

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Tuesday, 23 June 2026.

PRESENT

Cllr. Liz Blackshaw
Parisha Chavda
Cllr. Elly Cutkelvin
Cllr. Mohammed Dawood
Mr. D. Harrison CC
Peter Jones
Cllr. Kevin Loydall

Cllr. Michael Mullaney
Cllr. Joe Orson
Cllr. D. Singh Patel
Cllr. Les. Phillimore
Cllr. Rosemary Powell
Cllr. Michael Rickman
Cllr. Andrew Woodman

In attendance

Rupert Matthews	Police and Crime Commissioner
Oliver Bryan	Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner
Claire Trewartha	Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Kira Knott	Chief Finance Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Siobhan Peters	Director of Strategy, Partnerships and Commissioning, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

1. Election of Chairman.

RESOLVED:

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED that Cllr L. Phillimore be elected Chairman of the Panel for 2026/27.

Cllr. L Phillimore in the Chair

2. Election of Vice-Chairman.

RESOLVED:

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED that Cllr L. Blackshaw be elected Vice-Chairman of the Panel for 2026/27.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2026.

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2026 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

4. Minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2026.

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2026 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

5. Public Question Time.

The Chairman reported that the following question had been received from Mr Jonathan Smith:

“Why wasn't any town/city from across Leicester, Leicestershire or Rutland included in the Home Office's Winter of Action initiative, as per the list of involved locations listed on the Home Office website, despite being included in the similar Safer Streets Summer initiative earlier in 2025? According to the website this was led by Police and Crime Commissioners/Deputy Mayors to focus on anti-social behaviour, street crime and retail crime as well as night-time economy safety and violence against women and girls, many of which are issues highlighted in the Police and Crime Commissioners' Police and Crime Plan as areas of focus. It would seem that most, if not all, other Force areas were involved in this work.”

Response by the Police and Crime Commissioner:

“Thank you for your question. I take my responsibility to make Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland the safest place it can be very seriously. Last year I ensured that Leicestershire fully implemented a plan to take part in the Governments Safer Summer Streets, despite there being no additional funding to do so. I was incredibly grateful to the good will of partners across the policing area for their participation. When the Home Secretary asked for feedback on that campaign, I returned comments on the frustration around the lack of additional support when there was a request to deliver additional activity. The administrative burden of the planning process and reporting requirements put on us by the Home Officer were also significant to my staff, Leicestershire Police and partners.

As such when the Home Secretary wrote to me asking me to coordinate a similar approach for their Winter of Action campaign, again whilst offering no additional funding, I declined. That is however, not to say that there was not already significant activity planned by both my office and Leicestershire Police, to ensure safety on the streets of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland throughout the winter period.

I wrote to the Home Secretary at the time outlining my rationale for the decision not to formally take part in Winter of Action but also outlining the significant level of activity already planned to keep the people of our region safe. I have attached that letter for your reassurance.”

6. 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.

7. 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.

No declarations were made.

8. Review of Panel Membership.

The Committee considered report of the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer for Leicestershire County Council, regarding the Panel's membership and any changes

required to meet the balanced appointment objective as required by legislation. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 8', is filed with these minutes.

The Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer explained that the membership of Police and Crime Panels was required to represent all parts of the relevant police area, represent the political make-up of the relevant local authorities (when taken together), and have the skills, knowledge and experience necessary for the police and crime panel to discharge its functions effectively. However, the current membership of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel for 2026/27 did not reflect the requirements for precise political balance. The Panel proposed comprised two additional Conservative members, no Green appointee, and two Liberal Democrats instead of three.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i). A member of the Panel acknowledged the challenges associated with achieving political balance on an annual basis and queried whether an amend the Constitution would have implications for future years, including whether it could establish a permanent position in respect of the Panel's composition. In response, the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer clarified that an amendment to the relevant schedule within the Constitution would detail membership of the Panel and was subject to change on an annual basis, rather than fixed numerical allocations to political groups.
- (ii). A question was also raised regarding the basis for determining the political balance for the forthcoming year in the context of local government reorganisation, in particular whether the outcome of any 2027 unitary shadow authority elections, as part of the ongoing Local Government Reorganisation process, would be taken into account. The Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer confirmed that future shadow authority arrangements would not be taken into account until such time as they formally came into effect.

