

Budget Questions

General

1. You are proposing an increase of £13.95 (4.9%) for a Band D property. Do you have any indication what other Commissioners have proposed and how your proposed increase compares?

As I understand it most PCCs are in the position of increasing their council tax by the full amount. The PCC precept referendum threshold of £14 for 2025-26 was announced on 28 November 2024. In December the Minister said '*this strikes the balance between protecting taxpayers and providing funding for police forces*'.

The proposals of the surrounding counties are in the table below.

Proposed 2025/26 council tax increases:

PCC	Increase £	Increase %	Band D £
Lincolnshire	TBC		
Derbyshire	14.00	5.0	293.60
Leicestershire	14.00	4.9	300.23
Northants	14.00	4.6	320.04
Humberside	13.99	5.0	293.59
Sth Yorks	14.00	5.6	265.04
Notts	13.95	4.9	296.10

2. You carried out a consultation with residents on the basis of a proposed £10 increase in the Precept. How will residents benefit from a further increase of £3.95?

My consultation with residents asked them to consider a range of scenarios from zero up to £20, not just £10. Additional funding has enabled the short-term maintenance of services at current standards and allowed for some investment in technology to reduce future cost pressures. As can be seen from the draft MTFP significant savings or service reductions will be required in future years, without this additional precept support these would be significantly higher, especially towards the later years of the projection.

Specific information on what is included in the 2025-26 draft budget is in agenda item 4, Appendix 1.

3. Across all areas in Nottinghamshire, the main reason given for not supporting an increase in the precept was the rising cost of living. How have you taken account of the impact the proposed increase will have on Council Taxpayers?

The cost per week to households has been given serious consideration by the PCC. As shown in the table below, approximately 60% of Nottinghamshire's households fall into Council Tax Bands A and B so, for most households in Nottinghamshire, the rise is 21p per week or less, so less than £1 per month.

I understand that some respondents to the consultation did not support an increase and cited the cost of living as a reason, which was to be expected, however the majority did support the increase, and some supported a higher increase than my proposal. I am conscious of the service impact for taxpayers of Nottinghamshire if the increase is not maximised, not only in the 2025-26 budget, but in future years if that increase is not built into the base. I have taken a decision based on the budget proposals put forward by the Chief Constable for policing service levels to be maintained and improved for the people of Nottinghamshire.

Precept Impact: £13.95 Band D Council Tax

Increase of £13.95 raises £6.2m incl. increased tax base as at 30 January

Council Tax Band	Proportion of Band D	2024/25 Council Tax	£13.95 Annual Increase to Band D	Proposed 2025/26 Council Tax	% increase	Pence per week increase
A	6/9	£188.10	£9.30	£197.40	4.9%	£0.18
B	7/9	£219.45	£10.85	£230.30	4.9%	£0.21
C	8/9	£250.80	£12.40	£263.20	4.9%	£0.24
D	9/9	£282.15	£13.95	£296.10	4.9%	£0.27
E	11/9	£344.85	£17.05	£361.90	4.9%	£0.33
F	13/9	£407.55	£20.15	£427.70	4.9%	£0.39
G	15/9	£470.25	£23.25	£493.50	4.9%	£0.45
H	18/9	£564.30	£27.90	£592.20	4.9%	£0.54

Approx. 60% of Nottinghamshire households



4. In Para 2.6 of Appendix 1 the Police and Crime Commissioner states that he has written to the Home Secretary and the Minister of State for Crime, Policing and Fire expressing his views on the provisional grant settlement 2025/26. What were the main points raised in his letter?

The main points were:

- Highlighting the budget gap in 2025-26 following the provisional settlement.
- Requesting sight of the specific details and conditions attached to the Neighbourhood Policing grant, and that officer numbers be measured once per annum at 31 March, rather than twice per annum as they are currently.
- Noting the continued level of specific and ringfenced grants, requesting that they be secured into the core grant baseline.
- Highlighting that legacy council tax freeze grants amount have remained static since the initial allocation over a decade ago.

- Asking that consideration is given to providing capital grant to forces in the future.
- Requesting a multi-year funding settlement approach in the next spending review period.
- Welcomed the precept flexibility but pointed out the increasing burden borne by the local taxpayer. Making the point that the promised Formula Funding Review has not happened.
- Highlighting the continuing special grant request for the NUH Maternity Investigation.

