Melton CSP

North West Leicestershire

“The Safer North West Partnership has worked hard over the past two years to build a strong working relationship with Sir Clive Loader and his office. This has enabled us to work together to drive down crime and anti-social behaviour in North West Leicestershire, which over the past year has decreased by 7% and 3% respectively.

Our Partnership has addressed a number of local issues during 2013/14 which have contributed to the achievement of the PCCs strategic priorities. We worked hard to prevent and divert young people from offending, such as commissioning Supporting Futures who provide targeted diversionary activities in our most deprived neighbourhoods. The Respect initiative was also a great success and engaged over 100 young people in community projects in 2013/14. The Safer North West Partnership has also worked to reduce drug related offending and re-offending. During 2013, it was noted that the use of mephedrone was on the rise so the Joint Action Group responded quickly to set up a multi-agency sub-group, which included a number of local partners (including voluntary groups), to respond by educating communities, engaging with health and substance misuse professionals and taking enforcement action against dealers.

I am confident that by working together with the PCC and other partners we can make North West Leicestershire an even safer place for residents, communities, businesses and visitors.”

Cllr Trevor Pendleton, Chair, NW Leicestershire CSP

Oadby & Wigston

“Oadby & Wigston Community Safety Partnership would like to recognise the progress of the four priorities and the achievements of the police and crime objectives. Our work as a partnership has supported these during 2013/14.

We have worked closely in implanting a restorative justice initiative to reduce anti-social behaviour. We have organised a number of diversionary activities for young people in hot spot areas during periods of peak times for anti-social behaviour and criminal activity. The Community flat has been running a number of education sessions around drug and alcohol. We have done a number of initiatives such as the Support Tool Kit that has been provided to victims which include shock alarms, unmarked police car, number plate screws, allotment watch. We have also provided support by commissioning services to assist vulnerable people including Substance Misuse Worker, Domestic Abuse Outreach Worker and working alongside the Supporting Leicestershire Families.

The Partnership has achieved some positive results, by tackling crime with particular reductions in commercial burglary and Theft of Motor Vehicle, we have also achieved a 58.8% reduction in first time entrants into the CJ system over the previous year. Joint working on Anti-Social behaviour has ensured a 6.7% reduction in incidents across the Borough. This has given the partnership a sound base to plan its focus for the next three years work.”

Cllr Kevin Loydall, Chair, Oadby & Wigston CSP

Rutland

“Rutland is a very safe place to live and has the lowest crime rate per 1,000 population when compared with its most similar local partners. Levels of crime and anti-social behaviour have decreased steadily over the last six years and since the last Strategy in 2011 total crime has fallen by 27% with a reduction of 424 people as victims of crime.

During the last year there were 1,075 crimes recorded in Rutland equal to a rate of 29 crimes per 1,000 population with 180 fewer crimes (14%) compared with the previous year. Reported levels of anti-social behaviour have also reduced significantly throughout the last 3 years and are now 50% lower with over 300 less incidents being reported. This figure reflects the hard work and effective partnership working used to prevent and tackle anti-social behaviour effectively.

During the last year, the Safer Rutland Partnership has aligned its priorities with that of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner dedicating resources toward tackling anti-social behaviour and helping ensure victims are supported effectively and residents feel safe within their community. Since the last strategy we have supported a number of initiatives to tackle a broad range of community safety based themes, this has included:

- The development of internet safety projects designed to protect children on-line.
- The introduction of a mentoring programme to support young people at risk of anti-social behaviour and crime.
- The delivery of the bi-annual “Involved” event promoting community safety messages to the local community.
- The delivery of a Sanctuary Scheme to support victims of domestic abuse.
- The development of Farm Watch designed to minimise crime against our farming community.
- The development of a family personalised budget model for Changing Lives (Troubled Families).

Such projects have helped to ensure that those members of the community who needed assistance and services have been supported and we have seen the results of this. There is still work to be done and rest assured the partnership will continue to review trends and significant issues as they arise, adopting a multi-agency and focussed response.”

Cllr Roger Begy, Chair, Rutland CSP

[Back cover]

**POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER
FOR LEICESTERSHIRE****POLICE & CRIME PANEL**

PAPER MARKED

Report of	OFFICE OF THE POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER
Date	MONDAY 9 JUNE 2014 – 2.00PM
Subject	COMMISSIONING
Author :	SUE HASLETT, COMMISSIONING MANAGER

Purpose of Report

1. This paper to the Police and Crime Panel is intended to provide an update on commissioning activity within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for 2013/14 onwards.

Recommendation

2. The Police and Crime Panel is asked to note the contents of this report.

Background

3. The Police and Crime Plan was revised and published in October 2013. The Plan outlines four key themes which provide a clear direction for allocating the available budget to maximum effect.
4. The Commissioning Framework (Appendix A) was refreshed in December 2013 in response to the Plan. It sets out how the PCC intends to align the commissioning budget with those key themes and strategic priorities. A Commissioning Plan has been developed for each theme consisting of a number of commissioning intentions.
5. This report provides an update on progress of some of the key elements of the Framework.

Adult Mentoring

6. The OPCC has awarded a contract to Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust for the delivery of adult mentoring. The main target group are those adults subject to local Integrated Offender Management (IOM) and in particular adults who are serving/have recently served custodial sentences of less than 12 months and are therefore released without statutory supervision from the local Probation Trust. This will be the delivery mechanism for Commissioning Intention (CI) 004 'Supporting the resettlement of adult offenders post-release from a prison sentence of less than 12 months through mentoring'.

Partnership Locality Fund

7. The Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) for 2014/15 was allocated to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). The CSPs submitted business cases for the following commissioning intentions:
 - CI010 - Initiatives that pro-actively reduce anti-social behaviour and/or improve the recording of incidents.
 - CI011 - Interventions which increase the reporting of:
 - Domestic abuse
 - Serious sexual assault
 - Hate crime
 - CI013a – Initiatives that support victims of domestic abuse to cope and recover. (2014/15 only)
 - CI016 - Initiatives which reduce the risk and likelihood that the following crimes will occur:
 - Domestic burglary
 - Violence against the person with injury
 - Vehicle crime
8. Funding was awarded as outlined in Appendix B and will be monitored through performance frameworks which form part of the funding agreements.

PCC Grant

9. The budget for the PCC Grant in 2014/15 was £400,000. The scheme was open to all organisations and a maximum of £50,000 per application was available. Bids were accepted for the same commissioning intentions as those outlined at paragraph 6 above and 70 applications were received to a value of £1.9m.
10. As part of the long-listing process, it was noted that PCC Grant applications could potentially duplicate some of the young persons' mentoring co-commissioning arrangements with Leicester City, Leicestershire County and Rutland County Councils. As a result, £50,000 of the PCC Grant was reallocated to young person's mentoring. The co-commissioning budget was reduced and a new pooled budget of £450,000 over 3 years for young persons' mentoring established. The OPCC is currently procuring this service across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.
11. The PCC Grant applications were long-listed by the OPCC, prior to being scored and shortlisted by specialists in the relevant themed areas. 26 applications were considered by a multi-agency Grant Review Panel and recommendations made to the PCC. There were no successful applications in relation to hate crime and therefore £30k has been set aside to support hate crime initiatives.
12. PCC Grant funding was awarded as outlined in Appendix C and is being monitored through performance frameworks which form part of the funding agreements.