The Panel indicated that membership of the Panel met the balanced objective, as far as reasonably practicable and that no further steps should be taken.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Panel met the balanced objective, as far as reasonably practicable, and that no further steps be taken.
- (b) That Schedule 1 of the Constitution should be amended to reflect the Panel's currently membership as six Conservative members, three Labour members, two Liberal Democrat members, one Reform member, and one Independent member.

9. Complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer for Leicestershire County Council which provided an update on complaints and related correspondence received or being processed since December 2025. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 9', is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer outlined that the Panel's role was to receive and record complaints, undertake an initial assessment to determine whether any matters should be referred to the Independent Office for Police Conduct

(IOPC), an action delegated to the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer, and seek to resolve all other complaints through informal resolution. It was noted that the Panel was not permitted to investigate complaints or gather evidence beyond inviting comments from the complainant and the Commissioner. The Panel was reminded that, in line with its statutory role and the requirement to preserve confidentiality, discussion should focus on the overall process rather than the detail of individual complaints. An exception to this were items of general correspondence relating to complaints 03/26, 04/26 and 06/26, which had been appended to the report. These related to concerns regarding the use of the Neighbourhood Link resource for communications by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), and correspondence concerning a council tax leaflet and subsequent engagement with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC).

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i). A member raised a question in relation to complaint 11/25, regarding when and where the Commissioner's expression of regret had been recorded. In response, the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer for Leicestershire County Council confirmed that the matter had been considered at a Complaints Sub-Committee meeting and that a published summary of that meeting had been published to the County Council's website.
- (ii). With regards to complaints 01/26 and 05/26, the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer advised that an initial assessment had been undertaken and that a meeting of the Complaints Sub-committee would be convened in order to consider these complaints.
- (iii). A question was asked regarding governance of communications, specifically of the Neighbourhood Link resource by the OPCC. In response, the Chief Executive of the OPCC advised that communications activity was governed by a Communications and Engagement Strategy, which ensured that engagement undertaken by the PCC met legislative requirements.
- (iv). A member of the Panel queried how the use of resources such as Neighbourhood Link ensured political neutrality and would not be used for campaign purposes. The Chief Executive of the OPCC confirmed that the majority of communications were prepared by staff of the OPCC, all of whom were required to operate within politically restricted roles.
- (v). In response to a question asked by the Chairman regarding Neighbourhood Link user content, the Chief Executive of the OPCC clarified that recipients would only receive communications from the OPCC via Neighbourhood Link where they had explicitly opted in through the registration process, which allowed users to select their preferred types of information and provided the option to amend individual preferences or unsubscribe at any time.

RESOLVED:

That the update relating to complaints received or being processed since 1 December 2025, be noted.

10. 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 January 2026 to March 2026 (Quarter 4 2025/26). A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 10', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i). A member queried why the update report had been provided for the period January to March 2026. The PCC stated that his update reports were scheduled to be presented at every other meeting. The report was due to be presented at the Panel meeting on 21 April which had been cancelled and so accordingly, no report had been scheduled for this meeting. It was confirmed that the next update report would be presented at the next meeting and that this would cover the period April to June.
- (ii). A member of the Panel highlighted that the engagement activity outlined in the report appeared to consist largely of visits and interactions and questioned whether any priorities or decisions had demonstrably changed as a result of these engagements. In response, the PCC emphasised the importance of maintaining regular contact with residents, businesses and stakeholders between elections, and that informal engagement was essential in understanding local concerns. He emphasised that although it was often difficult to measure the impact and outcome of engagement work, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) continued to collect data across a number of performance areas in order to measure it against key metrics which had been identified within the Police and Crime Plan.
- (iii). With regards to the reporting of commissioned activity, a member of the Panel suggested that current reporting focused heavily on activity and inputs and requested clearer information regarding the outcomes and impact of funded projects. In response, the PCC stated that he was willing to provide additional detail where requested but emphasised the need to balance this against report length. The OPCC explained that project visits often occurred at early stages to ensure appropriate use of funding, with formal impact reporting provided at later stages, including six-month and twelve-month reports. It was also highlighted that attributing specific outcomes to individual projects could be complex due to the involvement of multiple partners working towards similar objectives.
- (iv). A further question was raised regarding whether there was a strategic approach underpinning the PCC programme of engagements. The PCC advised that a broad direction was set to ensure coverage across all areas and engagement with a wide range of demographic groups, with the detailed planning undertaken by staff. Engagement activity was structured through a Communications and Engagement Strategy, overseen by the OPCC's Head of Communications, and monitored in order to ensure balanced coverage across geographies, communities and protected characteristics.
- (v). A member of the Panel suggested that, as an interim measure, the report could include a small number of case studies or examples demonstrating impact. The OPCC advised that impact information would be available through an established performance framework and in specific reports on commissioned services, elsewhere on the agenda. Impact reports for funded projects could be provided as they became available, alongside the collection of case studies to illustrate outcomes.

