

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Monday, 23 March 2015.

PRESENT

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

Cllr. R. B. Begy, OBE

Cllr. David Bill MBE

Cllr. J. Boyce

Miss. Helen Carter

Cllr. A. V. Greenwood MBE

Col. Robert Martin OBE, DL

Cllr. Trevor Pendleton

Cllr. Sarah Russell

Cllr. Lynn Senior

Cllr. D. Slater

Apologies

Cllr. William Liquorish, Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE and Cllr. Paul Westley

In attendance

Sir Clive Loader, Police and Crime Commissioner, Simon Cole, Chief Constable and Paul Stock, Chief Executive

119. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2015 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

120. Public Question Time.

No questions had been received.

121. Urgent Items.

The Chairman advised that he had agreed to consider the following two items:

- Tony Greenwood – Apology
- David Morgan - Retirement

122. 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.

No declarations were made.

123. Police Complaint Statistics 2013/14 and 2014/15.

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Constable concerning the Force's performance with regard to complaints. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 5", is filed with these minutes.

The Chief Constable reported that his principal concern around the complaints that had been received was around the timeliness with which the Police had dealt with them.

The PCC confirmed that interviews would be taking place imminently for an Ethics and Integrity Committee which would look at this issue going forward and would carry out “dip sampling” of complaints files in the same way as the PCC currently did. The PCC confirmed that he was not comfortable with the 46% rise in complaints and would do everything possible to bring this down. The introduction of body worn video for all frontline officers was expected to play an important role in helping to achieve this.

Arising from the discussion, the following points were noted:

- The PCC received every two to three months a full list of all complaints made against the Force. He then chose which ones he wished to look at in more detail, primarily based on a thematic basis. He then made comments on them as appropriate. Considerations such as whether a complaint should be escalated to the IPCC were also part of this process. The Panel questioned whether there were methodologies which could be adopted which would enable the PCC to choose which files to look at in a fairer way or to demonstrate good practice;
- The PCC felt that the word “direct” in paragraph 28 of the report probably went too far. He confirmed that he could not direct the Chief Constable to take any particular action on reading a complaint file, though he could and did ask questions about process and suggest any improvements;
- The Home Office was consulting on the possibility of PCCs “owning” the complaints process. The PCC was not positive about this proposal, not least due to the resources required to carry out this work. He also felt that there may be a negative public reaction to PCCs investigating complaints against themselves. The Chief Constable was responsible for doing this in the Force and the operation of the complaints system was important to the discharge of these responsibilities;
- In response to a request for more recent data, the Chief Constable stated that the report had been produced to respond to the issues raised by the Panel. He suggested that there was a wealth of data available to compare performance with other forces and a breakdown according to complaints against frontline police officers, PCSOs and specials. The Chief Constable looked at all data available and any trends that became evident;
- The PCC could not attend hearings for staff, however as of May new legislation would mean hearings would be held in public. All panels had a serving independent member to ensure that the views of the public were represented;
- Complaints could be made by telephone, online, email, post, via the IPCC or at a station. There was no evidence to suggest that station closures had affected the number of complaints received;
- The OPCC had looked at how other forces had conducted their complaints processes. Other forces operated an earlier triage of the complaints to ensure they were dealt with quickly. This is one option the PCC was looking into;
- Most complaints related to “neglect of duty” or “incivility”. This trend was reflected nationally. The Chief Constable was keen to see how this might change with the

introduction of body worn video. Issues of training frontline staff would be addressed;

- The PCC did not intend to target specific complaints categories going forward, though he did expect and hope to see continuous improvement.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the report be noted;
- (b) That a report be brought to the Panel on complaints performance in September including some further data, including comparisons with other forces and a breakdown for complaints made against all categories of frontline police staff.

124. Change to the Order of Business.

The Chairman sought and obtained the consent of the Panel to vary the order of business from that set out in the agenda.

125. Force Change Programme Update.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning an update on the Force Change programme which had become operational from 9 February 2015. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 7", is filed with these minutes.

