

This matter is being dealt with by:

**Keith Ford**

Reference:

T 0115 9772590

E [keith.ford@nottsc.gov.uk](mailto:keith.ford@nottsc.gov.uk)

W [www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/thecouncil/democracy/partnerships/police-and-crime-panel](http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/thecouncil/democracy/partnerships/police-and-crime-panel)

## **Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Panel**

Mr Paddy Tipping  
Police and Crime Commissioner  
Arnot Hill House  
Arnot Hill Park  
Arnold  
NG5 6LU

cc Kevin Dennis, Chief Executive

8 February 2018

Dear Paddy

### **OUTCOME OF PANEL'S CONSIDERATION OF POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S PROPOSED PRECEPT AND BUDGET 2018/19**

I am writing to confirm the outcome of the Police and Crime Panel's consideration of your proposed precept at the Panel meeting of 7 February 2018.

As you are aware, 8 of the 10 Panel Members present supported your proposed precept increase of £11.97 for Band D properties, whilst the other 2 Members abstained.

Officers had supplied you initially with a number of queries relating to anomalies etc and Members would welcome a finalised response to those.

The Panel had also supplied you with a number of questions around the themes of budget management, risk management, impact for local residents, the new operating model and changing workforce, the Reserves Strategy and the Capital Programme to which you provided written responses to Members in advance of the meeting (appended to this letter). As ever, the timeliness of your response and the input of yourself and your officers into the previous budget workshop was appreciated by Members.

Within the meeting, you underlined the 'extra' £450 million funding which the Government was making available for policing (£330 million of which would go directly to Forces) and the increased limit, before a referendum was required, of precept increases to £12 for Band D properties. This grant settlement was for the next two years which also offered the Force greater certainty in its planning. You explained that if the proposed precept increase of £11.97 was agreed then this would result in an additional £4.5 million being available for Nottinghamshire Police, which would be used to maintain the level of Police Community Support Officers (200), increase the number of Police Officers by 80, mainstream the Knife Crime team and provide additional resource to address rural crime. With regard to the Capital Programme the proposed budget would also fund the planned Bridewell replacement, whilst discussions were ongoing with the Fire and Rescue Service and East Midlands Ambulance Service about exploring the potential for shared sites and costs.

During discussions, the Panel raised the following issues:-

- Members queried whether such a large increase in the precept was necessary in light of the budget underspend in 2017/18, the fact that you had been planning for potential reductions in government grant and the Government's concerns about Police reserves nationally.

In response, you highlighted the need to restore the previously depleted reserves to an increased level in line with recommended best practice. You also underlined that the increase would help fund the planned major capital works with the new Bridewell and improvement works at Force Headquarters, and meet the public's demand for more officers, which was raised on an ongoing basis throughout consultation.

The Chief Constable also underlined the Force's commitment to achieving efficiencies (such as the planned tri-emergency service base at Hucknall) and the additional resource from the precept increase which would also help to fund the mainstreaming of the Historical Abuse Team; the introduction of dedicated Schools Officers in each of the Neighbourhood Policing Teams and the maintenance of the number of officers working in Integrated Offender Management.

- Members welcomed the proposal to explore more joint working with other emergency services and queried whether there was scope to also co-locate the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC).

In response, you underlined your desire for any such co-location between the Police and Fire to result in genuine integration with a properly shared building and the two Command Teams working alongside each other. You feel that your key partners are actually local Councils and you would be keen to continue the co-location already introduced in West Bridgford, Beeston and Byron House in the City, with discussions underway with Bassetlaw District Council about co-locating the Police in the Council offices in Queens Buildings, Worksop. You also felt that any advantages and disadvantages of housing the OPCC more closely with the Force would need to be fully explored before such an approach was ever considered.

With regard to the plans in Bassetlaw, in response to Members' queries, you further clarified that the existing additional Police Officer that had been deployed in Worksop town centre would be complemented by 3 new PCSOs, with a further 2-3 Police Officers planned. The CID team would be based there and the Front Counter would be shared with the Council. Although the station would not be open 24 hours a day, access to the Police would continue to be available at any time of the day through telephone contact as currently.

- Members asked for clarification of the net amount of additional Police Officers which the precept increase would enable, referencing your existing plans to recruit more Officers anyway.

