

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Monday, 8 September 2025.

PRESENT

Cllr. Les Phillimore (in the Chair)

Cllr. Liz Blackshaw  
Cllr Sharon Butcher  
Cllr. Elly Cutkelvin  
Cllr. Bhupen Dave  
Mr. D. Harrison CC

Cllr. Michael Mullaney  
Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE  
Cllr. Christine Wise  
Cllr. Darren Woodiwiss  
Cllr. Andrew Woodman

In attendance

Rupert Matthews – Police and Crime Commissioner  
Charlotte Chirico - Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner  
Claire Trewartha – Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

13. Minutes of the previous meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2025 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

14. Public Question Time.

There were no questions submitted.

15. Urgent Items

There were no urgent items for consideration.

16. 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.

Cllr. M. Sood declared a Non-Registerable Interest in Agenda Items 6 and 7 as she was a member of the Violence Reduction Network.

17. Update on Panel Membership.

The Panel considered a report of the Director of Law and Governance at Leicestershire County Council which outlined a change to panel membership and confirmed that membership reflected the requirements for precise political balance. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 5', are filed with these minutes.

The Panel noted that on 5 August 2025, Harborough District Council notified the Director of Law and Governance at Leicestershire County Council that it had reviewed its appointment and had appointed Cllr Woodiwiss of the Green Party, rather than Cllr Knight of the Labour Party. The change in appointment by Harborough District Council

meant that membership of the Police and Crime Panel now reflected the requirements for precise political balance.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That a change to panel membership meant that Police and Crime Panel met the requirements for precise political balance, and no further steps be taken.
- (b) That Schedule 1 of the Constitution should be amended to reflect the Panel's current membership as four Conservative members, three Labour members, three Liberal Democrat members, one Reform member, one Green member, and one Independent member.

18. Police and Crime Commissioner's Annual Report 2024/25.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which presented a draft of his Annual Report 2024/25. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 6', is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the report, the PCC highlighted consultations he had undertaken with the public regarding the Police and Crime Plan and on the Policing Precept. He emphasised that he believed the current police funding formula to be unfair and that this left Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland disadvantaged compared to other areas. The PCC said that he continued to lobby the government for a review of the formula. The PCC thanked his Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC), Chief Finance Officer and other staff within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) for their work over the year. He also placed on record his thanks to the Violence Reduction Network and Community Safety Partnerships for the work they had undertaken over the year.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

- (i) With regards to finance, the PCC stated that the OPCC and Chief Constable had undertaken work in order to reduce costs whilst minimising the impact on service delivery. There had been no reduction in the number of police officers as a result of this work and the Force continued to manage any turnover in terms of police officers. However, the Force had reduced in size by removing 91 police staff roles and 50 PCSOs, with a further 35 needing to be removed in order to balance the budget for 2025/26. The Chairman raised concern that the Force was facing a £9.2 million deficit despite an increase in the Government Grant for Policing. The PCC assured the Panel that the Force would be financially sustainable over the next four-year period, within the current Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). However, a deficit position was likely to be reached towards the end of the MTFP period. This would place the Force in a challenging position financially. Any further efficiencies would place the Force in a vulnerable position in terms of service delivery. However, both the PCC and Chief Constable would undertake work in order to minimise the impact on frontline service delivery in order to ensure public safety. The Government's Budget was expected on 26 November 2025, but it remained unclear how policing would be impacted as a result. In light of continued concerns around the funding position, the PCC agreed that he would request that the DPCC work with the Panel to draft a letter for the Home Secretary, emphasising concerns relating to the Policing Funding Formula.

- (ii) A question was raised relating to a workforce planning exercise which the PCC had requested the OPCC to undertake. The PCC stated that the exercise had been carried out at the beginning of the current financial year in order to ensure that the OPCC was structured to be able to discharge the legislative requirements of a PCC plus the key policy areas that the Commissioner required at that time. The information had been included within a previous report on the policing precept, considered by the Panel on 5 February 2025. The PCC agreed to provide the Panel with a copy of the report following the meeting.
- (iii) Concern was raised regarding some of the wording used within the Annual Report regarding consultation and commissioning work. Concern was also raised relating to performance data not being clear in terms of progress achieved over a given period. Members of the Panel suggested that information and messaging needed to be clearer for members of the public so that responsibilities relating to work undertaken and associated outcomes could be fully understood. The PCC assured the Panel that he would ensure clarity within his Annual Report.
- (iv) With regards to community engagement relating to public safety, concern was raised regarding a review by the Force relating to arrangements for Diwali celebrations in Leicester. The PCC stated that a decision had been made by the local Safety Advisory Group to scale back elements of the celebrations on the grounds of serious concerns relating to public safety. The PCC stated that he had discussed the issue with the Chief Constable who had provided assurances that the Force remained fully committed to working with partners and communities to ensure that the celebrations were safe and successful.
- (v) A question was raised regarding the number of police officers who were trained in the use of tasers. The Panel member asked the question with regards to concern relating to public safety and the safety of police officers. The PCC stated that all police officers were offered training on the use of a taser and would be provided with one upon completion of the training. However, the training of, and use of, tasers could not be mandated by either the Force or the PCC.