Innovation Fund

13. The PCC had an Innovation Fund of £50,000 for 2013/14. The aim of the Fund was to promote and encourage individuals and organisations to present innovative projects and new ideas to support the achievement of the strategic priorities outlined in the Police and Crime Plan.
14. Innovation Funding was awarded as outlined in Appendix D and is available to be spent within one year.

Interns

15. The PCC has recruited two internships from Leicester University to undertake bespoke research. This will include the Missing Persons and Child Sexual Exploitation strategic priorities in the Police and Crime Plan. This research will include personal visits to the Missing from Home and Child Sexual Exploitation teams and engaging with staff. The results of their research will be used to provide a focus for the related commissioning intentions.

Next Steps

16. The Commissioning Framework will be refreshed for 2015/16 particularly in light of the PCC's new responsibility for the commissioning of victim and witness support services from April 2015. Consultation on the proposed new Commissioning Framework will take place during summer 2014 so that any funding application decisions can be made by the end of December 2014.

Implications

Financial	The total commissioning budget for 2014/15 is £3.8m. Details are provided in the Commissioning Framework.
Legal	Contracts/ funding agreements are in place for each allocation.
Equality Impact Assessment	An Equality Impact Assessment and action plan were completed for the Commissioning Framework. The completion of an Equality Impact Assessment is a requirement of each funding agreement/ contract.
Risks and Impact	The completion of a risk assessment is a requirement for each funding agreement/ contract.
Link to Police and Crime Plan :	The Commissioning Framework sets out how the PCC intends to align the commissioning budget with the key themes and strategic priorities in the Police and Crime Plan.

List of Appendices

- Appendix A Commissioning Framework
- Appendix B Partnership Locality Fund 2014 - 17
- Appendix C PCC Grant 2014 – 17
- Appendix D PCC Innovation Fund 2013/14

Background Papers

Police & Crime Plan 2013 - 2017

Person to Contact

Sue Haslett, Commissioning Manager - Tel 0116 229 8705
Email: sue.haslett@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk



**POLICE & CRIME
COMMISSIONER**
for Leicestershire

Your voice in Leicester,
Leicestershire & Rutland

Commissioning Framework Summary 2014-2017

Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Background	4
3. Commissioning Budget	4
4. Commissioning Outcomes	5
5. Commissioning Framework	5
6. Funding Mechanisms:	6
a) Direct Commissioning	7
b) Co-commissioning	7
c) Partnership Locality Fund	7
d) PCC Grant	8
7. Appendix A – Strategic Priorities	9
8. Appendix B – Summary of Commissioning Intentions by theme	10
9. Appendix C - Glossary	20

1. Introduction

When my role as a Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) was introduced in November 2012, I was given a very specific set of mandates which included: assuring an effective and efficient Police Service; writing the Police and Crime Plan ('the Plan') which reflects the aspirations and concerns of local people (and holding the Chief Constable to account in its delivery); and setting the local precept which is the local tax to help fund the Police. But, above all else, I consider it my core role to help the Chief Constable to continue to drive down crime – not least by fulfilling my duty to commission outcomes in support of the Plan. Indeed, I consider this to be both the most challenging but also the most rewarding and, potentially, beneficial aspect of my portfolio of responsibilities.

So it is with great pleasure and with a debt of thanks to my staff and all partners who have helped to define the commissioning intentions that I present this Commissioning Framework for the period 2014/17. In it, you will notice a very clear alignment to the Plan as each commissioning intention is linked to one or more strategic priority. This Framework also demonstrates my determination to achieve value for taxpayers' hard-earned money as we continue to move ahead in this era of PCC commissioning.

I look forward to working together with each and every organisation which, via this Commissioning Framework, will play its own part in our joint contribution towards making our streets safer, and our diverse communities more confident.



Sir Clive Loader

Police and Crime Commissioner

Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland

18th December 2013



2. Background

- 2.1 The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Leicestershire is responsible for setting the strategic direction for policing in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR) through the Police and Crime Plan. The Plan covers the whole of the PCC's period in office from 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2017. The Chief Constable is responsible for the operational delivery of policing, including the Strategic Policing Requirement. The PCC is responsible for understanding and supporting the dynamic relationship between policing and local partner activity in support of the [Police and Crime Plan](#) strategic priorities.
- 2.2 The priorities set out in the Plan inform the PCC's decisions as to what funding is made available to the police and partners to secure reductions in crime and disorder. The PCC must identify opportunities for reducing crime, enabling communities to feel and be safer, protecting people who find themselves in a vulnerable situation and ensuring that victims and witnesses of crime and anti-social behaviour are positively supported.
- 2.3 The Police and Crime Plan was revised and published in October 2013. The Plan outlines four key themes (please refer to section 5.2) and a number of strategic priorities (Appendix A), which provides a clear direction for allocating the available budget to maximum effect. This Commissioning Framework sets out how the PCC intends to align the commissioning budget with those key themes and strategic priorities.

3. Commissioning Budget

- 3.1 As a result of the appointment of Police and Crime Commissioners, there have been significant changes to Home Office funding streams with many being removed or merged. For 2013/14 each PCC was awarded their own Community Safety Fund by the Home Office to commission according to local need. For the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire this was £1.649m. This funding from 2014/15 onwards will be included within the Police Grant from the Home Office. Funding of £530k for victim support services, including restorative justice, will be transferred from the Ministry of Justice to the PCC in 2014/15, with an anticipated £833k in 2015/16.
- 3.2 The total commissioning budget for 2014/15 is currently an estimated £3.8m. The sections below detail proposals of the estimated allocations across a number of commissioning intentions (CIs). Due to the uncertainty about future funding, it is not possible to be precise about the size of the commissioning budget beyond 2014/15. However, it is the PCC's ambition to, as a minimum, maintain the size of the budget if overall funding allows and positive results from commissioning are demonstrated.
- 3.3 Many of the ways in which the commissioning intentions will be delivered in 2014/17 have already been determined, subject to satisfactory performance. These are summarised, together with details of the funding still available, in Appendix B.

4. Commissioning Outcomes

- 4.1 The PCC has made it clear that outcomes and not services will be commissioned. With this in mind, this commissioning framework has been created which, as it is used and developed, will ensure future commissioning decisions are focused on the achievement of clearly defined outcomes.
- 4.2 It is recognised that partners may have difficulties in identifying and measuring the impact of their proposed initiative(s) on the outcomes within the Police and Crime Plan. The Commissioning Framework has been designed to be an operational tool that strives to keep performance measurement processes as simple as possible.
- 4.3 It will be the PCC's responsibility, through the Chief Executive and staff within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), to monitor progress for each commissioned activity against the proposed improved outcomes. A range of performance management systems will be used to do this. The OPCC will continue to work with partners and providers to develop performance indicators and measures that can be easily managed and reported on. Proposed indicators and measures are contained within the individual Commissioning Plans.

