

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Monday, 27 October 2025.

PRESENT

Cllr. Les Phillimore (in the Chair)

Cllr. Liz Blackshaw
Cllr Sharon Butcher
Cllr. Elly Cutkelvin
Cllr. Mohammed Dawood
Mr. D. Harrison CC

Cllr. Kevin Loydall
Cllr. Michael Mullaney
Cllr Rosemary Powell
Cllr. Darren Woodiwiss

In attendance

Rupert Matthews – Police and Crime Commissioner

Claire Trewartha – Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

29. Minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2025.

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2025 were taken as read, confirmed and signed, subject to an addition to minute no. 18 to include Cllr. Elly Cutkelvin's query about the public survey on the police precept.

30. Minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2025.

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2025 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

31. Public Question Time.

There were no questions submitted.

32. Urgent items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

33. 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.

Mr. D. Harrison CC declared an Other Registerable Interest in all agenda items as he was a member of Reform UK which was the same political party that the Police and Crime Commissioner Mr Rupert Matthews now represented.

34. Police and Crime Commissioner's Update Report.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which provided an overview of his work and the work of his Deputy and office throughout July 2025 to September 2025 (Quarter 2 2025/26). A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 6', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) The PCC had allocated funding to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) for 2025/26. Some CSPs had already spent all their 2025/26 funding whereas others had funding remaining. The CSPs had been informed that the funding could not be carried over to the following financial year and therefore it needed to be spent in this year. The PCC gave reassurance that he was confident all the 2025/26 funding would be spent in time and his staff were liaising with the CSPs regarding this. Some of the CSPs that did have remaining funding had decided which projects it was going to, it was just that the money had not yet been transferred.
- (ii) Following feedback from Councillors in Harborough, the Commissioner had asked the Chief Constable for a report on the Policing operation surrounding the Light & Life Event that would be suitable for passing on to local members to provide reassurance to the public. The PCC had not yet been given a date for when this report would be received but he would ensure the action was completed.
- (iii) Following a suggestion from a small business regarding the potential for introduction of Fixed Penalty Notices for small scale shoplifting, as other forces had done, the PCC had raised the possibility with the Temporary Chief Constable in a Roundtable meeting. The PCC was not able to confirm when a full response to this suggestion would be provided but he agreed to raise the matter with the Chief Constable again.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Police and Crime Commissioner's update be noted.

35. Police and Crime Plan Delivery Update.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which provided an update on delivery of the 2025-29 Police and Crime Plan. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 7', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) Members welcomed the table at paragraph 8 of the report which set out progress against the different areas of the Police and Crime Plan. The PCC explained that the metrics were regularly reviewed at Police and Crime Plan delivery meetings and annual reviews of the metrics would also take place. If any metrics were not moving in a positive direction action would be taken. Future reports to the Panel would include the outcomes of the delivery meetings and the proposed next steps with regards to those metrics. Members requested that when the table was presented to the Panel in future it included more context around the metrics and a comparison with other Force areas. In response it was explained that some of the metrics were collected by all Forces nationally and were therefore marked on the table with 'CSEW' and comparison data could be provided for those, but other metrics were only used for the Leicestershire Force area therefore comparison data would not be available. A member requested that the table include not just the percentage of change for each metric, but also the numbers because if the numbers were small a large percentage increase could be misleading. The PCC acknowledged this request but explained that the purpose of the metrics was monitoring the impact of

the Police and Crime Plan and it was the percentage of change the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) was focusing on. It was explained that it would be difficult to bring the detailed figures to every single Panel meeting, however, if a detailed report was requested by the Panel on any of the metrics, all the figures would be provided in that report. The Chair suggested that any outlying metrics could be scrutinised in more detail at future meetings.

