

Budget Questions

General

1. You are proposing an increase of £14.94 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 Minister confirmed that the increase from £10 to £15 was in recognition of the financial pressures police forces are facing. The proposals of the surrounding counties are in the table below.

| PCC | Increase £ | Increase % | Band D £ |
|----------------|------------|------------|----------|
| Lincolnshire | 14.94 | 5.4 | 291.24 |
| Derbyshire | 15.00 | 6.0 | 266.60 |
| Leicestershire | 15.00 | 5.8 | 273.23 |
| Northants | 15.00 | 5.4 | 293.04 |
| Humberside | 14.99 | 5.9 | 268.19 |
| Sth Yorks | 15.00 | 6.7 | 238.04 |
| | | | |
| Notts | 14.94 | 5.9 | 269.19 |

2. Across all areas in Nottinghamshire, the main reason given by those who did not support an increase in the precept was the cost of living. How have you taken account of the impact the proposed increase will have on Council Taxpayers?

The cost per week was reviewed and for most households in Nottinghamshire the rise is 29p per week or less. I understand that some did not support the increase and cited the cost of living as a reason, which in the current climate was to be expected, however the majority did support the increase. I am conscious of the service impact on taxpayers of Nottinghamshire if the increase is not maximised, not only in 2023/24 but in future years where budget gaps are emerging.

3. You were notified in December 2022 about being able to increase the precept by £15 rather than £10 which was late in the budgeting process; what difference has that made to deliverables within the budget? Please explain what you plan to do with an almost 50% uplift in precept at a local level.

The additional amount generated by the increase of £5 (at the 23/24 taxbase level) is £1.6m. The current budget proposal includes £1.5m use of reserves. £0.5m of this is specifically included to balance the budget, having already factored in £4.7m of efficiencies and savings and a £14.94 increase in council

tax. Therefore, if the council tax was reduced to £10 it would increase the budget gap by £1.6m meaning a further use of reserves would be needed next year, whilst the underlying budget gap is addressed, and the budget gaps in future years would be significantly increased, with a higher likelihood of reductions in front line policing operations – most likely resulting in a reduction of PCs and PCSOs during the medium term planning period.

4. What consideration was given to an increase between £10 and £15?

I considered the level of precept increase based on the budget and MTFP information presented and the outcome of the consultations. It was clear that any amount less than maximising the precept would cause shortfalls next year and in future years, which would impact on service delivery for years to come. I am maintaining pressure on government to complete the formula funding review for policing and feel that my case is weakened if I don't maximise funding opportunities before asking for more from the core grant. Equally I am focused on delivering efficiencies, with £4.7m included this year. Without this continued focus the maintenance of current service levels could be compromised.

5. During last year's budget process, feedback from Focus Groups was that they wanted more transparency. How was this implemented within this year's budget-setting process and given that you received similar feedback this year what more can you do?

Providing the optimum level of information to participants as part of the budget consultation exercise remains an ongoing challenge. Whereas some respondents call for extensive technical detail, others are deterred from engaging in the consultation should the supporting information appear overly complex. We try to strike the right balance and have made a concerted effort to make more information available to participants in 2022/23 in response to the feedback received in previous years. This has included more detailed contextual information provided within focus group presentations and more detail relating to how the precept would be used in the police and crime survey. Consequently, we have seen a 2% point reduction in the proportion of respondents stating that they 'did not know or needed more information' in 2022 (down from 25% to 23%). Whilst this represents some progress, we recognise that there is more to be done.

Feedback from our focus groups indicates that residents would like to see more detail throughout the year on how police funding is being used and what efficiencies are being made. The Commissioner's Accountability Board is bringing a greater degree of openness, transparency and scrutiny to these matters than has ever been seen in Nottinghamshire previously. The Financial Strategy this year also has far more evidence of future efficiencies that are planned by the Chief Constable. Work will continue throughout 2023 to

proactively publicise this information and seek the views of local residents on this matter.

6. Noting you have provided some information around the composition of the focus groups, please can you provide information about the representativeness of the people who participated in consultation to provide reassurance that the sample was representative beyond age, race and gender?