5. Commissioning Framework

- 5.1 The Commissioning Framework is based upon four themes, and the strategic priorities, within the Police and Crime Plan. A Commissioning Plan has developed for each theme consisting of a number of commissioning intentions. A summary of the commissioning intentions by theme is available at Appendix B.
- 5.2 The four themes (within the Police and Crime Plan) and the Commissioning Plans are:
- 1) Reducing offending and re-offending (RO)
 - 2) Supporting victims and witnesses (VW)
 - 3) Making communities and neighbourhoods safer (MCN)
 - 4) Protecting the vulnerable (PV)
- 5.3 The Commissioning Plans have been prepared in collaboration and discussion with partners. The OPCC is extremely grateful to all partners involved for their ongoing willingness to provide detail and insight, as well as their readiness to suggest solutions and contribute to discussions around maximising limited resources. The team is looking forward to building on these relationships over the coming months and years.
- 5.4 The Plans provide a clear and consistent way forward for the commissioning of each theme. They outline how the PCC will commission for outcomes to achieve the priorities set out in the Police and Crime Plan. They should be used by potential providers to prepare for their involvement in the PCC's future commissioned activity.

- 5.5 The Commissioning Plans each contain an analysis of the current situation, describe the areas and performance measures on which the PCC will focus, as well as detailing needs and threats. They should be read within the context of section 6 below on funding mechanisms. Four different types of funding mechanisms have been developed. These are the ways in which the PCC will purchase the intervention needed to deliver outcomes. Information about the indicative commissioning values from April 2014 onwards is also included in each Commissioning Plan.
- 5.6 A range of performance measures across all themes and outcomes are currently in development and will be used to support contract tender specifications and final approved contracts. These are contained within the Commissioning Plans. The performance management options are being determined with partners and are expected to develop over time as measures and indicators are introduced and tested. The performance indicators will be used by the OPCC to select the best measure(s) for the interventions they wish to purchase. The OPCC will continue to work with providers and partners to develop meaningful measures that can reliably evidence that progress is being made across all areas.

6. Funding Mechanisms

- 6.1 The PCC has considered the ways in which the initiatives needed to achieve the outcomes in the Police and Crime Plan can be delivered. The following principles have been considered:
- The existing commissioning arrangements of partners should be used where they are fit for purpose and can deliver the PCC's outcomes within time. This will maximise local commissioning expertise.
 - There should be a focus on value for money, maximising resources and ensuring the impact of the money spent is measured and the value is assessed.
 - Commissioning should take place at regional, sub regional (i.e. Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland) and locality levels. Systems should be fit for purpose and work with existing structures where these are operating well.
 - Best practice in relation to procurement will be applied. The PCC expects all procurement processes to follow best practice and be accessible for any provider, including the voluntary sector, unless a single provider dispensation has been agreed (please refer to 6.2a below). All relevant regulations and legislation will also apply including the Equalities Act 2010 which includes the Public Sector Equality Duty.
- 6.2 As a result of feedback from partners and lessons learnt within the OPCC, the six purchasing systems in the original commissioning intentions document have been reviewed. From 2014, there will be four funding mechanisms as follows:

- a) **Direct commissioning** – the PCC will directly tender or contract with a provider. There are a number of areas where it is more efficient for the PCC to directly commission in order to achieve desired outcomes. All of these areas are being developed with the relevant partners. As partnership arrangements develop, these may evolve into co-commissioning opportunities (please refer to 6.2b below). There are some instances where a single provider dispensation will be applied. This relates to situations when there is only one provider who, given the nature of the outcomes to be commissioned, can be considered and contracted with directly. Examples include the Local Resilience Forum, Troubled/Supported Families Programmes and Crimestoppers.
- b) **Co-commission** – existing commissioners are already commissioning outcomes on behalf of the PCC under contracts for 2013/17. There are a number of both established and emerging commissioning structures which take on all or some of the core commissioning tasks. These include:
- Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Board
 - Children and Young People’s Commissioning Boards/Groups (three in total: Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland)
 - Drug and Alcohol Commissioning Group (sub-regional and managed by Leicester City Council)
- c) **Partnership Locality Fund** – to the Leicester City, Rutland and District Community Safety Partnerships under a contract based on business cases presented and agreed. An indicative £960k is available over 3 years which will be allocated according to specific crime and ASB figures per local authority area.

Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and Basic Command Units (BCUs) have a unique role in assessing, analysing, and responding to local need around crime and community safety. As such they have both a proactive strategic function and a reactive tactical function when assessing the threats to individual localities.

In order to benefit from the existing structures and systems in place, the PCC will ask the CSPs, in collaboration with the BCUs, to submit formal 3 year business cases built around their local strategic needs assessment. These will be assessed and considered against specific commissioning intentions to ensure alignment. Funding for years 2 and 3 will be released subject to successful performance and a review of the funding available to the PCC.

CSPs will also be able to request that 10% of their allocation is retained by the PCC. This contingency funding will be available for CSPs to respond to emerging issues within their locality which are linked to the relevant commissioning intentions. A mini business case for the contingency fund will need to be provided by 31st October 2014.

Timeline	Stage
5pm on 7 th February 2014	Deadline for submission of business cases to OPCC
February – March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business cases checked for alignment and areas of duplication. • Opportunities for efficiencies identified. • Affordability in short/medium/long term against potential outcomes assessed. • Evaluation completed
By 14 th March 2014	Applicants notified in writing of decisions made

- d) **The PCC Grant** - inviting any provider(s) to submit applications to deliver specific commissioning intentions and related outcomes. Any organisation can apply for a grant against a set of criteria aligned to the PCC's Police and Crime Plan. An indicative £1.2m is available over 3 years. Applications for up to £50k per annum will be considered. In exceptional circumstances, applications for up to 3 years of funding may be approved subject to clear evidence of achieving the required outcomes.

Timeline	Stage
5pm on 7 th February 2014	Deadline for submission of applications to OPCC
February – March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications checked for alignment and areas of duplication. • Opportunities for efficiencies identified. • Affordability in short/medium/long term against potential outcomes assessed.
By 14 th March 2014	Applicants notified in writing of decisions made

- 6.3 For all funding mechanisms the PCC will hold contracts/agreements with the successful organisations that specify the detail of what outcomes are to be commissioned and for what value. The contracts/agreements will also specify quality standards around procurement practice, as well as performance measures for monitoring purposes.