#### RESOLVED:

- (a) That the contents of the draft Annual Report 2024/25, be noted.
- (b) That the Police and Crime Commissioner be requested to provide a copy of a report which outlined details of a workforce planning exercise, as referenced within the Annual Report.
- (c) That the Police and Crime Commissioner be requested to request that the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner undertake work with the Panel to draft a letter for the Home Secretary, emphasising concerns relating to the Policing Funding Formula.

#### 19. Police and Crime Commissioner's Update.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which provided an overview of his work or the work of his Deputy and office throughout April 2025 to July 2025 (Quarter 1 2025/26). A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 7', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

- (i) A question was asked with regards to outcomes of the work undertaken by Turning Point. The OPCC contracted a drug and alcohol Out of Court Resolution (OOCR) offer through Turning Point, which provided Alcohol Treatment Requirements (ATR) and Drug Rehabilitation Requirements (DRR) as an alternative to sentencing in order to engage offenders in treatment services. The PCC agreed to present a report to the Panel in relation to the work undertaken by Turning Point, at a future meeting.
- (ii) With regards to a graph of the Violence Reduction Network (VRN) illustrating headline performance for serious violence, which continued to show a downward trend, it was suggested that national and regional data set alongside the data would provide some additional context in order to fully understand the impact of work undertaken by the VRN in reducing serious violence locally.
- (iii) The report outlined that the PCC would present to the Panel a set of metrics measuring the impact of the overall Police and Crime Plan at the meeting on 27 October 2025, and every meeting thereafter. It was noted that a comprehensive level of data would be included so that the Panel could fully assess progress made against these metrics.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the overview of work undertaken by the Police and Crime Commissioner, or the work of his Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner and Office, throughout April 2025 to July 2025 (Quarter 1 2025/26), be noted.
- (b) That the Police and Crime Commissioner be requested to present a report to the Panel in relation to the work undertaken by Turning Point, at a future meeting.

## 20. Public Disorder.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which outlined how he was fulfilling his duty by contributing to national and international policing capabilities set out by the Home Secretary, bringing together community safety and criminal justice partners to ensure local priorities and joined up and holding the Chief Constable to account for the policing of large-scale public disorder. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 8', is filed with these minutes.

In introducing the report, the PCC stated that although some elements of public disorder strategy remained confidential, he discussed the issue with the Temporary Chief Constable on a regular basis and had received assurances that the Force was prepared with the capability, capacity and equipment to be able to deal with policing of large-scale public disorder efficiently and effectively.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

- (i) The Chairman stated that reports which made reference to the Chief Constable should make it clear that there was currently a Temporary Chief Constable. In April 2025, David Sandall commenced the role of Temporary Chief Constable, following the retirement of Rob Nixon.

- (ii) Concern was raised regarding the potential for occurrences of public disorder within neighbouring population areas to extend into Leicestershire. The PCC assured the Panel that regional mobilisation arrangements were in place through the East Midlands Regional Information Coordination Centre (EMRICC) and national mobilisation arrangements were in place through the National Police Coordination Centre (NPoCC). Assistant Chief Constable Adam Streets acted as Regional Mobilisation Lead (RML) and represented the East Midlands on all such national mobilisations as well as managing the EMRICC on behalf of the region. It was noted that some officers from the Force had supported Essex Police with public disturbances which had taken place within Epping in July.
- (iii) The PCC stated that not all police officers were trained to respond to public disorder. In order to ensure there was adequate resource available to respond to public disorder, the PCC assured the Panel that shift patterns were well managed by the Force to ensure that a sufficient response to instances of public disorder could be put into place at any given time. In addition to this, regional and national mobilisation arrangements were utilised across police force areas to assist with any shortfalls in resource. The PCC had discussed long-term effects of long periods of low-level public disorder which could disrupt shift patterns and cause officers involved to become tired over extended periods of time. The Chief Constable had provided assurances that work was being undertaken in order to identify a solution to this risk.
- (iv) In response to a question relating to early decision making regarding public disorder, the PCC stated that police officers on the scene were responsible for calming instances of unrest and gathering intelligence. Intelligence would be passed to senior officers in order for a decision to be made regarding whether additional resources or interventions were required. The PCC stated that the force had taken significant learning from previous operational debriefs and evaluated the value of assigning investigative oversight during the early planning phases.
- (v) With regards to investigating social media in order to identify risk of unrest, the PCC stated that the Force did not routinely monitor social media but provided assurance that the Force did investigate large scale concerns which could lead to public unrest and would put measures in place as necessary.
- (vi) A concern was raised by a member of the Panel relating to an instance whereby a community group had attempted to make urgent contact with the Temporary Chief Constable regarding a community event but had not received a prompt response. The PCC agreed to speak with Temporary Chief Constable regarding response times for communications from community groups.
- (vii) A member of the panel had been contacted by a resident who was concerned around the risk of potential unrest in their area. The panel member asked what messaging the PCC had published in order to provide the public with reassures regarding potential unrest. The PCC stated that nothing had been published by him or by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC). He assured the Panel member that he would discuss the matter with his communications team within the OPCC and respond to the panel member accordingly.

