

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Friday, 23 September 2016.

PRESENT

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

Cllr. John Boyce  
Mrs. Helen Carter  
Cllr. Ratilal Govind  
Cllr. Malise Graham  
Cllr. Ozzy O'Shea

Cllr. Rosita Page  
Cllr. Trevor Pendleton  
Cllr. Lynn Senior  
Cllr. David Slater  
Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE

Apologies

Cllr. Lee Breckon, JP and Col. Robert Martin OBE, DL

In attendance

Lord Willy Bach, Police and Crime Commissioner and Cllr. Kirk Master

21. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

22. 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 the substantive item as a member of the Police's Independent Advisory Panel, as the Chairman of the Leicester Council of Faiths, as a member of the Bishop's Faith Forum and as a member of the Gold Community.

23. Confirmatory Hearing for the Post of Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) in regard to its proposed appointment of Cllr. Kirk Master to the post of Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC). A copy of a report of the OPCC, marked 'Agenda Item 3', is filed with these minutes.

Prior to the commencement of the Confirmatory Hearing, the Chairman outlined the process to be adhered to, taking those present through a process document which had been circulated to all members with the agenda for the meeting. A copy of this report was filed with the minutes.

The Chairman welcomed the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) and Cllr. Master to the Hearing, both of whom were present to respond to any questions the Panel had about the appointment process and Cllr. Master's abilities in respect of "professional competence" and "personal independence". Officers and Panel members each introduced themselves to Cllr. Master.

In order for the PCC to be able to take members of the Panel through the process of appointing Cllr. Master to the post, Cllr. Master was asked to leave the room.

*(Cllr. Master left the room.)*

The Panel put three principal questions to the PCC in relation to the appointment process. Broadly, these covered the following issues:

1. The PCC was quoted in the Leicester Mercury prior to his election in May 2015 as saying that he was initially keen to appoint a DPCC, but was not certain, and that if he were to win he would allow himself the time to assess what was needed and would only make an appointment for what an individual would add. It was asked what Cllr. Master would bring to the role of DPCC.
2. The Panel wanted to know whether the PCC was comfortable with Cllr. Master continuing in his role as Assistant Mayor at Leicester City Council with a portfolio for Neighbourhood Services and whether he believed Cllr. Master would have sufficient independence in the eyes of the public and the time necessary to carry out the Deputy PCC role to the best of his ability.
3. The Panel wanted to understand the PCC's justification for not having advertised the post in the same way as other posts in the OPCC.

In response to the Panel's questioning, the following points of the PCC were noted:

- It had been made clear in previous meetings with the Panel that the PCC wished to appoint a DPCC. He required someone with the expertise and skill to add value to the work of his Office. He believed that Cllr. Master fit the criteria for the post as outlined in paragraph 7 of his report. The portfolio of responsibilities he had set for Cllr. Master played to his strengths;
- The PCC had been impressed by the variety of work experience outlined in Cllr. Master's CV and his background in the Youth Offending Team, Youth Justice and the Home Office made him an ideal candidate. His involvement in third sector work and the City's Community Safety Partnership was also of great benefit;
- His personal background in areas such as sport and his involvement with young people would be of great benefit to the Force, which had traditionally found engaging young people challenging. It was noted that this would be of an immediate benefit in formulating the Police and Crime Plan;
- The PCC believed Cllr. Master could carry out both the DPCC role and his role as Assistant Mayor with a portfolio responsibility for Neighbourhood Services and that, in his view, this did not represent a conflict of interest. He referred to other examples in the country where a PCC had appointed a DPCC who had a role at another authority. Cllr. Master would be giving up his role as Chairman of the local Community Safety Partnership and this would add to his independence;
- The PCC did not advertise the DPCC post as he did not wish to waste time and public money carrying out a full recruitment process. He added that this was not necessary in law. He stressed that the responsibility for ensuring Cllr. Master's

appointment was a success felt as much on him as it did Cllr. Master;

- The PCC made reference to the fact that the Panel had stressed to the former PCC the need for a DPCC to ensure continuity in instances where the PCC might be incapacitated. The PCC was glad of the Panel's support in this regard and now believed that the role required a DPCC.