Strategic Priorities

Theme: Reducing Offending and Reoffending

1. Preventing and diverting young people from offending
2. Reducing reoffending amongst young people and adults
3. Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and reoffending
4. Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled/Supporting Families programme

Theme: Supporting Victims and Witnesses

5. To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse
6. To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences
7. To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences
8. To prevent anti-social behaviour (ASB) and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour
9. To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime

Theme: Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer

10. To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
11. To reduce all crime
12. To reduce domestic burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of burglary offences
13. To reduce violence against the person – with injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims of violent crime – with injury offences
14. To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims

Theme: Protecting the Vulnerable

15. To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses
16. Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs
17. To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports

Reducing Offending and Re-offending Commissioning Intentions

Strategic Priority 1 (SP1): Preventing and diverting young people from offending

Strategic Priority 2 (SP2): Reducing re-offending amongst young people and adults

Strategic Priority 3 (SP3): Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and re-offending

Strategic Priority 4 (SP4): Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled/Supported Families programme

All commissioning intentions have been (re)coded 'CI***' – previous codes are shown brackets (CI***). All strategic priorities within the Police and Crime Plan have been coded 'SP*' in the table below.

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI001 (CI200) SP1 SP2 SP3 SP4	Supporting a Youth Prevention and Diversion Pathway which targets two specific groups of young people: High Risk Entrants and repeat young offenders. Long term mentoring will be a key feature of this intervention.	Co-com	a) £150,800 b) £133,400 c) £5,800 Total: £290,000	a) £122,200 b) £108,100 c) £4,700 Total: £235,000	a) £96,200 b) £85,100 c) £3,700 Total: £185,000	For 2014/17 via: a) Leicester City Children and Young People's Commissioning Group b) Leicestershire Children and Young People's Commissioning Board c) Rutland Children and Young People's Directorate

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI002 (CI201) SP1 SP2 SP3 SP4	Targeting young offenders with a substance misuse problem.	Co-com	a) £62,400 b) £57,600 Total: £120,000	a) £62,400 b) £57,600 Total: £120,000	a) £52,000 b) £48,000 Total: £100,000	For 2014/17 via: a) Leicester City Drug and Alcohol Commissioning Board b) Leicestershire and Rutland Substance Misuse Commissioning Board
CI003 (CI202) SP3	Targeting street drinkers, the homeless, rough sleepers and those that are vulnerably housed.	Co-com	£34,000	£34,000	£34,000	For 2014/17 via Sub Regional Criminal Justice Substance Misuse Commissioning Board
CI004 (CI203) SP2 SP3	Supporting the resettlement of adult offenders post-release from a prison sentence of less than 12 months through mentoring.	Direct	£70,000	£50,000	£50,000	To be commissioned in early 2014 by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
CI005 (CI300) SP3	Targeting adult offenders with a substance misuse problem, specifically those tested and identified at point of arrest.	Co-com Direct	£412,774 £216,405 Total: £629,179	£412,774 £216,405 Total: £629,179	£395,000 £216,405 Total: £611,405	For 2014/17: via Sub Regional Criminal Justice Substance Misuse Commissioning Board via Leicestershire Police for drug testing, Alcohol Liaison Officer and Drug Intelligence Officer

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI006 (CI301) SP1 SP2 SP3 SP4	Integrated Offender Management (IOM) initiatives which target the highest risk offenders, within which there should be a specific focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16-24 year old offenders • prolific and other priority offenders • adults serving less than 12 months; and • members of a Troubled/Supported Families programme. 	Co-Com	£368,000	£368,000	£368,000	For 2014/17 via IOM Strategic Board
CI007 (CI302) SP4	Support to reduce offending and ASB caused by families in a Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Troubled/Supported Family programme.	Direct	a) £64,000 b) £56,000 c) £5,000 Total: £125,000	a) £64,000 b) £56,000 c) £5,000 Total: £125,000	a) £64,000 b) £56,000 c) £5,000 Total: £125,000	For 2014/17: a) Think Family (Leicester City) b) Supporting Leicestershire Families c) Changing Lives (Rutland)
CI008 (CI400) SP2	Targeting registered sex offenders, violent and other types of sexual offenders, and offenders who pose a serious risk of harm to the public.	Direct	£34,029	£34,029	£34,029	For 2014/17, via Leicestershire Police for Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA)

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI009 (CI402 and CI404) SP1 SP2 SP3 SP4	Support to reduce offending by children and young people aged 10 -17 years.	Direct	a) £162,554 b) £99,348 c) £91,687 Total: £353,589	a) £162,554 b) £99,348 c) £91,687 Total: £353,589	a) £162,554 b) £84,446 c) £77,934 Total: £324,934	For 2014/17, a) via Leicestershire Police - Police Officer support to the two Youth Offending Services b) Leicester City Youth Offending Services c) Leicestershire and Rutland Youth Offending Service
CI010 SP4 SP8*	Interventions that pro-actively reduce anti-social behaviour and/or improve the recording of incidents.	PCC Grant Partnership Locality Fund	£400,000 £330,000 Total: £730,000	£400,000 £355,000 Total: £755,000	£400,000 £275,000 Total: £675,000	These are the total amounts in the 2 funding streams which will also be used to fund other commissioning intentions. * this commissioning intention links to SP8 within the Supporting Victims and Witnesses Commissioning Plan.

Supporting Victims and Witnesses Commissioning Intentions

Strategic Priority 5 (SP5): To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse

Strategic Priority 6 (SP6): To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences

Strategic Priority 7 (SP7): To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences

Strategic Priority 8 (SP8): To prevent anti-social behaviour (ASB) and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour

Strategic Priority 9 (SP9): To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime

All commissioning intentions have been (re)coded 'CI***' – previous codes are shown brackets (CI***). All strategic priorities within the Police and Crime Plan have been coded 'SP*' in the table below.

Code	Commissioning Intention	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI011 (CI103)	Interventions which increase the reporting of: - Domestic abuse - Serious sexual assault - Hate crime	PCC Grant	£400,000	£400,000	£400,000	These are the total amounts in the 2 funding streams which will also be used to fund other commissioning intentions.
SP5 SP6 SP7	Partnership Locality Fund	£330,000	£355,000	£275,000		
		Total: £730,000	Total: £755,000	Total: £675,000		

Code	Commissioning Intention	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI012 (CI407) SP6 SP9	Initiatives which support victims of rape and sexual assault, as well as the investigative process.	Direct	£67,906	£67,906*	£67,906*	For 2014/15, via Leicestershire Police for Juniper Lodge and St Bernards - Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARCs)
CI013 SP5 SP6 SP7 SP8 SP9	To provide victim and witness support services across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.	TBC	£530,000**	£833,000**	TBC	Partnership Strategy to be developed which will review and analyse need, develop gap analysis and inform a commissioning plan from October 2014.
CI013a SP5 SP9	Initiatives that support victims of domestic abuse to cope and recover.	PCC Grant Partnership Locality Fund	£400,000 £330,000			These are the total amounts in the 2 funding streams which will also be used to fund other commissioning intentions. This provision will be incorporated into CI013 from 2015/16 onwards.

* to be reviewed following transfer of custody healthcare to NHS

** these figures include funding for Restorative Justice

Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer Commissioning Intentions

- Strategic Priority 10 (SP10): To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.
- Strategic Priority 11 (SP11): To reduce all crime.
- Strategic Priority 12 (SP12): To reduce domestic burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of burglary offences.
- Strategic Priority 13 (SP13): To reduce violence against the person with injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims of violent crime – with injury offences.
- Strategic Priority 14 (SP14): To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims.

