

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Monday, 14 July 2014.

PRESENT

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

Cllr. R. B. Begy, OBE
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. David Bill MBE

In attendance

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

73. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2014.

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2014 were taken as read, confirmed and signed subject to the following amendments:

Page 14 – bullet point 4 to be amended to reflect that the PCC became aware that going to Judicial Review was a possibility in early 2014;

Page 14 – bullet point 8 to be amended to reflect that the Blaby District Council had been warned by the OPCC of a possible Judicial Review in February 2014.

74. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

75. 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.

Cllr. M. Sood declared a personal interest in respect of all items on the agenda as a member of the Police's Independent Advisory Panel, as the Chairman of the Leicester Council of Faiths and a member of the Bishop's Faith Forum.

76. Section 106/Lubbesthorpe - The Commissioners' response to the Panel's recommendations.

The Panel considered a report and statement of the PCC in respect of his response to the Panel's recommendations at the previous Panel meeting in June 2014 in regard to

the damaged relations between partners as a result of the action taken by the PCC to take Blaby District Council to a Judicial Review over the timing of Section 106 contribution payments for the proposed "New Lubbesthorpe" development. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 4" is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the item, the PCC delivered the following statement:

"Mr Chairman, Panel members. At the last meeting of this panel you asked me to report to you, at our next meeting, on the measures being taken by me and my office to develop and nurture good working relationships with our partners. I fully agree the inference that we now look to the future to identify how we can develop working practices that will enhance our relationship with local authority partners.

Firstly, I would hope that anyone reading the Police and Crime Plan would see the importance that I already place upon Partnership working; the efficacy of those relationships is fundamental to the delivery of the Plan. Together, we have a statutory responsibility for the safety of our communities and I am also sure that we would all agree that nothing is more important than that duty.

So, what steps am I taking?

Since the last Panel meeting, the Chief Constable and I have met with the Leader, Chief Executive and Planners from 3 councils (Blaby, Hinckley & Bosworth, and Oadby & Wigston), and we have arranged similar meetings with representatives from the remaining councils; visits to Charnwood, North-West Leicestershire and Rutland are already in the diary whilst we are still refining dates with Melton, Harborough and the City. The aim of these meetings is to see how we can work more effectively in the future. I remain committed to the protection of policing services in the community – a commitment that I know is shared by us all – and I felt that these meetings would help us all to move forward and plan for the future with a shared understanding of just what is required and how that can be delivered.

Equally, I felt it would be helpful to discuss the community safety issues facing Leicestershire Police with the representatives from the Community Safety Partnerships. These partnerships, comprising representatives from a wide range of agencies, are critical to our – and I do mean 'our' – endeavours to reduce low level criminality, acquisitive crime and anti-social behaviour. I have therefore pledged to meet the Chair from every Community Safety Partnership within our area, to explain our situation in further detail, and to seek their help in finding a resolution that meets the needs of all parties. These meetings are being set up by my Office now but, somewhat inevitably, the summer holiday period is adding an extra complication.

Specifically regarding Lubbesthorpe, we clearly need to make plans for policing of the new development. While I would like to stress that there is no appetite for further dispute on the issue, we do need to find a workable solution – and we need to find that together.

Accordingly, I have asked my Chief Executive Paul Stock and the Force's Director of Finance Paul Dawkins to meet with the relevant executives at Blaby District Council at the earliest opportunity to seek a positive way forward. The seniority of these two executives is indicative of our commitment to repairing any damage to our relationship with Blaby District Council and I have every confidence that an acceptable conclusion can be reached. Let me stress that the meeting that the Chief and I had with Cllr Ernie White, the CEO Sandra Whiles, and the planner Rob Back, was highly productive in

setting the conditions for a much more constructive engagement at the 'working level'.

In isolation, however, I appreciate this is unlikely to be enough, so I have asked for a chief officer from the Force – and Chief Supt Sally Healey will be our representative on the Lubbethorpe Strategic Board. We are grateful for the invitation to this pivotal body and we are pleased to accept the opportunities that such liaison offers.

