



**Meeting:** Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel

**Date/Time:** Monday, 14 July 2014 at 9.30 am

**Location:** Sparkenhoe Committee Room, County Hall, Glenfield

**Contact:** Sam Weston (Tel: 0116 305 6226)

**Email:** sam.weston@leics.gov.uk

### **Membership**

Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC (Chairman)

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

**Please note:** this meeting will be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's web site at <http://www.leics.gov.uk/webcast>  
– Notices will be on display at the meeting explaining the arrangements.

### **AGENDA**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Report by</u>
1. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2014.	(Pages 3 - 18)
2. To advise of any other items which the Chairman has decided to take as urgent elsewhere on the agenda.	
3. Declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda.	
4. Section 106/Lubbesthorpe - The Commissioners' response to the Panel's recommendations.	Police and Crime Commissioner (Pages 19 - 22)

Democratic Services ◦ Chief Executive's Department ◦ Leicestershire County Council ◦ County Hall  
Glenfield ◦ Leicestershire ◦ LE3 8RA ◦ Tel: 0116 232 3232 ◦ Email: [democracy@leics.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@leics.gov.uk)



[www.twitter.com/leicsdemocracy](http://www.twitter.com/leicsdemocracy)



[www.facebook.com/leicsdemocracy](http://www.facebook.com/leicsdemocracy)



[www.leics.gov.uk/local\\_democracy](http://www.leics.gov.uk/local_democracy)

The Panel questioned the Commissioner on his decision to take Blaby District Council to a Judicial Review in regard to a new development in the district at its previous meeting on 9 June.

For reference, a copy of the Panel's decision on the matter is attached to the agenda.

A copy of the PCC's response is attached and the PCC will deliver a statement at the meeting in support of his report.

5. The Restructure of Leicestershire Police. (Pages 23 - 24)

A copy of a letter from the Chief Constable to partners is attached for information.

6. Police and Crime Commissioner's Annual Report 2013/14. Police and Crime Commissioner (Pages 25 - 106)

The Police and Crime Panel is required to make a report or recommendations on the Annual Report to the Commissioner.

7. Update on the Review of Communication and Public Engagement. Police and Crime Commissioner (Pages 107 - 110)

8. Performance Reporting Framework 2014/15. Police and Crime Commissioner (Pages 111 - 128)

9. Date of next meeting.

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

10. 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, 9 June 2014.

PRESENT

Cllr. R. B. Begy	Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC
Cllr. David Bill MBE	Cllr. Trevor Pendleton
Cllr. J. Boyce	Cllr. Byron Rhodes
Cllr. A. V. Greenwood MBE	Cllr. Sarah Russell
Mr. S. J. Hampson CC	Cllr. Lynn Senior
Miss. H. Kynaston	Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE
Cllr. William Liquorish	

Apologies

Col. R. Martin OBE, DL, Cllr. D. Slater 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

62. Election of Chairman.

It was proposed by Mr. Pendleton and seconded by Cllr. Russell that Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC be elected Chairman of the Panel for the period up to June 2015.

Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC - in the Chair

63. Election of Vice-Chairman.

It was proposed by Mr. Orson and seconded by Mr. Rhodes that Mr. T. J. Pendleton CC be elected Vice-Chairman of the Panel for the period up to June 2015.

64. Chairman's Announcement

The Chairman read out the following statement:

*"We may well be in for a lengthy meeting this afternoon, but before we get started, I do wish to make a few further remarks.*

*The papers for this meeting were circulated on Monday 2 June. To meet the legal requirements, papers should have been sent out on the previous Friday afternoon, 30 May. I know that the secretariat has already apologised for this to members of the panel and I repeat that apology from the chair. However, the secretariat does need papers provided to it in good time to meet these deadlines and on this occasion the papers arrived too late on Friday afternoon from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for them to be copied and despatched. I must ask those who work in that office to ensure that papers are provided to Sam Weston and his colleagues in Democratic Services in good time and in accordance with the timetable which they set for the production of the paperwork in order to meet the legal requirements.*

*At the last meeting on 17 March, we debated at some length the development of a Question Procedure for the Panel. I had intended that a further paper would come today on that issue to the Panel for information, but in light of the length of the agenda I have agreed that the procedure will now simply be circulated to Panel members by the secretariat. Consultation has taken place with the Chief Executive of the Commissioner and steps will now be taken to publicise this procedure in an appropriate manner.*

*I have also asked that this Panel receive a report from the Police and Crime Commissioner about the proposals for the future of the Public Relations function at the police. I understand that discussions are ongoing and I therefore agreed not to take this item on today's agenda; I do expect the Panel to return to this matter at its next meeting.*

*I have asked that the Commissioner reconsider my request for there to be a briefing to members of the Panel by the Chief Constable to assist the Panel in undertaking its work. I am awaiting a response from the Commissioner and will advise Panel members of that as soon as I have received it.*

*Finally, if the meeting is as lengthy as I suspect, I plan to have a comfort break at around 4.00pm."*

65. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

66. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

67. 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 and as the Chairman of the Leicester Council of Faiths.

68. Section 106/Lubbesthorpe.

The Panel considered a report concerning a the PCC's decision to take Blaby District Council to a Judicial Review in respect of the phasing of Section 106 funding for the proposed development known as "New Lubbesthorpe" in the district of Blaby. A copy of the High Court's judgement of the matter, dated 27 May 2014, is field with these minutes.

The Chairman invited the PCC to deliver a statement setting out his views on the matter. Accordingly, the PCC delivered the following statement:

*"I would like to make it clear before I start that I intend to focus on facts which can be evidenced. It is not my intention to incite media headlines or engage in petty political posturing. I have however observed several comments which appear to be little more than malicious in nature, factually incorrect and misleading to the public and I have no wish to add to this already unedifying spectacle. A vitriolic debate, conducted via the media, between different members of the public sector family is, I believe, wholly*

*unnecessary and highly inappropriate; I would expect that members of this panel would subscribe to a similar ethos.*

*Let me now talk about the actual events leading up to the decision to seek a Judicial Review regarding the Lubbesthorpe development – and, like I said, this sequence of events is fully evidenced. For the record, my only concern at all times, has been the preservation of community safety - an important quality of life – indeed, safety of life – issue that I personally do not believe should be diluted or compromised in any way to the benefit of those who stand to gain most from such developments.*

*I am sure that many of you, particularly those members of this panel who sat on the former Police Authority, will recall that the Lubbesthorpe proposals first came to light in late 2009, from which time until early 2011 there was regular Police involvement regarding the impact of the development and the necessary mitigations.*

*Then, on 28th April 2011, shortly after the submission of the Planning application, Leicestershire Police made a formal request for a financial contribution – a position fully supported by the Police Authority. Former members will no doubt recall that, at the Police Authority meeting held on 24 January 2012, they unanimously approved the following:*

*The realignment of the Architectural Liaison Officer to focus on secure by design and planning advice, managing demand against reducing resources. And that...*

*The ‘Policing Contributions from Development Schemes Policy’ [was to] remain in force to allow claims against major developments where a significant policing impact is foreseen.*