- (ii) It was suggested by a member that as the metric for 'incidences of shoplifting' had increased from 7.6 to 8 this metric should have been rag rated as red not green. In response it was explained that it may depend on whether the increase was considered to be statistically significant and it was agreed that the Director of Performance and Governance at the OPCC would come to the next meeting and give an explanation.
- (iii) The Chair noted that the data relating to two metrics in the table at paragraph 8 had been redacted – 'Staff satisfaction for Force' and 'Abstractions from Neighbourhood Policing', and all the Panel could establish from the table was that performance against these metrics was not moving in a positive direction. The Chair raised concerns that this made it difficult for the Panel to hold the PCC to account on these topics, and it was emphasised that these particular metrics were important given public concerns about trust in the Police. In response the PCC assured the Panel that he was holding the Chief Constable to account with regards to these two metrics but he acknowledged the Panel's difficulties if the data could not be published. The PCC said he would ask the Acting Chief Constable if the Force would consider publishing the data.
- (iv) The OPCC was carrying out a project designed to deter shoplifting and tackle assaults against retail workers and increase feelings of safety within the business community. This involved funding and providing over 110 Body Worn Video cameras across the Community Safety Partnerships and Business Improvement Districts. The localities were Ashby de la Zouch, Leicester, Oadby and Wigston, Loughborough, Hinckley and Melton. After 2 years the OPCC would no longer fund the cameras and the retailers themselves would have to decide whether they wanted to fund the cameras themselves. In response to a suggestion from the Chair that the use of body worn cameras by some retail staff could be pushing retail crime to other retailers that did not use the cameras, the PCC acknowledged that this was a possibility but stated that he was not aware of any data regarding this and emphasised that if it was the case, this was not a reason to stop providing the cameras. A member expressed disappointment that national retailers had a policy of not using the cameras. The OPCC was monitoring the impact of the cameras on crime and how the retailers felt about them and a report could be brought to a future meeting of the Panel regarding this.
- (v) In response to a concern raised by a member that the Police would not investigate thefts of property worth less than £200, the PCC provided assurance that this was not a policy of Leicestershire Police and all thefts would be investigated no matter how small the value. The PCC stated that if the evidence was available the file would be taken to the Crown Prosecution Service for a charging decision. However, it was acknowledged that more resource may be allocated by Leicestershire Police to thefts of a larger value.
- (vi) Underspend from the 2024/25 Community Safety Partnerships budget, had been used to fund a move to a new partnership shared Anti-social Behaviour case

management system known as ECINS. In response to a request from a member, the PCC agreed to provide a report on the system at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the update on delivery of the 2025-29 Police and Crime Plan be noted.

36. Road Safety.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) regarding how he was delivering against his Road Safety Priority in the Police and Crime Plan. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 8', is filed with these minutes.

In presenting the report it was explained that the two graphs at paragraph 43 of the report were incorrect, and the correct versions had been circulated at the start of the meeting. A copy of the amended graphs is filed with these minutes. It was explained that the first graph showed the total casualties in LLR and the second graph related to the number of people killed or seriously injured on the roads.

Arising from discussions the following points were noted:

- (i) Leicestershire Police in conjunction with partners undertook a number of road safety initiatives to encourage safe road use. These were split into school-based interventions and road use interventions.
- (ii) The PCC had launched the Community Action Programme in August 2025 which was intended to advise community organisations regarding what actions they could take with regards to crime and community safety. The Programme would help target different areas of the Police and Crime Plan and for a while would focus on Road Safety before moving onto other areas of the Plan.
- (iii) Members raised concerns regarding the difficulties in getting speed limits on particular roads reduced and the length of the process. There was a lack of understanding amongst parish councils about how the process worked and what evidence was required to get a limit lowered. In response the PCC acknowledged the difficulties that parish councils were having and advised that Parish Councils should contact the Road Safety Partnership for advice in the first instance. The PCC also asked that Police and Crime Panel members pass onto the OPCC any parish council queries relating to speeding so they could be covered by the Community Action Programme. It was explained that some of the guidelines relating to speed limits were set nationally and therefore there were restrictions on how much speed limits could be amended locally. It was requested that further guidance on the process be provided to members after the meeting. It was suggested that Highways officers at the relevant local authorities could be invited to a future meeting to help the Panel scrutinise the PCC on road safety issues. The Chairman agreed to consider this after the meeting.
- (iv) E-scooters were an issue regularly raised by the public at the community days attended by the PCC. The PCC had requested a conversation with the Chief Constable on the Force's activity to crack down on the illegal use of E-Scooters and E-Bikes to ensure that activity was reducing. Both the PCC and Panel members agreed that further regulation was required from central government regarding E-scooters and E-bikes. 'Operation Pedalfast' was the name given by Leicestershire

