

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Thursday, 12 February 2026.

PRESENT

Cllr. Les Phillimore (in the Chair)

Cllr. Liz Blackshaw	Mr. D. Harrison CC
Cllr Sharon Butcher	Cllr. Kevin Loydall
Parisha Chavda	Cllr. Michael Mullaney
Cllr. Ely Cutkelvin	Miss G. Waller
Cllr. Bhupen Dave	Cllr. Darren Woodiwiss
Cllr. Mohammed Dawood	Cllr. Andrew Woodman

In attendance

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
Temporary Chief Constable David Sandall – Leicestershire Police

74. Chairman's Announcement.

The Chairman advised the Panel that the Police and Crime Commissioner was not present at the meeting, for personal reasons, and would be represented by his Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (Engagement and Lobbying), Mr Oliver Bryan.

75. 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.

76. Policing Precept Proposal.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which outlined the PCC's revised precept for the 2026/27. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 2', is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman outlined that, at the Police and Crime Panel meeting held on 4 February 2026, the PCC had presented a proposed increase to the 2026/27 precept by £11 for a Band D property. After reviewing the proposal, the Panel had resolved to veto the PCC's proposed precept on the grounds that it had been too low. The PCC had been issued with the relevant statutory notice, setting out the veto and the reasons for it. Consequently, under Regulation 5(3)(b), the PCC had been required to submit a revised precept higher than the proposal originally considered. In a report published on 10 February 2026, the PCC, having considered the Panel's veto report, had proposed to issue a revised council tax precept of £15 for the 2026/27 financial year for a Band D property. The Panel had the opportunity to make comments and recommendations on the revised precept, although it no longer had the power to veto it. Any comments or recommendations agreed by the Panel would be provided to the PCC in writing as soon

as possible before 22 February, the statutory deadline. The PCC would be required to have regard to the Panel's report, issue a response, and publish that response. The PCC could then issue the revised precept by 1 March, or a different precept subject to the constraints of Regulation 8(3).

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (Engagement and Lobbying) outlined that the PCC had considered the concerns and comments raised by the Panel at the meeting on 4 February 2026. The change in precept from £11 to £15 reflected the concerns raised by the Panel and would remove the remaining deficit within the policing budget for 2026/27.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i) The Panel were pleased with the revised precept proposal and for the PCC's acknowledgment of the Panel's concerns. Several members of the Panel reiterated that the original precept had been too low and would have resulted in an underfunded police service at a time of increasing demand. Members of the Panel welcomed that the PCC had reconsidered his position and had recognised the importance of adequate police funding for the sustainability of neighbourhood policing and the long-term financial stability of the Force. It was emphasised that the Force continued to be amongst the lowest funded police force areas in the country, and that continued lobbying of central government for a fairer funding formula would be essential.
- (ii) With regards to the Government's proposals regarding the abolition of Police and Crime Commissioners by the end of their current term in May 2028, the Panel expressed concern regarding the status, and permitted uses of, reserves held by Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) should PCC functions be transferred to alternative governance arrangements. A member of the Panel asked whether unspent funds could be directed to frontline policing, including neighbourhood and prevention activity, prior to any structural change taking effect, or whether central government might reclaim or restrict the use of remaining funds following a structural transition. The DPCC advised that no clarity on this matter had yet been provided by government.
- (iii) The Chairman raised concerns regarding the PCC's claim relating to the results of a public consultation on the precept. The PCC's report outlined that he requested for a weighted average to be calculated across all respondents based on the number of respondents for each rate of increase from 0p to the maximum. The calculation showed a weighted average response of an uplift to a precept of £9.90. The Chairman emphasised that 56% of respondents had supported £14 or more, and requested that the PCC provide information relating to the calculation, in order to ensure accuracy. It was agreed that this information would be provided to the Panel in writing.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Temporary Chief Constable thanked the Panel for their scrutiny and support with regards to the budget and precept proposal. He emphasised that despite the positive impact of the £15 settlement, the Force would still face a challenging financial environment, including £3.5m in reductions across police staff and officer roles. He highlighted increasing demand linked to serious violence, public order events, and complex safeguarding work. He reassured the Panel that investments in the contact centre and safeguarding were being protected wherever possible and that modelling had been undertaken to minimise the impact on frontline services.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i) A member of the Panel asked whether partnership funding for community safety and youth justice would remain stable following the precept change. The Temporary Chief Constable stated that funding stability was essential and would continue to be reviewed in order to minimise risks to service delivery.
- (ii) The Panel raised concerns that upcoming savings could impact call handling, safeguarding or neighbourhood visibility. The Temporary Chief Constable provided assurances that the Force had invested an additional £1m in the control room and that this would remain for the coming year. Safeguarding functions would continue to be prioritised, and reductions were being targeted away from areas of high public impact, though some service impact would be inevitable.
- (iii) It was noted that the Force faced metropolitan police force type challenges, in addition to normal policing demands. These challenges presented due to the unique characteristics of the City and County, including significant deprivation, major football clubs, three universities, and a highly diverse population. All of which created pressures not experienced in many other force areas. In addition to this, the Force had responded to the continued occurrence of serious violence, despite efforts to keep murder and serious incident levels low. Escalating protest activity also required substantial operational resources, diverting officers from local neighbourhood duties in order to ensure lawful and safe management of demonstrations. A member of the Panel placed on record that there had been a significant reduction in crime within the City.
- (iv) With regards to the PCC's proposed Prevention Fund, members of the Panel emphasised the need for transparency, evaluation and future clarity on how such funds would be utilised. The PCC had outlined his intention to create a Crime Prevention Fund which could be utilised on activities which supported the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan for the remainder of the PCC's term in office. The PCC intended to transfer £1.2m from the Commissioning reserve and £2.5m from the Budget Equalisation reserve to the Crime Prevention fund to commission crime prevention activity. The Panel emphasised that the money should be utilised locally, in partnership with public sector bodies, and not diverted to short-term or non-local initiatives. It was suggested that the PCC should reconsider the proposed Crime Prevention Fund, with a view to directing £1.2m from the Commissioning reserve and £2.5m from the Budget Equalisation reserve towards policing and established prevention partnerships.

It was moved by Cllr. E. Cutkelvin and seconded by Parisha Chavda:

"That the PCC reconsider the proposed Crime Prevention Fund, with a view to directing £1.2m from the Commissioning reserve and £2.5m from the Budget Equalisation reserve towards policing and established prevention partnerships".

The motion was put and carried, 13 members voting for, and none against.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the information presented in the report, be noted;

- (b) That the revised precept of £15 for the 2026/27 financial year for a Band D property, be supported;
- (c) That the future risks, challenges, uncertainties, and opportunities included in the precept proposal together with the financial and operational considerations identified be noted;
- (d) That the PCC be requested to provide information relating to the weighted average calculated for public preference regarding the precept;
- (e) That the PCC be requested to reconsider the proposed Crime Prevention Fund, with a view to directing £1.2m from the Commissioning reserve and £2.5m from the Budget Equalisation reserve towards policing and established prevention partnerships.

The motion was carried unanimously.

77. Date of next meeting.

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Commission would be held on 21 April at 14:00.

2.00 - 2.54 pm
12 February 2026

CHAIRMAN