*At the subsequent meeting, held on 28 March 2012, Police Authority members considered a report from the Chief Constable covering Developer Contributions. The full report is available, but of particular pertinence at that meeting was that the Authority - unanimously once again - resolved to:*

*‘Confirm that developer contributions will continue to be actively pursued in accordance with the Police Authority Policy updated at the 24th January meeting’;*

*Quite clearly then, the Police Authority appreciated the risks ahead and was in favour of pursuing timely developer contributions. Indeed, these extracts are an important part of its legacy, a position with which I totally concur. Of note, this issue was included in the Police Authority Legacy Report, presented to me at the meeting of 20 November 2012, a mere 5 days after I was elected to Office.*

*However, on November 1st 2012, Blaby Planning Committee granted planning permission for the Lubbesthorpe development, subject to the execution of a legal agreement including (and I quote) "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".*

*Over the next 12 months, a series of meetings and other communication between Blaby District Council representatives and the Police ensued, during which time it appeared that we were all ‘on the same page’, not least as evinced by the fact that, in September 2013,*

*the Force refreshed and reduced their request for funding contributions at the suggestion of the Council.*

*The Council confirmed that most Police items were acceptable in principle but asked for further clarification of the Force's financial position, which was subsequently provided. The Force clearly restated its position on premises and, in mid-November 2013, we received notification from the Council that the wording on premises would be provided to us. However, nothing materialised.*

*In December 2013, following a meeting to finalise the overall financial position and to deal with an outstanding item on vehicles, the Force confirmed the outline agreement reached at that meeting. Without itemising every detail here, it amounted to a stated need for equipment, premises and other facilities totalling £1.67m. Correspondence from the Force continued to highlight the need for appropriate phasing of the s106 payments, but no confirmation was received from the Council.*

*And so it was with no small degree of astonishment that we discovered, during January this year, that Outline Planning Permission had been granted, particularly as there had been no further communication from the Council.*

*This agreement contained no commitment to paying a large element of the contribution necessary to provide extra premises for the police officers and staff required to protect and ensure the security of the new Lubbethorpe community. This position was exacerbated by the inclusion of trigger points as to when the money would be paid – of note, the Force was not party to this agreement, which was drawn up between the Council and the Developer. As a result, nothing at all was to be paid until 2600 homes were built and occupied. Therefore essential police radio communications, CCTV and ANPR equipment will not be funded by developer contributions when needed in order effectively to police the new community. This equates to several thousands of residents and a number of years into the build, with no money coming forward whatsoever. Even then, the Force would have to wait until 3750 homes are built for any contribution towards premises – this, by the way, something that would only happen if the Council and Developers decided it was needed at that time; Police advice would not necessarily be sought...or heeded.*

*When complete, this development will be the size of Market Harborough which, in terms of policing and community safety, as the Chair of the CSP knows, requires a lot of hard work.*

*Amongst other items, we discovered that Blaby District Council and the developer did make provision for the improvement of Leicester City bus station, the first payment being made at 50 dwellings, and also a Health Centre, funded once 250 homes are occupied, but did not see fit to agree something similar for safe policing. The real danger remains that the developer will choose not to build all of the houses with the result that less, or even no, funds might be released for policing the development at all.*

*Blaby District Council states that it wrote to the Force on 18 November 2013 outlining its position.. However, Mr Justice Foskett noted that it was indeed common ground that this letter was never received. In fact this fundamental, critical piece of correspondence was not mentioned until some three months after it was purportedly sent. And when we asked the District Council to supply us with details of any letters sent to other infrastructure providers at the same time notifying them of the conclusion of the negotiation process,*

*Blaby stated that the only other correspondence was with Leicestershire County Council, by e-mail, over a week later.*

*Moving on, the Council was notified of our intention to commence legal proceedings on the 18th of February, from which point it became clear that they, and the other interested parties, had no intention of revisiting the funding schedule for policing.*

*Following legal advice (at the request of the Chief Constable and the Force), we formalised our intention to seek Judicial Review. Members of this Panel, this was not some personal, shallow whim as some here have implied, but was undertaken with great deliberation, calculation and more than a little reluctance. It was done entirely in the interests of community safety – as you should already know, it is my sworn duty to do all in my power to ensure that the police are able to cut crime and protect the public. Furthermore, I am here to represent the public voice, a public which repeatedly tells me that it wishes to see more visible policing – an aspiration entirely at odds with this outcome. Indeed Mr Justice Foskett stated in his judgement:*

*“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.”*

*As you would expect, being keen to settle the situation at the earliest opportunity and without further recourse to legal representation, the Force, the OPCC, and other interested parties made approaches to Blaby District Council between February and May 2014, with a view to achieving a resolution through means other than litigation. In these approaches we offered and encouraged mediation, facilitated meetings, and individual meetings, all of which were rebuffed by the Council and the developers.*

*I should emphasise, as I have done repeatedly in other places, that the Chief Constable and I are fully supportive of such developments. We both appreciate the benefits they can bring to the area. But we are both wholeheartedly opposed to anything that poses further risk to community safety – particularly at a time of acute austerity, with budgets stretched to the limit. I sought to secure a fair financial contribution, at realistic points in the development process, to enable the Force to continue to provide effective community safety services.*

*You will no doubt know that local authorities and Community Safety Partnerships are required to take into account community safety in their decision making to prevent crime and disorder in their areas. It is not, in my view, unreasonable to expect local authorities to consider the needs of policing when negotiating Section 106 agreements, this being for the mutual benefit of the new and existing communities we serve.*

*It is correct that, in February 2014, Blaby wrote to the Chief Constable offering to (and I quote) "cover the contribution towards the agreed police equipment" and although this has since been described as the offer of a loan, this is not a word used in that letter by the Blaby Chief Executive. Whilst it was accepted that this was a genuine offer from the Council, we were made aware of legal concerns that the offer made could potentially be challenged as "unlawful", and even as to whether Blaby had sufficient authority to make such a payment. Crucially, even if those concerns could have been addressed, the offer made no commitment to fund the police premises requirements and still involved using public funds to meet infrastructure costs – costs which are clearly intended, by s106*

*legislation to have been met by the developer, not by hard-pressed tax-payers.*

*I have to say, it does appear somewhat inconsistent for Blaby to be a party, on the one hand, to an agreement that virtually ignores the need for timely police funding whilst, on the other, it offers to put up the money for policing from their own taxpayers – money that they have decided not to exact from the Developers. The inference, nonetheless, is clearly that they concur our point of view.*

*For the reasons outlined above, disappointingly, we were forced to take our case to court. As the leader of Blaby District Council said on Radio Leicester, they had a very expensive barrister acting on their behalf. This very eloquent QC stated words to the effect that the Force did make representations, which the evidence suggests were considered and which were accepted – by all parties involved – as being CIL-compliant.*

*Naturally I was deeply disappointed to learn that we were unsuccessful in our claim; however, as Mr Justice Foskett explained, there is a very high legal threshold to overturn a decision such as this. I did take succour from several other areas in his Judgement in support of our case when he wrote:*