#### RESOLVED:

- (a) That the contents of the report on public disorder, be noted.

- (b) That the PCC be requested to speak with the Temporary Chief Constable regarding response times for communications from community groups.
- (c) That the PCC be requested to discuss public messaging regarding potential public unrest with his communications team within the OPCC.

*Mr. D. Harrison left the meeting at 15:25 and did not return.*

## 21. Section 106 Update.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which provided an update 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. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 9', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

- (i) The Chairman suggested that a more consistent approach across planning authorities could be introduced in order to overcome variability of interpretation relating to Section 106 rules. The Force's approach to section 106 for each of authority differed dependent on specific need, but consisted of regular operational, tactical and strategic level meetings. The PCC confirmed that this work was being undertaken by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC).
- (ii) A question was raised by a Panel member regarding Leicester City appearing to have no Section 106 funds spent or outstanding. The PCC stated that historically, the police and Leicester City Council had not worked together to pursue proposals for contributions. Assurance was provided that a Section 106 Officer was place within the Force. The Section 106 Officer had made contact with the planning department within Leicester City Council and proposals would be pursued.
- (iii) A panel member stated that the data provided within the report relating to the total spent and the amount outstanding for Charnwood Borough Council differed to the information held within the Authority. The PCC stated that his Chief Finance Officer would contact the member to discuss the matter.
- (iv) A question was raised regarding whether section 106 agreements were subject to viability assessments in terms of the risk that they could decline in the future and be more difficult to secure. The PCC stated that he expected that Section 106 agreements would be harder to secure in the future. As developers made reduced profits on housing developments due to rising costs, they often became more challenging regarding what they were prepared to provide section 106 contributions for. The OPCC would continue to undertake work with planning authorities in order to maximise the available opportunities for Section 106 agreements.
- (v) The Chairman stated that it would be important for developers, Section 106 officers, the OPCC, the Force, and councillors to maximise the opportunities for section 106 agreements and that agreements should be flexible in terms of what they could be allocated towards.

- (vi) It was noted that the Force ensured that section 106 bids were compliant with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

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 request that his his Chief Finance Officer contact the member for Charnwood Borough Council to discuss Section 106 funds for Charnwood.

22. Police Funding Formula.

The Panel considered a report of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) which outlined issues with the current Police Funding Formula and the impact it had on Leicestershire Police. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 10', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

In introducing the report, the PCC stated that he believed the current Police Funding Formula was not fit for purpose and should be reviewed by the Government. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) stated that the formula was reliant on 2005 census data. In addition to this, the formula did not account complexities of Leicestershire in terms of the transient population as a result of the number of universities in the County, as well as the number of prisons within the County. Issues with the Police Funding Formula had been raised with successive governments by the Panel, the PCC, and the Force.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

- (i) A Panel member emphasised that public services in Leicestershire continued to be underfunded, in terms of local authorities, the police, and the fire service. He stated that levels of funding for public services in Leicestershire did not reflect the requirements of the County's growing population or increasing expectations from Government in terms of delivering public services.
- (ii) A question was raised regarding whether it was possible to disaggregate data which related to offenses which were committed within the prison population from data relating to crimes which were committed within the community. Concern was raised that crime data for the Harborough District was often skewed as it included offences committed in prisons within the District. A similar concern was raised regarding other specific areas which caused a skew in local data. The DPCC stated that she would investigate the possibility of this and provide the data if possible.
- (iii) In response to a question raised regarding the position of Government on a review of the funding formula, the PCC stated that the position was unclear. Government had provided some assurance that the concerns were fully understood, but no timeframe or context for a review had been provided. Members of the Panel were encouraged to

## RESOLVED:

- (a) That the contents of the report which outlined issues with the current Police Funding Formula and the impact it had on Leicestershire Police, be noted.
- (b) That the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner be requested to investigate whether it was possible to disaggregate data which related to offenses which were committed within the prison population, and other specific areas, from data relating to crimes which were committed within the local community, and provide the Panel with the data if possible.

23. Date of next meeting.

## RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of Police and Crime Panel would be held on 22 September 2025 at 14:00.

2.00 - 3.58 pm  
08 September 2025

CHAIRMAN