

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Friday, 1 February 2019.

PRESENT

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

Cllr Richard Allen

Mr Keith Culverwell

Cllr. Ratilal Govind

Cllr. Malise Graham

Ms Mehrunnisa Lalani

Cllr. Kevin J. Loydall

Cllr. Elaine Pantling

Cllr. Michael Rickman

Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE

Cllr. Deborah Taylor

Apologies

Cllr. Lee Breckon, JP, Cllr. Abdul Osman and Cllr. Alan Walters

In attendance

Lord Willy Bach – Police and Crime Commissioner

Kirk Master – Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner

Paul Hindson – Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Lizzie Starr – Performance Manager, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Chief Constable Simon Cole – Leicestershire Police

44. Minutes of the previous meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2018 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

45. Public Question Time.

There were no questions submitted.

46. Urgent items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

47. 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.

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

Mr. K. Culverwell declared a personal interest in respect of all substantive items as he had two close relatives that worked for Leicestershire Police.

Ms. M. Lalani declared a personal interest in respect of all substantive items as she had a close relative that was a member of the Police Cadets.

48. HMICFRS Report: Crime Data Integrity re-inspection 2018.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner which presented a report from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) entitled Leicestershire Police: Crime Data Integrity re-inspection 2018. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 5', is filed with these minutes.

In presenting the report the PCC acknowledged that Leicestershire Police were not performing well enough with regards to crime recording and whilst the report stated that improvements had been made since the previous inspection, there was further work that needed to be done. It was hoped that the 2019/20 budget for Leicestershire Police would help address some of the issues that had been raised by HMICFRS.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) The findings of the inspection needed to be viewed in the national context. Of the 26 forces inspected 8 others received the same 'Inadequate' grading as Leicestershire Police. Leicestershire Police had been found to be 84% compliant with regards to crime recording which was just below the national average of 87.7%.
- (ii) There was no suggestion from HMICFRS that Leicestershire Police had been deliberately manipulating the crime figures. HMICFRS had rated Leicestershire Police as 'Good' for leadership and they would not have done so had they had any concerns about the ethics of senior officers or a deliberate lack of transparency from the force.
- (iii) At the time of the 2017 inspection Leicestershire Police had 3 dedicated decision makers for crime recording whereas they now employed 12 decision makers. As a result of the previous inspection HMICFRS had recommended that training should be provided to all staff within Leicestershire Police that made crime recording decisions. To date Leicestershire Police had provided training to those staff whose roles were relevant to crime recording such as investigators and many others; over 1000 staff in total. There were some staff who had not received the training and in an organisation with over 4000 staff it would take time however the recommendation from HMICFRS had been complied with.
- (iv) The Police and Crime Panel welcomed the steps that had been taken by Leicestershire Police to improve crime recording but raised concerns that the HMICFRS report would affect the levels of confidence that the public had that crime was being dealt with appropriately. In response the PCC stated that the public had no reason to fear that crime was not being recorded to a satisfactory degree and that in his view the rules in relation to crime recording were unnecessarily rigorous.
- (v) With many of the incidents where a crime had not been recorded by Leicestershire Police and where HMICFRS were of the view that a crime should have been recorded, a separate crime had been recorded by the Force relating to the same victim or offender, but it was the view of HMICFRS that more than one crime should have been recorded for that victim. This issue particularly arose in Domestic Abuse cases where several incidents had occurred over a period of time but Leicestershire Police had only recorded one crime of Domestic Abuse for that victim and offender. Reassurance was given that in most of these cases, despite the recording error, the

victim had been referred for support and the offender had been dealt with. It was just the case that each separate incident of abuse had not been recorded as a separate crime. Leicestershire Police would endeavour to record each individual incident of Domestic Abuse as a crime in future. In response to assurances sought by the Panel, the PCC stated that he was content that victims of Domestic Abuse and rape in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland were receiving sufficient support, within the resources that were available.