*‘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 (who was acting on our behalf), in my judgment, makes some entirely fair points about the actual terms of the Section 106 Agreement so far as they affect the Claimant.’*

*He went on to say:*

*‘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.’*

*We have all heard a lot about who won, and who lost, legally. But morally and ethically, I remain firmly of the opinion that we were right to take a robust stance in an attempt to redress the situation created by the Lubbethorpe development.*

*I have been asked why we don't use our six million pound General Reserve, our only uncommitted reserve. If we were to deplete our prudent, but far from lavish, General Reserve to pay for the policing infrastructure of new developments, we would risk having no finance available for the very purpose for which we are legally required to hold them - unforeseen events and critical emergencies such as major public order incidents. In any case, it is not appropriate for taxpayers to pay, via the mechanism of Police funds, the price of policing new developments when that is clearly the onus to be laid upon those developers who stand to gain most. This is entirely consistent with the approach taken by other Local Authority partners.*

*Frankly, developers' cash-flow plans should not be my problem. Nor, indeed, should they adversely affect the safety of our existing communities. Either new funds are made*



*available for policing new developments, or policing in current communities must suffer; no ifs, no buts.*

*Meanwhile, as the Chair of this Panel highlighted in a previous meeting, the Force is facing the loss of a potential additional 250-300 officers and staff, on top of a similar reduction that has already taken place prior to my commencement in Office. Any further financial pressure will simply see a reducing blue line trying to spread itself ever more thinly over a greater area.*

*Let me re-state that I deeply regret that public money had to be spent in this way, but in the circumstances I am clear that it was necessary. As the Chief Constable has said: "together, we are charged with the safety of all of our communities; no one should be in any doubt that we will pursue every possible avenue – including legal recourse – as we strive to fulfil that public duty." Let no one be in any doubt that he and I stand firmly together on this.*

*Our legal costs were in the region of £25,000, but I understand that other costs for which we are liable are coming in much higher than that, some of which are still subject to negotiation. Of course, had we been allowed to adopt a less adversarial form of negotiation, such as formal mediation, or perhaps a meeting with the relevant parties, then the costs would have been far lower.*

*The Lubbethorpe case provides stark evidence regarding the effects on policing that can be wrought by large, new communities if appropriate funding is not secured. That is bad enough. But the greater threat to our safety is the potential further £13m the Police would need to find should this approach and outcome be repeated on the other planned developments in our Force area.*

*Those new communities must all be kept safe and secure – I repeat, it is my sworn duty to do all in my power to enable the Chief Constable to do that.*

*And as the elected Police and Crime Commissioner, it will be me who has to have difficult conversations with communities to explain why their expectations need to be lowered, and it will be the reputation of our police that will suffer when something doesn't happen as quickly as it might have, just because the requisite funding is not provided at a timely point in the development process.*

*We are all here to serve the interests of the public and I will have no need to remind you of your own role in ensuring safe communities. I do appreciate that, for some members, their Panel responsibilities may be difficult to reconcile with their roles elsewhere, but I would hope and expect that you are all able to put this issue to one side for the greater good.*

*We now need to work together and you might want to consider the words of the Policing Protocol which is unequivocal when it states (and I quote):*

*'While the Panel is there to challenge the PCC, it must also exercise its functions with a view to supporting the effective exercise of the PCC's functions.'*

*This action was taken entirely in the interests of community safety, to try to ensure the sustainability of policing, and ultimately the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan that you on this Panel approved. The public will not want to see a dilution of the policing in their neighbourhood, particularly as they will see no simultaneous reduction in their council*

*tax. It is also a matter of record that growth developments generate significant additional demands on the police service, this increased load beginning at the very commencement of the development and as the earliest homes are occupied – not when all are built and all are fully occupied.*

*As I have already alluded, and as you well know, Lubbesthorpe is not the only ball in play. Current proposals will see housing growth of around 70,000 homes and a resultant population increase in excess of 200,000 people in our area. Without appropriate funding this will inevitably impact significantly upon the Force's ability to sustain current service levels. What is going to give? And where?*

*Given the strength and content of Mr Justice Foskett's judgement, we chose not to appeal. However, while we have appreciated support for our action from the general public, I think it is now time to encourage Blaby District Council and the developers, having read the judgement, to reconsider their position.*

*I am certain that I am not alone in thinking that the taxpayers of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland should not be expected to suffer a reduced policing provision as a result of private sector developers failing to make adequate and timely provision for safe and secure communities.*

*So how do we work more effectively together in the future on planning issues that may impact upon community safety? Looking at the wider planning landscape it is clear that the situation could soon become untenable. It is absolutely critical for the safety of all our communities that this work starts now in addressing the risks posed by the new Lubbesthorpe development. It would be helpful to know if and how this Panel intends to support the Chief Constable and me in this regard. Meanwhile, my commitment to partnership working, on Lubbesthorpe and elsewhere, remains absolutely undiminished –*

*I am sure that you all feel the same.*

*Thank you."*

The Chairman invited Mark Alflat, Director of Place at Blaby District Council to deliver a statement setting out the views of Blaby District Council on the matter. Accordingly, Mr. Alflat delivered the following statement:

*"Good afternoon. I do not intend to give a comprehensive report to the panel on the whole process of the planning application and the judicial review. It will be useful for the panel however to have an overview of matters from Blaby District Council's point of view.*

*In February 2011 a planning application was received for "New Lubbesthorpe". This was for 4,250 dwellings, district centres, retail, commercial, employment, leisure, health, community and residential use, new schools, an employment site of 21 hectares with accompanying open space and woodlands. A huge infrastructure project was necessary to support the site including proposals for two new road bridges over the M1 motorway and M69 motorway and access points from various lanes. In March 2011 extensive consultation was carried out with various interested parties. Officers from the Council spent a large amount of time getting the Police requests into a form that could meet the statutory requirements. Indeed we assisted them more than any other Authority requesting funding. On 1st November 2012 the Planning Committee of Blaby District Council met to consider the application. On the day of the actual planning meeting at 4.30pm an objection was received from the Police to the planning application. The then*