- (vi). A member raised a question regarding comments reportedly made by the PCC on social media regarding the results of a by-election in Gorton and Denton in February 2026. The Chairman advised that this matter was outside the scope of the agenda item and would not be considered at the meeting. The Panel member requested that the PCC provide a report relating to the governance, management and use of the PCC's official communications channels, including social media, at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the contents of the Police and Crime Commissioner's update be noted.
- (b) That the PCC be requested to provide a report relating to the governance, management and use of the PCC's official communications channels, including social media, at a future meeting.

11. Police and Crime Plan Delivery Update.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which provided an update in relation to the delivery of the 2025-29 Police and Crime Plan as at the end of Quarter 3 2025/26 (October - December 2025). A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 11', is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the report, the PCC stated that references throughout the paper referring to the Chief Constable should refer to the Temporary Chief Constable. He outlined that the recruitment to the position of Chief Constable remained ongoing.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i). A member of the Panel asked how long the process to appoint a substantive Chief Constable had been ongoing and what barriers were preventing an appointment. The PCC explained that the appointment process was prescribed by the College of Policing and was extensive, complex, and time-consuming. He confirmed that the process had previously been undertaken; however, the recruitment panel had determined that neither of the two candidates who had applied should be appointed. The recruitment process had since recommenced, however a lack of availability of those involved with the recruitment process had resulted in a delay of approximately eight weeks.
- (ii). A question was asked regarding the average length of service for Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and whether a comparison exercise with other police forces had been completed, particularly in relation to PCSOs acting as a pathway to becoming warranted officers. The PCC explained that the role and powers of PCSOs varied by force and were determined locally by the Chief Constable. He advised that, in accordance with the Police and Crime Plan, the Commissioner had scrutinised the PCSO model in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland at the Corporate Governance Board. The Temporary Chief Constable had provided a detailed rationale for the current model. It was noted that the length of service metric had been discussed at that meeting. He explained that increasing PCSO numbers through recruitment could distort the average length of service, as new recruits would lower the overall average despite retention being stable. The Panel

received assurances that further work was ongoing in order to review and refine how this metric was measured.

- (iii). A member of the Panel asked why the report stated that 29% of the Plan had been completed over the first three quarters, whereas a graph indicated an expected completion rate of 46%. The PCC acknowledged the discrepancy and confirmed that delivery was currently behind the anticipated trajectory. He advised that the team had scheduled a session to review progress against delivery and to prioritise activity for the forthcoming quarter within the 2026/27 period.
- (iv). It was noted that paragraph 17(a) referred to the period 2025-25 and that this should have read 2025-2026.

RESOLVED:

That the update in relation to the delivery of the 2025-29 Police and Crime Plan as at the end of Quarter 3 2025/26 (October - December 2025), be noted.