- (vi) In response to a question regarding the proportion of reported rapes which were historical it was clarified that approximately half of rape reports were made within 7 days of the incident whereas a third of rape reports were made 6 months or more after the incident.
- (vii) It was acknowledged that crime mapping was based on recorded crime therefore it was important to correctly record crime so that the analysis of trends and hot spots would be accurate.
- (viii) A member queried whether it could be ascertained from the data whether crime recording was better in some districts than others however it was confirmed that a judgement on this could not be made from the figures.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted.

49. Proposed Precept 2019/20 and Medium Term Financial Plan.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) concerning the Proposed Precept for 2019/20 and the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 6', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) Part of the budget proposals was that the total number of police officers within Leicestershire Police would be increased by 80 in the 2019/20 year and a further 27 in the year 2020/21. In reality Leicestershire Police would actually be recruiting a total of approximately 250 officers to account for those that had left the force. The 27 officers that were intended to be recruited in 2020/21 could not be recruited a year earlier due to the manpower and resources it took to carry out the recruitment and training process and it was not feasible to recruit all 107 in the same year. When recruitment had been frozen in previous years the capacity of the force to carry out recruitment had also diminished therefore additional staff were now needed to carry out vetting, medical checks and training. The Chairman informed members that Recruitment and Retention in Leicestershire Police would be on the agenda for a future meeting of the Police and Crime Panel.
- (ii) The Panel sought reassurances from the PCC that in future adequate resources would be allocated to policing rural areas. In response the PCC explained that the Police had to allocate the most resources to areas where the most crime was committed however the Force did have a responsibility to ensure that the whole of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland was effectively policed. Therefore the rationale behind the budget was to move police officers away from central locations into Neighbourhood Policing Areas to provide more visibility and better response

times in those localities. Whilst there would be abstractions of Neighbourhood Police Officers to other areas where necessary, this would be kept to a minimum. The Panel supported this approach and the emphasis on Neighbourhood policing, though one Panel member raised concerns that there may not be sufficient space in the Neighbourhood offices to accommodate the additional officers.

- (iii) In response to a question from a member as to why pension costs formed such a significant part of the budget it was clarified that traditionally police pension costs were borne by central government. However, the Treasury had made a decision that the cost of the pension deficit should now be borne locally, and individual Forces had no discretion over the level of their contribution. The PCC stated that in his view it was unreasonable that the pension deficit was required to be made up locally and that he had made these views known in the House of Lords and to Government ministers including the Home Secretary.
- (iv) Members raised concerns that Leicestershire Police were at a disadvantage compared to other forces with regards to the amount of central funding they received due to the way the funding formula worked. It was noted that the funding formula was due to be reviewed but this was long overdue. Lord Bach stated that he shared members concerns and had attended a meeting with the seven MPs that represented the County of Leicestershire to discuss the issue. The message was slowly getting through to government ministers that the funding system was not fair. It was hoped that a new funding formula would come into place at the time of the 2019 Comprehensive Spending Review.
- (v) Although the Medium Term Financial Plan relied on the use of reserves over the first four years of the plan, reassurance was given that the level of reserves would still be sufficient and would remain above the minimum level set by the national guidelines.
- (vi) The income referred to in Appendix 1 to the report included funding from the government to combat counter terrorism, monies received under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002, payments from the Road Safety Partnership, payments received for the work the Force carried out for the Disclosure and Barring Service, and money received for policing East Midlands Airport and football matches.
- (vii) In response to a question from a Member, it was explained that funding received under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 did not form part of the core budget. It was part of the capital budget. A working group within Leicestershire Police made decisions on how Section 106 funding would be spent.
- (viii) Leicestershire Police gave regular consideration to which would be the most cost effective methods of procurement including whether it was appropriate to bring contracts in house. For example the forensics service had now been brought within Leicestershire Police. The Force would only enter procurement on a national basis where that was the most cost effective option, for example Leicestershire Police were part of the national procurement scheme for uniforms. HMICFRS had assessed police forces for value for money and Leicestershire Police came in the best 5 forces under that category.
- (ix) It was noted that the PCC's commissioning budget was forecast to remain the same for the next 4 years and members questioned whether this was going to be an adequate level of funding in the future. The PCC stated that he thought the