*Deputy Chief Executive of Blaby District Council and the Police's Finance Director agreed a form of words that meant that the police did not object to the application. The planning application was then approved. Following consideration by the Secretary of State of the application, negotiations on the detail of the S106 agreement commenced again in March 2013. At that point the potential of £5m of pinch-point funding for the M1 bridge was on the cards which added urgency to the negotiations. All through the process the developers did not agree with the amounts that the police were claiming, particularly with regard to premises and felt the police accommodation needs could be met from a community building on the new development. One of the underlying themes throughout this process has been the police lack of understanding that they are part of a complex process where the role of the District planning authority is to create opportunities for development in according the national policy which requires the reconciliation of competing demands from the various bodies requesting funding and the need to bring viable development forward. There appears to be no recognition of the wider world beyond the provision of the police service or recognition of the role of the planning authority to mediate between all of these requests and the need to deliver development. The huge cost of the setting up of the initial infrastructure has meant that in order to be viable, trigger points have been set with interested parties as the development progresses. At the conclusion of extensive negotiations, planning consent was issued on 14th January 2014. On 29th January 2014 we sent a copy of the S106 to the Leicestershire police at the same time as it was sent to others. Three days before the expiry of the judicial review period, notice from Leicestershire Police of their intention to apply for judicial review was sent to the Council. There have been no previous discussion or intention notified to the District Council from the Police. It should be noted that throughout the negotiation process Leicestershire Police advised the District council they could borrow against the developer contribution to enable services to be provided in advance of the contribution. Given the scale of Leicestershire Police budget this appeared to be a reasonable assumption. The timing of the contribution payments were set in this context but through the legal process it became clear that the police no longer considered this to be a possibility. The District Council sought and obtained legal advice from Queens Counsel. The summary of which was that the police had an unwinnable case. Nevertheless in order to protect the overall public purse Blaby District Council's CE, Sandra Whiles and its Leader Ernie White agreed to put a proposal to the police where Blaby District Council would lend the money for the equipment element of the 106 agreement to the Leicestershire Police on a phased basis as suggested to the Police by the CE and GM at a meeting attended by Sir Clive, Simon Cole and Paul Dawkins. Given the relevant budgets of the two organisations this was a significant offer but it was declined by the Police despite the fact that it would on face value have solved the matter. Advice had been sought from the Council's financial manager that this was a perfectly valid and legal use of Council funding. As part of that response Leicestershire Police contended that it was unreasonable for them to have to justify the needs for new police premises later on in the course of the development. The Council's position has been that the position is entirely logical given the funding cuts and service delivery changes taking place across the public sector. No public sector body can be clear on the premises requirements 20 years from now. The original papers laid before the court had three claims:*

- 1. Irrationality that the decision made by the council to issue the planning permission (and the associated agreement on payments and timing of payments) was irrational.*
- 2. The Council should have taken the agreement back to Committee as in the Police view it had not complied with the committee resolution.*

3. Legitimate expectation that the Council had a duty to further involve and consult Leicestershire Police before issuing the planning permission.

Following the service of the claim papers the police then sent in a solicitor to the Council Offices in an undercover operation designed to reveal alleged weaknesses in how it keeps its planning register. Following this visit a fourth ground was submitted to the courts that the Council are not maintaining an up to date register of planning applications on 106 agreements and therefore prevented and excluded the Leicestershire Police from the public process. I will note that following these actions by a supposed partner the position of the Blaby District Council hardened and we felt that the only way to resolve these matters was before the court. On 2nd May the Police wrote to Blaby District Council's legal representatives suggesting alterations to trigger points for the infrastructure requirements and tellingly despite public statements following the court case stated "the commissioner does however make clear that he is not proposing mediation. He merely seeks the party's assistance at a meeting in exploring the above question (or trigger points). The Council responded through its legal representatives pointing out that the District Council had already offered to lend money from its own finances to provide equipment and further to suggest reopening negotiations in coming to a conclusion before the court case of the 25th May and certainly without prejudicing the pinch-point bridge money with all the interested parties and the need for public bodies to go back to their members to agree any changes was not feasible. The District Council suggested that Leicestershire Police withdraw the claim and meet the district costs in defending the proceedings. We then stated we would be happy to continue discussions with the Police and developer's with a view to assisting Leicester Police in a way round their concerns. Again pointing out that all the interested parties would have to agree. Following this correspondence, proceedings took place on the 27th May, 2014 in the court. I understand that members have an overview of that judgement and I will not therefore go through that in any detail here. Suffice to say that the judge found that ground 2 reasonableness and ground 4 the planning register were refused permission to progress at all and were dismissed out of hand. The judge allowed grounds 1 and 3 to be considered and then dismissed them on their merits. The judgement endorsed the Council's decision and planning process and allowed us to return to focussing on delivering a new community. The PCC has decided not to appeal this judgement and we are currently seeking reimbursement of our direct costs which total an amount over £70,000. Regardless of what the total net cost to Blaby District Council residents is the public purse has suffered enormously from this action. In addition to this Council Officers have been taken off their normal duties to prepare statements which have impacted on the service available to the public. The police, despite losing the court case comprehensively appear to have taken some comfort from a small proportion of the judge's words. The judge had before him only the information that which was necessary to make a legal ruling. The Council's exercise of its planning judgement is based on much more information relevant to the 106 agreement. Neither the judge nor the police had been party to that full picture. The police have never had the full picture because they never asked. Instead they chose to challenge. Instead of challenging they could have trusted that the Council do its job properly and operate in the public interest just as the Council trust that our partners and the police will do their job without fear of challenge. Ironically, since before this arduous legal process began, Blaby District Council have been leading on behalf of Leicestershire planning authorities to establish a clear and appropriate process for calculating, delivering developer contribution. In other words BDC has been at the forefront in trying to support police funding.

Finally perhaps as a parallel, from day one of the first house being built the Council will need to service those householders with refuse collection and the other council services

*it is responsible for. The Council has not asked for extra contributions out of the development as it will receive, as the police will, monies through the Council Tax and Central Government Funding.”*

The Chairman then invited Cllr. Greenwood to deliver a statement setting out his views as a Blaby District Councillor on the matter. Cllr. Greenwood delivered the following statement:

*“The Council has strong operational links with Leicestershire Police and considers community safety a fundamental aspect of delivering a sustainable community at Lubbethorpe. It is for this reason that Blaby District Council worked hard to ensure a significant development contribution of over £1.6m in favour of Leicestershire Police.*

*I was party with the Chief Executive at Blaby to the signing and sealing of these documents which amounted to in excess of £150 million – signed and agreed at that time with £1.6 million going to the Police for the infrastructure necessary to support a new town that was bigger than Market Harborough.*

*The Panel is now fully aware of how Blaby District Council sought to support Leicestershire Police and secured them the highest level of S106 contributions ever achieved in any development in the county. I ask members to remember the meeting on 24 January this year – agenda item number 5 – when I made a statement relating to Section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy. At that time, the prepared statement by the lead of all the district councils, appointed by members, to look at Section 106 indicated that Blaby District Council were the lead on Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy. At the time, I held out the olive branch after the meeting and indicated that we were still willing to come and agree with the Police. As the Chairman of the Lubbethorpe Strategic Consultative Board, there are representatives from all aspects of the public sector and developers, including the Police. I have had no approach at all as Chairman to be able to take this forward. That olive branch is still open to work with the Police.*

*I am obviously pleased that the High Court dismissed the PCC’s claim on all grounds and found the Council’s planning process and decision reasonable, rational and legally sound.*

*One of the most worrying and bitterly disappointing elements of the recent costly legal proceedings is the lack of trust and respect demonstrated by our Police partners. It is this adversarial approach taken by the Police and the continued threat of action against other local authorities that has so deeply damaged relations with all local authorities on planning matters. If public sector partners cannot trust each other to carry out our distinct roles in local governance then it is a very sad day for Leicestershire.*