12. Update on the how the Police and Crime Commissioner and Force are implementing the recommendations that were provided as part of the Police and Crime Panel Tasking group S106 funding review.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which provided an update in relation to how the PCC and the Force were implementing recommendations arising from the Police and Crime Panel Task and Finish Group review of Section 106 funding. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 12', are filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i) The Chairman asked whether there had been increased flexibility from planning authorities and legal advisers in the wording of Section 106 agreements to improve accessibility to funds. The OPCC stated that flexibility varied across agreements. Some had demonstrated good levels of flexibility, while others remained more restrictive, resulting in ongoing inconsistencies despite previous efforts to achieve a more standardised approach. It was noted that a new Estates Strategy had been developed which incorporated Section 106 funding considerations. It was anticipated that this would enable the identification of priority areas for future investment and providing a clearer basis for forward planning.
- (ii) A member of the Panel queried the £1.1m of agreements which were due to expire in 2026 and asked how confident officers were that these funds would be allocated before expiry. The OPCC outlined that discussions had taken place with the Force, which had identified a number of projects capable of utilising this funding. Applications to draw down funds had already commenced and priority was being given to agreements nearing expiry to mitigate the risk of clawback. However, whilst progress had been positive, that success remained dependent on local authority approval, with some authorities approving expenditure more readily than others. It was noted that work was ongoing to reduce barriers and maximise the use of available funds.

- (iii) With regards to clawback arrangements and whether unspent funds were returned in full or in part, the OPCC stated that to date, no funds had been returned to developers.
- (iv) A member of the Panel raised an issue with discrepancies in reported figures relating to Charnwood Borough Council. The panel member stated the borough council's records suggested that approximately £728,000 had been identified as uncommitted and £120,000 as committed, giving a combined total of around £848,000. The panel member emphasised the importance of working collaboratively to prevent any clawback of funds to developers would be essential and that further reconciliation of figures was required to ensure consistency. Some contributions had not yet been triggered and that in some cases certain developments were unlikely to reach their trigger points, meaning associated funding may never be realised. It therefore suggested that this could distort the reported figures. The OPCC acknowledged these concerns and confirmed that these issues would be reviewed and that future reporting would distinguish more clearly between committed funds, uncommitted funds, and those still held by developers or yet to be triggered.
- (v) Concern was raised regarding why approximately £8 million in Section 106 funding remained unspent, particularly in the context of wider police funding pressures. The OPCC explained that Section 106 agreements were legally binding arrangements between developers and local authorities, prescribing specific uses for the funds. As such, funding could only be drawn down strictly in accordance with the agreed terms. Both the OPCC and the Chairman emphasised that many agreements had been drafted several years previously and often reflected outdated requirements, such as the provision of physical buildings, which might no longer align with current operational needs. This rigidity significantly limited the ability to utilise available funds.
- (vi) It was noted Section 106 funding was restricted to capital expenditure, such as buildings, vehicles, or equipment, and could not be used for revenue costs or ongoing expenditure. The OPCC highlighted that many capital projects carried associated ongoing costs, which created further challenges, as these could not be funded through Section 106. For example, funds might be allocated for police premises within a specific development area; however, if there was no longer an operational need for such a facility in that location, the funding could not easily be redirected to alternative priorities.
- (vii) The Chairman acknowledged the inherent complexity of the Section 106 system and the challenges faced by all parties. He emphasised the importance of achieving better outcomes, improved alignment in drafting legal agreements, and ensuring sufficient flexibility to respond to changing operational needs while maintaining compliance with statutory requirements. He emphasised that stakeholders needed to collectively strengthen their approach to securing and effectively utilising Section 106 funding, given its importance as a public resource.

RESOLVED:

- (a). That the update provided on the how the PCC and Force were implementing the recommendations that were provided as part of the Police and Crime Panel Tasking group S106 funding review, be noted.

- (b). That the PCC be requested to ensure that future reporting relating to Section 106 funding distinguish more clearly between committed funds, uncommitted funds, and those still held by developers or yet to be triggered.