commission budget was already a large one but it would be kept under review. It was too early to say with confidence whether any changes would be required but for now an assumption had been made that the figure would be £4,296,550 each year until 2023/24. Some of the commissioning budget was already committed to organisations such as Victim First, Safeguarding Boards and Community Safety Partnerships. Some commissioning contracts that were in place between the PCC and providers required the PCC to pay more for the service after the first year of the contract and this had been taken into account in the budgeting process.

- (x) The Government had set out four priority areas for Police Forces to drive efficiency, productivity and effectiveness. One of the priorities was smarter use of data and digital services and there was an aim to deliver £50m worth of productivity gains nationally from data and digital services. However, little detail had been provided by the government on how these priorities should be tackled and further guidance was expected.
- (xi) The Police Negotiating Board had recommended a 3% increase in police officer pay for 2018 however the Government had not supported the recommendation and only granted a 2% pay increase. The Police Federation had lodged an application with the High Court for Judicial Review of this decision therefore in case the Government's decision was overturned, an assumption had been made in the Leicestershire Police budget that officers would be awarded the additional 1% pay increase.

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by Cllr. Rickman that:-

- (a) The information presented in the report be noted, including:
 - the total 2019-20 net budget requirement of £187.139m, including
 - a council tax (precept) requirement for 2019-20 of £72.062m.
- (b) the proposal to increase the 2019-20 Precept by £24.00 per annum (12.05%) for police purposes to £223.2302 for a Band D property be supported.
- (c) the future risks, challenges, uncertainties and opportunities included in the precept proposal, together with the financial and operational considerations identified be noted.
- (d) it be noted that any changes required, either by Government grant alterations notified through the final settlement or through amended council tax base and/or surplus/deficit notifications received from the collecting authorities, will be balanced through a transfer to or from the Budget Equalisation Reserve (BER).
- (e) the current Medium Term Financial Plan contained in Appendix 1 be noted.

The motion was carried unanimously.

50. OPCC Performance Report.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner which presented the performance of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

(OPCC) for December 2018. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 7', is filed with these minutes.

Panel members welcomed the style of the report and stated that they found the content informative. The Panel requested to receive the OPCC performance data on a quarterly basis in future and asked if the report could include targets or performance measures. In response it was explained that there were not targets in place for all data categories, though correspondence to the OPCC did have a target within which it should be responded to. Nationally not all OPCCs published this kind of performance data therefore it would be difficult to use other OPCCs as a benchmark, however in future it was hoped that the Leicestershire OPCC would be able to measure its performance against its own previous performance.

The Panel was particularly interested in the information in the report regarding the Independent Custody Visiting scheme which was run by the OPCC and the Chairman asked to receive a report on this topic at a future Panel meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted.

51. Ethics Integrity and Complaints Committee.

The Police and Crime Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner which provided an update on the work of the Ethics, Integrity and Complaints Committee for the period September 2017 to September 2018. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 8', is filed with these minutes.

The Panel welcomed the report and supported the work of the Ethics, Integrity and Complaints Committee.

In response to concerns raised by a member that some people were unable to use the internet to report crimes, reassurance was given that although Leicestershire Police were looking to increase the opportunities for the public to report crimes online, this was in addition to, not instead of, the traditional methods of telephone and face to face reporting. Some offences were more suitable for online reporting than others. In Leicestershire 75% of Road Traffic Accidents were reported online which indicated that the public were happy to use the online service for this type of incident. The Panel welcomed the approach of Leicestershire Police to developing the online reporting service.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted.

52. Date of next meeting.

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Panel would be held on 18 March 2019 at 1:00pm at City Hall, Leicester.

10.00 am - 12.50 pm
01 February 2019

CHAIRMAN