5. Has an equality impact assessment been carried out on the budget proposals and their anticipated outcome? What assurances can you give that the proposals will not adversely impact groups with specific protected characteristics?

With reference to PCC commissioning, an “Equalities Impact Assessment” is completed as part of all new commissioning activity. The EIA considers the impact of spend proposals against every protected characteristic. In addition, for services that go out to tender, there is always a scored question relating to equalities and how the bidder intends to ensure that the service is accessible to all Nottinghamshire’s diverse communities.

With reference to Chief Constable activities, an “Equalities Impact Assessment” is completed as part of all new areas of work. The EIA considers the impact of spend proposals against every protected characteristic. In addition, for services that go out to tender, there is always a scored question relating to equalities and how the bidder intends to ensure that the service is accessible to all Nottinghamshire’s diverse communities. There are no significant changes or new activities included in the budget proposals, which are mainly centred on maintaining current service, improving efficiency, and the replacement of capital items at the end of useful life.

6. Can you provide the taxbase per District/Borough/City multiplied by the proposed Band D Council Tax to show the Council Tax requirement by area?

As at 30/01/2025 the position is as follows:

Local Council	2025/26 Council Tax Requirement
	£
Ashfield	10,269,547.47
Bassetlaw	11,372,460.75
Broxtowe	10,531,752.90
Gedling	11,744,587.39
Mansfield	9,265,057.83
Newark & Sherwood	12,649,587.43
Nottingham City	21,041,458.20
Rushcliffe	14,144,637.78
Total	101,019,089.75

Workforce

7. Can you provide clarification on the current Police Officer establishment and the anticipated establishment in 2025-26? Can you provide a breakdown of the age and service profile of the current establishment and that anticipated for 2025-26? Is any information available on the number of Police Officers that need to be redirected from operational duties to supervise/mentor new recruits?

In 2024-25 the Police Officer establishment is a headcount of 2,378 plus 30 which is for an additional uplift which totals 2,408. In 2025-26 this is planned to continue at this rate.

Service and Age Profile is below:

Service	%
Less than 5 years	34.2%
5-10 years	19.7%
10-15 years	7.1%
15 - 20 years	12.8%
20-25 years	19.5%
25-30 years	6.3%
30 years and over	0.4%
Grand Total	100%

Age Band	%
Under 26	13.2%
26-40	45.7%
41-55	39.7%
Over 55	1.4%
Grand Total	100.0%

The number of police officers who have the skill of being a tutor is 451, this includes those who are PIP2 tutors, (120). Operational Officers are not redirected to supervise/mentor new recruits they undertake tutoring in their operational capacity.

8. An increase in the police staff establishment vacancy factor to 6.50% is proposed for 2025/26 compared to 4.75% for 2024/25. What is the current vacancy factor? What is the anticipated impact of this increase upon performance levels? Can assurances be given that the demands placed upon existing staff are to be carefully monitored and support provided where necessary? Will specific Police staff functions, e.g. 101 call handling, be protected or is the increased vacancy factor intended to be applied across the board?

The budgeted vacancy factor for 2024-25 is 4.75% and we continue to see that in actual terms we run higher than this. As of December 2024, the actual vacancy rate was 6.51% so the proposed 6.5% in 2025-26 feels realistic and wouldn't impact on performance levels. This vacancy rate is broadly the same across all the East Midlands regional forces.

The increase is reflected across the force but as mentioned above the proposal is aligning to what we are currently witnessing. Functions such as the Control

Room still performing as one of the best in country in percentage of 999 calls answered within 10 seconds, but as a critical service this is monitored on an ongoing basis by senior management.

We will continue to monitor any impact this has on wellbeing on existing staff and from a welfare and support perspective within in the wider force there are many initiatives run by the People Services' team and within departments (such as wellbeing ambassadors in each department), these are targeted at mental health support, access to GPs, physical health as well as financial wellbeing.

Revenue Budget

9. Further to 1.2 of Appendix A to Appendix 1, do we now have the Nottingham City Council taxbase data? If so, was this in line with the estimate?

This was received on 30 January 2025. It was more than the estimated figure, so the provisional overall taxbase increase is 1.5%. Conversely the collection fund position is 85% less than last year, and less than we had provisionally included in the potential budget balancing table. The net impact is shown below:

Amount of additional precept compared to draft budget	£0.300m
Less: Additional assumed amount of Collection Fund Surplus included in possible budget balancing	(£0.260m)
Net increase	£0.040m

10. In para 5.4 of Appendix 1 reference is made to a number of specific grants that are to continue in 2025/26. Could the funding to be received from each of these be provided?

