



PCC's council tax precept proposal

January 2017

Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Summary of feedback	2
Copies of all feedback received	3
Copy of PCC's council tax proposal (January 6 2017)	12

Introduction

Under the terms of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) must set their force's budget and determine the precept. They must also notify the Police and Crime Panel of the precept which he/she proposes to issue for the financial year.

Based on feedback received from his Safer in Kent survey the Kent PCC proposed a 3.3% increase to the policing precept for 2017/18. This was published on January 6 and the public and partners were welcome to offer feedback to a bespoke email account prior to a deadline of January 23.

Consideration was given to providing a longer feedback period but the PCC and his team wished to first fully understand the implications of the Government's Police Grant Report for 2017/18 - which was delivered on December 15, 2016 – on Kent Police's finances.

The proposal was published on the OPCC website, where it was read by more than 1,100 unique users. It was also circulated by email to more than 5,000 OPCC e-newsletter subscribers and was promoted to more than 10,000 followers of the OPCC Twitter feed. Local media reported on the proposal, inviting further comments, and the PCC participated in media interviews with KMFM and BBC Radio Kent.

The PCC also used his personal social media channels to promote the proposal and invite feedback.

Summary of feedback

The OPCC received 51 formal responses by email to the PCC's council tax precept proposal. In addition, 11 comments were posted on the [OPCC website article](#) and 13 comments were posted underneath an article on the [Kent Online website](#).

The PCC has also taken account of any relevant posts from the public or partners on the OPCC Twitter feed (two), his own personal Twitter feed (five) and his personal Facebook page (four).

In total, 86 responses have been recorded. Five individuals were identified as having posted two comments, resulting in 81 unique responses.

Of these:

- 53 were recorded as being 'for' the proposal (65.4%)
- 21 were recorded as being 'against' the proposal (25.9%)
- Seven were recorded as being neutral (8.6%)

Of the 21 responses recorded as being against the proposal, the most common reason given was dissatisfaction with the current service Kent Police provides (12 responses). Others believed funding for Kent Police should come

from Central Government rather than local taxation; or that Kent Police was too wasteful or inefficient; or that the council tax proposal was unaffordable.

In the interests of openness and transparency, copies of all 86 recorded responses are included below. They are listed unedited. Only respondents' personal details, and/or names of authorities they are responding on behalf of, have been removed.

Copies of all feedback received

The 86 recorded responses received are listed below. Where multiple pieces of correspondence from the same individual have been identified - for example an email and a comment on social media - these have been listed together, resulting in 81 unique responses.

1. Good Evening

I would just like make it clear that I do not support any increase in my council tax to fund policing. Please do not think this means I don't support increased police funding, which I do. I however believe this funding should come from central Funding. There are many savings that the government could make to fund such an increase, such as using funds from the Foreign Aid budget, clamping down further on benefit cheats and tax avoiders.

I am like many people who appears to have to work harder everyday for a smaller and smaller return. Since the Conservatives have been in government I have had below inflation pay increases, large increases in my pension contributions, increases to my NI contributions, council tax increases. All to see less in return.

I like many people feel that I wasn't responsible for the economic issues of this country yet those that were appear to be doing very nicely for themselves once again, whilst the rest of us pay for there mistakes. I'm sure this email will make no difference to the decision you make but I felt that I had to make my feelings clear

Thanks

2. Sir,

Please consider the overworked and reliant on overtime (both paid and unpaid) requirements and pressures on police officers/staff.

In order to reduce such pressures etc. consider raising the household precept by between £10 and £20 per year in order to give frontline staff and resources sufficient support. Monies to be spent not on chief officers but supporting those at the "coalface". Your frontline staff are your best assets and should be allowed adequate "downtime" between shifts to recharge their work/life balance.