The focus groups aimed to ensure broad representation on the basis of age, ethnicity, gender and locality. No further stratification of the sample was undertaken, however participants were randomly drawn from respective areas as part of a randomised telephone-based recruitment method. It should be noted that the focus groups were designed to obtain a deep and rich understanding of resident views and as such, the small sample sizes concerned affect our ability to determine a statistically robust and representative sample.

The Police and Crime Survey by contrast achieved a truly robust and representative sample of views from across the police force area with respondents being representative of the local population at local authority area by age, gender, employment status, ethnicity and deprivation. This is achieved via sampling points set in each of the 189 wards of the local authorities, reaching every lower super output area (approximately 200 households) within the police force area. Further details of the sample frame can be shared with panel members on request if required.

7. What weight can be given to the feedback collected through the Police and Crime Survey given that the indicative figure is below the proposed level and the survey was carried out on a rolling basis in 2022 during which time the economic context has changed?

Whilst we recognise that it was not possible to take account of the additional flexibility afforded by the government in December 2022 as part of the police and crime survey, our consultation clearly demonstrates indicative support for an increase in the precept in 2023. This has been triangulated with findings from our focus groups and online polls – both of which consulted on a £15 proposed increase in precept and elicited a similar level of support.

There are considerable benefits to collating views on the budget and precept throughout the year. For example, this method helps to avoid significant skews in the data which can occur at different times of the year or as a result of extraordinary events; it helps us to monitor emerging trends more effectively and it helps us to achieve a larger and more geographically representative sample of respondents within the budget available. We appreciate, however, that the economic climate at the beginning of the year was very different to that seen at the end of the year. Panel members should be assured, however, that levels

of support for an increase in the precept remained broadly stable throughout 2022. Of the 1,068 residents surveyed between 29 October and 13 December 2022, 47% supported an increase in the precept compared to 29% that did not.

| | Jan-Mar 2022 | Apr-Jun 2022 | Jul-Sep 2022 | Oct-Dec 2022 |
|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Yes | 47.0% | 44.9% | 45.6% | 47.4% |
| No | 30.2% | 31.3% | 32.0% | 29.4% |
| Don't know | 22.9% | 23.8% | 22.4% | 23.2% |
| | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

8. How did you advertise the online survey to optimise the number of respondents and what alternatives were in place for people who were unable to complete the survey online? What monitoring data do you hold that shows the representativeness of the people who completed the online poll?

The online survey was hosted on the OPCC website and shared extensively on our social media channels (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, LinkedIn). The survey also featured in Commissioner Henry's monthly PCC newsletter, 'Connect'. The OPCC has used available networks such as the City Council, County Council and each borough and district council communications team to ask that the consultation is shared – or for social media posts to be created by partner agencies themselves to promote it the consultation.

We shared three different posts on social media, a launch of consultation, a reminder and a last chance to have you say. The Commissioner's first two posts relating to the consultation achieved 4,044 impressions on social media with 255 engagements.

Due to the open access method employed, the online poll is unable to provide a truly representative sample of the resident population. Of the responses received as at 2 February 2023, however, the distribution was as follows: Nottingham (11.5%), Mansfield and Ashfield (28.3%), Bassetlaw, Newark and Sherwood (15.9%), South Nottinghamshire (57.5%). Male (57%), female (38%). 16-24 (8.6%) 25 to 44 (36.7%), 45 to 64 (44.5%), Over 65 (10.2%). Non-White British (17.2%).

The door step 'knock and drop' method via the police and crime survey provides a non-digital means by which we are able to obtain the views of a robust and representative sample of the general population.

Workforce

9. Now that all posts within the new structure have been filled, is the new structure delivering the efficiencies you had projected?

Yes, we believe it is. However, it is hard to quantify these at the present time, until we have had at least a full year of the new structure posts being filled.

There were some delays in filling all posts, due to a variety of reasons such as re-advertising and vetting. While all posts are now filled, many of the staff remain on a steep learning curve and as such it would be fair to say they are not quite where we need them to be to see the maximum efficiencies.