All commissioning intentions have been (re)coded 'CI***' – previous codes are shown brackets (CI***). All strategic priorities within the Police and Crime Plan have been coded 'SP*' in the table below.

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI014 (CI303) SP10 SP11	To support initiatives to prevent and detect crime through community intelligence.	Direct	£26,190	£26,190	£26,190	For 2014/17, the Crimestoppers National Hub
CI015 (CI405) SP10 SP11 SP12 SP13 SP14	To test a business concept - an Interagency Analyst Team to support the Community Safety Partnerships in the execution of their commissioned functions.	Direct	£62,500			To Leicestershire Police. This funding is until 30 th June 2014 only.

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI016 (CI304) SP12 SP13 SP14	Initiatives which reduce the risk and likelihood that the following crimes will occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic burglary • Violence against the person with injury • Vehicle crime 	PCC Grant Partnership Locality Fund	£400,000 £330,000 Total: £730,000	£400,000 £355,000 Total: £755,000	£400,000 £275,000 Total: £675,000	These are the total amounts in the 2 funding streams which will also be used to fund other commissioning intentions.
CI017 (CI406) SP10	To support work with partners to prepare, respond and recover from local emergencies.	Direct	£6,536	£6,536	£6,536	For 2014/17, the Local Resilience Forum
CI018 (CI409) SP11	To support the work of partners to reduce domestic homicides.	Direct	£32,000	£32,000	£32,000	For 2014/17, supporting Domestic Homicide Reviews
CI019 SP11	To support and engage the voluntary and community sector to reduce all crime.	Co-Com Co-Com Direct	£10,000 £10,000 £5,000 Total: £25,000	£10,000 £10,000 £5,000 Total: £25,000	£10,000 £10,000 £5,000 Total: £25,000	For 2014/17, Via Leicestershire Community Infrastructure Organisation contract Part of Leicester City VCS Support Review Voluntary Action Rutland

Protecting the Vulnerable Commissioning Intentions

Strategic Priority 15 (SP15): To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses

Strategic Priority 16 (SP16): Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs

Strategic Priority 17 (SP17): To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports

All commissioning intentions have been (re)coded 'CI***' – previous codes are shown brackets (CI***). All strategic priorities within the Police and Crime Plan have been coded 'SP*' in the table below.

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI020 (CI100) SP15	To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses.	TBC	£200,000	£150,000	£150,000	Partnership strategies to be developed by April 2014 which will review and analyse needs, develop gap analysis and inform commissioning plans. These commissioning intentions will be defined when the above strategies have been produced.
CI021 (CI205) SP16	Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs.					
CI022 (CI204) SP17	To work with partners to reduce the number of repeat missing person reports.					

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Estimated Amount 2014/15	Estimated Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI023 (CI408) SP15 SP16 SP17	To work with partners to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and vulnerable adults	Direct	a) £87,890 b) £18,185 Total: £106,075	a) £87,890 b) £18,185 Total: £106,075	a) £87,890 b) £18,185 Total: £106,075	For 2014/17 via: a) Leicestershire & Rutland and City Safeguarding Boards for Children b) Leicestershire & Rutland and City Safeguarding Boards for Adults

Glossary

ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
ASB	Anti-Social Behaviour
BCU	Basic Command Unit – the largest unit into which Leicestershire Police is divided. There is a City BCU and a Counties BCU.
CJ	Criminal Justice
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CSE	Child Sexual Exploitation
CSP	Community Safety Partnership
ED	Emergency Department
EET	Education, Employment or Training
FTE	First Time Entrants
IDVA	Independent Domestic Violence Advocate/ Advisor
IOM	Integrated Offender Management
Index Offence	The proven offence that leads to an offender being included in a particular cohort (a group of people who have shared a particular event together during a particular time span)
LA	Local Authority
LAC	Looked After Children (LAC) i.e. those looked after by local authority
Locality	Blaby District, Charnwood Borough, Harborough District, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, Leicester City, Melton Borough, North West Leicestershire District, Oadby and Wigston Borough or Rutland County
LPU	Local Policing Unit
LLR	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
LR	Leicestershire and Rutland
MAPPA	Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements
MAPPOM	Multi Agency Prolific and other Priority Offender Management
MFH	Missing From Home

MSG	Most Similar Group i.e. police force areas that are the most similar to each other using statistical methods, based on demographic, economic and social characteristics which relate to crime
OAC	Output Area Classification
OPCC	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner – the PCC’s staff team
PCC	Police and Crime Commissioner
PCP	Police and Crime Plan
PPO	Prolific and other Priority Offenders
Regional	East Midlands which includes Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire
SARC	Sexual Assault Referral Centre
SLF	Supporting Leicestershire Families
Sub Regional	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
TFMV	Theft from Motor Vehicle
TOMV	Theft of Motor Vehicle
TF	Troubled/Supported Families
VAPWI	Violence against the Person with Injury
YOS	Youth Offending Service

This page is intentionally left blank

PARTNERSHIP LOCALITY FUND 2014/15

Community Safety Partnership	Initiative	Amount
Safer North West Partnership	Domestic Abuse Outreach Service	£16,000
	Tackling Vehicle Crime	£5,000
	Tackling Violent Crime in the Night time economy	£3,100
Harborough District Council	Harborough Be Safe	£2,500
	Diversionsary/Prevention Activities	£3,000
	Journey Away from Domestic Abuse (JADA)	£3,500
	Harborough Sanctuary Scheme	£1,500
Safer Leicester Partnership	Street Drinkers Outreach Service	£35,000
	Alleygating: Reducing Opportunities to offend	£20,000
	Anti-Social Behaviour Victim Support for Leicester City	£25,000
	Encouraging reporting of domestic abuse and sexual violence in Leicester to ensure better reporting and improved outcomes	£25,000
	Safer Communities In Leicester	£42,800
	<i>Contingency</i>	<i>£10,000</i>
Blaby & Hinckley & Bosworth	Children's Worker	£22,500
	Home Security	£12,000
	Safety Crew Initiative	£4,000
	Male Domestic Abuse Worker	£8,500
Oadby & Wigston Community Safety Partnership	Community Flat	£2,000
	Sanctuary/Support Victims of ASB	£5,700

Charnwood	Initiatives to reduce anti-social behaviour and to improve the recording of incidents	£6,000
	Crime Reduction initiatives	£10,000
	Domestic Abuse Outreach Service	£10,000
	Hate Incident Awareness	£1,000
	<i>Contingency</i>	<i>£22,200</i>
Safer Melton Partnership	Increasing confidence in crime prevention in the Borough of Melton	£11,600
Countywide	Partnership Crime Prevention and Awareness Campaign Programme	£10,500
Rutland	Domestic Abuse Awareness & Prevention	£4,000
	Evening Economy Stay Safe	£2,300
TOTAL		£324,700