In addition, and subject to invitation, the Force's Director of Finance Paul Dawkins will attend meetings of the 'HPIG' (Housing Planning Infrastructure Group) to ensure that our voice is heard at an early stage. This Group is chaired by the Chief Executive of NW Leicestershire District Council, Christine Fisher.

Also, and as I'm sure you know, there is a county-wide Chief Executive's Forum. These regular meetings, between peers from all responsible authorities, must be (or, if they are not, must become) a key strategic driver of the partnership work-streams necessary over the coming years to provide our residents with the quality of services they expect and deserve. My Chief Executive, who already sits on this forum, will seek mutual agreement on the distinct areas of work necessary to achieve this. He will of course report progress to me – and I to you.

You will also be aware of the forthcoming additions to my responsibilities vis-à-vis the services provided to victims and witnesses. I wish, and have emphasised my determination, to engage fully with our partners in the development of our plans here. We have adopted an approach of every day conversations with key partners and stakeholders, so this will become very much a part of the office culture – effectively, 'business as usual'. This is essential to the success of the transition to the new arrangements and subsequent embedding of the services commissioned.

Moving on, my Commissioning Framework already deeply reflects the significant priority I place on working effectively with partners to secure effective outcomes. Recently, I have issued the updated Framework for consultation on commissioning of services in FYs 15/16 and 16/17. Members of the panel, and key partners and stakeholders, will have received an invitation to contribute to the consultation and I welcome comments and contributions to the proposals within the Framework. I hereby give my commitment that all will be considered fully.

My commitment to daily working with all partners, including wider engagement with them on key priorities (eg Mental Health) remains steadfast. For the same reason, I sit on and hopefully contribute to the likes of the Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board. By working together with partners, we can indeed make a difference and both my team and I are well aware of the significance of these work-strands. We are all, I think, seeking to build on and enhance current relationships.

Mr Chairman, I will now turn to new initiatives and approaches from my office that will also contribute to this endeavour.

Firstly, at the recent meeting of the Strategic Partnership Board (on which representatives from all our statutory partners sit) it was agreed that a fundamental review was needed. This review has now been commissioned and it will include the supporting groups as well as the under-pinning Executive Board. I feel we need jointly to define its core purpose and the appropriateness of the associated administrative support. It is now over 18 months since I took office and it is timely to consider whether the

original raison d'être remains cogent and relevant.

Secondly, the Chief Constable and I will host a Partnership Summit in early October, to shape the joint creation of a shared Crime Reduction Strategy. We are acutely aware of the need to consult, listen and act upon partners' views and their potential to make a valuable contribution to ensure the optimum outcome for local residents.

Thirdly, as you are aware, overall responsibility for the Force's Infrastructure Growth and Design is delegated to the Chief Constable. However, following a review of my Office conducted by the Chief Executive, we are planning to enhance the support given to my Chief Finance Officer in order to align better the activities of Force resource planning with the strategic planning activity within my Office.

Fourthly, I have considered the importance of media and communications in some depth. I have instructed the relevant officers from my office and the force to develop a policy and/or protocol with peers in partner organisations. The aim is to share information on matters that have a significant impact on the image and reputation of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and to promote an understanding of our shared vision on the likes of crime prevention, crime reduction and community reassurance. I should stress immediately that I am not seeking to place restrictions on freedom of expression but, rather, to create opportunities to promote joint working for the benefit of the public we all serve.

Another paper on this agenda will provide you with information on the review of communications and the latest developments, so I will not go into that here, but suffice to say that I think the changes I seek to make will improve our relationship with partners and our overall service delivery.

Finally, I have considered the structure of my team and its capacity to devote sufficient time and expertise to partnership working. As a result, I have created a new post dedicated to partnership support. The role of this key individual will be to boost our ability to react to, and meet demand from, partnership issues. I believe that this will prove hugely beneficial in our future working relationships, and I plan to have the individual in post as soon as possible.