In the interim, huge improvements are being made already including:

- Building an inhouse comms function (thereby saving on contracted out services) to increase our ability to let people know about the activities of the Office and any key opportunities*
- Increased capacity to ensure partnership engagement, contributing more fully to local crime, policing, health and wellbeing fora.*
- Capacity to improve governance arrangements around data protection and publishing of specified information, in line with statutory duties*
- Build on the relationship with volunteers*
- Improved arrangements for the joint audit committee that is convened between the PCC and CC.*
- Better community engagement*
- Proactive approach and visibility on what the PCC and the office are delivering and providing more opportunities for the public to engage with the PCC.*
- Capacity for horizon scanning and analytics*
- Producing quality bids for funding*
- Proactive approach on the best use of the grants and commissioning budget, as well as better governance and more structure which will lead to the best outcomes going forward.*
- Refocussing the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU) to the Violence Reduction Partnership (VRP) to better support partners subject to the Serious Violence Duty*

It is anticipated that the full benefits will become evident during 2023, but the early signs are very positive.

10. The Panel has been advised during its previous meetings that Nottinghamshire Police is ahead of schedule with its uplift targets.

- Where are new recruits on the progression scale and are they fully funded?

- Where Nottinghamshire is ahead of schedule in terms of officer uplift, is funding released early or does funding for the early meeting of the target have to be met locally until the funding for the tranche is released?
- If it is necessary to wait for funding to be released, what impact does that have on Nottinghamshire's budgeting?
- What is the impact of new staff progressing through the pay scales compared to the average funding?
- Is this the last year of uplift or are more planned – how does the number of incoming officers compare with the churn?
- The closing balance for the FTE equivalent of Police Officers was projected last year as 2,342 on 31 March 2023. The figure in this year's papers state a figure of 2,337. Please could you explain the difference?

New recruits will be on various points on their pay scales dependent on experience and relevant start dates. For budget purposes however actual individual salaries and projected incremental progression has been used for budget build purposes, so is fully budgeted for in the annual budget and MTFP projections.

The Force funded the advancement of the uplift targets by the use of Uplift Performance Grant, an additional amount available each year to Forces that were delivering their uplift targets - as this funding was not built into the annual budget this had no net impact on the annual budget. Some impact of additional pay progression along their pay scales do arise, but as stated above, this is built into the budget build.

Most new recruits pay is generally still below that funded by uplift (as this is based on average national pay costs), this 'additionality' has been used in past years to fund Direct Revenue Financing (DRF) of the capital programme. As a result of the higher than budgeted for pay award in 2022-23, expected DRF (£2m) in 2023-34 has been reduced to the £0.6m as stated in the Annual Budget Report.

No net additional Officers are planned in 2023-24, although on-going recruitment is required as Officers retire or leave the Force, this is designed to maintain the operating model of 2,337 FTE Officers (2,378 headcount). This is an increase of 397 from the 2019-20 base (357 as a result of Uplift, with 40 being locally funded).

The 5 Officer difference between the estimated outturn in the previous years annual budget report of 2342 and the actual opening number in the 2023-24 report of 2,337 is due to officer churn in the last 3 months of the year being slightly higher than that estimated in December 2022.

11. Further guidance on what the implications are regarding Para 12 of the Reserves Strategy, which talks about the level of back-office support being at its lowest quartile making it difficult to find additional savings to fund shortfalls. Where can you find additional savings to fund the shortfalls and how much do you see this affecting the number of police officers who would be pulled to back-office roles and how will this impact the delivery of the Make Notts Safe Plan?

The MTFP gives full details of where efficiencies to meet shortfalls are expected to be delivered, this report shows that the MTFP is considered to be in a sustainable financial position during the period of the strategy (to 2027-28), based on the prudent assumptions made.

There is no intention of increasing the number of police officers engaged in 'back office' functions during the period of the MTFP

12. Within the report, it is stated that conditions for the Uplift ringfenced grant are not yet known.
- Have you been given an indication of when they will be available?
 - What risks do you foresee either within the requirements of those conditions and the timing of that information becoming available.

The settlement letter in December referred to providing details of the ringfence mechanism in the New Year. In a letter from the Minister to Police & Crime Commissioners Treasurers' Society at the end of January it confirms that the funding will be released on a bi-annual basis, following the publication of police workforce statistics, and will be based on officer headcount in forces as at 30th September and 31st March. Should forces not meet the necessary requirements to claim the funding available at the mid-year point, this funding will not be available to forces at the end of the year.