PCC GRANTS 2014/15

Name of Initiative	Name of Organisation	Amount
Warning Zone Year 6 Schools Programme & Early Intervention Group Work	Warning Zone Ltd.	£15,000
Community Action Against Crime	Catch22	£37,000
Targeted Counselling Support for Victims of Domestic Abuse in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR)	Safe Project, Trade and New Dawn New Day	£32,046
Project Go!	Pedestrian Limited	£13,010
To the Hoop	KB in the Community	£13,633
Street Sport	Community Projects Plus	£22,595
Box Smart	Waterfront Sport and Education Academy (WSEA)	£22,000
Tackling Domestic Burglary and Vehicle Crime Hotspots	Leicestershire Police Counties BCU	£9,000
Game Over	Soft Touch Arts Ltd.	£7,960
Textile Project to train disengaged young people	Whitwick Community Enterprises	£10,799
Children & Young Persons Independent Sexual Violence Advisor (ISVA)	FreeVA	£46,167
ADAM Project	Women's Aid Leicestershire Ltd.	£43,085
Building Bridges	The Contact Project	£11,904
Catching the Wave	Pedestrian Limited	£29,745
Set aside towards Reporting of Hate Crime		£30,000
TOTAL		£343,944

This page is intentionally left blank

INNOVATION FUND 2013/14

ORGANISATION	INITIATIVE	AMOUNT
Best M8s Mentoring	Pilot and development regarding a mobile phone app for young people	£5,000
Your Artisan Local	Bakery in Leicester Prison for offenders / ex-offenders	£5,000
AGE UK	Over 50s to raise awareness of crime and crime prevention	£19,000
Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust	Victims & Witnesses – video portal and consultant to develop training package	£5,500
Crimestoppers	Domestic Abuse: Cross Promotion / Comedy Performance	£5,000
Youth Commission	Desistance qualification	£10,000
TOTAL		£49,500

This page is intentionally left blank

**POLICE & CRIME
COMMISSIONER FOR
LEICESTERSHIRE**

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

PAPER MARKED

Report of	POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER (PCC)
Subject	PERFORMANCE REPORTING FRAMEWORK 2014/15
Date	MONDAY 9 JUNE 2014 – 2.00PM
Author :	CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of the report is to provide the Police and Crime Panel with an overview of the Performance reporting framework that will support the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan in 2014-2015.
2. The Panel are invited to note the contents and proposals within this report.

Summary

3. As the 2013-2014 performance year came to an end, the OPCC Planning and Performance Co-ordinator worked with the Chief Constable's Threat Assessment Unit Manager and the Chief Superintendent Corporate Services to complete a review of the Plan's performance framework. This included products, meetings and assessment techniques used to measure performance towards achieving the Police and Crime Plan ('the Plan').
4. Please read this report in conjunction with Appendix A – 'Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017 Executive Summary' and Appendix B 'Table of Police and Crime Plan Priorities'.
5. The review was completed with a view to improving performance reporting products and the processes that support the delivery of the Plan.

Performance Framework – Supporting the Police and Crime Plan

6. The performance assessment framework will continue to reflect activity that focuses on the four key themes in the Police and Crime Plan, namely:
 - Reducing Offending and Re-offending;
 - Supporting Victims and Witnesses;
 - Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer;
 - Protecting the Vulnerable.

7. Measures used to assess performance have been updated in line with the findings of the Public Affairs Select Committee report '*Caught red-handed: Why we can't count on Police recorded crime statistics*' published on 1 April 2014. Taking the recommendations of the report into account, there are no numerical targets set in the 2014-2015 framework. The revised framework further supports core policing values and enables Senior Policing Leaders to stress the importance of data quality and integrity.
8. Performance will continue to be monitored against continuous improvement and the iQuanta Leicestershire Most Similar Group of Forces (MSG).
9. There will be no change to the 'Strategic Priorities' in the Police and Crime Plan as this would constitute a fundamental change to the Plan.

Police and Crime Plan Themes

Reducing Offending and Reoffending

10. The commitment to reducing offending and reoffending continues into 2014-2015. The performance measures relating to **Strategic Priorities 1-4** remain appropriate and therefore unchanged.

Supporting Victims and Witnesses

11. There are some crime types that are almost certainly under-reported – e.g. domestic abuse, serious sexual offences and hate crime. It is important that victims have the confidence to report such crimes and therefore there is an acceptance of a short-term increase in the recording of crimes which are likely to have been under-reported historically, with the long term expectation of reducing harm and supporting victims. Trends will be analysed and reported upon in 2014-2015.
12. In respect of **Strategic Priority 6** due to the sensitive nature and level of vulnerability of victims and witnesses, performance measures are no longer cited, although a focus remains firmly on area.
13. The commitment to improving the quality of service for victims of crime and Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) continues. Reporting and performance management of satisfaction and confidence in the Police (cited in **Strategic Priorities 5, 7, 8 and 9**) will continue in 2014-2015. As continuous improvement in the quality of service provided is sought, there is no numerical target set.

Making Communities Safer

14. The PCC has requested that the Chief Constable significantly reduces crime in certain categories detailed in the Police and Crime Plan (**Strategic Priorities 10-14**). These are:
 - All crime
 - Burglary Dwelling
 - Theft of Motor Vehicle
 - Theft From Motor Vehicle
 - Violence Against the Person with Injury

15. A significant reduction does not guarantee that we will reach or maintain a positive below average position in our Most Similar Group (MSG)*. It is likely that significant reductions would enable a below average position but cannot be guaranteed due to the inability to influence how other forces will perform. However, if there was a performance issue within Leicestershire, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) would wish to see that there is a process in place to support the delivery of 'significant reductions' (along with an operational response to the issue).
*A Most Similar Group (MSG) is a group of forces against which performance is compared. Leicestershire, Bedfordshire, Essex Hampshire, Hertfordshire Kent Nottinghamshire and Sussex make up Leicestershire's MSG.
16. It is proposed that CSPs provide a return quarterly on work undertaken to support delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.

Protecting the Vulnerable

17. **Strategic priorities 15-17** remain high priority. The assessment of performance in these areas will continue to be developed by Safeguarding Boards and partnership leads during 2014-2015. Due to the sensitive nature and level of vulnerability of victims and witnesses, performance measures are not cited for strategic priority 15 but it remains a high priority and focused resources are dedicated to this area.

The Financial Challenge

18. **Strategic Priority 18** relates solely to how the Leicestershire Police, with staff and partners will deliver revenue savings of £20 million. The performance measures remain as unchanged in 2014-2015.

Crime Outcome Rates

19. The Home Office and HMIC are both very clear that no outcome categories are to be seen in any form of 'priority order', what matters is that the appropriate outcome is applied to each individual case.
20. HMIC intends to build an inspection schedule to inspect each force and dip sample individual crimes to ascertain whether, in their opinion, the outcome is appropriate to the circumstances in that particular crime. They will then report on their findings so that the public can see whether their force is performing acceptably in terms of crime outcomes. Therefore performance should be assessed using findings in crime outcome audit reports.
21. Crime outcome data will be reported in monthly Police Performance Delivery Group (PDG) meetings to ensure that there is an understanding of trends and a robust approach to ensuring the correct outcome is achieved for each case; The PCC routinely attends PDG.