*Since before this arduous, expensive legal process began, Blaby District Council has been leading on behalf of the Leicestershire planning authorities to establish a clear and appropriate process for calculating and delivering developer contributions. This work continues and I truly hope that Leicestershire Police and the Police and Crime Commissioner will engage positively in this work with us and use their energies constructively as opposed to using the courts to try to get their own way at the expense of others, especially the public that we serve.”*

The Chairman invited members of the Panel to ask questions of the PCC. Arising from the questions asked, the following points of the PCC were noted:

- The PCC felt that it was his duty to do what he could to enable the Chief Constable to effectively police communities. He wanted to try and build a firm financial base for the Police against a backdrop of financial reductions. If he had agreed to the New Lubbesthorpe development, he would have had to agree to a number of other developments across the County and this would have diminished the service the Force was able to provide these new communities. With advice, he had sought to mitigate this by taking legal action. He felt that the public was very understanding of why he had taken this action;
- His legal advisers had felt that the PCC had a strong case with a good chance of success, though this was within the context of what he felt was a “high legal hurdle” in challenging a planning decision. He suggested that the Judge had confirmed in his judgement that the Police were justified in raising concerns about the extent to which they would be resourced to police this and other new developments in the Force area in the future. Though he regretted the outcome, he remained of the view that he was right to make the challenge and give support to his Chief Constable;
- Government policy was to build new homes and drive the economy forward and this was within the context of the significant financial challenges the public sector faced. Local planning authorities had a duty to enable development and there was the potential for Section 106 funds to be lost completely in instances where planning applications were refused and this was then overturned by developers at appeal;
- The PCC became aware that going to Judicial Review on this issue was a possibility in early 2013. He had then sought the advice of colleagues in the OPCC and the Force. He had reluctantly decided that this was his only option in order to have a chance to police the new developments effectively. He had also sought external legal advice;
- The population of the Force area had risen by 100,000 over the last 10 years with no increase in provision for policing though the increase in Council Tax revenues as a result of the population increase was acknowledged. He had felt that he had to make a stand against this continuing trend and ensure that the resources were in place to effectively police those communities. There had been a significant assessment carried out of the likely operational impact on policing of the new development being built. It was estimated that this would be equate to around 8,000 additional calls to the police. The Chief Constable felt that the most pressing concern of the development was inadequate radio coverage and significant investment would therefore be required in this regard;
- The PCC had decided not to appeal the High Court Judgement, despite being provided with legal advice to the contrary;
- The PCC felt that a number of members had made unnecessary public remarks in the press about the legal action, though members felt that they had only been responding to the situation at hand;
- Blaby District Council had been warned by the Police in November 2013 of the possibility of a Judicial Review. This had been authorised by the Chief Executive of the OPCC and the Finance Director of the Force;
- The PCC recognised that this was seen nationally to be a “landmark case” and was aware that other PCCs felt the same way about the lack of resources to effectively

police future developments. Though he had the support of some of his PCC colleagues across the country, it was noted that they would not be making a contribution towards the legal costs the Force would now incur as a result of losing the case;

- A risk assessment was not carried out by the PCC prior to going to a Judicial Review, though a number of meetings were held with senior officers and a number of options were looked at carefully;
- The PCC maintained that a dialogue between the Force and Blaby District Council was required by planning law to cease at the point when the planning permission was granted. It was subsequently stated by members of the Panel that planning permission could only be granted when the Section 106 agreement was signed off by all parties. The PCC acknowledged that communication was not as good as it could have been;
- The PCC had considered the impact this legal action could have on other developments and that his legal action could result in negotiations between developers and planning authorities being made more challenging in the future. The PCC chaired a Strategic Planning Board which had looked at the wider partnership aspects of the decision to take legal action and the possible knock-on effects this could have on relationships;
- The PCC acknowledged that there was a risk with the timing of the bridge associated with the development and the potential to lose £5 million of government infrastructure grant, though he was pleased that his actions turned out not to jeopardise this funding in the end;
- The PCC's Council Tax precept increase in January 2014 of 1.5% had received the support of the Panel, though the PCC now faced losing at least 50% of this additional revenue in legal fees. He did not regret taking legal action, though he did regret that the funds would now be lost to the legal system;
- The PCC was now willing to work with partners on moving Lubbesthorpe forward. He pointed out that, in his opinion, he did not always get the support he required from the Panel and he hoped that this case would provide a turning point to move this relationship forward into a more "harmonious partnership". The Chairman pointed out that the PCP had given support to the PCC on a number of occasions, namely in his setting of the precept and his appointment of a Chief Finance Officer;
- The PCC felt that he had learned a lot through this process and felt that there was a need to negotiate in good faith in order to achieve a good result for all partners as a result of future development.

The Chairman thanked the Panel, the Commissioner and Blaby District Council for taking part in the meeting. He indicated that the meeting would be adjourned to enable the Panel to consider what recommendations it would wish to make to the Commissioner.

The meeting was adjourned at 3.55pm and reconvened at 4.55pm to announce its decision to the Commissioner and his staff.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Panel expresses concern that, in his opening statement to the Panel, the Commissioner failed to demonstrate that he had considered the following key issues:
- The impact on all public bodies of the cost of judicial review;
  - The impact of his decision to issue judicial review proceedings on partnership working;
  - The context of planning decisions in terms of economic sustainability and viability of developments;
  - The reality of reaching agreements on planning issues and the need to compromise, set against the risk of losing developer contributions on appeal or in the event of piecemeal development;
  - The actions, which this Panel condemns, on the part of the Commissioner seeking information from Blaby District Council in a way which lacked any form of openness and transparency in order to bolster his case long after the event;
- (b) That the Panel:
- (i) notes that the Court's dismissal of all of the grounds put forward by the Commissioner confirms in the plainest terms its view and that of member authorities that permission for Review should never been sought, particularly in the light of the genuine attempts by Blaby District Council to find an agreed way forward, which were rejected by the Commissioner;
  - (ii) regrets that at least £125,000 of taxpayers' money has been wasted as a result of the Commissioner's action, money which could otherwise have been used on frontline policing and to improve community safety at a time when crime figures continue to display worrying trends;
  - (iii) further regrets that the Commissioner's application for Judicial Review has inflicted more damage to partnership working;
  - (iv) hopes that the Commissioner will learn lessons from this failure on his part and that of his advisers and now look to work with local authority partners in a much more constructive manner than hitherto by withdrawing the threat of judicial review made to other planning authorities and working to achieve appropriate and agreed outcomes in planning matters; and
  - (v) welcomes the statements made by the Commissioner that he will engage in discussions with partners, but expresses concern about the tone of the comments which demonstrated an apparent lack of willingness to compromise in discussions relating to planning permissions and agreements.

That, having regard to all of the above, the Panel requests the Commissioner to report back to this Panel at its next meeting on measures he proposes to take to repair damaged relationships with partners.



RESOLVED:

That the item be deferred for consideration at a meeting to be scheduled in July.

70. Commissioning.

RESOLVED:

That the item be deferred for consideration at a meeting to be scheduled in July.