In response, you explained that if the grant settlement had been reduced then the total number of Police Officers had been projected as 1640. The realignment of structures to remove some of the layers of supervision and rebalance the level of Sergeants / Inspectors against the number of Officers would enable a further 60 police officers. You stated that at the start of your initial term as PCC, there were 1760 Police Officers, which had risen to 1850-60 today. The ultimate aim would be for 1940 FTE equivalent posts, which would equate to 2000 Officers including part-

time people. You also underlined that the nature of the recruitment process meant that costs were geared towards the medium term and that this was partly responsible for the budget underspend in 2017/18. You also underlined that this was a two year plan being worked to, in light of the Government grant settlement covering 2018-19 and 2019-20.

The Chief Constable added that additional resources would also be utilised to enable smarter working by Officers, including hand-held devices and improved technology to tackle cyber-crime such as paedophilia. The Chief Constable also underlined that this would be fresh blood into the organisation, with 200 new, if not additional, Officers on board.

- Further to your response to Question 2, Members underlined that the public will expect a visible increase in policing for their increased Council Tax payments.

You underlined that there is some debate about the most effective means of deploying officers. The Chief Constable underlined that deployment of officers is an operational decision but added that the newly recruited officers will initially be inducted around Neighbourhood Policing and Response so they would be immediately visible to the public. Members felt that, regardless of the issue of deployment, there was a recognised need for increased numbers overall.

- Further to your response to Question 8, Members underlined the need to increase representation from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities within the Force, particularly in relation to neighbourhoods with language issues.

In response, you reiterated the efforts which the Force had put into targeting recruitment from BME communities, with 12% of applicants in the most recent recruitment round coming from these communities. You invited Members to observe the recruitment events organised for that purpose. The planned apprentice Police Officer posts which would commence in September 2018 were the first of their kind nationally and it was hoped that this route could also be used to recruit more BME Police Officers.

- Further to your response to Question 9, Members queried what is being done to increase retention of officers, in light of the costs associated with recruiting replacements.

In response you said that the vast majority of Officers leave due to retirement and that there is no longer any benefit for them in working longer. You underlined that the reasons being given in exit interviews were echoed in other Forces nationally and are not specific to Nottinghamshire. The Chief Constable explained that the workforce profile would change with time and with people having to work longer in the future. The benefits of facilitating some retirements on the grounds of ill-health where officers were no longer able to undertake all aspects of the Police Officer role also had to be considered as appropriate.

- Further to your response to Question 10, Members requested further information around the resources dedicated to tackling cyber-crime and what that means in practice for local victims, and how that differs from the work being undertaken by Trading Standards.

You offered to arrange for a presentation to the Panel on this issue and underlined that perpetrators can be nationally and internationally-based, meaning that the Police response has to be national and cross-Force.

The Chief Constable clarified that Trading Standards concentrate on cyber-crime by companies rather than individuals and this accounts for a small proportion of all cyber-enabled crime. He clarified the much wider scope of cyber-enabled crime which the Police were tackling, including such issues as paedophilia, public protection, safeguarding, and preventative work in schools. The Force was also grappling with the greater use of technology within the traditional Criminal Justice System, including issues such as disclosure of evidence from mobile phones and social media.

- Some Members welcomed the spending proposals whilst recognising that the Government's reduction in public sector expenditure meant that Council Tax payers were having to cover some of the previously Government funded costs of services.

You agreed with this view and stated that the rise in the precept would be dwarfed by the overall increases in Council Tax proposed by Nottingham City Council and Nottinghamshire County Council. In response, Members underlined that although the increase by Councils was greater in terms of financial amounts, the percentage increase was likely to be smaller at 5% than the equivalent 6.5% increase you are proposing to the Police precept. Members also added that residents' incomes are not increasing by 6.5%.

- Members queried whether funding could be made available for the DARE drugs education programme in schools. You confirmed that you had previously contributed grant funding towards this and that discussions were underway around possible interfaces and overlaps between this work (which focussed on primary age children) and the work of the new Schools Officers, who would be concentrating on secondary schools.
- Further to your response to Question 12, Members reiterated the query as to why earmarked reserves were being increased when some of them do not appear to have been used often. You underlined the need to build up the Force's reserve base and your overall belief that the Police are over-reliant on Central Government grant compared to locally raised Council Tax.
- Members asked for a session with City Council officers and Members to clarify the reasons for the Bridewell replacement, the proposed solution and potential implications (whilst recognising that extensive discussions had taken place between the Police and the City Council, including around potential uses of the existing building by the Council or the courts). I suggested that any such session be progressed outside of the Panel.
- I fed in the views of Executive Mayor Kate Allsop to the meeting, underlining that she did not support the proposed precept increase due to its impact on residents in Mansfield, many of whom are already, or are close to, living in poverty.

In summary, the Panel overall supported your proposed increase in the precept.