*(When the Panel's questions to the PCC ended, the PCC agreed to leave the room to ensure that Cllr. Master was able to be questioned independently. Cllr. Master returned to the room.)*

The Chairman asked Cllr. Master why he had chosen to undertake this new role. He asked Cllr. Master to refer in his answer to how he felt he would be able to carry out the role of DPCC given his continued role as Assistant Mayor for Neighbourhood Services at the City Council.

Accordingly, Cllr. Master read out a statement which set out his experience for the role and included some of the following points:

- He was excited by the opportunity represented by becoming the DPCC and overseeing with the Commissioner a budget of over £180m;
- He wanted to provide support to communities at a grassroots level and help to develop the Police and Crime Plan;
- His experience included working as a Social Worker for a local authority, working as a Case Manager within the Youth Offending Service and working in the Home Office with the Youth Justice Board dealing with challenging cases and groups. He was a national lead at the Home Office for juveniles, leading on over 60 projects across a £12m budget;
- He had the core qualities required for the role – including understanding, caring and empathy combined with a professional manner;
- Both the DPCC role and that of Assistant Mayor at the City Council could be carried out well together, though he had assessed the time commitment and organisation required to ensure this was the case. He acknowledged that he would require the support of staff in both organisations and that he may need to adapt his working style in order to make the arrangements work effectively;
- The portfolio responsibilities that had been proposed in the report for DPCC role matched Cllr. Master's professional and personal experience;
- Delivery of the "Prevent" agenda remained a huge challenge. He had been required to deliver this policy across England and Wales, despite significant unrest in some communities. He had previously designed programmes that would deliver the policy and work for communities;
- The dual role of DPCC and Assistant Mayor would assist in delivering different agendas and a collective working approach across the City and County;
- He had an ability to present information in a way that was understandable for all, particularly those in hard to reach communities. He was also approachable in his

style;

- He would ensure that the DPCC role was neutral from politics and external factors.

The Panel then questioned Cllr. Master regarding his suitability for the post under the following key headings:

- Professional Competence;
- General;
- Skills/Background;
- Working with Communities;
- Managing Change;
- Partnership Working;
- Personal Independence.

Arising from questioning, the Panel noted the following points made by Cllr. Master:

- The former PCC had a period when he was unable to carry out his duties and was in a position where he wished to appoint an "Acting PCC". The Panel had been concerned about this at the time and the opportunity represented by appointing a DPCC would provide greater continuity in circumstances such as these. It would also enable more of a presence in the community to inform future decision making;
- It was hoped that a Police and Crime Plan could be developed with clear objectives. The portfolio areas given to Cllr. Master would enable him to consult the community and provide feedback;
- The Force faced a number of challenges, though one of the most significant was the budget and how an acceptable level of service could be maintained in light of a reduced resource. The Force would also need to improve communication with hard to reach groups;
- The PCC had shaped the portfolio responsibilities for Cllr. Master with his experience and working background in mind. Cllr. Master had worked across the public and voluntary sectors in all of the 4 portfolio responsibilities highlighted in the PCC's report;
- The relationship between the Panel and the OPCC should continue to be constructive and in the spirit of being a "critical friend". The Panel was welcome to raise issues of concern and criticism with the OPCC. An increased dialogue between the OPCC and Panel members would be required to achieve this;
- He had engaged stakeholders to enable some influence over policing and crime issues when there were growing concerns around the number of stop and search incidents associated with ethnic minority groups in the Force area. Cllr. Master had been involved in engaging local groups to educate them on the use of stop and search and he had involved the Force in this work. Arising from this engagement, changes were made to the way in which stop and search was applied in the Force area;
- Cllr. Master was involved in the delivery of the Counter Terrorism Strategy across England and Wales. The Strategy was heavily contested amongst communities. Cllr. Master had been required to deliver the policy in liaison with local authorities,

communities and the police;