Arising from the discussion, the following points were noted:

- One amendment to the report was highlighted. The PCC now believed that, following some work that had taken place between the OPCC and OCC, the budget gap was nearer to £27.8 million. A further report on the Medium Term Financial Plan would be brought to the Panel in June;
- The Force was on track to deliver £10.2 million savings for this financial year. One of the challenges going forward would be the setting of accurate budgetary projections. Government top slicing of budgets had made this more difficult;
- In response to concerns that had been raised in the City that response teams were coming to crime scenes from Loughborough and were often not managing to find their way to sites in the City, the Chief Constable reported that these issues were being looked into as part of the monitoring of the early stages of delivery of the new policing model;
- The Force's back office had the third lowest costs of any force in the country. Further saving possibilities were being investigated, including the outsourcing of some functions though this were not expected to yield large scale savings;
- The PCC was content that the work carried out thus far to put the new model in place was able to respond to the realities of modern crime. The PCC hoped that projections going forward would provide a reasonable basis on which effective and prudent financial planning could take place;

- The PCC was happy that Leicestershire was currently gaining from Government's top slicing. He felt this was unlikely to continue to be the case.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

126. Child Sexual Exploitation Review.

The Panel considered a statement by the PCC concerning his review of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) cases over the last 20 years. Prior to inviting the PCC to deliver his statement, it was made clear that the panel had been allowed access to the statement shortly ahead of the meeting in order to enable them to develop any key lines of enquiry to pursue with the Commissioner.

In asking the Commissioner to deliver his statement, the Chairman took the opportunity to thank the Commissioner for having conducted this review so expediently following the publication of the independent report on CSE cases in Rotherham.

"On 2nd September last year, following the publication of the Alexis Jay report into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham, I commissioned the Force to conduct a wide ranging review going back 20 years into CSE in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

We all vividly remember the sense of shock and outrage we felt when hearing about the systematic abuse of 1,400 children in Rotherham, and I felt it was critical that we examined our own past to determine whether the children in this area had been properly safeguarded.

The terms of reference for the review (which became known as Operation Sepia) were fourfold, namely:

- 1. To review information held within all of Leicestershire Police's crime and intelligence systems regarding suspected child abuse / grooming in the Force area during the past 20 years.*
- 2. To review both the action(s) taken on such communication received and the outcomes reached (or logged) – including evidence of Gold groups set up to look into areas of concern.*
- 3. To review any decisions where action was not taken and the rationale for this. To re-consider if any action should or could now be undertaken in response to information received at that time where no action was implemented.*
- 4. And, to identify any failures by the organisation in responding appropriately to information received which could now be addressed.*

You will recall that I provided an interim, also verbal, report on the progress to you at our last meeting on January 29th. Operation Sepia has now concluded and I want to share with you its findings. At the conclusion of this meeting, the Force and I will publish a joint statement about the review on our respective websites for public consumption.

Operation Sepia involved a team of officers and support staff conducting nine separate audits of existing police records and systems going back to 1994.

It must be noted that the electronic trawl was only able to capture information held on the Force's own internal systems and Leicestershire Police therefore remain open to reviewing any additional information brought to its attention from external sources.

These audits deliberately excluded any victims who feature in two live investigations currently being conducted by Leicestershire Police into historic CSE, namely Operations Enamel and Antelope, and the recently concluded Operation Fedora.

As a team of specialist auditors examined each and every record, they asked themselves a series of questions:

- Did they feel the person had been a victim of CSE?*
- If so, was that properly identified by the Force, and had it been appropriately investigated?*
- If the Force hadn't investigated the matter, had another agency done so. And if so, which agency?*

The records of some 866 individuals were closely researched. Inevitably the names of other people appeared in this research and, in all, the team examined cases involving the names of almost 7,000 individuals.

Further analysis suggested the vast majority of cases had been fully and properly investigated at the time, leaving 32 which the auditors were unsure about; they handed these over to a team of detectives for "moderation".

At this second stage, 22 cases were deemed to have been properly investigated, leaving 10 which were then sent for further analysis by the Regional Review Unit. And, following their further scrutiny, a total of five cases were considered worthy of re-investigation. New investigations will now be carried out into these five cases by a team of specialist detectives under the supervision of a Detective Superintendent.

I should point out that these five cases are not related to one another in any apparent way. They refer to different alleged victims and different alleged offenders, they emanate from different times during the twenty year period under review, and they are alleged to have happened in different locations. In other words, no discernable pattern has been found in these cases.

Notwithstanding these five new cases, and the pre-existing separate investigations codenamed Enamel and Antelope (both of which relate to historic allegations of CSE), the conclusion of this major review is plain, and I quote from the report's conclusions:

'There is no evidence to suggest that any large scale systematic child sexual exploitation has been uncovered in Leicestershire'.