13. Police Contact Demand.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which outlined how he was fulfilling his duty by securing efficient and effective policing for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and holding the Force to account in relation to contact demand and calls performance. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 13', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i). With regards to abandonment rates, the PCC stated that it was often inherent difficult to accurately determine whether calls had been abandoned, as individuals might choose alternative contact methods. The PCC advised that a range of measures were being explored in order to manage demand, including preventative approaches to reduce the need for contact and additional investment to enhance call-handling capacity. He confirmed that this remained a priority area of ongoing discussion with the Temporary Chief Constable, with benchmarking against best practice elsewhere.
- (ii). A Member of the Panel queried significant year-on-year increases across all contact methods and asked whether this correlated with an increase in crime. There had been rises of 36% in emergency calls, 50% in non-emergency calls, and 49% in online reporting. The PCC explained that the rise in contact demand did not directly equate to an increase in recorded crime. The Police were frequently the default point of contact for a wide range of non-crime-related issues, such as incidents linked to weather events. Whilst some of these incidents required police involvement, they did not constitute crimes. The Panel acknowledged that the scale of the increase was significant and was being treated as a priority, with detailed analysis underway and overseen by the Deputy Chief Constable.
- (iii). Concerns were raised regarding the impact of increased digital reporting on those who were digitally excluded given that proportion of the population lacked access or confidence in using online systems. The Member asked what steps were being taken to ensure that digital reporting did not create barriers to accessing police services. The PCC acknowledged the risk that an over-reliance on digital approaches could disadvantage a segment of the population. He confirmed that, whilst digital reporting was being encouraged, traditional contact methods, including telephone lines, remained available to ensure accessibility for all.
- (iv). The Chairman raised concern regarding online reporting, in particular that the national online reporting system was not user-friendly and may discourage completion. He suggested that understanding where in the process users abandoned reports would be valuable in identifying improvements. He also suggested that this issue be raised with central government. The PCC acknowledged the concerns raised regarding the usability of the system and assured the Chairman that efforts had been made to identify the appropriate national bodies responsible in order to raise these issues.

- (v). A Member of the Panel asked how the outcomes of online reports were monitored and whether submissions were actively reviewed or risked not being actioned. In response, the Chief Executive of the OPCC outlined that all online reports were triaged in the same way as reports received via the 101 service. Each submission was reviewed by staff and assessed for appropriate follow-up or investigation. Assurance was provided that all reports were actively managed within the system and did not go unaddressed.
- (vi). A Panel member raised concerns about whether the increased volume of contact could negatively impact service provision, particularly for individuals experiencing genuine emergencies. The PCC acknowledged that increased demand inherently carried some level of risk. However, he advised that the triage system in place was effective in prioritising incidents according to urgency, supported by well-trained staff within the contact centre. Emergency calls (999) continued to be answered promptly in the majority of cases, with performance closely monitored by both the Commissioner and the Temporary Chief Constable. It was noted that additional investment had been made into the contact centre in recent years to maintain service standards. Further assurance was provided that emergency calls were typically answered within national performance standards and that response performance remained strong. It was emphasised that members of the public experiencing an emergency should continue to dial 999 with confidence that their calls would be answered promptly.
- (vii). The PCC placed on record his appreciation for contact centre staff, acknowledging the challenging and demanding nature of their work and commending their professionalism in dealing with high-pressure situations.
- (viii). The Chairman highlighted the report's indication that, due to financial pressures, the number of additional full-time equivalent posts in the contact centre had reduced and that further resources would be required to achieve improvements in performance.

RESOLVED:

That the report outlining how the Police and Crime Commissioner was fulfilling his duty by securing efficient and effective policing for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and holding the Force to account in relation to contact demand and calls performance, be noted.

14. Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner Commissioned Services Report.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which outlined the commissioning of relevant services by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC). The report related specifically to commissioned services delivered through contracts and not grant-funded services. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 14', is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the report, the OPCC stated that there were two errors in the table on page 83 of the report. It was noted that the table should have referred to Q1 2025/26 and that reference to 44% in the upper left of the table should have read 34%.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:

- (i). In relation to Victim First, a free, independent and confidential service supporting victims and witnesses of crime, and the largest of the OPCC's commissioned service, 1,833 positive victim contacts had been recorded during Quarter 3. This represented victims who had consented to engagement through the triage process. The Service achieved a satisfaction rate of 95.12%, measured through sample surveys undertaken at the beginning and end of service users' engagement. It was noted that 349 individuals felt better equipped to build resilience following support, and that 16 positive restorative justice outcomes had been achieved. Restorative justice cases often required lengthy intervention periods and that not all victims required extensive support, with some only seeking an initial discussion.
- (ii). The Panel were pleased that stakeholder feedback from partners and police colleagues showed that service improvements had led to processes becoming significantly easier to use. Areas for further development, particularly around consent processes, had been identified and would be incorporated into future service planning. Performance data also showed that 220 of 9,876 eligible victims had become repeat victims during the year, representing approximately 2.23%.
- (iii). With regards to Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence (DASV) services, it was reported that 531 victims had subsequently been referred into wider support services, including mental health and housing support, while 160 referrals had been made to the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) process in order to ensure comprehensive support arrangements were in place.
- (iv). In response to a question asked, the OPCC stated that sexual violence services had received 748 referrals through more than 50 referral partners, with the largest referral sources being self-referrals, police referrals and the Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC). It was noted that increasing delays in court proceedings continued to affect victims and support services. Feedback from some service users reflected dissatisfaction with delays in the criminal justice process rather than with the support provided. In order to address engagement issues, additional feedback channels including online submissions, telephone contact and WhatsApp messaging had been introduced.
- (v). With regards to Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) services. The Panel were informed that the current provider had withdrawn from the contract and that, following procurement activity, Mountain Healthcare had been appointed to deliver services from 1 October 2026. A comprehensive mobilisation and risk management plan was in place and progress was reported to be on track. It was noted that an innovative pilot project using the GoodSAM platform, would enable victims and survivors who did not attend a SARC to access crisis support and wraparound services directly via mobile phones. Positive interventions through the scheme had increased from 130 at the time of writing the report to over 180.
- (vi). Regarding substance misuse services, the OPCC reported that Home Office funding for Drug Testing on Arrest (DToA) had reduced significantly over a three-year period, which had contributed to declining performance. To address this, the PCC had committed £200,000 over the next two years to restore activity levels. It was anticipated that this would support both substance misuse interventions and reductions in acquisitive crime. It was noted that wider substance misuse services were delivered through Turning Point contracts commissioned by local authorities and therefore detailed local performance information would need to be obtained from public health teams.

- (vii). The Chairman welcomed the positive progress highlighted within the report, in particular the continued development of services supporting victims of rape and serious sexual offences. He referred to the Panel's Task and Finish Group which was focussing on rape outcomes for victims. He stated that work in this area would continue after some delay. He highlighted that concerns regarding delays within the court system reflected issues previously identified by the Panel and welcomed the enhanced support arrangements available to victims.
- (viii). A Panel member suggested that services supporting victims appeared fragmented across multiple organisations, including policing, housing, healthcare and local authorities and asked where strategic leadership for this work should sit. The OPCC acknowledged that better alignment between services was required and provided assurances that work was already underway with both city and county partners in order to review commissioning arrangements and improve service alignment from April 2027 onwards. The PCC had funded a pilot programme in Belgrave to develop community champions, enabling trusted individuals such as GP receptionists and school staff to identify and signpost victims effectively. It was noted that several prevention programmes, including the Speaking Honestly 2 Understand Sexual Harm (SHUSH) initiative for younger children, the Sexual Harm Awareness and Recognising Abuse (SHARA) programme for older teenagers. The OPCC was also undertaking work with colleges and education partners in order to address identified gaps in provision and to create a consistent evidence-based programme across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.
- (ix). A question was asked in relation to a statement within the report that referred to a lack of forensic examination capability following the previous provider's withdrawal from SARC services, and whether this position would still apply following the appointment of the new provider. The OPCC confirmed that the issue had been resolved. Mountain Healthcare would provide the full range of forensic examination and crisis intervention services under the new contract. Independent Sexual Violence Advisers (ISVAs), Children's ISVAs and counselling partners would continue to operate alongside these services, ensuring that no gaps remained in service provision. The Panel received assurances that all required capabilities were now in place.
- (x). The Panel welcomed developments made with regards to services commissioned by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) but were concerned regarding the most appropriate long-term governance and strategic oversight arrangements for coordinating the range of organisations involved.

RESOLVED:

That the overview of the commissioning of relevant services by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), be noted.

15. Local Criminal Justice Board Update.

The Panel received a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which provided an update in relation to the activity of the Local Criminal Justice Board. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 15', is filed with these minutes.

A member of the Panel queried the current chairing arrangements for the Board, emphasising that neighbouring PCCs chaired their respective boards. The Panel member highlighted that a previous recruitment process had sought to appoint a specific Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner with responsibility for the Criminal Justice portfolio to undertake the role, who had subsequently withdrawn. The PCC stated that consideration had been given to restarting the recruitment process; however, an alternative approach had been adopted, with the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for Lobbying and Engagement undertaking the role on a trial basis. The PCC advised that the arrangement had worked well and would therefore continue.