Performance Reporting – Providing one version of the truth

22. Quarterly performance reporting to existing boards will provide the strategic performance reporting structure. Previous month end data regardless of the meeting date will ensure that there is one version of the performance picture. This enables each group and board to be discussing the same data and situation. This has also been proposed by the Baker Tilly external audit team as a recommendation following the Police and Crime Plan audit.

23. Police and Partners have agreed to report data quarterly on strategic priorities. Data sets have been agreed and the first return for the end of quarter one is due to be submitted at the start of quarter two (July 2014).
24. Performance reporting within the Police will continue on a monthly basis to ensure a robust response to emerging performance threats.
25. A revised meeting structure will support the new framework.

Police and Crime Panel Performance Report

26. It is proposed that The Police and Crime Panel be provided with a thematic performance report. This will enable an in depth review of the performance in a specific area. The report will provide trend data and contextual information regarding in each of the four key themes on a rotational basis.

Changes to the Published Police and Crime Plan (2014 version)

27. It is proposed that a revised version of the Police and Crime Plan with a summary of the new performance framework detailed in this report is published in August 2014.

Implications

Financial	This report is an update for the Police and Crime Panel to note. There are no financial implications identified.
Legal	There are no legal implications identified.
Equality Impact Assessment	The Police and Crime Plan has been Equality impact assessed.
Risks and Impact	No risks have been identified.
Link to Police & Crime Plan	Performance reporting structure supports the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017 Executive Summary
 Appendix B – Table of Police and Crime Plan Priorities
 Appendix C - Revised meeting structure

Background Papers

No background papers.

Person to Contact

Miss S Houlihan, Planning & Performance Co-ordinator – Tel 0116 229 8986
 Email: suzanne.houlihan@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk

Police and Crime Plan 2013 - 2017

Executive Summary

Putting you at the heart of policing

Your voice in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland



**POLICE & CRIME
COMMISSIONER**
for Leicestershire

Your voice in Leicester,
Leicestershire & Rutland

Executive Summary



This Police and Crime Plan (the Plan) covers the whole of my term in office but is a living document that is reviewed and considered against emerging threats and opportunities. I will re-issue it on a yearly basis to capture changing priorities.

The two key strands that were considered in the development of this plan are:

1. Setting the strategic direction and accountability for policing and partnerships; and
2. Contributing to resourcing of policing response to regional and national threats.



Setting the strategic direction and accountability for policing and partnerships

In my manifesto I made clear the issues and priorities that would enable police and partners to drive down crime. These priorities are placed within four key themes:

1. Reducing Offending and Reoffending
2. Supporting Victims and Witnesses
3. Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer
4. Protecting the Vulnerable

Strategic priorities set out in each of the themes are based on comprehensive research and analysis provided by police and partners and also commissioned on my behalf. Details of these data sources are described in 'Police and Crime Plan Data Sources' available on the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) website: <http://bit.ly/16xT7ai>

I have conducted community consultation and engagement to make sure that emerging concerns are captured and inform the Plan.

The Plan accepts that levels of crime and anti-social behaviour change throughout the year and are dependent on a range of influences. This means emerging threats can be added to the Plan and threats that have been mitigated or are no longer a priority can be taken out.

It allows for the changing economic forecast to be assessed and plans to be drawn up to meet austerity measures through to the financial year 2016/17 and beyond, as announced in the Chancellor's Autumn Statement (2012).

The core values of **selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty** and **leadership** will shape the way in which I will act, make decisions, deploy resources, invest public money and engage with the Chief Constable and key partners for the purpose of ensuring the achievement of this Police and Crime Plan.

The statutory responsibilities and goodwill of all our partners enables this Plan to be delivered. The core responsibilities held by partners are detailed in 'The Statutory Responsibilities of Partners' document available on the OPCC website: <http://bit.ly/HhbLgN>

The confidence and trust of victims and witnesses to seek the help of the police, and their experiences when they do so, is a golden thread throughout this Plan.

I have purposely chosen measures of success that are meaningful and transparent, so performance is not restricted to achievement against targets on crime or disorder reduction, but more specifically on meeting the needs of victims. The methodology used to set the targets is detailed in 'The Positive Outcome Rate and Target Setting' document available on the OPCC website: <http://bit.ly/1adN8K6>

I will hold routine and regular local meetings throughout my term of office so that I can listen to the concerns of local residents and address their priorities.



Contributing to regional and national threats

The Home Secretary's Strategic Policing Requirement recognises that police services need to work cooperatively across boundaries to plan for, and deliver, effective capabilities to tackle threats that stretch from local to national level.

This response is embedded in specialist and local policing. These threats (such as terrorism, organised crime, public disorder and civil emergencies) can spread across the country quickly and dynamically, as witnessed in the disturbances in Summer 2011.

This Plan sets out how Leicestershire Police will deliver the Strategic Policing Requirement (SPR), which includes:

- Responding to public protest and policing large events
- Serious and organised crime
- Counter terrorism
- Civil contingencies and local resilience

I will work with the Chief Constable alongside local and regional partners to ensure robust management and response to these threats.



Commissioning

The Commissioning Framework has taken the strategic priorities contained within the Police and Crime Plan and combined them into four Commissioning Themes. Each theme has its own Commissioning Plan and associated purchasing systems i.e. the mechanisms through which I will allocate the funds within a specific process.

I will continue to monitor progress for each commissioned activity against the proposed improved outcomes, a range of performance approaches has been developed to support this. The OPCC will continue to work with partners and providers to develop a suite of performance indicators and measures that can be easily managed and reported on.

Commissioning intentions published in June 2013 describe the commissioning arrangements planned with the partnerships and strategic boards. These can be found on the PCC website at the following address: www.leics.pcc.police.uk/Document-Library/Planning-and-Money/Commissioning/CommissioningIntentionsFull.pdf



The financial challenge

The 'Leicestershire Police Strategy for Change' sets out the following strategic objective:

With our staff and partners, transform the way we protect our communities and deliver over £20million in revenue savings by 2016.

From this the strategic priorities below have been set:

- A vision for Leicestershire Police that is radical, challenging and will deliver the policing priorities set out in the Plan within the resources available;
- Evidence-based business cases for change, developed from and based on current project mandates and options under consideration; and
- Implementation of options approved through the Leicestershire Police Change Board.

Working with the Chief Constable, I will ensure an efficient and effective police service, where resources are focussed, configured and used in such a way as to provide the best possible value for money. Critically in this, I look to and indeed expect the Chief Constable to encourage, recognise, reward and spread excellence throughout Leicestershire Police.