This further information is timely and has reduced the risk that we perceived on this ringfenced element of the funding settlement. We don't have any concerns about meeting the target officer numbers.

Revenue Budget

13. With regard to the robustness of the estimates, what confidence do you have around assumptions for the rate of general inflation and any increased burden of energy costs. Are you confident that you have allowed for all inflation increases (e.g. energy, costs of materials) and what sensitivity analysis has been undertaken?

The latest information available at the time of building the budget was used for inflation assumptions (appendix A includes more details used to build the budget). In addition, due to the current levels of uncertainty, an additional 'volatility' allowance of £1.4m has been provided for. As CFO this gives added assurance that overall, the estimates are robust. Should any extreme events occur beyond the estimations, the use of reserves would be considered to fund any pressures arising that could not be accommodated within the budget. There is a balance to achieve in terms of not over inflating the revenue budget versus including prudent estimations for uncertainties.

14. Next year you are hoping to achieve £4.7m 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? What contingency plans do you have if the budgeted efficiency savings are not delivered?

- A £1.30m efficiency was identified in ICT budgets; given the redundancy rate of technology and increased reliance on it in modernising services and ways of working, what impact will this have. How does this fit alongside the procurement of equipment following further delays in the national rollout of the Emergency Services Network?

Savings/reductions in the past 3 years have generally exceeded targets set. Budgets have been built on the assumption that savings will be delivered, and plans are in place to ensure delivery. If savings, or spend levels, appear not to be on target then cohort recruitment of PCs, PCSOs, PSIs or Contact Management staffing could be delayed (but not reduced). It is not expected that this will be required, indeed in past years recruitment has been advanced where budget allows.

15. Stepping away from the Multi Force Shared Service has an estimated saving of £1.9m.

- What certainty do you have around achieving this level of saving and how has this been calculated.

- Please also provide any additional comment on the statement in the papers that now the functions undertaken by the shared service have been brought back in house there is limited scope for future savings.

There is a high level of certainty regarding the MFSS savings as we have now been operating the new arrangements for over 9 months and 2023-24 has budgeted for the required staffing and system costs associated with the new delivery model. These savings are on-going amounts and have been built into the MTFP projections.

However, as a result of the high level of savings already achieved it is not considered prudent to assume that further savings can be achieved at this time, especially as long term contractual arrangements for the supply of systems and hardware are now in place.

16. Recent capital projects, specifically the new custody suite and joint headquarters were promoted on the basis of the savings they would bring from co-location and energy efficiency. The Panel has also been made aware of wider changes within the police estate. The revenue report indicates that there has been a £0.3m reduction in premises costs but the overview of budget changes states that premises expenditure has increased by £0.8m due to a full year of the new builds at force headquarters and custody alongside increases in energy costs. Please can you explain this further?

The £0.3m reduction in premises costs is specifically due to sale/vacation of 3 properties. The increase in premises costs (generally because of increased energy costs), would have been higher had it not been for the efficiencies delivered as part of the estates strategy. Further savings from operations are expected in future years, and these are identified in the Financial Strategy.

17. What are your plans around reducing energy costs?

There is provision in the revenue budget for the Carbon Trust to undertake a review of the Force's sustainability agenda. It is estimated that recommendations will be focused on delivery of energy reductions (previous budgets have identified spend on new boilers, energy efficient lighting as well as solar panels on new buildings). The capital programme has resources dedicated to sustainability investment on an ongoing basis to support the outcomes of the Carbon Trust report.

Capital Programme -

18. The proposed capital programme states that there is £3,513k slippage from the 2022/23 capital programme. Please provide commentary to cover:

- What projects have slipped?
- What has caused that slippage?
- What is going to happen to that slippage?
- How can we prevent similar slippage in future years?
- What impact is previous years' slippage going to have on the deliverability of this capital programme
- Taking into account the size of the slippage again how confident are you of the estimated cost and profile spend in the capital programme?
- Does the slippage of the capital programme have implications on costs given the cost of materials etc.is increasing significantly? How has sufficient inflation been factored in to the projected 5-year capital programme?