The information is provided in table below, you will note that the VRP funding amount is yet to be confirmed; the PCC will be underwriting this from the Grants & Commissioning Reserve if we do not know by the time the budget is set.

Government Department	Grant	2024-5	2025-6	Difference	Note
		£	£	£	
MoJ	Victim Services Grant	1,354,866	1,298,245	-56,622	Shortfall to be drawn from PCC reserves
MoJ	Victims "top up" funding	1,489,341	1,489,341	0	
MoJ	Sexual Violence Test Area	413,856	413,856	0	
Home Office	Children Affected by Domestic Abuse (CADA)	409,408	409,408	0	
Home Office	Domestic Abuse Perpetrator	355,000	353,301	-1,699	Shortfall can be absorbed
Home Office	Violence Reduction Grant	1,121,689	TBC	-1,121,689	
Total		5,144,160	3,964,150	-1,180,010	

11. How much investment income is anticipated in 2025-26, and how much expenditure on borrowing (MRP) and interest is anticipated?

Investment income is estimated to be £2.1m, interest expenditure is £1.6m, and an MRP of £2.9m.

12. With regard to the robustness of the estimates, what confidence do you have around assumptions for the rate of general inflation (2% for 2025/26) and any increased burden of energy costs? Are you confident that you have allowed for all inflation increases (e.g. energy, costs of materials)? Has an attempt to undertake a sensitivity analysis of the estimates (e.g. what would be impact if the pay award was 1% higher or lower than the estimate etc?) been made and, if so, why is this not included in the report.

We use best professional judgement in setting annual budgets and factor in an element of volatility. This includes looking at market trends, gathering data from the Office of National Statistics and liaising with our counterparts in the region. We expect inflation to level out over the coming years and this is reflected in our MTFP assumptions.

With regards to the 1% movement in pay, this would be equivalent to just over £1m and if needed we would mitigate this by finding savings in year and within our existing envelope. We do note that in the past 2 years where the pay award is above the nationally budgeted amount the Home Office have provided some support in year for these costs, and this approach is expected to continue in our risk assessment. When we set our pay award rate we do comparisons with other

forces, and ours at 2% as far as we are aware is in line with others. This is also the figure also used for collaboration activities where the accountable bodies are other Forces in the region.

Assumptions have been presented and discussed at the PCC's Planning and Efficiency Group (PEG) meetings during the autumn as part of the budget build process. See also the CFO assessment of the budget proposals for further information.

13. In 2025/26 you are hoping to achieve £4.9m in efficiency savings. To give the Panel confidence please can you set out how you have performed against your efficiency targets in the previous three years.

The efficiencies achieved over the past 3 years equate to £13.3m, with £5.2m of that in 2024-25. In each of those years the force has achieved an underspend against budget and delivered reductions in excess of the relevant year's efficiency targets. This demonstrates that the force is well equipped to manage their budgets and efficiencies effectively, although it is recognised that this becomes more challenging each year.

14. How has the £1.7m efficiency proposed for 2025/26 arising from a lower minimum revenue provision (MRP) charge arisen? Is this in respect of a timing issue regarding the financing of capital expenditure with the impact to be met in future years?

MRP charges in previous years were higher than the statutorily required minimum and in addition significant direct revenue financing was made from available underspends:
Historic DRF

Direct Revenue Financing (DRF)	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
DRF	239	10,860	4,107	4,585	5,927	25,718

It was deemed prudent to reduce the capital financing requirement, thus negating the need to borrow at times when the underlying borrowing rates were higher than the expected norm.

MRP is expected to increase throughout the MTFP due to the level of borrowing expected to be required to finance the capital programme, especially if no capital grant is provided to PCCs.

15. Some of the proposed efficiencies (e.g. lower gas and electricity charges) may not be realised due to a range of different factors such as global events. What mitigations do you have should such efficiencies not be achieved?

Gas and Electricity can be affected by many global factors however we have reviewed this activity in 2024-25 and realised a saving in year and used this evidence to include a prudent budget for 2025-26. It is also recognised that pricing in this area is perhaps more stable now than in previous periods.

The majority of efficiency savings are in the Chief Constable's budget and in the instance that we thought there was a possibility of efficiency savings not being met, then we would expect the Chief Constable to identify alternative in year savings as this is part of good budget monitoring practise.