Yours sincerely,



Christine Goldstraw OBE  
Chair of the Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Panel

## **Budget 2018-19 Police and Crime Panel Questions And Police and Crime Commissioner's Response**

### **Budget Management**

#### **1) In your opinion, how well has the budget been managed in 2017/18?**

**PCC Response:** Much better. Regular budget monitoring meetings take place throughout the year and the force is going to underspend against the budget. In addition the force has undertaken a detailed priority budget review last year to identify further efficiencies. This departmental review process will take place on an annual basis as part of the budget development process and identification of efficiencies.

#### **2) To what extent will the proposed budget deliver the required improvements in use of resources and force planning for the future highlighted in the PEEL Effectiveness inspection published in November 2017?**

**PCC Response:** We believe that the PCP question relates to the Legitimacy and Efficiency Inspection that was published last November. The HMIC report made five main recommendations for improvement. Detailed responses to the HMIC recommendations are reported to the Audit and Scrutiny panel. In response the force has developed a detailed delivery plan that focuses on: undertaking a training needs analysis for officers to improve succession planning, introducing a leadership programme for managers and aligning the forces financial plans with future demand and priorities. This has informed the development of the new police operating model, which seeks to invest in proactive neighbourhood policing, schools liaison, burglary reduction unit, working in partnership to improve mental health and growing the police officer numbers to 1940 FTE and 200 PCSOs. Following consultation the new policing model will be implemented on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018.

#### **3) Your update report elsewhere on the agenda refers to a projected 2017/18 year underspend of £2.365 million which would go some way to covering the amount which the proposed precept increase will generate. Therefore is there any need to raise the precept to such an extent? How else will this 2017/18 underspend be utilised?**

**PCC Response:** It is anticipated that the underspends will be slightly higher than the figure stated, but will be approximately 1% of total budget. This will be transferred to reserves to meet one-off capital expenditure as there are some major building works being planned over the next few years.

### **Risk Management**

#### **4) Does the Force have any existing contracts with Carillion or Capita? Can you please clarify the implications for the Force of the recent announcements about those companies or of any similar PFI arrangements which the force has in place?**

**PCC Response:** There are no contracts with Carillion. Capita provide accommodation and travel for the force and Office of Police and Crime Commissioner. In addition to some significant IT contracts such as our Command and Control system and telephony system. Capita is not assessed at greater risk than any other provider.

Command and Control system is due for replacement in the near future. Part of the tendering process will assess the financial stability of the businesses that apply.

**5) With reference to page 78 and page 116, how confident are you that regional collaboration with other forces is delivering more efficiencies than it costs Nottinghamshire residents?**

**PCC Response:** The force has a good history of collaboration across the region with other forces. The Commissioner chairs a regional resources board and acts as the lead PCC for the region and nationally on behalf of the APCC. It is now estimated that over £13.7 million of annual savings have been achieved when compared with the running costs prior to collaboration. This equates to 33% reduction in costs and over £70 million of cumulative savings.

### **Impact for Local Residents**

**6) What will residents actually get for their increased Council Tax payments?**

**PCC Response:** 80 extra police officer posts are attributed to the increase in council tax payments. This will specifically provide an increase in the number of officers in areas of Response, Neighbourhood, Public Protection and CID officers. There will be also an increase investment in rural crime, development of 'Crime Fighting Fund' to target known problems and to support partnership working. The additional investment in Public Protection will be to increase the number of officers dealing with cyber-crime and online grooming and sharing of images. In addition there will be investment in our custody suite provision with the building of a new Bridewell and in new technology to enable agile working for officers and staff and a new Command and Control system in the longer term. The increased income will ensure that the new policing model is affordable into the future.

**7) With reference to page 61 of the agenda pack and the number of new properties in the area, how much impact and how visible will any additional policing be?**

**PCC Response:** The new force operating model will see increased resources within response, neighbourhood policing, Public Protection and CID. It will also establish the Knife Crime Team as a force wide proactive capability targeting offending with knives, and create a dedicated City and County burglary team. The operating model will see a return to multiple locally based operating hubs and take account of the changing pattern of crime and threat, risk and harm. The increase in officer numbers will help ensure policing is visible on line and in the street across all areas of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire.

### **New Operating Model and Changing Workforce**

**8) With reference to pages 85-87, can you clarify how many additional officers the latest recruitment drive will actually deliver?**

**PCC Response:** In 2018/19 there will be 198 new recruits. It is planned that at the end of 2018/19, there will be 1,940 officers. There will be an increase of budgeted establishment of 80 officers, moving from 1860 operating model to 1940.