RESOLVED:

That the update in relation to the activity of the Local Criminal Justice Board.

16. Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (Engagement and Lobbying) Update.

The Panel considered a report of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (Engagement and Lobbying) which provided an update on activities carried out since his appointment. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 16', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i). With regards to the forward programme of continued lobbying, expanded engagement, national representation and updated reporting, a member of the Panel asked how progress against these commitments would be measured and when the Panel could expect to receive evidence of outcomes. In response, the DPCC advised that Police and Crime Commissioner offices (OPCCs) nationally were working collectively in order to secure concessions from Government regarding proposed police force amalgamation plans. He stated that updates would be provided as developments emerged and explained that a key objective was to ensure officers funded by local taxpayers and committed to serving local communities were not disproportionately redirected to meet wider regional priorities. He added that there appeared to be scope for further discussion with Government on these matters.
- (ii). A Panel member asked how lobbying activity was progressing across the East Midlands and whether collaborative work had been undertaken between Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC) and their deputies. The DPCC confirmed that there were established networks for both PCCs and DPCCs and that regular engagement continued to take place. He reported that the majority of regional colleagues shared concerns regarding proposed reforms to policing and were broadly united in their opposition to the changes.
- (iii). With regards to the report's comments regarding democratic accountability with regards to policing reforms, a member of the Panel stated that Police Authorities had provided oversight of chief officers prior to the creation of PCCs. The Panel member suggested that consideration should be given to learning from previous governance arrangements and questioned whether replacing the current PCC model might ultimately prove beneficial. In response, the DPCC acknowledged the observations and stated that the principal issue remained that the decision to proceed with reorganisation appeared to have already been taken at a national level. He stated that the reforms were linked to wider local government reorganisation proposals and that meaningful discussions regarding future

governance structures would only be possible once further details had been confirmed.

- (iv). A member of the Panel referred to engagement with underrepresented communities and asked which communities had been engaged with, what issues had been raised and what actions had followed. The DPCC advised that he had completed mandatory training in this area and had attended a variety of events across urban and rural communities, in addition to meetings of the Ethics and Transparency Panel where such issues were regularly discussed. He stated that he intended to continue this engagement activity. When asked to provide a specific example of an underrepresented community, The DPCC referred to the range of engagement events he had attended and reiterated the value of participation in the Ethics and Transparency Panel.
- (v). A question was raised regarding the DPCC's definition of underrepresented communities and concern was raised regarding the difficulty in identifying examples within the report. The DPCC responded that interpretations of what constituted an underrepresented community could vary.
- (vi). A member queried who had drafted and signed representations made to the Secretary of State for Justice, the Home Secretary and the policing minister, as referenced within the report. The DPCC confirmed that he had prepared and signed the correspondence. A further question was raised as to whether lobbying Government was a responsibility that would ordinarily be undertaken by the PCC. In response, the DPCC stated that lobbying formed part of his delegated responsibilities and that the PCC had reviewed all correspondence and had co-signed a number of representations.
- (vii). A member commented that effective scrutiny of lobbying activity was difficult without sight of representations made to Government and suggested that future lobbying activity be shared with the Panel, either directly or through the Chair. The DPCC welcomed the suggestion and agreed to share relevant lobbying correspondence and summaries where appropriate. The Chairman supported this approach, noting that summaries of significant lobbying representations would assist the Panel in carrying out its scrutiny role.

RESOLVED:

That the update regarding activities carried out by the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (Engagement and Lobbying) since his appointment, be noted.