This level of reassurance has not come without expense. Operation Sepia has cost more than £60,000 and has involved many officers and specialist support staff from the Force and regional units. I think that this Panel will know that I am not slow to hold this Force to account. But, by the same token, I have a positive and trusting relationship with Chief Constable Simon Cole and his top team, none of whom has been associated with this Force area further back than 5 years. I am, therefore, satisfied that Assistant Chief Constable Roger Bannister and his team have conducted an appropriately full, wide-ranging, and comprehensive inspection into the available police records over the last twenty years.

Its conclusions, I am sure, will provide reassurance to you and to the public of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

Having examined the past, and acknowledging the live enquiries underway into allegations of historic CSE, I believe it is important to stress how much policing in Leicestershire has evolved over the last twenty years.

Crime recording over this time has progressed substantially and Leicestershire Police now has different processes in place to ensure that ethical crime recording is both expected and delivered. Additionally, the Force has continued to develop how it investigates CSE. Today, there are dedicated, multi-agency CSE teams specifically working to combat this crime type. There is also a Paedophile Online Investigation Team, a Missing from Home Team, and a Child Abuse Investigation Unit.

Looking forward, there are a number of important developments also in the pipe line:

- You will recall that at our last meeting I announced that I would be making available up to £2m of additional funds from reserves. This will be applied over the next two financial years specifically to facilitate greater partnership activity to combat crimes that threaten the most vulnerable in society, and in particular in tackling CSE. Bids for funding from this pot are hopefully going to be made shortly and assessed by the Strategic Partnership Board.*
- Next month, the Force will introduce Niche. This is a new crime recording system which will provide a single method of searching for crime and intelligence records and in this way further enhance the ability of officers to cross-refer, to highlight inter-connectivity, and to act upon issues of concern.*
- On March 4th the Home Secretary announced a package of measures to strengthen our fight against CSE, including making available £1m to be spent on a high profile, national publicity campaign to highlight the signs of CSE.*
- And on March 18th, the first ever National CSE day was held, whereby numerous agencies up and down the country sought to raise awareness of this most callous crime, to ensure greater reporting, and to excite more effective investigation. I know that Chief Constable Cole and his team are already well-seized with this imperative, but this is an area where we really must strain every sinew in order not to let our vulnerable youngsters down.*

In sum, Operation Sepia has provided some reassurance to me about the past. But there remains much work we must all do, in partnership, to safeguard today's generation and future generations of children.

For obvious legal reasons, I cannot elaborate on the new cases to be re-investigated or on Operations Antelope or Enamel. However, if there are any questions about Operation Sepia, I am happy to take them."

Arising from the discussion that took place in response to the PCC's statement, the following points were noted:

- The PCC suggested that, had there been any indication of any abuse within the 20 year window he had chosen which related to issues before that period, then he would have considered going further back into police records beyond this time frame. He felt that 20 years was a reasonable and proportionate window within which to investigate this issue further. He had significant reassurance that the*

records the Police had would advocate that there had not been the systematic problems such as had been found in Rotherham. The County Council made reference to reviews having been undertaken after the “Beck” case in Leicestershire. The timescale also related to the Rotherham report;

- The Review had examined police records. Had the Review identified cases where there was concern about the response of other agencies contact would have been made with them. The reinvestigation of the five cases would involve other agencies if the cases required this;
- The Panel raised the issue of the potential perception that there had been a lack of independence in carrying out the Review. The PCC had been concerned to make sure that the Force had not failed to act on issues it knew about. The Chief Constable felt that the Force had exactly the right expertise to be able to do a full and honest investigation;
- Prostitution, grooming and missing people were three specific areas looked at as part of the Review. A number of other keys search terms were also used in an effort to identify historic CSE cases. The Review had focused on young people up to the age of 18;
- The enquiries had been made into the relevant systems. It was not thought that there were other significant records held in other ways;
- The County Council considered that it was appropriate for the Force to investigate the five cases referred to. This would be done objectively and to a very high standard. Matters would be referred to the IPCC if appropriate.

RESOLVED:

That the statement from the Commissioner be noted.