16. What is the anticipated impact of the proposed efficiency savings for 2025/26 upon performance levels? For example, the proposed £0.5m reduction in overtime.

Efficiency savings are already factored into departmental budgets and activity, so are not in addition to that expected, this should mean that performance levels will not be negatively affected.

In relation to the £0.5m reduction in overtime it is an appropriate challenge to a budget of more than £9m, and we know that our expenditure here tends to be higher than those in our most similar comparator group, however performance and delivery impact will be monitored during the year. Also, as more of the officers that were recruited through the Uplift Programme become more experienced, we would expect to see gains from being able to reduce overtime.

The majority of efficiency savings are in the Chief Constable's budget and in the instance that we thought there was a possibility of efficiency savings not being met, again we would expect the Chief Constable to identify alternative in year savings. Regular budget monitoring would highlight any issues.

17. One of the proposed efficiencies for 2025/26 is a saving of £0.4m from uniform replacement costs and reduced IT system costs. Is there a Procurement Strategy?

There is a Procurement Strategy within force and the Procurement Team is expected to drive out savings and efficiencies through the procurement process, with a good track record of success. Performance is monitored both locally and at a national level via Bluelight Commercial, with data routinely reported to the Home Office.

The £0.4m quoted in uniform is already an identified efficiency saving that is factored into the proposed 2025-26 budget as a result of actual savings achieved in the current year.

18. What contingency plans do you have if the budgeted efficiency savings are not delivered? How is the implementation of these efficiency savings to be monitored and reported?

The efficiency savings are already factored into departmental budgets and not in addition, which will help with achievement.

The majority of efficiency savings are in the Chief Constable's budget and in the instance that we thought there was a possibility of efficiency savings not being met, then we would expect the Chief Constable to identify alternative in year savings.

Ultimately, any net overspends will affect reserves and the risk of this is factored into the General Fund Reserve calculation.

Capital Programme

19. In 9.2 of Annexe C it states that there is approximately £1.2m slippage anticipated from the 2024/25 capital programme into 2025/26, predominantly in respect of the Fleet. What steps are being taken to ensure that the capital programme is delivered as intended?

The expected slippage predominantly relates to Fleet and has arisen due to lead times and availability of specialist vehicles which can span timescales of 6 months or more.

Fleet, Estates, IT and the Procurement Team will continue to work together to ensure the programme is delivered as intended. Over the last 5 years the Force has significantly improved its percentage of in year expenditure to budget, and we expect to maintain this improved performance level, but as capital schemes often span multiple years, and often have complex procurement and delivery elements some level of slippage is to be expected as part of normal business, therefore both capital and revenue expenditure is monitored monthly.

20. In the table in 9.3 of Annexe C it states that it is proposed to use £0.3m of capital receipts per annum to finance capital expenditure over the 5 year period. What is the anticipated level of capital receipts at 31 March 2025? What steps are to be taken to generate sufficient capital receipts to meet financing requirements?

Capital receipts at quarter 3 were £0.1m and it is anticipated receipts at year end will be £0.3m.

Capital receipts relate predominantly to vehicles sales as part of the replacement cycle. Vehicles are sold at auction and amounts received are determined by the market.

The PCC and Force have already taken significant steps to reduce the estate in the past and it is not considered, given the recent rise in uplift numbers, that there is currently any capacity to reduce this further. Therefore, it is unlikely that estate related capital receipts will be generated in the future meaning new capital expenditure will predominantly be funded by borrowing, see also Q14.

21. Additional borrowing of around £50.6m is proposed over the 5 year period to finance capital expenditure. Assuming interest at 5% per annum this would result in an additional interest burden upon the revenue budget of £2.5m before any requirement to make provision for the repayment of principal. What steps have been taken to ensure this is prudent, affordable and sustainable in accordance with the Prudential Code and other legislative and regulatory requirements?

Gross borrowing is £50.6m but MRP repayments of £20.4m mean net borrowing in the period will be £30m.

We would expect this borrowing to be carried out at an estimated coupon rate of 4% as we are currently internally borrowing whilst rates remain above this level. These figures have been factored into the MTFP projections and capital costs as a percentage of revenue expenditure remain low, typically below 4%.