3. Dear sir

May I remind you I live in crockenhill,not the gazza strip! In my unfortunate 20 years in this time capsule I've been burglarized and only got an officer when you knew id caught the dear fellow and whilst in mu custody he fell and hurt himself.then a family feud when your force had given our case to around 20 officers over 2 years who didn't talk to each other ,or know the law.you don't need more money!!! You need infrastructure.perhaps you can speak to the council who ferl greater need to hang nice flowers and decorate our roundabouts with our taxes.i wish you well but your on a hiding to nothing.great,great ideas but we all no they wont work.they never do.and pcso? Hmm,train a real policeman.yet they need incentive which they don't get,more leave than join.any idea why? The officers we have met on the whole are good hard working people.remember what you do will never matter,those from above just want figures.you cant rebuild public faith with money.infrastructure is what's needed.as I say I wish you well with an impossible task.regards

4. Dear Matthew

Brilliant proposal expertly explained - you have my full support

5. **First comment:**

My family and I see Community Safety & Security paramount and easily trumps health, education, etc. Personally I'd be very happy for the Policing portion (only) of my Council Tax bill to increase by 10%. It's SO important.

Meanwhile I would urge the PCC to chase Home Office funding for policing THE Frontier County with

Europe and all the additional costs it involves on our roads, rail, pubs and infrastructure in relation to crime and disorder.

Keep up the great work Matthew Scott!

Second comment:

My top priority is the safety/security of my family. This is delivered 24/7 primarily by the police service. For me, it's a much higher priority than health, education, environment, welfare etc.

I'm very happy to pay more Council Tax if it directly benefits the security of our neighbourhood and public places. If we lose security and safety nothing else is worth having anyway.

6. You have my full support for your proposals

7. Does not seem an unreasonable proposal to me.

Why Kent Police should be expected to fund additional fire arms officers is beyond me when it is Central Governments flawed immigration policy that has given rise to the need and the cost should therefore be met by them!

I see £5 million is to be taken from reserves. How much is kept in reserve and for what purpose? or do I need to ask this question under the Freedom of Information Act?

It is nice to know we now have a proper Police Commissioner rather than that silly woman and her gimmicks

8. Dear Mr Scott

Thank you for keeping me so fully informed. £5 does not seem excessive.

Good wishes

9. Dear Matthew,

Thank you for your correspondence concerning Kent Police funding.

I understand the pressure on the budget, rising demand and the cuts imposed by the Government on all public services. I have no doubt that there will be similar proposals to fund the shortfall in social care, education and health at some stage in the future.

However, I would only be in favour of an increase in the precept if those resources are to be ring fenced to local policing. The forensic escalator that pushes resources towards more serious crime results in the denuding of local patrols, response policing and traffic policing.

Most people have very little contact with the police until they have to report a crime, traffic incident or local disorder. Unfortunately from my own and friends experiences the response to 'minor' matters is less than reassuring. I say this with some regret having spent 45 years as a police officer, but the accounts that I have heard are too numerous to be discounted. I have lost count of the times that I have had my ear bent by friends and acquaintances about poor response to crimes in action, particularly from farmers reporting incidents on their land or intruders in their farm yards. I know that the police call handling policy has criteria for response, but my theory is that control room staff are overwhelmed by calls and that as they have few resources to deploy they apply a secondary informal screening policy that results in callers being denied a proper response. These deployment decisions receive little day to day scrutiny from supervisors and are often only examined in any depth when HMIC carries out an inspection.

In addition to this extra money, another pruning of HQ staff will help to put police officers where they are needed. Using this extra resource for local warranted officers would do much to reestablish confidence in local policing.

Best wishes,

10. Dear Mr Scott

Thank you for your email explaining your receipt increase for kent Police.

I support this increase as I concerned about terrorism and continued PCSO support in rural communities- I live in capel le ferne near Dover.

I am not ideologically, as you say you are, a low tax conservative. In fact, I believe we have to fund our public services properly so that we enjoy them as a civilised society.

Police is a central core of these. I, in fact, despite not being wealthy would rather pay MORE council tax if I were reassured of the outcome of my tax subsequently.

Life is difficult for many at the moment, but removing or reducing key services will not help the majority.