The following table shows the estimated slippage, with reasons, expected in the 2022-23 capital programme:

Slippage as at Q3 2022/23

£'000

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---|
| Estates | Building Condition Works | 1,438 | Reluctant to commence works at Phoenix House until lease is signed. Other projects have just had tenders returned and contractors are going through vetting process which has delayed many projects |
| Estates | Custody Improvements | 8 | retention to be paid in 23-24 |
| Estates | Estates Improvements | 646 | Delayed start on converting office space due to request for additional funding. Estates waiting on Net Zero Carbon Trust strategy before commencing other works. |
| Fleet | Fleet | 1,397 | Vehicles on order but not likely to arrive before the end of March |
| Information Technology | Is Investment Programme | 24 | Esn Delayed Until 2027, budget being used to fund replacement Airwave Radios (see 23/24 Capital Programme) |
| TOTAL: | | 3,513 | |

It is anticipated that this slippage will be carried forward to the 2023-24 programme in due course. Slippage is a normal part of Capital Expenditure, which by its very nature is often programmed over multiple years. The anticipated slippage of £3.5m is less than the previous year (£4.9m), and represents outturn spend at over 70% of the programme. This is within what is considered normal operating parameters for an organisation of our size.

Outturn spend of capital has improved significantly over the last 6 years, (when outturn was below 40%), and for the last 3 years this has been stabilised in the 60%-75% range, giving confidence that the 2023-24 expenditure is appropriately budgeted for.

As schemes covers multi-years the Capital Expenditure Report shows indicative spend over the next 5 years, with this level of investment being provided for in the MTFP projections.

19. Reference is made to further delays in the rollout of ESN which has meant current airwave terminals need to be refreshed; what is the timeline for this project now and what representations have been made by the PCC to government about the impact of delays on the budget and the burden on the council tax payer? Have we previously funded the national programme and are there expectations around a need to fund them in future?

The roll out of ESN is expected to be delayed by approximately 5 years, although this is a national project which the Force has little control over. The Force does not contribute to the funding of this national programme (although funds are top sliced from total police allocations). We have however funded local regional implementation costs; these are now in abeyance.

The Commissioner is working cross party with colleagues in the APCC to bring the issue to the attention of the Home Office.

Medium Term Financial Plan

20. The Draft Financial Strategy and MTFP annex talks about pensions revaluation and assumes a net increase on 3.5% for police officer pensions. Earlier in the document reference is made to the previous revaluation which states that employer contributions following the last revaluation were high and are anticipated to be high again (40%) following the next valuation. Please could you provide the Panel with an explanation and highlight any risks and steps you've taken to mitigate them.

In previous years any increase in pension costs as a result of revaluation has been funded by additional Home Office Grant, and it would be reasonable to assume that this would be the case going forward.

However, as we are in uncertain times for future public sector funding, and that actual deficit may be as much as 10%, a net impact has been assumed for the MTFP. This is considered a prudent approach, recognising that there could be a net impact on the local cost of policing. This also demonstrates the general level of prudence built in to the MTFP projections.

21. Paragraphs 4.2 to 4.4 make assumptions on the basis of Fairer Funding review. Please can you provide a further explanation on the funding position of Nottinghamshire Police regarding government grants, the assumptions you have made and whether they are realistic?

Assumptions for additional grant have only been made in the later years of the MTFP as detailed in the report. The last funding formula review, which was not fully implemented, would have identified an increase in grant funding to Nottinghamshire Police in excess of £10m.

It is considered reasonable therefore to assume that Nottinghamshire would be a net gainer out of such a review in the future. Assumptions for this gain are much more modest than the previous review would suggest and allows for any gains to be scaled over a number of years. As more details emerge the MTFP will be updated accordingly.

22. Last year members were provided with side-by-side comparison of budget headline costs that showed changes in allocation from the previous year (page 69 of the agenda pack: [Document.ashx \(nottscc.gov.uk\)](http://Document.ashx (nottscc.gov.uk))). Please could you provide a similar analysis for this year's budget (Annex A)?

The current annual budget report has this detail, in a new format, at appendix B of the budget report at annex A. This is designed to provide a more readable analysis and adds additional high level supporting commentary as to the reasons for changes to the budget.

Reserves

23. On specific reserves – some of these again look like they will stay the same amount for the next 4 years.
- What process do you undertake to assess the need for the reserve?
 - How confident are you that you really need those reserves where there has been no change in a significant number of years and looks to be staying the same for the next 4 years?
 - Can you explain why you continue to hold all reserves when you do not use them?