71. Performance Reporting Framework 2014/15.

RESOLVED:

That the item be deferred for consideration at a meeting to be scheduled in July.

72. Date of next meeting.

It was NOTED that the next meeting of the Panel would be held on a date to be confirmed in July to enable the Commissioner to report back on the issues raised in the debate on Lubbesthorpe/S106 (Minute 67 refers).

2.00 - 5.00 pm  
09 June 2014

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

# POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE POLICE & CRIME PANEL

PAPER MARKED

Report of	<b>POLICE &amp; CRIME COMMISSIONER</b>
Date	<b>MONDAY 14 JUNE 2014 – 9.30 AM</b>
Subject	<b>S106 AND DEVELOPING PARTNERSHIP RELATIONSHIPS</b>
Author	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE</b>

## **Purpose of Report**

1. Following discussion at the Police and Crime Panel on the 9 June 2014, it was resolved that:

***“...the Panel requests for the Commissioner to report back to this Panel at its next meeting on measures he proposes to take to repair damaged relationships with partners.”***

2. The work required to enhance partnerships is ongoing and this report will be supplemented by a statement from the Police and Crime Commissioner at the meeting which will expand on the measures referred to in this paper and update on additional measures and actions proposed as at the date of the Police and Crime Panel meeting.

## **Recommendation**

3. The Panel is recommended to discuss the contents of this report and the detailed statement by the Commissioner on proposed measures.

## **Background**

4. The Police and Crime Commissioner places huge importance on Partnership working and the effectiveness of those relationships are fundamental to the safety of our communities, for which the PCC, the Police and key local partners are statutorily responsible.
5. To reflect the importance of these partnerships the Commissioner has worked with the Chief Constable to prioritise a number of measures and actions which will assist in finding joint solutions and plans to enhance and enrich the relationships with local authority and other key partners.

6. The full range of actions and measures will continue to be refined and developed by working with partners. Identified priorities include (but are not limited to):
- Meetings between local authority leaders, Chief Executives, the Chief Constable and the PCC. The aim of these meetings is to see how the PCC, the Force and partners can work more effectively together in the future.
  - Meetings with other key partners, including CSP chairs. The PCC and Chief Constable will meet the Chair of each Community Safety Partnership within Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, to discuss opportunities to work together in delivering the priorities within the Police and Crime Plan.
  - Senior executives within the Force and the OPCC will work directly with Blaby District Council to seek a positive way forward, including senior Force representation on the Lubbesthorpe Strategic Board.
  - Proactive working with partners to review meeting structures and engagement activities already in place to enhance and ensure the most effective arrangements are in place to deliver the important partnership agendas.
7. The PCC will provide a statement at the meeting which will go into greater depth regarding his commitment to working with partners and the proposed actions and measures. This statement will facilitate and enable wider discussion at the Police and Crime Panel meeting.

### **Summary**

8. Paragraph 6 above highlights some of the actions and measures being progressed by the PCC since the last meeting of the Panel in June 2014. These will be complemented by a fuller range of actions and measures which have been referred to within this report and will be outlined by the Commissioner in more detail to the Panel at the meeting. This discussion will also include proposals which are being discussed currently at the Strategic Assurance Board and the OPCC Senior Management Team meetings.

### **Implications**

Financial :	n/a
Legal :	n/a
Equality Impact Assessment :	n/a
Risks and Impact :	Good relationships and effective engagement is fundamental to effective delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.
Link to Police and Crime Plan :	Good partnership relationships and effective engagement is fundamental to effective delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.

### **Person to Contact**

Mr P Stock, Chief Executive – Tel 0116 229 8980

Email: [paul.stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk](mailto:paul.stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk)

## RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Panel expresses concern that, in his opening statement to the Panel, the Commissioner failed to demonstrate that he had considered the following key issues:
- The impact on all public bodies of the cost of judicial review;
  - The impact of his decision to issue judicial review proceedings on partnership working;
  - The context of planning decisions in terms of economic sustainability and viability of developments;
  - The reality of reaching agreements on planning issues and the need to compromise, set against the risk of losing developer contributions on appeal or in the event of piecemeal development;
  - The actions, which this Panel condemns, on the part of the Commissioner seeking information from Blaby District Council in a way which lacked any form of openness and transparency in order to bolster his case long after the event;
- (b) That the Panel:
- (i) notes that the Court's dismissal of all of the grounds put forward by the Commissioner confirms in the plainest terms its view and that of member authorities that permission for Review should never been sought, particularly in the light of the genuine attempts by Blaby District Council to find an agreed way forward, which were rejected by the Commissioner;
  - (ii) regrets that at least £125,000 of taxpayers' money has been wasted as a result of the Commissioner's action, money which could otherwise have been used on frontline policing and to improve community safety at a time when crime figures continue to display worrying trends;
  - (iii) further regrets that the Commissioner's application for Judicial Review has inflicted more damage to partnership working;
  - (iv) hopes that the Commissioner will learn lessons from this failure on his part and that of his advisers and now look to work with local authority partners in a much more constructive manner than hitherto by withdrawing the threat of judicial review made to other planning authorities and working to achieve appropriate and agreed outcomes in planning matters; and
  - (v) welcomes the statements made by the Commissioner that he will engage in discussions with partners, but expresses concern about the tone of the comments which demonstrated an apparent lack of willingness to compromise

in discussions relating to planning permissions and agreements.

That, having regard to all of the above, the Panel requests the Commissioner to report back to this Panel at its next meeting on measures he proposes to take to repair damaged relationships with partners.



**Simon Cole, Chief Constable**, QPM, BA (Hons) (Dunelm), MA (Worcester), DipCrim (Cantab)  
T: 0116 248 2005 E: [simon.cole@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:simon.cole@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk) @ccleicspolice

30 June 2014

Dear Colleague,

For a number of years Leicestershire Police has been working to develop more efficient and effective ways to deliver policing services to our communities in a time of severe financial constraint.

As we look ahead, our budget, which is currently £172m, will reduce by a further £16m in the years in up until 2016/17.

The Force has worked with officers and staff to assess how services are currently delivered.

We have now developed a new policing model that enables us to deliver against the Police and Crime Plan and remain within a reducing budget. The Police and Crime Commissioner has been briefed about this operational work.

These changes will transform policing across the Force area, allowing us to:

- Handle non-emergency calls for service through a same day appointment system;
- Re-focus our existing response teams into a smaller, single team responsible for responding to incidents across the whole Force area from local hubs;
- Ensure Neighbourhood Teams are focused exclusively on community engagement, problem-solving and targeting offenders;
- Introduce a crime investigation function that will give the public an outcome to their crime at the earliest opportunity;
- Continuing to focus on anti-social behaviour, ensuring our response places the victims needs at the heart of our service;
- Remove the responsibility for crime investigation from Response and Neighbourhood officers, freeing up their time to focus upon community priorities;
- Create dedicated investigative teams to enhance the quality and timeliness of investigations and improve the experience of victims.