- When Cllr. Master had been responsible for delivering the “Prevent” Strategy, no programmes had existed across England and Wales. By the time he left the Home Office over 60 programmes existed. This had been achieved by working with communities to ensure their views were heard and the Policy was applied in a way which worked for all parties;
- His voluntary work had also been in the area of sport. He had campaigned for increased resources and had been involved in forming a group across the City and County to lobby the FA to draw down around £12 million of funding for better facilities;
- With his experience of the third sector, he appreciated how difficult it was becoming to access grant funding. This could be overcome by being innovative, sharing ideas and learning and avoiding duplication;
- It was challenging to apply national policy directives at a local level. An example was given of data protection and how this could become a barrier to sharing ideas and intelligence across different agencies. This could be overcome by getting stakeholders around the table and identifying a mutually beneficial goal;
- Communications about decisions taken by the PCC had to be effectively communicated at a grassroots level. This could be achieved by being accessible and more active in communicating messages in communities. Attending network meetings and forums at the heart of the community would assist with this goal and build trust in the Force;
- Operational independence was explained as being the application of policy to meet business need without discrimination. Personal independence was explained as being objective and open and the importance of not being influenced in a way which would affect operational delivery;
- There were many similarities between the portfolio of the DPCC post and that of the Assistant Mayor role for Neighbourhood Services. He felt that he had the professional ability to divide tasks accordingly across the two roles and, where opportunities existed to share learning across the two roles, he would take advantage of them;
- He intended to offer input into the PCC’s decision making. If the PCC wished to pursue a course of action that he was not supportive of then he would be understanding of this and the need to make decisions as a team. He was happy to pursue his opinion as far as was necessary and would not be shy in providing this to the PCC;
- The time commitment required to carry out both roles effectively was achievable in his view. He would do what was required to get both roles done effectively and seek support when it was required. He compared this to having been able to balance his role as a ward councillor and that of the Assistant Mayor. He did not believe that the DPCC represented a conflict of interest given his current role;
- He wished to increase his presence in the County and Rutland, given his historically City-focused role. He wanted to demonstrate that he could take on board the

concerns of County and Rutland residents and they could influence decision making going forward. He was not fazed by the challenge this represented and was happy to demonstrate what he had done at County and Rutland level as the DPCC at a future meeting of the Panel;

- His success in the DPCC role would best be judged by crime levels dropping, satisfaction levels rising and a Police and Crime Plan which included high quality projects to improve policing;
- He had campaigned all of his life on the equalities agenda and was committed to applying this thinking to the DPCC role.

The Chairman thanked the PCC and Cllr. Master for their attendance and informed them that it would be necessary for the Panel to come to a view in private on whether to endorse or otherwise the PCC's proposed appointment.

The Chairman indicated that the OPCC would be notified of the Panel's decision within one working day and that they would need to come to a view together on when it would be appropriate to publicise this decision in order that Cllr. Master be given a "cooling off" period to consider his position and ask any further questions of the PCC prior to agreeing to take on the role.

*(The PCC and Cllr. Master left the room.)*

24. Date of next meeting.

It was NOTED that the next meeting of the Panel would be held later in the day at 1.00pm.

25. Exclusion of the Press and Public.

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1, 3 and 10 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act specified below and that, in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

- Panel Deliberations on the Proposed Appointment of a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner.

26. Panel Deliberations on the Proposed Appointment of a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Panel, having gone into exempt session, considered the statement and answers provided by Cllr. Master to their questions, in addition to the introduction and responses to questions provided by the PCC and all relevant paperwork provided.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Panel supports the appointment of Cllr. Kirk Master as Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC), but that assurance is sought that the following two

areas be the subject of further discussions between the Cllr. Master and the PCC:

- (i) the potential conflict of interest represented by Cllr. Master's continuing role as Assistant Mayor with a portfolio for Neighbourhood Services; and
  - (ii) Cllr. Master's capacity to balance the DPCC and Assistant Mayor roles;
- (b) That Cllr. Master's commitment to developing a thorough knowledge of the community safety issues faced in the County and Rutland be welcomed and that the Panel believes that Cllr. Master should prioritise his presence in the County and Rutland to ensure he is able to develop an ongoing understanding of the issues faced by rural communities;
- (c) That a report be submitted to the Panel in 6 months' time setting out how the PCC is addressing the issues raised in (a) above and seeking assurances that the way in which the role is carried out by Cllr. Master does not infringe upon the operational independence of the Chief Constable and his officers.

9.30 am - 12.10 pm  
23 September 2016

CHAIRMAN