



**Police Superintendents' Association Ltd**

67a Reading Road  
Pangbourne  
Berkshire RG8 7JD

Tel: 0118 984 4005

Email: [enquiries@policesusers.com](mailto:enquiries@policesusers.com)

10<sup>th</sup> March 2022

Rt Hon Priti Patel MP  
Home Secretary  
Home Office  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF

Dear Home Secretary

I write with regard to the 'Commutation Cap' currently affecting thousands of your government's police officers as they near retirement age. I have raised this issue continually with Home Office officials on behalf of my members over the last four years.

To summarise the issue:

Currently, officers reaching retirement age with 30 years' pensionable service have the option to receive one quarter of their total pensionable income as an immediate lump sum based on the Government Actuary Departments retirement factors, therefore reducing their ongoing annual income.

In contrast, officers who retire at aged 50 and over, and have 25 years' service, are not entitled to the same provision. Those with less than 30 years' service can still access a lump sum upon retirement, but this is equal to 2.25 x their pensionable income, offering them a far smaller amount.

This restriction is in place despite the fact that it does not impact on the overall pensionable income, which is calculated based on length of service. Anyone choosing to access this provision is making the decision to reduce their annual income, in favour of a lump sum calculated according to their individual position. There is no overall financial advantage / disadvantage to those in either circumstance, the resulting payment is dependent on the individual.

To date, we are aware that we have broad national agreement amongst policing stakeholders to change the police pension regulations, so that those retiring at age 50 or above with 25 years' service are entitled to the same pension choices.

This was achieved years ago in the private sector, after wholesale agreement that having this divisive rule was not required. Allowing someone to access their lump sum early, on the same calculations, is cost neutral to the government.

Currently, there is no agreement over who would fund this change to police pensions regulations. The Home Office argues that the cost should be covered by police force budgets, and chief officers argue it

[www.policesusers.com](http://www.policesusers.com)

should come from the Treasury's pension fund.

Instead of dealing with this issue we are therefore in a situation whereby it is being ignored, leaving police officers facing unfair pensions provisions for no clear reason.

The Scottish Public Pensions Agency has now dealt with this issue, removing the restrictions that prevent police officers aged 50 and above with 25 years' service from accessing the full lump sum entitlement. I attach the relevant circular.

I am receiving a volume of concern and frustration from members and therefore ask for responses to the following questions:

- What is the Home Office's justification for retaining this divisive rule?
- Why is it that the Home Office accept that officers can be treated unfairly based on age and length of service, despite there being no additional cost to resolve this issue?
- What are your proposals for resolving this issue?

I intend to share this letter with police media publications who have shown interest in publishing this within printed magazines and online. I will also share any response you provide with the publication for full transparency.

I look forward to hearing from you within the next 10 working days and I am happy to discuss this further at any time.

Yours sincerely

Dan Murphy

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dan Murphy', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Chief Superintendent Dan Murphy, BA(Hons), MSc.  
National Secretary

[www.policessupers.com](http://www.policessupers.com)