The Home Office published a Revised Financial Management Code of Practice for the Police Forces of England and Wales in 2018. This states that Reserves should be held by the PCC and managed to balance funding and spending priorities and to manage risks.

They should be split into three categories:

- *Funding for planned expenditure on projects and programmes over the period of the current medium term financial strategy.*

- *Funding for specific projects and programmes beyond the current planning period.*
- *As a general contingency or resource to meet other expenditure needs held in accordance with sound principles of good financial management (e.g. insurance).*

Each reserve is reviewed, and its future use considered with regard to the budget and MTFP being proposed.

It is reasonable to hold reserves for specific reasons for many years, e.g. statutory restrictions on the use (Police Property Act), or one off events that you would not wish to increase the base budget for, or to provide funds for invest to save projects when they become viable.

The latest Home Office national comparison on Police reserves was published in May 2021, this showed the percentage of reserves to funding (grant and precept) for each force. Nottinghamshire had 12.1% compared to the England and Wales percentage of 11.7% so not excessive nor meagre.

Appendix A - Detailed Assumptions

| Area/Year | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | Notes: |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---|
| Pay: | | | | | | |
| Police Officers | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | Locally Funded. Treasury expectations and future market pressures, as at 23/24, move financial impact to April from September each year from 2023/24. |
| Chief Officers | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | As Police Officers |
| Staff | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | Locally Funded. Treasury expectations and future market pressures, as at 23/24, move financial impact to April from September each year from 2023/24. |
| PCSO's | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | As Police Staff |
| PSI's & GI's | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | As Police Staff |
| Pension: | | | | | | |
| LGPS (Staff Pension) | 18.2% | 18.2% | 18.2% | 19.0% | 19.0% | Current review takes us to 2022/23; this review changed the rate to 18.2% this is fixed for 3 years, assume increase to 19% for the following 3 years (not including remedy) |
| Police Pension | 31.0% | 34.5% | 34.5% | 34.5% | 34.5% | Current review takes us to 2023/24; then fixed for 3 years; assume each review causes an increase of 3.5%. Revised to leave as 34.5% due to the increase in officer numbers, which in turn will increase contributions thereby mitigating against future increases. |
| Effective officer take up adjustment | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | Assessment of scheme take up, affects planning of new intakes |
| Pay Vacancy Rate: | | | | | | |
| Police Officers | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Known attrition rates and planned recruitment |
| Staff | 3.5% | 4.5% | 4.5% | 4.5% | 4.5% | Variable based on size and local knowledge |
| Investigators | 3.5% | 4.5% | 4.5% | 4.5% | 4.5% | Variable based on size and local knowledge |
| Custody | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | Variable based on size and local knowledge |
| Contact Management | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | Variable based on size and local knowledge |
| PCSO's | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | Known attrition rates and planned recruitment |
| Inflation Rates: | | | | | | |
| Gas | 96.0% | 5.0% | -20.0% | 5.0% | 5.0% | Market assumption, assuming by 2025/26 other market solutions will be in place www.ons.gov.uk/economy/inflation-price-indices |
| Electric | 54.0% | 5.0% | -10.0% | 5.0% | 5.0% | Market assumption, assuming by 2025/26 other market solutions will be in place www.ons.gov.uk/economy/inflation-price-indices |
| Water | 3.8% | 2.5% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | Market assumption www.ons.gov.uk/economy/inflation-price-indices |
| Business Rates | 12.3% | 2.5% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | Market assumption, linked to RPI |
| Diesel | 10.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | Market assumption; base line amended for increase in vehicles; vehicle efficiency in mix of fleet; increase in officers 1:6 cars:officers |
| Petrol | 20.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | Market assumption; base line amended for increase in vehicles; vehicle efficiency in mix of fleet; increase in officers 1:6 cars:officers |
| General Inflation | 5.0% | 2.5% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | Market assumption |
| Insurance | 10.0% | 5.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | base on outturn + 10%, generally expect double inflation due to costs and valuation increases |
| Collaboration | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | Based on Officer Pay |
| Police ICT Charges | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | Market assumption |
| Home Office IT | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | Market assumption |