

**SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL****OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER  
2014/15 END OF YEAR FINANCIAL REPORT****29 September 2015****SUMMARY:**

This report is to inform the Police & Crime Panel of the OPCC's financial performance for the 2014/15 financial year. This report compares the expenditure and income incurred and received by the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner during 2014/15, against the financial budget approved by the PCC in January 2014.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Police & Crime Panel is invited to note and comment on the financial performance of the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Surrey for the Financial Year 2014/15.

**EQUALITIES & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

None arising.

**Lead Officer:** Ian Perkin, Treasurer & Chief Finance Officer

**Telephone Number:** 01483 638724

**E-mail:** [Perkin11584@surrey.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Perkin11584@surrey.pnn.police.uk)

## 1. Introduction

In terms of budgetary performance for the financial year 2014/15, I am pleased to report that spending was contained well within budget and produced an under spend at the year-end of £225k.

## 2. Individual Significant Budget Variances

The detail of spending against individual budgets is shown at Appendix A to this report. As you can see there were no great areas of concern arising from the figures shown in this appendix and all budget variations are being managed within the total envelope of the Commissioners budget.

However, the report does highlight a few individual variances from the budget and these are:-

1). The Assistant Police & Crime Commissioners: This budget shows a small overspend compared with the budget that I set in January 2014, the additional expenditure reflecting the payment of the extra hours that I required to be worked in this area, in line with the arrangements that I reported to the Panel earlier in the year.

2). Staff Budget: Because of staff vacancies at various times during the year the pay budget produced was underspent on the year by 10% producing a significant underspend of about £78,000.

3). PCC Roles: This budget produced a significant underspend primarily as a result of savings on the Communication and Consultations budget as my office made increasing, but not exclusive, use of cost effective social media to make contact with the Surrey public.

4). Office Running Costs: This budget produced a 28% reduction in expenditure against budget as a direct result of the careful management of consumer spending throughout the year.

5). Audit Costs/Independent Member Costs: This budget was overspent for two reasons. Firstly, the external audit fee was overspent as a result of the PCC sharing with the Chief Constable the cost of the special audit carried out by Grant Thornton with resulted in the publication of a Public Interest Report by the auditor. The second reason for overspending arose from an increase in Independent Members costs, which resulted from the increased number of Police Appeal Tribunals that took place during the year.

6). Victim Services & Restorative Justice budget: I deliberately overspent on Victim Services because the funding I was given by the Ministry of Justice had restrictions on its use and there were areas such as the appointment of Independent Sexual Violence Advisors and the Domestic Abuse Outreach Service that I wanted to support and could only do so by utilising some of the managed under spend that I had achieved on my other budgets. In fact £158k the funding my office received from the Ministry of Justice has to be returned to them, because it did not prove possible to spend it in line with the grant conditions placed upon me in the relatively short time scales that the government allowed for these services to be transferred to police and crime commissioners and the end of the financial year.

This page is intentionally left blank