Police to their activity to target E-scooters and E-bikes. Tackling the use of E-bikes was resource intensive and required specific strategies. Over time Leicestershire Police had become more adept at running these operations and learnt from experience. The locations for Operation Pedalfast were chosen based on where the Police would have the ability to prevent offenders from escaping. A member welcomed the reduction in the use of E-bikes in the Harborough area.

- (v) A member raised concerns that parents were bringing E-bikes to schools and therefore schools were at risk of litigation as a result. It was suggested that there needed to be education programmes at schools regarding E-vehicles particularly in relation to safety and wearing bright clothing whilst on the vehicles.
- (vi) The OPCC was carrying out a research project regarding the main causes of road collisions known as the Fatal 4 – speeding, driving under the influence of drink or drugs, distractions (like mobile phones) and not wearing a seatbelt. When the research project was completed, a report would be put together with the findings.
- (vii) As part of the capital programme, a provision for the rolling out of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) had been included by the PCC. The technology would be used by the Force, sometimes in static locations and sometimes mounted within Police vehicles, to catch vehicles being driven without insurance or MOT. A member queried whether the ANPR in Police vehicles should be paid for out of Leicestershire Police capital funding rather than OPCC capital. A member also raised concerns about the amount of data sharing between different organisations that would be required.
- (viii) An OPCC arranged residents meeting had taken place in Castle Donnington on 4 September 2025 where the issue of ‘car cruising’ had been discussed and particularly high speeds on the local roads. It had been found that some of the people involved in the car cruising were not from the local area and had come from far away to take part. Efforts by the Police to tackle the problem in Castle Donnington did have an impact in the short term but the problem kept coming back. The PCC offered to write to Cllr. A. Woodman with more details about what was discussed at the meeting.
- (ix) Members raised concerns that district councils were not aware of some of the road safety initiatives taking place in their districts, and if they were aware they could offer assistance.
- (x) Data showed that the number of people killed and seriously injured due to road accidents was falling. The Commissioner wanted to see partners across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland work together towards a ‘Vision Zero’ aim, as other areas had adopted. The PCC suggested that this should be led by the Road Safety Partnership, but the PCC was willing to engage with the Road Safety Partnership on this and attend Partnership meetings.
- (xi) The PCC funded the Pathfinder project, a one week driving course which was aimed at Young Drivers aged 15-17 and their guardians. A member raised concerns that taking part in the project required the guardian to take the time off work and let the young person have use of their car. In response the PCC submitted that these were the right types of people that should be undertaking the course. In response to a question about the impact of the course and whether behavioural change

occurred as a result, it was explained that participation was monitored and an evaluation would be undertaken by the commissioning team at the OPCC.

RESOLVED:

That the update regarding the Road Safety Priority be noted.

37. Review of Complaints Procedure.

The Panel considered a report of the Director of Law and Governance, Leicestershire County Council, which sought approval to amend Part 4 of the Panel's Constitution in relation to complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner or his Deputy. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 9', is filed with these minutes.

RESOLVED:

That an amendment to Part 4 of the Constitution be made to the delegated authority so that the Director of Law and Governance, Leicestershire County Council, has the delegated power to make decisions, in consultation with the Chairman of the Panel if appropriate, as to whether complaints about the PCC or Deputy PCC should be referred to the Independent Office for Police Conduct.

38. Date of next meeting.

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Panel would be held on Thursday 30 October 2025 at 10.15 am.

2.00 - 3.38 pm
27 October 2025

CHAIRMAN