Kind wishes

11. I'd like to tell you where you can stick your increase in the council tax precept, but I won't because I won't be paying it.
I don't see why I should pay towards a 'service' that can't be bothered to do the job it is overpaid for.
12. I broadly support the policing initiatives outlined in Matthew Scott's email of 9 January and must therefore reluctantly support the council tax rise he proposes to pay for them.
I do not agree with the Home Office police funding for Kent being cut further and believe that the new government should look again at the Old Chancellor and Home Office's austerity budgets for policing generally and particularly recognising the unique issues arising from Kent channel crossings.
13. Dear Police Commissioner
I am disappointed that you are not seeking to increase the precept for the police service by a more realistic amount, say 8%. While cuts have usefully ensured greater cooperation between police forces ~ there is no doubt much more to be done in this area ~ there is a limit to the amount that can be saved or taken from reserves. I am also disappointed that you have not had the courage to tell residents that if they want good local government and police services they have to pay for it.
Best wishes
14. I just thought that you are very candid in explaining that basically during an election campaign promises can be made that sound good but after the election reality calls. Welcome to the real world and increased demands on Police caused by accumulated effects of cuts in spending in other areas.
15. Good morning,
I read this communication with great interest.
I am a Councillor at both Parish and Borough level - and have sympathy with the financial predicament you've been put into. I am very aware of the financial pressures imposed on Councils too!
I endorse the points you make reference to - in particular the items referring to local community and its safety.
I have lived in a semi rural location for several years and have noticed a considerable change to the 'visibility' of the Police, either full time officers or latterly - PCSO's.
I'm aware of the pressures and echo some of your sentiments, if the financial burden imposed on the public provides a tangible display of where the money goes. I have a huge concern that continual financial pressures on authorities will have to reach a point where it's utterly exhausted. With the growing demands on infrastructure, housing, schools, medical facilities and the like - sometime soon I hope - the pressure must ease.
However, we must move forward and remain strong.
I fully endorse an increase in personal contributions - as I say, just as long as it's solely utilised to better the service you're all offering.
On a small point - my local Parish [location removed] used to have regular attendance : once a month, at our public meeting by either an officer or PCSO. This hasn't happened for months. I understand the pressures of the job - but really do miss the visibility.
Thank you for your update and if there's any way in which Councils can work closer with you, I'd fully subscribe to it.
Best regards
16. Dear Mr. SCOTT,
To see a police officer in Folkestone and indeed in the surrounding area is as one says as rare as rocking horse poo.
I find the propaganda laid out by Government and those in your position not particularly related to reality, for we both know that even if ten new officers were introduced they will be spread over the whole County and with no disrespect, their impact will not greatly if at all improve on services. It is like successive Governments promising the paperwork will decrease it never did, and now police men and women are tied up with reports for everything, which of course means that they are in rather than out of their respective police stations.
I find it difficult to support such subjects as you mention, because there are organisations within the public service system that should be held to account rather than police officers being burdened with it.
I cannot make no difference to what price you or others place on policing, and I shall contribute as I have too by law, however I personally no longer have any belief in a system where Senior Police Officers will Not stand as one and tell the truth and how it is. With people more concerned with Political Correctness diversity and minority groups being considered before the "average Band D" house owner the system

seems to be bending under the pressures of those topics rather than concerns with real policing matters. I do however wish you all the very best in your quest for improving the lives of communities within the County.