17. Crime Prevention Activity.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) relating to crime prevention activity. The report had been provided in response to a letter from the Chairman of the Panel seeking clarification on a number of issues, which had been addressed within the report. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 17', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i) Panel members questioned what measurable reduction in policing demand had been achieved as a result of investment in prevention activity and when demonstrable outcomes would be expected. In response, the PCC stated that it was inherently difficult to evidence crimes that had been prevented or to directly attribute reductions in demand to specific interventions. He advised that performance was instead assessed through trend analysis, including reductions in certain categories of crime. He stated that outcomes were often influenced by a combination of partnership activity rather than any single intervention.
- (ii) With regards to whether further reporting would be provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of prevention initiatives, the PCC confirmed that it would be possible to provide the Panel with a further report but that producing such a detailed analysis would require additional time and resource within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC). He also highlighted that there was typically a lag before preventative activity translated into measurable outcomes. It was noted that an existing performance framework, which indicated that a number of crime types had reduced, was presented alongside the PCC's Police and Crime Plan Delivery Update to the Panel on a quarterly basis.
- (iii) Members raised significant concerns regarding reports that funding for a proposal to create security patrols in town centres across Leicestershire and Rutland was to be directed towards private security firms rather than frontline policing. Questions were asked as to why such funding would not be used to increase police or PCSO presence, particularly given concerns around powers of enforcement and overall value for money. In response, the PCC stated that no final decision had been made and that the proposal remained a work in progress. He provided assurances that discussions were ongoing with the Chief Constable regarding a police-led approach, with the private sector being considered only as a potential fallback option. He further clarified that funding would be drawn from the Crime Prevention Fund, rather than the core policing budget.
- (iv) Members sought clarification on the role and effectiveness of private security personnel, particularly in relation to their lack of enforcement powers and reliance on police intervention. Concerns were expressed that such an approach may increase demand on police resources rather than reduce it. In response, the PCC emphasised that the intention of any proposal was to increase visible presence and deter crime, rather than to replicate policing functions. He maintained that no final delivery model had been agreed and that options remained under consideration.
- (v) A member of the Panel challenged an assertion within the report that there had been limited appetite from local authority partners, highlighting ongoing public sector-led initiatives and partnership working within Leicester and other areas. Clarification was sought on which local authorities had been consulted and at what level. The PCC acknowledged the positive work being undertaken by local authorities, particularly within Leicester City, but noted that the current proposal was focused on market towns and remained under development.
- (vi) Members expressed concern regarding inconsistencies between media reporting and statements made by the PCC within the meeting. The Panel were in agreement that proposals appeared to have been communicated publicly prior to being scrutinised by the Panel. In response, the PCC reiterated that media reporting did not always accurately reflect the position and confirmed again that no final decisions had been taken.

- (vii) The Panel questioned whether the proposed approach represented best value for money, particularly in the context of ongoing financial pressures within policing. The Panel were in agreement that investment in officers with enforcement powers would provide greater benefit and public confidence. The PCC responded that value for money would be a key consideration and that no decisions would be taken without assessing the most effective use of available resources.
- (viii) Members of the Panel raised strong concerns regarding the level of scrutiny applied to the proposal to date and the absence of a clearly presented evidence base, including research, comparative models and a defined business case. It was emphasised that the Panel expected to review such information prior to any significant expenditure being committed. The PCC confirmed that research had been undertaken, including consideration of models used in other areas, and indicated that further detail could be made available.
- (ix) The Panel remained concerned and sought assurance that the Panel would have the opportunity to scrutinise proposals prior to implementation. In response, the PCC confirmed that no final decision had been made and that discussions with the Temporary Chief Constable were ongoing, although he did not commit to granting the Panel the opportunity to provide pre-decision scrutiny on the matter.
- (x) A member of the Panel reiterated their concerns regarding the proposed use of crime prevention funding, particularly in relation to non-police personnel, governance arrangements and the need for greater clarity and transparency. The Panel emphasised the importance of robust evidence, clear communication, and appropriate scrutiny before any final decision was made.

It was moved by Cllr. E. Cutkelvin and seconded by Cllr. L. Phillimore:

“That the Panel remain concerned around potential plans for the PCC’s office regarding proposals to spend £2m from the Crime Prevention Fund on security industry authority licensed contractors. The Panel ask that ahead of any decision being made, it be presented with evidence of research undertaken and what it indicates, along with the Temporary Chief Constable’s proposals in full, in a disclosable format.”.

The motion was put and carried, 10 members voting for, and none against.

18. Date of next meeting.

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Commission would be held on 29 September 2026 at 14:00.

2.00 - 4.56 pm
23 June 2026

CHAIRMAN