The PCC fully complies with the prudential code to ensure that borrowing is prudent, affordable and sustainable. This forms part of the Treasury Management Strategy which is monitored regularly internally and reported bi-annually to the Joint Independent Audit Committee (JIAC).

22. Additional borrowing of around £50.6m is proposed over the 5 year period to finance capital expenditure. Assuming interest at 5% per annum this would result in an additional interest burden upon the revenue budget of £2.5m before any requirement to make provision for the repayment of principal. What steps have been taken to ensure this is prudent, affordable and sustainable in accordance with the Prudential Code and other legislative and regulatory requirements?

Duplicate of Q21

23. Which schemes underpin the proposed £3.9m expenditure on Estates and Facilities in 2026/27? Is there an Asset Management Strategy (or similar) that provides a framework for decisions on Estates and Facilities?

The PCC does have an Estates Strategy that covers all aspects of asset management. The proposed expenditure in 2026-27 is aligned to that strategy.

Detailed analysis of the proposed expenditure in 2026-27 remains confidential at this time.

24. Which schemes underpin the proposed £3.9m expenditure on Estates and Facilities in 2026/27? Is there an Asset Management Strategy (or similar) that provides a framework for decisions on Estates and Facilities? *Duplicate of Q23.*
25. What is the current maturity profile position with regard to the existing loans? Are any significant loans expected to mature in the short-term? If so and these are presently at low rates with the prospect of being replaced with new loans at higher rates, how is the re-financing risk being evaluated and reported?

Debt maturity as at 30/09/2024, as per TM Mid-Year Review and reported to the Joint Independent Audit Committee (JIAC) in accordance with their Terms of Reference:

- Within 1 year - £1.1m,
- between 1 and 2 years - £3.5m,
- between 2 and 5 years - £3.1m,
- between 5 and 10 years - £7.4m,
- more than 10 years - £44.5m.

Loan repayments within the next 5 years are at an average rate of circa 2.7% versus current base rate of 4.75%, however part of our Treasury Management Strategy has focussed on internally borrowing in the short term as the expectation is interest rates will lower. Although it is likely that new loans will be at a slightly higher rate than the historic loans that are being repaid.

New borrowing is not refinancing of old loans as repayment of these has been fully provided for by MRP, and new borrowing as detailed in the capital programme has been costed in business cases at the appropriate rates, reflecting likely market position at the time of new borrowing being taken. This is factored into the MTFP position.

Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)

26. The MTFP (as at January 2025) set out in 3.3 of Annexe C identifies total efficiencies of £31.7m required to balance the budget over the life of the MTFP to 2029/30 with £18.7m of these yet to be identified. Is there a strategy or plan setting out how it is intended to achieve the unidentified efficiencies?

The current MTFP and Value for Money & Efficiencies plan sets out how Business as Usual and Stretch efficiency targets would be met. The combination of increasing staff costs, cost pressures and demand, a lower-than-expected

settlement and an increased level of borrowing to fund the capital programme has meant that forecast MTFP gaps are now a reality. The focus in January has been to, work on scenarios to balance the budget and consult with the PCC in respect of his precept proposal, and, to prepare for the workshop with the panel as well as the formal meeting on 3 February. The Chief Constable will be required to formulate a plan for achieving the savings and efficiencies in the medium term as use of reserves only delays the issue it does not resolve the underlying shortfall. The PCC is required to approve the budget, MTFP and Capital Programme by the end of February so that is the focus of activity now. The suite of financial strategies will be approved by the PCC in March which will include an updated Value for Money and Efficiency Plan.

27. Given that there is an estimated increase of 1.2% in the council tax base for 2025/26 (before confirmation of the figure for Nottingham City Council), how realistic is it to assume an increase of 1.25% from 2026/27 to 2029/30?

Over recent years the taxbase increase has fluctuated between 1.11% and 1.92% (*excluding 0.25% post covid year 2021/22*). Although actual increases in the Tax Base will vary each year expectation of a 1.25% increase is below the historic norm. This assumption is not considered in isolation as it links with the precept increase assumption. The assumption on precept is prudent at £10 per annum from 2026-27 onwards, rather than assuming it remains at the higher level seen in recent years. Therefore, in the view of the CFO the overall value included for the precept in the MTFP is an appropriate balance of these two assumptions.

28. Does the MTFP take account of the revenue costs anticipated in respect of the projected additional borrowing of £50.6m to 2029/30 to assist with the financing of the capital programme?