To complement my own activities, I am now considering the appointment of policy advisors. If I decide to proceed, these posts would be on a part-time basis and they may well be political appointments (or to be fair, they may not, I haven't quite decided yet). The intention, Mr Chairman, is to bring on board people experienced in specific areas of critical policy work, who have the capacity to focus their attention on those key areas. As a minimum requirement, my current thinking is to have a Policy Advisor with a focus on Community Safety and Policing and, with the changes as a result of Transforming Rehabilitation and the Victims agenda looming, a Policy Advisor for Criminal Justice priorities. I am currently working up a firm proposal on this, with a view to implementing a Special Advisory Panel to support and work with me on developing future policy, advising on the impact of proposals and subsequent implementation. Any changes to structure from suggestions within this report would be met from within existing OPCC budgets and would not increase the cost of the office.

I hope, Mr Chairman, that you would agree that in just a few short weeks a great deal has been achieved. These, and previous actions, indicate my commitment and unswerving desire to foster efficient and effective relationships with partners – we are all here to serve the public and we all owe this to the people who put their trust in us. It is the people

who gave us the privilege of doing the job we do and I will do everything in my power to deliver on my pledges to them.

For the moment, that is as much as I can say. And, whilst I am happy to take questions, you will appreciate that there will be some aspects that simply have not yet been fully designed or implemented; it really is work in progress. My intention is to drive a continuing programme of improvement, and I think you may find it more meaningful if we were to review progress in, say, a year's time. For the moment, though, you can see my ambition in taking all of these issues most seriously.

Thank you."

Arising from the PCC's statement, the following points were noted:

- The PCC agreed that an adequate risk assessment as part of the action taken to go to a Judicial Review should have been completed. He further acknowledged that any decisions taken by the PCC or his office from this point forward would be better risk assessed;
- A new partnership post that was being created in the OPCC was currently being scoped. It would be a senior officer post and it was likely that the post would be externally advertised. The PCC was keen that the post would have sufficient seniority to enable the post holder to make decisions at partnership board level;
- It was intended to bring a report to the Panel in September on the structure of the PCC's office;
- To ensure effective partnership working, it was important that representatives of appropriate seniority and, where possible, delegated authority attended partnership meetings;
- The importance of aligning strategic priorities was emphasised;
- A group of political posts would be devised to form a "contact group" to assist the PCC and his office in effective decision making. The posts were unlikely to be remunerated beyond expenses.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the PCC be thanked for his statement and that the work being undertaken to improve partnership working be welcomed;
- (b) That the progress made in moving partnership working forward be reported to the Panel's meeting on 29 September;
- (c) That a report on the structure and cost of the OPCC be submitted to one of the Panel's remaining meetings in 2014.

77. 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.

78. Police and Crime Commissioner's Annual Report 2013/14.

The Panel considered the PCC's Annual Report. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 6" is filed with these minutes. The Panel was required as part of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act to consider and comment on the PCC's Annual Report.

Arising from a discussion on the contents of the Annual Report, the following comments were noted:

- The Annual Report was more detailed report than the previous iteration, in response to the comments made by the Panel last year;
- The geographical spread of resources to the neighbourhood police teams and CSPs aimed to prioritise against risk and ensure a consistent neighbourhood presence was in place across the Force area;
- The PCC continued to commission outcomes in support of the Police and Crime Plan with his annual budget of between £2.9 and £3.8 million. All commissioning activity was set out on the PCC's website. It was important to get partners' views on the new Commissioning Framework to ensure that the right services were being commissioned in the right areas;
- The strategic priority to achieve a reduction in domestic burglary offences by 13% was not being achieved – crimes had increased by 6.7% (3935 offences to 4199). The PCC was not happy that this situation had not yet been brought under control. He wanted to maintain ambitious targets to increase public confidence. It remained a focus of the Force to target a reduction in this area;
- The strategic priority to reduce violence against a person with injury by 2% was not being achieved – crime had increased by 15.7% (4365 offences to 5052). Theft from and of vehicles had also seen an increase. Were crimes to rise in these categories again next year, the PCC would regard the upturn in crime as a "trend";
- The Chief Constable stated that the British Crime Survey showed a reduction in crime nationally, but that this might not be the case for "recorded crime". He further stated that it did not include a significant sample from the Leicester Police Force area. However, the Office of Crime and Statistics showed that, last year, there was a national decrease in police recorded crimes and that this was backed up by the statistics in the British Crime Survey. The PCC did not regard Leicestershire's crime statistics as a "disaster" though he acknowledged that, at present, the figure showed that performance was not going in the right direction. The Chief Constable stated that he had seen more recent statistics that showed that some force areas were seeing an increase in recorded crime, particularly in the north of the country;
- It was recognised that it might be helpful to include some case studies and statistics in future Annual Reports around substance abuse and how many people had been helped through treatment;
- The setting of high targets was stressed as a possible demotivating factor for police staff. It was felt that achievable, yet challenging, targets were required;
- The formal method of measuring crime detection rates had changed nationally because of a perception that the previous measuring method led to some forces

“chasing” detections. The new method would hopefully lead to the best outcome for the victim;

- There was an absence of recognition in the Annual Report for the diversity and complex nature of the City, particularly in regard to engagement. Furthermore, there were specific crimes which affected specific communities which it was felt should be better taken account of. The restructuring of the Police PR and communication function (as referred to in Minute 80) would hopefully enable better engagement with non-English speaking communities and the “hard to reach”;
- The one-to-one meetings between the PCC and the Chief Constable were minuted meetings, though they were not open to the public. The Strategic Assurance Board was a formal public body that enabled the public to access information on performance;
- Victim satisfaction rates had either matched or exceeded targets throughout all strategic priorities. The Panel welcomed this news;
- It was felt that it would be helpful to indicate in the Annual Report where a small number of criminals were committing large numbers of crimes to give a more balanced picture;
- Monitoring of the progress made through the Mental Health Triage Car was done through the Strategic Partnership Board and the NHS Partnership Trust. At present, there was no case to add another car. The present car dealt with around 200 incidents per month.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the PCC’s Annual Report be approved, subject to the comments made by the Panel;
- (b) That the comments made by the Panel form a report to be submitted to the Commissioner for his information.

79. The Restructure of Leicestershire Police.

The Panel considered a letter from the Chief Constable highlighting a number of high level changes to be made to the structure of Leicestershire Police. A copy of the letter, marked “Agenda Item 5”, and a supplementary high level briefing note from the Chief Constable, is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman introduced the item by highlighting that the PCC had previously made several comments in regard to the significant forthcoming changes, including the references made to this in the Police and Crime Plan. Reference was made by the Chairman to some of the concerns made by partners about a perceived lack of consultation on the changes.

In support of the Chief Constable’s letter, the PCC delivered a brief statement, as follows:

“In order to remain within ever decreasing budgets for policing, and to ensure that the police continue to provide the best possible service to the public, the Chief Constable has

been working hard with his colleagues in developing a new model for policing for the coming years.

I should stress that this is but the latest phase in a re-engineering of how policing is delivered in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, a process that began some four years ago. I do fully accept that the City Mayor, Sir Peter Soulsby's concerns and indeed the media coverage that has ensued has led to some anxiety about the possible impact the new policing model may have had on communities, on neighbourhood policing and indeed on the well-established partnership links. For my part, I have tried to address some of those concerns publicly in media interviews and privately in a meeting with Sir Peter that happened last week. Whilst the design of policing services, the configuration of structures and the allocation of resources are indeed matters solely for the Chief Constable, I clearly have a very significant interest in what the model will look like and the impact that it will have. To be fair to Simon, he had only just completed the work in agreeing the general structure of the new model with his senior colleagues when Sir Peter made his concerns public. The intention had always been that, once agreed, he and his colleagues would then begin the next stage – sharing the general overview of the model with internal staff who will be affected, then with partners and key stakeholders and finally with the public at large. Central to this process is seeking the help of partners in designing the detail to ensure that the new target operating policing model is fit for purpose.