**9) The number of officers leaving the Force seems excessively high – what plans are in place to address this and improve retention?**

**PCC Response:** The force has experienced an increase in the number of officers leaving the service, this is a combination of an increase in leavers and high numbers of retirements due to recruitment drives in the 1980's. They are broadly in line with national averages.

Exit interviews are conducted with those leaving the service, with the answers and feedback monitored to identify trends in addition to individual issues. There have been no local trends identified, however it is believed that national changes to terms and conditions, specifically pensions, has made a huge impact on retention of officers.

**10) You have regularly updated the Panel on the changing nature of crime and demand – what proportion of the overall additional funding of £4.5m in 2018/19 will be used to specifically tackle online crime and historical abuse?**

**PCC Response:** Op Equinox includes a dedicated team to investigate historical abuse and under the new operating model this team will be mainstreamed. The changes to the force operating model allocates specific resources to the tackling of online dependent and enabled crime, such as a dedicated Detective Chief Inspector of Cybercrime and Fraud, and Graduate PIOs allocated to cyber-crime. Due to the nature of policing, the total of staffing costs allocated to online dependent and enabled crime is £3.6 million within the new structure. In addition to staffing investment there is also an investment in technology such as mobile device download kiosks that will enable front line officers an efficient access to the data stored on devices, such as mobile phones.

**11) In light of the need to employ people in different roles to address online crime and improve proceeds of crime confiscation rates, why are the Police Staff numbers predicted to reduce rather than increase over the course of the year?**

**PCC Response:** within the budget there is a reduction of 11 police staff posts this is due to the adjustment of temporary posts there were created to manage the change in the operating model. Under the previous operating model the number of police officers were lower and as such there was a higher number of PIOs. However due to the recruitment lag the PIO numbers were kept temporarily higher to ensure a smooth transition and service to the public. 2018/19 will see these posts removed.

New entry systems are being introduced, such as Graduate PIOs for cyber and Public Protection; these are temporary posts as it is anticipated that those individuals will then transfer into officer posts as the scheme develops. It is anticipated that the core number of police staff will be 1140, which is an increase from the current position when vacancies are removed.

### **Reserves Strategy**

**12) Page 116 – a number of the earmarked reserves pots have increased since 2017 (e.g. MTFP, PCC Reserve, Grants & Commissioning, Property Act Fund, Revenue Grants, Night Time Levy) – were all of these reserve pots utilised in 2017-18?**

**PCC Response:** The MTFP, PCC and Revenue Grants reserves are reducing in 2017-18 and new reserves for Asset replacement and IT investment are being

created. The biggest proportion of the Revenue Grants Reserve relates to the Road Safety Partnership and there is currently a review underway on how this partnership is governed and funding utilised. The Night Time Levy has now developed business case and consulted upon with partners.

These reserve pots are utilised when the risk arises and this can be at any point over the medium term or not at all. For example in recent years specific risk relating to A19 were included in the earmarked reserves. This risk has not materialised and so the amount earmarked is being set aside for other risks.

## **Capital Programme**

**13) Page 123 – Bridewell replacement - Members who attended the recent tour of the Bridewell recognise that the building is no longer fit for purpose. Could you clarify the actual projected cost of the replacement and in light of the current building's problems, the anticipated potential receipt expected from the sale of the building and/or the land?**

**PCC Response:** The estimated cost of a new Bridewell is £15.750m. Any capital receipt will not materialise until after the new build is operational. The potential receipt was estimated at £250k in 2016. The existing Bridewell is adjacent to the Magistrates courts. Discussion has taken place with the courts service to see if they have any interest in the building.

**14) The Capital Programme does not make any reference to possible partnership arrangements with the Fire and Rescue Service – to what extent do you think such arrangements could have an impact in this regard?**

**PCC Response:** There is currently a review underway of property held by Police, Fire and EMAS with a view to increased collaboration. In addition to this a specific piece of work has been commissioned in relation to Fire and Police. This budget does include some major capital expenditure for police buildings, which could be utilised or re-prioritised. The Fire Service would include elements within its own capital programme to fund its element of any joint plans.

**15) The latest Forward Plan of Decisions of Significant Public Interest appended to your Update Report now includes the cost for the new training centre at Force Headquarters of £10,549.621. Why does this not feature in the Capital Programme whilst the issues planned for approval at a later date (Bridewell replacement, Hucknall Police Station, Worksop Police Station) are included?**

**PCC Response:** This has yet to be finalised and will be included with any plans for co-location with Fire following the review currently being commissioned. Within the capital programme there is an amount for a new control room – this is the same building works.