**Simon Cole, Chief Constable**, QPM, BA (Hons) (Dunelm), MA (Worcester), DipCrim (Cantab)  
T: 0116 248 2005 E: [simon.cole@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:simon.cole@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk) @ccleicspolice

The restructuring of the Force is integral to this process. The existing fifteen Local Policing Units will transform into eight 'Neighbourhood Policing Areas', each commanded by an Inspector, to focus exclusively on local problem-solving and engagement.

To ensure a continued focus on community issues, local policing, including call-handling, response and neighbourhood functions will be led by a Chief Superintendent in a local policing directorate. They will be supported by a number of Superintendents whose key responsibilities will include working with local and strategic partners. This new local policing directorate will replace the current BCU structure.

Similarly, a Chief Superintendent will lead all safeguarding, crime investigation and intelligence management, with a Force-wide responsibility.

The Force is working closely with Staff Associations and Trade Unions in planning and delivering these changes.

As this work progresses I will ensure that you are kept aware of the steps that we are taking to keep the local communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland safe.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Cole  
**Chief Constable.**



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

PAPER MARKED

Report of	<b>POLICE &amp; CRIME COMMISSIONER</b>
Date	<b>MONDAY 14 JUNE 2014 – 9.30 AM</b>
Subject	<b>ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14</b>
Author	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE</b>

**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. I thank partner agencies for their contributions and these 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](mailto: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
<b>Delegations of functions made by the PCC</b>	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	33
Focus: A BID to address alcohol-related anti-social behaviour	36
Strategic Priority 4: Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled Families Programme	38
Theme: Supporting Victims and Witnesses	39
Strategic Priority 5: To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse	40
Strategic Priority 6: To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences	41
Strategic Priority 7: To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences	43

Funded training for Hate Crime-related incidents treated by the Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust .....	44
Stop and Tell Campaign by Leicestershire County Council .....	44
Focus: PCC and MENCAP reach out to deliver the facts about Mate Crime.....	45
Strategic Priority 8: To prevent anti-social behaviour and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour.....	46
Focus: Designated police cars to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour .....	47
Strategic Priority 9: To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime.....	48
Theme: Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer.....	49
Strategic Priority 10: To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.....	50
Strategic Priority 11: To reduce all crime .....	51
Partnership Locality Fund grants for City target hardening.....	52
Strategic Priority 13: To reduce Violence against the Person with Injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims .....	53
Strategic Priority 14: To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims of vehicle crime .....	55
Theme: Protecting the Vulnerable .....	57
Strategic Priority 15: To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses .....	58
Focus: Safeguarding.....	58
Strategic Priority 16: Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs.....	60
Mental Health Concordat.....	61
Focus: PCC praises work of NHS arts engagement .....	62
Strategic Priority 17: To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports .....	64
Child sexual exploitation (CSE) research project in conjunction with the University of Leicester .....	64
Theme: The Financial Challenge.....	66
Strategic Priority 18: With staff and partners, transform the way we protect our communities and deliver over £20m in revenue savings by 2016 .....	67
Focus: Changes to Leicestershire Police's front enquiry service .....	68
<b>Section 3) Contributions from Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) .....</b>	<b>70</b>
Blaby and Hinckley .....	71
Charnwood.....	72
Harborough .....	73
Leicester City .....	74
Melton .....	75
North West Leicestershire .....	76
Oadby & Wigston.....	77
Rutland.....	78

# 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, my 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](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](http://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 (OOCd) 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 52.4%. 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 23.9%.

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 48.5%
- 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 for 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](http://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 13.7% 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 51.4%, a rise from the previous year's figure of 50.0%.

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 7.8% 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 20.4%. 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 unavailability) 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/1jXgjlO>

### ***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. During the year, £3.2m was realised by savings identified by the Change Programme in advance of the 2014/15 financial year and a further £0.466m was set as an in year savings target. Savings equating to £1.84m were also highlighted by the Change Programme in 2013/14 and carried forward for potential realisation in a future financial year.

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 for 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 the early part of 2014/15; the shape of the major transformational change would be progressed by the force during the year.

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.”

**Cllr 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]

This page is intentionally left blank

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

PAPER MARKED

Report of	<b>POLICE &amp; CRIME COMMISSIONER</b>
Date	<b>MONDAY 14 JULY 2014 – 9.30 AM</b>
Subject	<b>UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT</b>
Author	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE</b>

**Purpose of Report** This report provides the Police and Crime Panel (the “Panel”) with an update on plans to transform the communications and public engagement functions of the Force and OPCC which have been jointly agreed by the Chief Constable and Police and Crime Commissioner.

### **Recommendation**

The Panel is recommended to note the contents of this report.

### **Summary**

The Chief Constable and the Police and Crime Commissioner have agreed recommendations which we believe will significantly improve communications and engagement in policing with the people of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

It follows a comprehensive review of the current communications functions and takes into account the need to inform better local people, to involve them more effectively in the business of policing, and to drive change within the police service.

The Police service is facing very significant challenges in a rapidly changing world. The way in which the public wants to access information and receive services has changed dramatically in recent years; it is imperative that the communications services provided by the police locally are fit for purpose in responding to those challenges and that heightened expectation.

The new arrangements for the delivery of communications and engagement will enable us to meet those challenges and changing demands at every level, from the front line to the Commissioner and to the Chief Constable.

Our aim is to develop a lean, professional shared service at a reduced cost, but which will deliver a more responsive, innovative and effective service.

Specifically, the new shared model will deliver the following:

- Effective communications to support the priorities set out in the Police and Crime Plan.
- Continued support for the Force in response to major incidents, operational priorities and campaigns.
- Communications that drive the Force's change programme, not least in reducing the cost of contact and making policing information and services more accessible to the public.
- A greater use of the web and other social and digital platforms to promote greater public awareness and involvement, as well as increasing the availability of transactional services on-line.
- Greater use of on-line and electronic channels to inform better and engage with officers, staff and other stakeholders.
- Communications targeted at community safety, criminal justice, the voluntary sector and other partners, including government, MPs and other key stakeholders.
- Researched and targeted programmes involving the public and sections of the public both geographically and within communities of interest, to reflect the diverse nature of the area we serve
- Monitoring and evaluation of all communications, consultation and engagement activities in order to measure effectiveness and to drive continuous improvement.
- Targeted campaigns to influence public behaviour.

We expect to begin implementation of the improvements in the next few weeks.

**Implications**

- Financial : No additional spending is being incurred in making these improvements. This report is an update for the Police and Crime Panel to note. There are no financial implications identified.
- Legal : None identified.
- Equality Impact Assessment: These changes will improve communications and public engagement between the police, Police and Crime Commissioner and the people of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, specifically taking into account the need to improve these aspects in respect of local communities and communities of interest.
- Risks and Impact : None identified.
- Link to Police and Crime Plan : The delivery of the Plan is core to the successful implementation of the Review and the ongoing work of the shared service unit.