Much of last week was spent therefore unsurprisingly fast-forwarding to share those proposals with staff and partners and this important piece of work is underway at the moment. As part of that process, Simon will now present the overview of the model to this Panel and he will leave you all with a copy of the slide pack that he's about to give. Whilst the Chief Constable and his team plan to be speaking to you and your colleagues in the near future to share with you those details I would wish to take this opportunity to reassure you that the impact on local areas will be positive. Neighbourhood, local policing will remain the cornerstone of all of our communities. There will be no separation of local policing and the crime investigation parts of policing and our response to 999 incidents will be strengthened, our approach to non-emergencies will be more consistent and, I believe, appropriate.

I would like to hand over to Simon to give you some more flesh to hang on those bones and talk you through the Force Change Programme before we get to questions if we may Mr. Chairman."

The Chairman indicated that, prior to receiving the presentation he would allow Cllr. Russell to ask a question. Cllr. Russell stated that she was pleased that the Chief Constable was present at the meeting to provide more detail as part of the engagement process on the restructuring. However she reaffirmed that the Panel's role was to scrutinise the PCC, not the Chief Constable and, specifically his responsibilities to secure and efficient and effective police force for the area and bring together community safety and criminal justice partners to make sure local priorities were joined up. On this basis, she asked that, in future, the Panel have a standing item on the Force change Programme on the agenda for all meetings. She stressed that by doing this, the Panel would be enabled to scrutinise the PCC's engagement role in the Force Change Programme. Accordingly, she asked that the following information be including in future reports on this matter:

- The role the PCC had on the Change Board;

- The authority the PCC had in relation to decisions made on the Change Programme;
- How the PCC was assuring himself on the impact each element of the Change Programme would have on securing an 'efficient and effective' Force;
- The impact assessments the PCC had seen/requested/carried out prior to agreement of each element of the Change Programme, including equalities, financial, environmental and community impacts;
- How the PCC had met his responsibilities for 'bringing together community safety & criminal justice partners to make sure local priorities were joined up' regarding the Change Programme and also the variety of, budget forced, changes being made by partners;
- Any independent assurances the PCC was receiving regarding the Change Programme and the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan;
- Any impact the PCC believed elements may have on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan and why.

The PCC indicated that he was happy to include this information in a standing agenda item to the Panel.

In support of his letter, the Chief Constable indicated that he was aware of the anxiety that the plans had caused amongst partners, that he was sorry that this had happened and that this had not been his intention. Though he acknowledged that it may not have appeared as such, both he and the PCC had always wished to take the Force Change Programme forward in an inclusive way.

The PCC stated that he felt that it was unfortunate that the offer he had made to the Panel through the Chairman to hold a briefing in June on, amongst others, this issue had been rejected by the Chairman. He felt that much of the difficulties experienced by partners on the issue of engagement could have been avoided if that briefing had been allowed to take place.

In response, the Chairman indicated that he was and remained concerned that the briefing could be perceived to be a "pseudo Panel meeting" behind closed doors. He stated that he had the full backing of the Panel in taking the decision to reject the offer. However, he further stated that he continued to request of the PCC and the Chief Constable a briefing on operational issues to aid the Panel's understanding of strategic matters. It was felt that the Strategic Partnership Board would have been an appropriate means through which the PCC could have briefed partners on the detail of the Force Change Programme; the PCC had taken that opportunity.

Cllr. Palmer asked whether external consultants had been engaged in the Force Change Programme and what their involvement had been thus far. The Chief Constable stated that consultants had been engaged in this work in January 2014 with a brief to bring their methodologies for delivering change within policing services to enable Leicestershire Police to deliver a change with a significant return on investment. The current policing model was unsustainable and the change was required within this financial year. This would equate to a reduction of 90 officers in 2014/15. The consultants spoke to a number

of frontline officers and their focus was to work within the Force, rather than to seek advice from partners at this early stage.

