

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (REIGATE & BANSTEAD)**

**DATE:** 12 SEPTEMBER 2016



**LEAD OFFICER:** GORDON FALCONER

**SUBJECT:** LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PROJECTS

**DIVISION:** ALL

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The Local Committee has a delegated budget of £3,000 for community safety projects. This report recommends the introduction of a simple process enabling the local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and other organisations to outline their planned spend for projects that meet the criteria outlined in this report.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) is asked to agree that:**

- (i) The delegated Community Safety budget of £3,000 per Local Committee for 2016/17 is to be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Local Committee, and that the Community Safety Partnership is invited to submit proposals that meet the criteria and principles for funding, as defined at paragraph 2.6 of this report.
- (ii) Authority is delegated to the Community Partnership Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, to authorise the expenditure of the Community Safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated at paragraph 2.6 of this report.
- (iii) The Committee receives a report detailing the projects that were successful in being awarded the local community safety funding and the outcomes and impact they have achieved.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

A recent analysis of how the local committees' community safety funds were spent in 2015-16 revealed a mixed picture. While there were some notable examples of good practice, much of the funding was spent on activities that could have otherwise been delivered either through existing partnership work or by closer synergy with Surrey's established, strategic community safety projects. This report makes recommendations that are intended to secure greater oversight of the committee's expenditure and better value for money for projects that help to achieve the County's community safety priorities.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 In 2016-17, each Local/Joint Committee has a delegated budget of £3,000 to spend on activities in support of community safety. Committees have traditionally transferred this funding to their local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to assist efforts in tackling crime and anti social behaviour. However, following an analysis of CSP expenditure and outcomes for projects supported in the financial year 2015-16, Local Committee Chairmen collectively proposed that committees should instead retain their delegated funding and invite CSPs to identify proposals for its potential use to the committee for approval.
- 1.2 The Committee is requested to consider the process presented in this report and to make a decision on this executive function.

**2. ANALYSIS:**

- 2.1 At the end of the 2015-16 financial year each CSP was asked for an update on how the Local Committee's funding had been utilised and for an assessment of the impact or outcomes the funding had achieved.
- 2.2 The CSP responses varied in terms of how the funding had been used in each locality. There were some notable examples of innovative practice across the county such as providing bespoke support to people with complex needs, making changes to local physical environment to prevent anti-social behaviour occurring and collaboration across three boroughs and districts to tackle fly-tipping. However, many of the other activities referred to funding leaflets, training or campaigns that could have potentially been delivered either through closer partnership working or by tapping into existing cross-county strategic projects. Additionally, few CSPs were able to provide an analysis of the impact that the funding had produced or the outcomes it had achieved.
- 2.3 In the context of the County's Medium Term Financial Plan and the requirement on all services to contribute to significant savings over the next 5 years, it is also imperative to ensure that the Committee's

funding secures better value for money and helps to achieve corporate and partnership priorities.

### **Community Safety Funding**

- 2.4 A clear and simple process designed to support CSPs will ensure that funds are processed efficiently.
- 2.5 Local CSPs will be invited to submit a brief outline of any projects that they would like to put the funding towards, and a simple template would be offered for this purpose.
- 2.6 To assist CSPs when identifying suitable projects, the following criteria is suggested as a guide:
  - (a) Results in residents feeling safer
  - (b) Has clear outcomes that align with the priorities of the Local Committee and/or the CSP
  - (c) Is non recurrent expenditure
  - (d) Does not fund routine CSP activities (e.g. salaries, training)
  - (e) Is not subsumed into generalised or non-descript funding pots
  - (f) Does not duplicate funding already provided (e.g. domestic abuse services, youth work, transport costs, literature which could be co-ordinated across all CSPs)
- 2.7 To ensure funds can be utilised within the current financial year, it is suggested that a deadline of 15 December to submit an outline of any project, is communicated widely to local CSPs.
- 2.8 To ensure funds can be processed in a quick and efficient manner, it is recommended that authority is delegated to the Community Partnership Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, to authorise expenditure. This will allow local organisations to initiate and implement projects with the minimum of delay.
- 2.9 In the event that there are insufficient applications from CSPs, and/or there are unspent community safety funds remaining once the 15 December 2016 deadline has past, the Local Committee could consider alternative local projects from other sources that meet the above criteria; or it could offer funding towards strategic or county-wide community safety delivery e.g. cross-county training or services; or alternatively, it could offer any unspent funds up to assist in meeting the Council's wider budgetary savings.

### **Monitoring Funding**

- 2.10 The CSP and any other recipients of funding will be required to provide the Local Committee with a short update outlining for each project how the funding was used and the difference and impact it has made in local communities.

**3. OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 All viable options were considered and appraised when forming the recommendations to the Local Committee.
- 3.2 Following the analysis undertaken at the end of the financial year 2015-16, the previous arrangements where the Committee transferred its funding to the CSP for it to decide how the funding was to be used was not considered to provide sufficient information on the impact that the funding had produced or the outcomes it had achieved.
- 3.3 The recommended funding arrangements will introduce a simple process for the commitment of funds by the Local Committee and will enable greater scrutiny over the use of this funding.

**4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 The Local Committee Chairmen have collectively been consulted about the recommendations contained in this report.

**5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 5.1 The costs of the recommendations in this report are contained within existing revenue budgets. Early scrutiny of proposed projects by CSPs and local organisations will help to achieve better value for money for the Committee's funding.

**6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 6.1 There are no direct equalities and diversity implications, however through its membership of the local CSP, the County Council helps to ensure that services are accessible to harder to reach groups. The CSP maintains ongoing monitoring of hate and domestic abuse crimes.

**7. LOCALISM:**

- 7.1 The proposals contained within this project would initially enable CSPs and potentially, after that, other local groups to submit project proposals which directly support the aims of the County Council as outlined in this report.

**8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

<b>Area assessed:</b>	<b>Direct Implications:</b>
Crime and Disorder	Set out below
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After	No significant implications.

Children	
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications.
Public Health	No significant implications

### 8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

Providing funding for local community safety projects will enable the CSP and/or other local organisations to help to promote safety, reduce crime, and tackle antisocial behaviour and raise awareness of safer practices and behaviours.

### **9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

9.1 The recommendations contained in this report are intended to secure greater oversight of the Committee's community safety expenditure and achieve better value for money through projects that help to achieve the County's community safety priorities.

### **10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

10.1 The CSP will be advised of the funding process agreed by the Local Committee and invited to access this funding.

**Contact Officer:**

Gordon Falconer, Community Safety Manager, Telephone 03456 009 009

**Consulted:**

Surrey's Local Committee chairmen.

**Annexes:**

None.

**Sources/background papers:**

Not applicable.

This page is intentionally left blank