17. The views of [location removed] Parish Council to the proposed increase is that it is disproportionate. Rural Areas see no visible Policing, and response time for assistance is appalling. [Location removed] is let down by the service provided by Kent Police.
Any form of increase is unacceptable.
Sent on behalf of the parish council
18. No no no, I do not agree with any rise, our P C S O has been changed so many times I am no longer sure if our village has one or who he or she is. Police cars race through the village constantly, we would be very fortunate to physically see a Policeman or woman.
19. I am against the proposal. At the moment I never see any police presence and it is all reactive not proactive. We wanted a say in how we thought our PCSO could be better deployed but wasn't listened to. Needs a complete overhaul and a better service and then happy to pay
20. Dear Sir,
I am in full agreement with the rise in the precept for the coming year.
21. Thank you for inviting responses to your proposals.
I am in full support of your proposals for an increase in precept on the understanding that it allows for more front line policing across the whole of the Kent Police area, including rural communities.
Kind regards
22. To whom it may concern,
Thank you for giving [location removed] PC the chance to comment on the proposed £5.00 per year rise towards the police.
You mention that this will help you with, and I quote from your webpage *I believe that the proposal is fair and reasonable - £5 a year for an average household to fund more police officers and PCSOs, increased visibility in communities, investment in protecting the vulnerable and action to keep residents safe from emerging threats and terrorism.*
[Location removed] Parish Council area has no PCSO at this time. We have been informed that we 'Share' with a nearby parish. Well we have never been able to find out who this may be, and on the one occasion when the Council requested their presence or that of a police officer as we were expecting a rather volatile meeting nothing happened. The meeting went ahead, but only due to the strenuous management by the chairman, the verbal abuse and threats notwithstanding.
The only time we see any police is when they drive through the village on a blue light call - so I suppose they are visible, albeit for a very short time.
When we reported HGV's parked under the motorway and high speed bridges, with concerns about terrorism, we were told not to be so dramatic. (If some-one thought about it the South East could be ground to a halt with a lorry bomb under these.) These HGV's were also blocking the pavement, the drivers were defecating on the path - even when children were being walked to school, so parents had to walk on the road.
In the end the Parish Council spent from it's own precept and put in bollards for something that should have come from a national pot of money not a local one.
([Location removed] is on the main A20 road between Ashford & Hythe)
On the election of the current Police and Crime Commissioner I invited him to come to the village of [Location removed] and join in a parish council meeting, to date I have not had a reply!
Fly parking has also been an issue in [Location removed], we have been told there is a number to phone to report this, however on requesting this phone number no information has been forthcoming.
It has taken a local resident, who speaks a large number of foreign languages and the chairman of the PC going out and moving HGV's on to alleviate the issue. (where is the police then)
So unless there are to be more police actually visible and not virtually, the PC are not very supportive of this increase.
Regards
23. We are strongly in favour of the increase proposed.

24. First comment:

Dear Commissioner

I was pleased to get your message, passed on to me via Deal Town Council. I was even more pleased to hear that you have learnt after only a short time in office that public services have to be paid for and ultimately, the taxpayer will pay for them one way or another.

Like most people, I want good services above all. I know that historic cuts have already reduced budgets to the extent that a full and high quality service, be it health, policing or other service, is very difficult to deliver. I hope when you meet other politicians that you pass on your learning. Empty promises designed to get a person elected are not honest and a candidate with integrity does not make them. The fact that you have reversed your approach is courageous and praiseworthy.

Please do everything you can to influence other Conservative politicians to take off the blinkers and change their attitude. We all deserve better.

Second comment:

I was pleased to hear that you have learned after only a short time in office that public services have to be paid for and ultimately, the taxpayer will pay for them one way or another.

Like most people, I want good services above all. I know that historic cuts have already reduced budgets to the extent that a high quality service, be it health, policing or other service, is very difficult to deliver. I hope when you meet other politicians that you pass on your learning. Empty promises designed to get a person elected are not honest and a candidate with integrity does not make them. The fact that you have reversed your approach is courageous and praiseworthy.

Please do everything you can to influence other Conservative politicians to take off the blinkers and change their attitude. We all deserve better.

25. Against rise in council tax to fund policing

My reasons being:

- your message states we have already paid an increase for 24 firearms officers but these are not yet in post. So where has that money gone?
- pcos are a waste of space so get rid of them and reallocate the money
- you state you will work with charities but it isn't clear if that is your time or money
- it's only £5 - yes it is but families are already struggling. A bit on council tax, a bit on electricity it all adds up and hits hard working families once again while those on benefits don't contribute

26. I am happy to see the precept raised by the proposed 3.3% in line with the PCC draft budget and the objectives put forward in support of it.

27. Could we possibly have exemptions for pensioners? Many of us are on low incomes and could do without the extra burden.

