

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Wednesday, 29 March 2017.

PRESENT

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

Cllr. John Boyce  
Cllr. Lee Breckon, JP  
Cllr. Ratilal Govind  
Cllr. Malise Graham  
Cllr. Ozzy O'Shea

Cllr. Abdul Osman  
Cllr. Rosita Page  
Cllr. Trevor Pendleton  
Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE  
Cllr. Alan Walters

Apologies

Mrs. Helen Carter, Col. Robert Martin OBE, DL and Cllr. Lynn Senior

In attendance

Lord Willy Bach, Police and Crime Commissioner  
Cllr. Kirk Master, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner  
Simon Cole, Chief Constable

56. Minutes of the previous meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2017 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

Further to minute no. 46 the PCC confirmed that Paul Stock had now left the OPCC and the vacancy for the role of Chief Executive would be advertised.

57. Public Question Time.

There were no questions submitted.

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

There were no urgent items for consideration.

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

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

It was noted that Cllr. M. Sood had a standing personal interest in respect of all substantive agenda items as a member of the Police's Independent Advisory Panel, as the Chairman of the Leicester Council of Faiths and a member of the Bishop's Faith Forum.

No other declarations were made.

60. HMIC report - PEEL Police Effectiveness 2016.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which provided an update on the recent HMIC Inspection of Leicestershire Police. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 5', is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Chief Constable Simon Cole to the meeting for this and other items.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) An Action Plan had been put in place to address the issues raised by HMIC in their report. The actions of the Force in response to the HMIC report would be held to account by the PCC at the Strategic Assurance Board. The PCC was of the view that some of the criticism of Leicestershire Police in the HMIC report was unjustified and that HMIC had not given sufficient credit for the good work that Leicestershire Police carried out particularly with Neighbourhood Policing. Leicestershire Police were in discussions with HMIC to gain further understanding of some of the areas for improvement identified in their report and in particular regarding the service to victims.
- (ii) HMIC would be carrying out a further inspection of Police effectiveness in 2017 which may not give enough time for the results of the Action Plan to become evident. It was the view of the Chief Constable that HMIC inspections should take place in alternate years to give time for areas for improvement to be addressed and he had written to the Chief HMI expressing this view.
- (iii) Whilst HMIC were of the view that effective risk assessments were carried out whilst the Police were at the scene of an incident, they had concerns that at other times risk was not assessed appropriately, for example when reports of domestic abuse were graded as not requiring an immediate response. The Panel were reassured that the risk assessment process had now changed so that all assessments had to be signed off by an officer at Inspector level.
- (iv) Clarification was given that the figures for England and Wales given on page 5 of the HMIC report (page 21 of the agenda pack) were an average per 1,000 population.
- (v) With regard to issues identified by HMIC around the control room response and advice given to callers, the Panel were informed that this was partly due to the pressure of the workload in the control room and partly due to training issues. New staff were paired together with more experienced staff on a workstation which, although it meant they could share experience with the new staff member, also meant they were not available to answer separate calls.
- (vi) With regard to the statement of the PCC in a media release of 3 March in which the PCC stated that he intended to lobby for a fairer funding deal for Leicestershire Police, discussion took place on the best way for the Panel to support and scrutinise the PCC on this topic. The Panel felt it would be of benefit to receive a report at a future meeting on progress towards resolving the issues identified in the HMIC report and explaining how any additional funding would be spent. In the meantime it was offered to circulate to Panel Members a report that had been written for a meeting with the Policing Minister on the topic of fairer funding. It was proposed that

a letter should then be sent to the PCC from the Panel setting out that the Panel supported, in principle, his campaign for fairer funding for Leicestershire Police.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the contents of the report be noted;
- (b) That the PCC be requested to submit a report to the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel on 26 July 2017 on the progress of Leicestershire Police towards addressing the areas for improvement identified by HMIC.
- (c) That a letter from the Police and Crime Panel be sent to the PCC in support of his campaign for fairer funding for Leicestershire Police.

61. Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire Update.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner which provided an update on the work of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) during his first six months in office. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 6', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) Since taking up his role the DPCC had visited every district of Leicestershire and Rutland and observed the different requirements of policing rural areas as opposed to the city. He had also met with the National Farmers Union.
- (ii) In response to a question regarding how the DPCC would deal with a situation where Leicester City Council had concerns about the performance of Leicestershire Police, bearing in mind the dual role of Kirk Master as a City Councillor, the Deputy PCC stated that he had a sufficiently good relationship with the City Mayor that they would be able to deal with the matter. The DPCC stated that with meetings where a potential conflict of interest was identified decisions would be made as to whether Kirk Master was the appropriate person to attend the meetings and if necessary decide whether a substitute should go in his place. The DPCC also reminded the Panel that he had relinquished his role as Community Safety Partnership Chair.
- (iii) With regard to the weekly timetable of Kirk Master as detailed at paragraph 9 of the report the DPCC stated that he tried to commit to the timetable as much as possible and it had worked well so far. Kirk Master praised staff at the OPCC and Leicester City Council for enabling him to carry out both roles successfully.
- (iv) The PCC stated that he was extremely content with the contribution Kirk Master had made so far as DPCC and felt that the expertise of the DPCC complemented that of the PCC.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the contents of the report be noted;
- (b) That the PCC be requested to bring a report to the Panel on a bi-annual basis on the DPCC, his portfolio of work and his contribution to the implementation of the Police and Crime Plan.

62. OPCC Youth Commission Update.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report from the PCC which provided an update on progress of the Youth Commission. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 7', is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed PC Clive Ellis to the meeting for this item.

Arising from discussions the following points were made:

- (i) The Youth Commission had required re-energising due to less emphasis being placed on it in the previous year. A problem had also been identified with retention of Youth Commissioners as people of that age tended to have very fluid life circumstances causing some of them to be unable to commit to the Youth Commission for long periods of time. Consequently there had been a new recruitment campaign which had resulted in 18 new Youth Commissioners being appointed in addition to the existing Members of the Youth Commission and there would be a further recruitment campaign in the near future. The makeup of the Youth Commission would be kept under constant review to ensure that there were sufficient numbers and they were of the right diversity.
- (ii) The Panel supported the Youth Commission and work to involve the youth of Leicestershire in policing matters and highlighted the value of using the Youth Commission in crime prevention work. The PCC confirmed that crime prevention would be an area of work for the Youth Commission.
- (iii) In response to a submission that £3700, as quoted in the report, was a small amount of money to fund a large project such as the Youth Commission, the PCC stated that he believed this demonstrated that the Youth Commission was cost effective. Clarification was given that the travelling expenses of the Youth Commission were met by the Volunteers budget of Leicestershire Police not the OPCC budget.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted.

63. Victim First Update.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report from the PCC which provided an update on progress of the Victim First Service. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 8', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) A meeting was to take place on 30 March 2017 where the future of the Victim First Service would be decided. Therefore it was suggested that a further report on Victim First should be considered by the Police and Crime Panel at its next meeting. As the current contract with Catch 22 expired on 30 September 2017 staff at Catch 22 would need to be made aware by 30 June 2017 whether the contract would be extended.

- (ii) It was confirmed that HMIC had no powers to inspect the activities of Police and Crime Commissioners therefore the work of Victim First did not come under the remit of the HMIC Inspection – Peel Effectiveness. Consequently the finding that victim support was an area that Leicestershire Police needed to improve on had no relevance to the Victim First Service.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- (b) That the PCC be requested to submit a further report on Victim First to the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel on 22 May 2017.

64. Date of next meeting.

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Commission would be held on 22 May 2017 at 1:00pm.

1.00 - 2.50 pm  
29 March 2017

CHAIRMAN