

Minutes of a meeting of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Police and Crime Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Thursday, 20 December 2012.

PRESENT

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

Cllr. David Bill MBE	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Cllr. J. Boyce	Oadby and Wigston Borough Council
Cllr. Colin Golding	Harborough District Council
Miss. H. Kynaston	Independent Member
Col. R. Martin OBE, DL	Independent Member
Cllr. Trevor Pendleton	North West Leicestershire District Council
Cllr. Byron Rhodes	Melton Borough Council
Cllr. B. Roper	Rutland County Council
Cllr. Sarah Russell	Leicester City Council
Cllr. Lynn Senior	Leicester City Council
Cllr. D. Slater	Charnwood Borough Council
Cllr. Manjula Sood, MBE	Leicester City Council
Cllr. Paul Westley	Leicester City Council
Cllr. Ernie White	Blaby District Council

In attendance.

Sir Clive Loader – Police and Crime Commissioner

Chairman's Announcements.

The Chairman welcomed the newly appointed independent members of the Panel, Helen Kynaston and Colonel Robert Martin OBE, to their first meeting.

He also reported on a discussion at the recent meeting of the Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board regarding a suggestion that the Police and Crime Panel consider co-opting additional members from organisations such as the Combined Fire Authority, NHS and the Probation Trust: he had asked officers to look at this matter and report back to the next meeting of the Panel. At the same meeting, concerns that District Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) Chairmen were being overlooked in wider community safety discussions were raised and the Chairman was also asking officers to look into this matter and raised the possibility that members of the Panel should attend their local CSP, to provide regular updates on the work of the Panel.

The Chairman drew the attention of members of the Panel to the handover document that had been prepared by the outgoing Police Authority for the new Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), which could be viewed on the PCC's website: <http://www.leics-pa.police.uk/files/library/paper-a-legacy-report-police.pdf>.

9. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2012 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

10. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

11. Declarations of interest.

All members of Community Safety Partnerships declared non-pecuniary personal interests in all matters relating to those partnerships.

Mr J T Orson CC, Cllr T Pendleton, Cllr B Roper and Cllr S Russell all declared non-pecuniary personal interests as members of the Strategic Partnership Board.

Cllr M Sood declared a non-pecuniary personal interest as the Chairman of the Leicester Council of Faiths.

12. Police and Crime Plan and Budget Preparation for 2013/14.

Sir Clive Loader, the Police and Crime Commissioner, gave a presentation focusing on the preparation of the draft Police and Crime Plan 2013 – 2017. A copy of the presentation is filed with these minutes.

The Commissioner explained that the draft Plan had been prepared in the light of his manifesto and reflected the wishes, aspiration and expectations of the citizens of the Force area, while taking account of the national Strategic Policing Requirement. The Plan would include realistic, measurable targets against which his own performance, as well as that of the Police, could be measured. It would be a significant challenge to close the gap between projected spend and budget and the Commissioner hoped to be able to achieve much of this through internal efficiencies and through sharing activities and resources with other forces.

The following key points arose from discussion:

- i. There would be a large publicity campaign to raise awareness of the Plan, including the targets, once finalised.
- ii. The importance of retaining a visible presence in communities across the County was accepted and it was hoped to be able to maintain levels of uniformed officers (warranted, PCSO, or specials) through achieving efficiencies from elsewhere; however, this would be dependent on the availability of funding from a variety of streams, all of which would be under increasing pressure. A balance therefore had to be struck between ensuring the most efficient use of resources and the deterrent effect of visible local policing.
- iii. If necessary, outsourcing of services would be considered to free up resources to keep officers on the streets.
- iv. The force had a Change Board reviewing a range of initiatives to prepare it for future challenges, including a review of the use of information technology.

- v. The PCC would seek to reduce the diversion of officers to handle mental health and missing persons cases that could more properly be dealt with by other organisations.
- vi. It was important that partners avoided taking decisions in a vacuum, without considering the potential impacts that cuts in one area might have on other organisations.
- vii. Consultation would be carried out to ensure the priorities in the Police and Crime Plan took account of the priorities of the force's strategic partners. However, PCCs had only been given eight weeks within which to produce their first Police and Crime Plans, which did not allow time for a full consultation. It was intended to review and revise the Plan regularly, starting in the summer of 2013. It was suggested that a meeting of the Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board, supplemented by representatives from Leicester City and Rutland County Councils, could provide a useful opportunity for further discussion of joint priorities.
- viii. The PCC was aware that there was still much he had to get to grips with in relation to how the force operated, its performance and understanding the factors that impacted on performance across the County.
- ix. The City of Leicester was now the most diverse city in the country and therefore presented a unique policing challenge: it was suggested that the recent census figures could therefore be used to argue a case for increased funding for Leicestershire. It was noted that currently, Leicestershire loses out under the damping arrangements (whereby, if the pot of funding for all forces is not large enough, money is diverted from some forces to those with greater need).
- x. The intention to include measurable targets was welcomed. It was noted these would form one of the means by which the Panel could scrutinise the performance of the PCC.
- xi. The 41 PCCs across England and Wales could be a powerful voice when united in dealing with central government.

RESOLVED:

That the information now provided by the Police and Crime Commissioner be noted.

13. Police and Crime Commissioner's Remuneration Scheme and Code of Conduct.

The Panel considered the Police and Crime Commissioner's Remuneration Scheme and Code of Conduct, copies of which are filed with these minutes, marked B.

It was noted that a Register of Interests for the PCC had been published on the website: <http://www.leics.pcc.police.uk/Document-Library/Sir-Clive-Loader---Disclosable-Interests-Completed-Form.pdf>.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Commissioner's Remuneration Scheme and Code of Conduct be noted.

14. Arrangements for dealing with complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Panel considered a report of the County Solicitor on possible arrangements for handling complaints made against the Police and Crime Commissioner, the delegating of difference aspects of the procedure to be followed and the reporting to the Panel. A copy of the report, marked C, is filed with these minutes.

The following points arose in discussion:

- i. The legislation did not allow for any sanctions to be taken against a PCC.
- ii. It would be helpful if a simple diagram of the process could be produced and added to the Panel's webpage.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the Panel delegates authority to the County Solicitor to:
 - i. act as the first point of contact for complaints and that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman act as second or reserve points of contact;
 - ii. make decisions, in consultation with the Chairman of the Panel if appropriate, as to whether (1) a complaint has been made which requires resolution under the complaints procedures; (2) that complaint should be referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission; (3) the complaint should be subject to the informal resolution process; and (4) to make arrangements for the process of informal resolution;
 - iii. produce such further procedures, notes of guidance and forms as may be helpful to assist in the operation of the process and the provision of information to complainants;
 - iv. report to the Panel on the first meeting after the County Council elections in May 2013 on the operation of the complaints processes;
- b) that authority be delegated to the County Solicitor, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to:
 - i. resolve complaints informally, or
 - ii. arrange for a meeting of a sub-committee to be drawn from the full membership of the Police and Crime Panel, to resolve complaints informally.

15. Date of next meeting.

It was noted that the next meeting of the Panel would be at 10.00 am on Wednesday 30 January 2013.