28. I support the proposed increase as living in Herne/Herne bay i am only to aware of the lack of visible policing. We have a large number of vulnerable residents, not all elderly and our Warden / PCSO do an excellent job supporting them and the community.

29. As a retired Kent police officer who is a member of [location removed] Parish Council I am regularly frustrated by the failure of the local service to honour the promises made from time to time. There is a lack of will to cooperate with residents.

Over the years, at irregular intervals, we have been advised of a change in our local community officer and each time we are promised an introductory visit. Once that has taken place (perhaps 50% actually take place) we never see the local contact again. This was happening BEFORE all the cut-backs. Why should we be expected to pay extra for a service which is never going to improve.
I am against the proposed increase.

30. I am emailing to inform you I am in favour of the increase. There have been many cuts in services impacting on the resources to fulfil the extra needs for our communities and the increase goes some way to helping to bridge this gap.

Regards

31. I would be happy to pay such a small amount for an improved service.

Kind regards

32. I support the proposed rise – I am convinced that the police (like other services) need better funding. I wish that this were coming from central government, but since that is not the case then I think the suggested increase is justified
33. Sorry but can you inform the PCC, Mr Scott, that I am unable to send a reply to his link. I wanted to state my reluctant approval for the £5 increase but I was unable to pass a technical hurdle for some reason..
Thanks
34. [Location removed] Parish Council considers the proposed increase as outrageous.
[Location removed] seldom sees a Police presence and when one is required the response time and interest shown is unacceptable.
There should be no increase to Kent Police precept as residents [of location removed] receive very little support from the Service and therefore an increase cannot be justified.
Regards
35. I fully endorse the proposed increase in the precept as a strong and proactive police force is key to underpinning a safe and prosperous community.
Yours faithfully,
36. 1) I am vexed that Central Government is continuing to make large cuts to Kent's budget. I think by and large KCC does a good job but the mentality behind this is beyond sense, making public service year by year an increasingly demoralized activity while no longer making for either greater effectiveness or efficiency.
2) I am surprised that no mention is made of policing in the wider context. What other increases can we expect? And what other areas would be affected if this proposal is not followed through?
3) There is a lot spoken about visibility of police as though it is a virtue to see 'bobbies on the beat'. It isn't. We need a good intelligence-led force, and thank goodness we seem to have it, so don't waste money on a show.
4) And now a personal plea. As well as the big issues in bold in the Police Commissioner's message we need some improvements in local services. For example, a short but visible purge on speeding in Cranbrook High Street might make an appreciable difference to the lives of local residents, at very low cost. The speed and traffic volume are getting almost intolerable at times.
5) How can we possibly judge whether the money is being well spent? This is crucial to support and to answering this proposal. Or could this just be a PR exercise in anticipation of the inevitable? I'm no cynic, but I just don't know.
37. Sir,
I write in support of your proposed budget and precept increase.
I am pleased you are planning to employ more officers and PCSOs and to make policing more visible, particularly in rural areas.
I am also pleased you are strengthening teams that deal with the most serious issues facing society such as terrorism and child exploitation, mental health issues and cyber crime and fraud.
Regards
38. Dear Sir
Following on from Matthew Scott's email, given the pressure on funding from Central Government and the increasing expectations of police in Kent, I'd personally support the suggested increase in the police precept as suggested.
Yours faithfully
39. [Location removed] Parish Council supports the Commissioners proposal to increase the Kent Police precept by 3.3% especially if it delivers greater efficiency and visibility in rural areas.
40. I support this move and hope it results in a police presence and better policing in Sissinghurst. This applies especially to current inadequate policing of speed limits (cars currently hurtling through Sissinghurst which has a 30mph limit at 60mph!!)
Yours sincerely
41. Thank you, that sounds reasonable