**Person to Contact**

Mr P Stock, Chief Executive – Tel 0116 229 8980

Email: [paul.stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk](mailto:paul.stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

**POLICE & CRIME  
COMMISSIONER FOR  
LEICESTERSHIRE**

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

PAPER MARKED

Report of	<b>POLICE &amp; CRIME COMMISSIONER (PCC)</b>
Subject	<b>PERFORMANCE REPORTING FRAMEWORK 2014/15</b>
Date	<b>MONDAY 14 JULY 2014 – 9.30AM</b>
Author :	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE</b>

**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 agree the 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 (PASC) report 'Caught red-handed: Why we can't count on Police recorded crime statistics' published on 1 April 2014. A quote from the summary states '*We deprecate the use of targets in the strongest possible terms. The Home Office, which claims credit for abolishing national numerical targets, should also be discouraging the use of such targets*'. Taking the recommendations from 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. MSGs are groups of force areas that have been found to be the most similar to each other based on an analysis of demographic, social and economic characteristics which relate to crime. Each force area has its own group of up to seven force areas to which it is 'most similar'. 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 Nolan Principles and performance framework detailed in this report is published in August 2014. All changes are detailed in Appendix A – Amendments to the Police and Crime Plan. The Chief Constable agreed these changes on 19<sup>th</sup> May 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

### **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](mailto:suzanne.houlihan@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# 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](http://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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>
2	Reducing reoffending amongst young people and adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in offending by 18-24 year olds</li> <li>• Reduction in re-offending by 18-24 year olds</li> </ul>
3	Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and reoffending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the number of successful drug and alcohol treatment completions</li> <li>• Reduction in the number of re-entry into structured treatment within six months of successful completion</li> <li>• Reduction in reoffending rates amongst offenders within a criminal justice treatment programme</li> <li>• Reduction in the number of incidents recorded in or near licensed premises during the night-time economy hours of 7pm to 7am</li> <li>• An assessment and evaluation of the use of late night levy options through partners with a view to implementation</li> </ul>
4	Reducing crime and Anti-social behaviour (ASB) caused by families in a Troubled/Supported families programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in re-offending within families engaged in a Troubled/Supported family programme</li> <li>• Reduction in recorded ASB committed by families engaged in a Troubled/Supported families programme</li> </ul>

## 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"> <li>• 50% Domestic abuse with injury crime outcome rate (please refer to Appendix B: <a href="http://bit.ly/1adN8K6">http://bit.ly/1adN8K6</a>)</li> <li>• 90% Satisfaction rate</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 55% Crime outcome rate</li> <li>• 88% Satisfaction rate</li> </ul>

### 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"> <li>• 85% Satisfaction rate</li> </ul>
9	To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85% 'all user' Satisfaction rate</li> <li>• 1% increase to this target, year on year, to achieve an overall satisfaction rate of 88% by the end of 2016</li> </ul>

### 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"> <li>• 75% Confidence rate in the Community Based Survey that the 'police are doing a good job'</li> </ul>
11	To reduce all crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5% Reduction in all crime</li> </ul>
12	To reduce domestic burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of burglary offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13% Reduction in burglary</li> <li>• 25% Crime outcome rate</li> <li>• 90% Satisfaction rate</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 2% Reduction in violence against the person with injury offences</li> <li>• 50% Crime outcome rate</li> <li>• 82% Satisfaction with service for victims of violent crime with injury</li> </ul>
14	To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims	<p><b>Theft from Motor Vehicle</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14% Reduction in theft from motor vehicle</li> <li>• 9% Crime outcome rate</li> <li>• 85% Satisfaction rate</li> </ul> <p><b>Theft of Motor Vehicle</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10% Reduction in theft of motor vehicle</li> <li>• 23% Crime outcome rate</li> <li>• 85% Satisfaction rate</li> </ul>

### 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"> <li>• Key stakeholders to complete a review of the identified partnership priority areas so to facilitate evidence-based planning</li> <li>• To develop a programme of joint working between key stakeholders further to the above review and findings around the partnership priority areas</li> <li>• Agree a broader set of specific outcomes and measures for all key stakeholders</li> </ul>
17	To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in number of missing reports</li> <li>• Reduction in police time and cost spent dealing with missing persons</li> <li>• Reduction in reports received from the nine key locations</li> </ul>

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



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](mailto:police.commissioner@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk)

**Website:** [www.leics.pcc.police.uk/Contact](http://www.leics.pcc.police.uk/Contact)

**Follow us on Twitter:** @LeicsPCC @Clive\_Loader



Police and Crime Plan Performance Measures				
Theme	Priority Number	Priority	How this will be measured	Organisation to supply data
Reducing Offending and Reoffending	1	<b>Preventing and diverting young people from offending</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	YOS (City and County)
	2	<b>Reducing reoffending amongst young people and adults</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in offending by those 18-24 years old</li> <li>Reduction in reoffending by 18-24 year olds</li> </ul>	Police
	3	<b>Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and reoffending</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in the number of successful of drug and alcohol treatment completions</li> <li>Reduction in the number of re-entry into structured treatment within 6 months of successful completion</li> <li>Reduction in reoffending rates amongst those offenders within criminal justice treatment</li> <li>Reduction in the number of incidents recorded in or near licensed premises during the night-time economy hours of 7pm to 7am</li> <li>An assessment and evaluation of the use of late night levy options through partners with a view to implementation</li> </ul>	CJ Team     Police  Local Authorities (Unitary and Tier 2)
	4	<b>Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled Families programme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in reoffending within families engaged in a troubled/supported family programme</li> <li>Reduction in recorded ASB committed by families engaged in a troubled/supported families programme</li> </ul>	Police  Troubled Families Teams (City and County)

Police and Crime Plan Performance Measures

Theme	Priority Number	Priority	How this will be measured	Organisation(s) that will supply data
<b>Supporting Victims and Witnesses</b>	5	<b>To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous Improvement in satisfaction rate</li> </ul>	Police
	6	<b>To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leicester City and Leicestershire Safeguarding Boards to advise</li> </ul>	
	7	<b>To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous Improvement in satisfaction rate</li> </ul>	Police
	8	<b>To prevent anti-social behaviour (ASB) and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous Improvement in satisfaction rate</li> </ul>	Police
	9	<b>To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous Improvement in satisfaction rate</li> </ul>	Police

APPENDIX B

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"> <li>• Continuous Improvement in confidence rate</li> </ul>	Police
	11	To reduce all crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A significant reduction in all crime</li> </ul>	
	12	To reduce domestic burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of burglary offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A significant reduction in burglary</li> <li>• Continuous Improvement with service of burglary offences</li> </ul>	
	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"> <li>• A significant reduction in violent crime with injury</li> <li>• Continuous Improvement in satisfaction rate</li> </ul>	
	14	To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A significant reduction in Theft of Motor Vehicle (TMV) and Theft from Motor Vehicle (TFMV) offences</li> <li>• Continuous improvement in satisfaction rate (TMV and TFMV)</li> </ul>	

APPENDIX B

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"> <li>• Reduction in number of missing reports</li> <li>• Reduction in police time and cost spent dealing with missing persons</li> <li>• Reduction in reports received from the nine key locations</li> </ul>	<p>Police</p> <p>Police</p> <p>Police</p>