You can read more about the Change Programme and the Medium Term Financial Strategy in 'Leicestershire Police - The Financial Challenge' document available on the OPCC website: <http://bit.ly/1akLGHM>



Summary of Priorities

On your behalf, I will listen, decide, and then act in an open and even-handed manner. I will serve each and every resident of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland without fear or favour and I will be seen to do so. In summary, I will be a Police and Crime Commissioner for all. That is why, in this Plan, I have set clear priorities for the Chief Constable according to your expectations and demands; I will hold him to account for their delivery. A summary of the strategic priorities follows:

Reducing Offending and Reoffending

No.	Strategic Priority	How this will be measured
1	Preventing and diverting young people from offending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in the number of 10-17 year olds entering the criminal justice system for the first time and receiving community resolutions, youth cautions and youth conditional cautions
2	Reducing reoffending amongst young people and adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in offending by 18-24 year olds • Reduction in re-offending by 18-24 year olds
3	Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and reoffending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in the number of successful drug and alcohol treatment completions • Reduction in the number of re-entry into structured treatment within six months of successful completion • Reduction in reoffending rates amongst offenders within a criminal justice treatment programme • Reduction in the number of incidents recorded in or near licensed premises during the night-time economy hours of 7pm to 7am • An assessment and evaluation of the use of late night levy options through partners with a view to implementation
4	Reducing crime and Anti-social behaviour (ASB) caused by families in a Troubled/Supported families programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in re-offending within families engaged in a Troubled/Supported family programme • Reduction in recorded ASB committed by families engaged in a Troubled/Supported families programme

Supporting Victims and Witnesses

No.	Strategic Priority	How this will be measured
5	To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% Domestic abuse with injury crime outcome rate (please refer to Appendix B: http://bit.ly/1adN8K6) • 90% Satisfaction rate
6	To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences	Under review in line with Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) guidance
7	To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55% Crime outcome rate • 88% Satisfaction rate

Supporting Victims and Witnesses

No.	Strategic Priority	How this will be measured
8	To prevent ASB and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85% Satisfaction rate
9	To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85% 'all user' Satisfaction rate • 1% increase to this target, year on year, to achieve an overall satisfaction rate of 88% by the end of 2016

Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer

No.	Strategic Priority	How this will be measured
10	To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% Confidence rate in the Community Based Survey that the 'police are doing a good job'
11	To reduce all crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5% Reduction in all crime
12	To reduce domestic burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of burglary offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13% Reduction in burglary • 25% Crime outcome rate • 90% Satisfaction rate
13	To reduce violence against the person – with injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims of violent crime – with injury offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2% Reduction in violence against the person with injury offences • 50% Crime outcome rate • 82% Satisfaction with service for victims of violent crime with injury
14	To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims	<p>Theft from Motor Vehicle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14% Reduction in theft from motor vehicle • 9% Crime outcome rate • 85% Satisfaction rate <p>Theft of Motor Vehicle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% Reduction in theft of motor vehicle • 23% Crime outcome rate • 85% Satisfaction rate

Protecting the Vulnerable

No.	Strategic Priority	How this will be measured
15	To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses	Partners have agreed to work together to agree the most robust and victim focused performance measures. Performance indicators will be published in January 2014
16	Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs	By December 2013: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders to complete a review of the identified partnership priority areas so to facilitate evidence-based planning • To develop a programme of joint working between key stakeholders further to the above review and findings around the partnership priority areas • Agree a broader set of specific outcomes and measures for all key stakeholders
17	To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in number of missing reports • Reduction in police time and cost spent dealing with missing persons • Reduction in reports received from the nine key locations

The Financial Challenge

No.	Strategic Priority	How this will be measured
18	With staff and partners, transform the way we protect our communities and deliver over £20m in revenue savings by 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vision for Leicestershire Police that is radical, challenging and will deliver the policing priorities set out in this Plan within the resources available • Evidence based business cases for change, developed from and based on current project mandates and options under consideration • Implementation of options approved through the Leicestershire Police Change Board



If you require a copy of this summary in an alternative format please contact the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Feedback

I am always keen to hear from members of the public and partners.
Comments can be sent to me by:

Post: Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire

Police Headquarters
St John's, Enderby
Leicester LE19 2BX

Phone: 0116 229 8980

Email: police.commissioner@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk

Website: www.leics.pcc.police.uk/Contact

Follow us on Twitter: @LeicsPCC @Clive Loader



Appendix B – Performance Measure Tables

Police and Crime Plan Performance Measures				
Theme	Priority Number	Priority	How this will be measured	Organisation to supply data
Reducing Offending and Reoffending	1	Preventing and diverting young people from offending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the number of 10-17 year olds entering the Criminal Justice System for the first time and receiving community resolutions, youth caution and youth conditional cautions. 	YOS (City and County)
	2	Reducing reoffending amongst young people and adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in offending by those 18-24 years old Reduction in reoffending by 18-24 year olds 	Police
	3	Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and reoffending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in the number of successful of drug and alcohol treatment completions Reduction in the number of re-entry into structured treatment within 6 months of successful completion Reduction in reoffending rates amongst those offenders within criminal justice treatment Reduction in the number of incidents recorded in or near licensed premises during the night-time economy hours of 7pm to 7am 	CJ Team Police

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment and evaluation of the use of late night levy options through partners with a view to implementation 	Local Authorities (Unitary and Tier 2)
	<p>Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled Families programme</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in reoffending within families engaged in a troubled/supported family programme • Reduction in recorded ASB committed by families engaged in a troubled/supported families programme 	<p>Police</p> <p>Troubled Families Teams (City and County)</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Police and Crime Plan Performance Measures				
Theme	Priority Number	Priority	How this will be measured	Organisation(s) that will supply data
Supporting Victims and Witnesses	5	To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% Satisfaction rate 	Police
	6	To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences	Leicester City and Leicestershire Safeguarding Boards to advise	
	7	To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 88% Satisfaction rate 	Police
	8	To prevent anti-social behaviour (ASB) and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85% Satisfaction rate 	Police
	9	To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85% 'all user' Satisfaction rate • 1% increase to this target, year on year, to achieve an overall satisfaction rate of 88% by the end of 2016 	Police

Police and Crime Plan Performance Measures

Theme	Priority Number	Priority	How this will be measured	Organisation that will supply data
Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer	10	To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75% Confidence rate in the Community Based Survey that the 'police are doing a good job' 	Police
	11	To reduce all crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A significant reduction in all crime 	
	12	To reduce domestic burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of burglary offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A significant reduction in burglary 90% Satisfaction with service 	
	13	To reduce violence against the person – with injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims of violent crime – with injury offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A significant reduction in violent crime with injury 82% Satisfaction with service 	
	14	To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A significant reduction in Theft of Motor Vehicle (TMV) and Theft from Motor Vehicle (TFMV) offences 85% Satisfaction with service (TMV and TFMV) 	

Police and Crime Plan Performance Measures				
Theme	Priority Number	Priority	How this will be measured	Organisation(s) that will supply data
Protecting the Vulnerable	15	To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses	To be provided by the Leicester City and Leicestershire County Safeguarding Boards	
	16	Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs	To be provided by West Leicestershire CCG	
	17	To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in number of missing reports • Reduction in police time and cost spent dealing with missing persons • Reduction in reports received from the nine key locations 	<p>Police</p> <p>Police</p> <p>Police</p>

This page is intentionally left blank