42. As a new resident to Kent, I think this proposal is fair and just. More police/visibility/makes for a better environment.
43. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the raising of the Police Precept in Kent. Parish Councillors in this Parish feel that a rise is necessary as outlined but ask for a greater Police presence in rural areas; our PCSO service is under strain and is such a valuable contribution to ensuring residents feel safe. The feedback we get from our PCSO [name removed] at Parish Council meetings is welcomed and has helped the Parish Council to engage more fully with community safety.
Sincerely
44. Sir, as a pensioner on a fairly fixed income, I realise that if we wish to have a continued police presence in the village and given the constraints on the budget, we will have to pay more.
As long as the villages continue to receive the support of the PCSO's and the Community Wardens, I support the increase in the precept
45. Dear Matthew
You can willingly increase my contribution.
Asking for 10% would still be fine with me.
Too many English think that we can avoid Tax and still keep proper services.
I am of a generation that knows that you get what you pay for.
I would never vote for a low-tax candidate as they are delusional.
46. As Chair of [location removed] Parish Council, I quite understand the pressures the Police are facing. We have had to raise our precept this year by a large amount, just in order to cope and know you face the same issues so clearly set out in your e-mail. You have my support.
47. Further to Have your Say [location removed] Parish Council are happy to support commissioners proposal. Our PCSO [name removed] is great and keeps in regularly contact via email. However, from time to time we would like face to face contact in particular at our Parish Meetings. Recently there has been a spate of burglaries in our village. We are disappointed with the local community warden scheme and that contact with the village has all but virtually dried up. Over a year ago the local community warden would visit the village on a weekly basis and attend our Parish Meetings regularly. KCC's recent consultation regarding parish councils supporting financially the volunteer community warden scheme who will work along side community warden. The Parish Council would have to raise the precept to contribute to the scheme. As a Parish Council we are mindful of raising the precept. KCC are under pressure to reduce their costs but asking the parish councils to increase theirs, passing it on to our parishioners. The same can be said of Kent Police where costs are being cut in other re Home Office in turn its being passed down to parishioners.
Kind regards
48. Dear Sir,
I agree with your reasons for the proposed increase of 3.3%. Please use it wisely.
Yours faithfully,
49. I agree with the proposal and hope It will be successful.
50. The government continue to strip the police resourcing. Instead of increasing the contribution per house hold to help fund this, they need to review how they use there resources currently.
Too much of the police officers times are wasted in custody. therefore, I believe that a civilian team should be employed. The officers bring the individuals to custody. Hand over to the civilian team they are then responsible for interviewing and collating the necessary evidence. They would also do the constant supervisions instead of the police officers.
This would allow the police officers to continue there hard work and you would have resources on the streets and more of them to deal with the domestic abuse calls, the increased calls due to the increase in mental health and to deal with the terrorist threats.
Regards
51. We need to support our police services at the grass roots. If the money is really going to be used to provide a safer environment for people I agree it is money well spent. If it is used for red tape, paper

pushing and I'll thought out initiatives it will be a travesty.

52. I for one have no problem finding just ten pence extra a week, if it is well-targeted as this proposal comes across as being.

53. Yes. We already had a rise to help pay towards the 'needy' hopefully genuine needy!!!

54. I'd rather it applied to the larger properties thus not affecting lower income families #counciltax

55. I don't object to Kent Police getting enough funds. However I do object to KCC Cabinet members getting more.

56. fully support these proposals.

57. A 3.3% rise is less than 10p a week. What can you buy for that? Not much! Collectively, all those small amounts make a real difference.

58. **First comment:**

the 1 % pay rise the police get from the torys will go along way towards this... not!

Second comment:

cant believe federation supporting this from PCC! This will be in addition to the other raises that KCC need!

59. grasping realities of job. He campaigned on holding precept down. How many voted for him on that basis.

60. I think we all know it will be the maximum hike in poll tax they can have without a referendum.

61. Ahh, there we go. 3.99% just magically under the threshold. How did they arrive at that figure I wonder?

62. 3.3% you cheeser

63. Why be rude?

64. **First comment:**

I'm sure none of us will mind if we actually see more police on the streets! If the councils could also make good use of any additional revenue claimed that would also be a bonus. Let's not just see the staff wages bill eating up our taxes.

Second comment:

Forgot about the degrees now required by new police recruits! Someone has to pay their £9250 fees per year. Looks like it's you and I!