127. Police and Crime Plan Thematic Update: Supporting Victims and Witnesses and Protecting the Vulnerable.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning a thematic update on the supporting victims and witnesses and protecting the vulnerable themes of the Police and Crime Plan. A copy of the report, marked “Agenda Item 8”, is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the item, the PCC reported the following:

- “Sentinel”, the multi-agency IT system for recording anti-social behaviour across the Force area was being run by the City Council until the end of year. The PCC funded a partnership officer who was looking at how the service could be further developed;
- Two bids had been received as a result of a tendering exercise for the operation of the Victims and Witnesses service. These bids had been received by Victim Support and Catch22 (who would work in partnership with Restorative Solutions). Catch22 were the preferred bidder. Leicestershire was the first Force area to have received more than one bid and this was the first time therefore that the contract had not been awarded to Victim Support;

Arising from the discussion, the following points were noted:

- Sentinel had been through a process of development for around seven years. A workshop was being held with partners to see how best the platform could be developed. The PCC reported that he was absolutely committed to making Sentinel work for the good of all partners;
- It was suggested that Community Safety Partnerships could play a more active role in commenting on the commissioning intentions of the PCC. The PCC offered to take this suggestion back to his colleagues to see how this could be developed.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

128. Communications and Engagement Update.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning an update on communications and engagement activity. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 9", is filed with these minutes.

Arising from a discussion, the following points were noted:

- Behaviour change was a key part of the Force's new engagement and communications strategy. It was hoped that this initiative would help to drive down priority crimes such as theft from cars;
- The "Rate Your Local Police" service had attracted national interest. The current average rating for the Force was 2.5 stars (out of 5). It was felt that this likely represented that those who encountered the police were most likely to go online to rate them if they had had a particularly good or bad experience. The service provided a useful mechanism through which key problems could be identified and tackled;
- An engagement event at Beaumont Leys Shopping Centre had enabled some 100 people to stop and speak to either the Chief Constable or the PCC. These events would continue to be held on an ad-hoc basis. It was felt that it would be helpful to have a follow up feedback exercise via the PCC's website to report responses to the issues raised at these events;
- The new Communications and Engagement team was being operated under a slightly reduced budget because one senior post had been removed from the structure. It was acknowledged that the number of posts may have increased;
- The responsibility for the shared service sat with the Force, under the control of the Chief Constable. The Deputy Chief Constable and the CEO for the PCC had responsibility for priority setting.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

129. Quarter 3 Performance Report.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner concerning an update on performance during quarter 3. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 10", is filed with these minutes.

Arising from the discussion, the following points were noted:

- The Panel had previously asked for a clearer and easier to understand version of the performance dashboard. It was noted that this would be looked at ahead of the next performance report;
- It was hoped that further information in terms of case studies and outcomes from the commissioning activity of the OPCC could be included in future reports. It was noted that a new performance post was being recruited to which would enable more of this type of work to take place;
- Satisfaction levels in regard to car crime had reduced. Cllr. Begy reported an incident in his local area where a police officer had told a victim of crime that the theft of a car would not be investigated any further. The PCC indicated that, with Cllr. Begy's assistance, he would look at this case further.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

130. Date of next meeting.

It was NOTED that the next meeting of the Panel would be held on 25 June at 1.00pm.

131. Urgent Item: Tony Greenwood - Apology.

The Panel considered the following matter, the Chairman having decided that it was of an urgent nature as a result of an anonymous complaint which had been received relating to a comment made by Cllr Tony Greenwood at the previous meeting of the Panel and the need to issue a public response in a timely manner.

In response to the complaint, Cllr. Greenwood delivered the following statement:

"As a result of a comment made by me at the last meeting of the Panel, I received a letter which was sent on an anonymous basis by a Special Constable asking me to apologise for using a remark which that person found to be disparaging, a copy of which was sent to the Commissioner.

May I take this opportunity to state quite clearly that I had no desire to personally offend the writer although I unequivocally stand by the views I expressed at the last panel meeting on frontline policing. I am happy to apologise if my choice of words has caused offence to the author of the letter."

The PCC thanked Cllr. Greenwood for delivering that statement. He further stressed the importance of volunteers to the future of the Force.

132. Urgent Item: David Morgan - Retirement.

The Panel considered the following matter, the Chairman having decided that it was of an urgent nature as a result of the need to thank David Morgan for his contribution to the Panel at the final meeting he would attend before retiring from his position of County Solicitor at the County Council.

The Chairman thanked David for his hard work in setting up the Panel in 2012 and his contribution to its work ever since. He also took the opportunity to wish David the very best for a long and happy retirement. The PCC added his thanks for David's honesty and willingness to do the right thing for all parties around the table.

David Morgan thanked the Panel for these comments and paid tribute to the work of the Democratic Services section of the County Council in supporting the Panel.

1.00 - 4.15 pm
23 March 2015

CHAIRMAN