Arising from the Chief Constable's presentation, the following comments were noted:

- The changes would hopefully be implemented by early in the New Year;
- IT capabilities were a key element of the Plan. The Chief Constable was confident that the systems were robust, though some required modernisation. There were significant opportunities in this respect to increase public access through the use of mobile technologies. Mobile signal, particularly in rural areas, was an issue and was highlighted in the risk register;
- Middle ranks would be removed from Police staff, which would mean that much experience would be lost;
- Frontend delivery would be maximised as part of the Plan and recruitment going forward would be minimal;
- The knock-on effect on the career progression of officers was highlighted as an issue which may have an effect on staff morale going forward;
- Leicestershire's fleet costs were amongst the lowest in the country. Air support provision was now dealt with nationally;
- It would be helpful to have greater detail in regard to risk included in the Plan. The Chief Constable was happy to include this in future reports to the Panel.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Chief Constable's presentation be noted;
- (b) That the Panel receive a standing item on the Force Change Programme at future meetings.

80. Update on the Review of Communication and Public Engagement.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning the Review of the Police's Communication and Public Engagement function. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 7", is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman invited the Chief Executive to report on the Review. The following points were noted:

- The report was written prior to a consultation exercise with staff groups and for that reason was vague;
- The formal "shared service" being proposed was innovative. It would be jointly accountable to the Chief Constable and the PCC;
- It was hoped that the new arrangements would be in place by early 2015;

- The shared service would increase resilience and capacity to enable the Chief Constable and his officers to engage at the appropriate level and for the Chief Constable and the PCC to engage the many communities in what was an increasingly diverse force area;
- It was suggested that more detail could be reported at the Panel's meeting in September.

The PCC reported the following:

- The success of the new shared service was of the utmost importance;
- The current PR and engagement function was not adequately equipped to deal with the requirements of the new governance structure of a PCC (strategic matters) and a Chief Constable (operational matters);
- It would be lean and accountable – a single team able to service two corporation souls with differential levels of detail;
- There would be issues that would need to be clarified in relation to promotional work in the lead up to elections.

The Chief Constable reported the following:

- Engagement at neighbourhood level was increasingly complex given the diversity of the Force area. The new structure would enable this to happen in a more consistent way;
- There would need to be an operational/political “firewall”;
- The new structure would enable the Force to do more work on insecurities and the positive influence of public behaviours.

Arising from the information provided, the point was made that the report had insufficient detail to enable a useful debate to take place. If necessary, the Panel would be able to receive exempt reports.

RESOLVED:

That the matter be deferred to the Panel's meeting on 29 September for a full update on the detail on the progress of the Review of Communication and Public Engagement.

81. Performance Reporting Framework 2014/15.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning the Performance Reporting Framework 2014/15. A copy of the report, marked “Agenda Item 8”, is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the Framework, the Chief Executive reported the following:

- The Performance Reporting Framework would be taken forward in a more partnership focused way;

- The new Framework was a response to the Public Affairs Select Committee's report entitled "Caught Red Handed" which suggested a move away from targets, which were felt to be demoralising.

In response to questioning by the Panel, the following comments were noted:

- The Framework stated that there would be quarterly reporting from CSPs to suggest what they had done to support the Police and Crime Plan. A suggestion was made that the Force could in future report back on what it had done to support the priorities of the CSPs;
- It was felt that the partnership emphasis should be better reflected in the content of the Framework. Work was ongoing on this issue;
- Crest Advisory had appraised the Framework and commented that it was one of the few in the country that had received data contributions from all partners and CSPs;
- Female Genital Mutilation had not been raised as an issue in the current Plan, though it would be acknowledged in the next iteration of the Plan.

RESOLVED:

That the Performance Reporting Framework be noted.

82. Date of next meeting.

It was NOTED that the next meeting of the Commission would be held on 29 September 2014 at 2.00pm.

9.30 am - 12.45 pm
14 July 2014

CHAIRMAN