65. I do not begrudge an extra fiver a year (a whole ten pence a week)if it does mean more front line police.

66. **First comment:**

That won't happen trust me I know the internal politics. Like the report says most of it will go on anti-terror policing (important yes but not effecting people's day to day life) and child exploitation etc. For the majority of the population suffering from low level crime and anti social behaviour it will make no difference which is a great shame. With the destruction of neighbourhood teams and swarms of very experienced officers leaving the force due to the horrendous working conditions the place has been doomed for years.

Second comment:

Exactly it's incredibly frustrating I had a brick thrown at my moving car the other week I stopped and the offenders were still at the scene and I called 999 only to be told no one would be coming and that I would receive a crime number (still waiting!). Strange though that when a fight or something 'exciting' gets reported there are four to five cars there.

67. Policing, and the funding thereof is a vast and broad issue, but...over the last ten or so years, the police have changed themselves from what many folk understood, and supported..i.e, community

based 'policing by consent' by smartly dressed Officers walking the streets to the paramilitary dressed rayban and baseball cap wearing egos' driving around ignoring the kind of antisocial behavior that makes no difference to their Uni 'educated' boss's statistics but makes a world of difference to peoples quality of life.

68. Okay, Mr Scott. Let's try 3%... but for that I want a policeman in Whitstable... a proper, one mind! That's one that walks under his own steam... thinks... isn't afraid of the dark... and doesn't take three steps before his hat moves.
I can do without a uni degree provided that he breathes in and out at pproximately the right intervals.
Hey.. it's thumbs down time! ;)
69. I do not mind paying extra for Policing, as long as that is what we get. Not PCSO's, real Policemen that can tackle our problems.
Next we need proper Judges that pass sentences that fit the crime.
70. Here here. Well said.
71. I do not. support your increase. You continue to waste public money on PCSO's that lack the powers to be effective. Do your police dogs lack teeth?
72. I would say that your proposal is fair and makes sense. It is unfortunate that we are going through these times of change in this manner but the service needs to adapt to suit the times. £5 is a small amount to ask for looking at the whole picture. Thank you for all your hard work and keeping to your values.
73. Having called the police in dover on sunday evening as an emergency situation, the police advised they would come out and never showed up ...all night. Something needs to be done. People were put at risk in my care as was I. I'm not convinced that increasing my council tax would give me any reassurance that it would not happen again. Also are the police force saying then that they are incapable of doing there jobs at this time unless we pay more money for you to do it?
74. Ok by me ,
75. I would sooner see extra money coming from central government and a local increase going to Ashford Boroug Council
76. I am not convinced that more P.C.S.O.s is the answer, they have little power and generally appear to be poor imitations of the real thing. We require a better visible old fashioned Bobby on the beat not riding around in vehicles.
77. Yes, we are prepared to contribute
78. As a Parish Councillor I am clearly in agreement with adequate funding for the police. I feel it would have been helpful, however, for councils to have more time to discuss this proposed increase and for greater detail over the financial implications for each payment band to have been given.
79. I agree with the increase. It is definitely needed.
80. I disagree with this back handed funding from the people, management are paid too much money and should be sorting the funding out rather than begging from the wider public. Last year was the same excuse, now again this year, no matter what anyone says it will be put through and I bet this will also happen again next year.
81. On the basis that I don't see any chance of getting more funding from central government and we desperately need front line police then I agree with the proposed precept.

Appendix: Copy of the PCC's proposal

A message from the Police and Crime Commissioner Matthew Scott:

I am responsible, as Police and Crime Commissioner, for determining the overall budget for policing in the county and for setting the amount that Kent Police receives from the annual council tax. Policing is mainly funded in two ways; about two thirds come from grants we receive from the Home Office and the rest from the council tax.

For the next financial year, Kent will lose more than £2million of funding from the Home Office, as money is set to be taken away to pay for other things. I believe some of these, such as giving money to the courts service to pay for changes to police bail, are unfair and I will be challenging those.