The net impact of changes to borrowing are factored into the MTFP and will be reflected in the 2025-26 Treasury Management Strategy, this will be reviewed by JIAC prior to PCC approval.

29. The MTFP includes an additional £2 million income in 2029-30 arising from the Funding Formula Review. What measures are you taking to lobby for the Review to be brought forward?

The funding formula projection is very modest and has been moved to the very end of the MTFP, this is realistic given the other areas of focus set out by the government that will mean this review will likely remain a lower priority. This subject is still being raised in various forums, so we wish to demonstrate the need for this to conclude in the MTFP period. Opportunities to keep the discussion alive are taken wherever possible until the point at which it is confirmed as not

happening. This is discussed with the Home Office via APCC, NPCC, PACCTS and in any consultation responses.

Reserves

30. In 8.6 of Annex C it states that “the Reserves Strategy will be revised and approved for 2025/26”. Is this not a key component of the work on the proposed precept and budget 2025/26, and so should it be included in this report? How can a revenue budget, capital programme and MTFP be produced without a firm understanding of the implications upon the projected levels of reserves?

It is indeed a key component of the work on the budget and precept proposal. The published Reserves Strategy is current and is the basis of considerations with knowledge of what has happened in year versus the projections. Section 2.3 of Annex C shows the post settlement position on the budget. This was considered in early January by the two CFOs and the Head of Finance where budget balancing options were discussed, and the reserves were reviewed to provide the PCC with assurance of how the budget could be balanced when taking account of all information known at that time. The resulting potential budget balancing proposal was presented and discussed at PEG in January and included in the familiarisation slides for the Panel. Subject to the outcome of the Panel’s review and report on the precept proposal the PCC will be approving the budget 2025-26, the MTFP and capital programme w/c 24 February 2025. The focus of the work in the next two weeks will therefore be finalising the budget, MTFP, capital programme and Reserves Strategy in parallel as all final awaited information becomes known, see section 7 of Annex C. The final budget, MTFP, capital programme, reserves, and workforce plans will be considered at the PEG meeting on 20 February in readiness for the PCC’s approval the following week.

31. Can you outline which reserves are anticipated to be used in 2025-26, and the intended outcomes from this?

Op Perth c£0.9m – to offset the cost of the operation in relation to the NUH Maternity investigation. We anticipate 75% of funding received from Government as part of the Special Grant terms and conditions.

Op Catalyst c£0.35m – This is in relation to the continuing work being conducted by the force in response to being put in ‘Engage’ status in February 2024 following a HMICFRS inspection.

Medium Term Financial Plan c£3.1m subject to the final budget position – to provide stability in 2025-26 and allow for effective savings plans be put in place to balance the deficit over the medium-term. (PCC will approve any allocation to the MTFP reserve, currently estimated to be a potential addition of at least £1.5m).

Asset replacement £1.5m – To ensure the smooth replacement of assets over the replacement lifecycle.

32. The General Fund Reserve at 31 March 2024 was £9.1m. How is this expected to fluctuate over the lifetime of the MTFP?

The current Reserves Strategy is to maintain the general reserve at between 2% and 5% of total net budget, there is no plan to vary this strategy. Therefore, the review of reserves alongside finalising of the budget will ensure that the general reserve is in accordance with the strategy considering the total net budget per annum in the final MTFP. The reserve is reviewed every year on a risk basis, so it may fluctuate commensurate with risks being considered in any given year.

33. The table in 8.5 of Annex C shows a balance of £212,000 on the Night Time Levy reserve at 31 March 2022 increasing to £330,000 at 31 March 2024. What are the plans for the use of this reserve?

By the end of the current financial year the balance is expected to be £197k and estimated balance at end of 2025-26 is £99k due to active planned use of these funds. Remaining funds will be allocated following the completion of an impact evaluation of Nighttime Levy funded projects due in summer 2025. Funding has been provided for various projects including Body Worn Video provision in the Nighttime Economy, Consent Coalition, Bleed Kits, St John Ambulance, Street Pastors, and 'Who's Your Mate?' Campaign.

34. The General Fund Reserve at 31 March 2024 was £9.1m. How is this expected to fluctuate over the lifetime of the MTFP? Duplicate of Q32

Additional note:

Please be aware that the final settlement was received on 30/01/15, this indicates an additional amount of Neighbourhood Policing grant of £1.8m but without the conditions associated with it, so cannot be assumed to help to balance the budget at this stage.