So in my first year as your Police and Crime Commissioner, I have been faced with a difficult choice. Ideologically, I am a low-tax Conservative. During the course of my campaign, I said that I did not want the precept to rise, unless it was needed to protect frontline policing. However, I believe that this announcement meets that test. In 2017/18, I am proposing that the council tax precept for Kent Police rises by 3.3%, equivalent to £5 for an average Band D household, supported by a contribution from reserves.

These are the grounds for my proposal:

Last year, residents were asked to contribute to the **increase in the number of firearms officers**. I have been holding the force to account to ensure that the 24 extra firearms officers promised will be delivered. This year's rise in the council tax will help Kent Police go a little further and be even more readily able to respond in the event of a terrorist attack, such as those we have seen in Europe over Christmas. It also means I can fund the proposed **increase in police officer numbers** that residents have told me they want to see and we can **keep PCSOs** in the county as I promised, whereas other forces consider their future.

Secondly, changes will be made so pressure will be taken off local policing teams in order that community **visibility can improve** in urban, rural and coastal areas. **Mental health** accounts for one third of all police time now in Kent and I am working with other public bodies, including the NHS, to understand and alleviate some of this demand on Kent Police officers' time. **Domestic abuse** calls are on the increase, nearly doubling in recent years thanks to the confidence of victims in coming forward, and **fraud and cyber-crime** could soon account for more offences than any other crime type. Dedicated police teams will be established with support from police staff to address these issues.

Vulnerability is the new Home Secretary's top priority. We have seen here in Kent and Medway that, even now, people are continuing to target the vulnerable for their own gain. Those involved in **modern day slavery, child sexual exploitation and human trafficking** are not just using Kent as a gateway to and from the continent, but committing these crimes right here in our local communities. These often complex networks require substantial investment to investigate and disrupt.

So, as you see, my proposal is about not standing still. I will be doing my bit as Police and Crime Commissioner to ensure Kent Police delivers **an effective and efficient service** to the residents of Kent and Medway. My **new Police and Crime plan**, which will be published soon, will set the Chief Constable's priorities for the next four years and will reflect what residents told me they want and expect when I consulted with them in the autumn. I shall also hold the Chief Constable to account and provide the appropriate scrutiny so that we all get **value for taxpayers' money**.

Already, Kent Police has made in excess of £8million of savings towards next year through better working, sharing procurement with other forces and investing in technology. That is on top of the £62million of savings already achieved since 2011/12 by sharing a significant amount of back office functions with Essex Police and by collaborating on a number of projects with Kent Fire and Rescue Service. Even with the rise in council tax further savings need to be achieved and so, with the uncertainty over future funding levels, I have decided to support the force with up to £5million from reserves. This decision does not absolve the force from making those savings but does allow it to make them over a longer period.

In 2015, when the then Chancellor announced police spending would be protected in cash terms, he did so on the basis that Police and Crime Commissioners increased their council tax precepts by the maximum amount allowable. His announcement did not account for the 1% pay rise awarded to police officers and staff, increases in national insurance contributions, and the new apprenticeship levy on organisations' payrolls.

In the future, we have opportunities. I am lobbying hard for Kent to get a better deal on police funding, so that the unique challenges we face here are properly recognised. There is a fund that we can apply to for extra resources for new technology and other projects that will help improve policing and the way forces work together. I will also be supporting Community Safety Partnerships and local charities who police officers and staff work with to make our communities safe.

I believe that the proposal is fair and reasonable - £5 a year for an average household to fund more police officers and PCSOs, increased visibility in communities, investment in protecting the vulnerable and action to keep residents safe from emerging threats and terrorism.

Even with this rise, the Band D precept in Kent will remain one of the lowest in the country at £157.15 for the year. The alternative is even fewer police officers and PCSOs, and less of a visible policing presence in our local communities.

I hope that you will support these plans.

- *To let the Commissioner have your feedback on this proposal, please email **haveyoursay@pcc.kent.pnn.police.uk** by 9am on Monday, January 23. Due to the volume of correspondence received, the Commissioner will not be able to respond to each email but all comments will be read by him personally. The Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel will be notified of this proposal for its review on Thursday, February 2.*