

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**JOINT COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE)**



**DATE:** 15 JULY 2019

**LEAD OFFICER:** GORDON FALCONER, COMMUNITY SAFETY MANAGER

**SUBJECT:** JOINT COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING

**DIVISION:** All

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The Joint Committee has a delegated budget of £3000 for community safety projects in 2019/20. This report sets out the process by which this funding should be allocated to the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local community organisations that promote the safety and wellbeing of residents.

NB – In Spelthorne the Community Safety Partnership is known as the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership (SSSP) which is how it will be referred to in this report.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) is asked to agree that:**

- (i) The Committee's delegated community safety budget of £3000 for 2018/19 be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Joint Committee, and that the SSSP and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at paragraph 2.4 of this report.
- (ii) Authority be delegated to the County Council's Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated at paragraph 2.4 of this report.
- (iii) The committee receives updates on the project(s) funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The report sets out a process for allocating the committee's delegated community safety budget of £3000 to local organisations.

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 Prior to 2016, the Committee had historically chosen to passport its delegated community safety funding to the local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to assist in their efforts to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour on behalf of residents.
- 1.2 Following countywide analysis of the projects that were funded through CSPs and the outcomes achieved, the Joint Committee agreed that the SSSP should firstly be invited to provide an outline of any prospective projects that could be supported from the committee's funding for approval. This aimed to provide greater oversight of the committee's expenditure. In the context of the County's Medium Term Financial Plan and the requirement upon all county services to contribute to significant savings, the process would also help to achieve better value for money from projects in support of the County Council's wider community safety priorities.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

- 2.1 In 2018/19 the committee awarded funding for a project to deter knife crime through a theatre presentation that would be performed in local schools. An officer from the Community Safety Team will talk about this project to the Committee at the meeting.
- 2.2 As in the previous year, a clear and simple process designed to support SSSP will be adopted in order that funds can be processed efficiently this year.
- 2.3 SSSP will be invited to submit a brief outline of the projects that it would like to put the committee's funding towards, using a simple template designed for this purpose.
- 2.4 To assist CSPs in identifying suitable projects, the following criteria will be provided 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 coordinated across all CSPs).

2.5 To ensure that funds can be distributed speedily and efficiently, it is recommended that authority is delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee, to authorise the expenditure of the committee's funds outside the formal quarterly committee meeting cycle. This should allow local organisations to obtain approval, initiate and implement projects with the minimum of delay.

2.6 Once implemented, SSSP and any other recipients of this funding will be required to provide the joint committee with a short update on each project, outlining how the funding was used and the difference and impact it has made in the local community.

### **3. OPTIONS:**

3.1 All viable options were considered and appraised when forming the recommendations to the Joint Committee. The previous arrangement, whereby the committee transferred both its funding and the decision-making about how the funding could be used to SSSP was not considered to provide sufficient information on the impact that the funding or the outcomes it had achieved.

3.2 The recommended funding arrangements will employ a simple process for the commitment of funds by the committee to enable greater scrutiny over the use of this funding.

### **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

4.1 Local and Joint Committee chairmen were collectively consulted about the process for allocating community safety funding, as recommended 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 SSSP 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 or diversity implications. However, through its membership of SSSP, the County Council can help to ensure that local services are accessible to harder to reach groups. SSSP also maintains ongoing monitoring of hate and domestic abuse crimes.

## **7. LOCALISM:**

7.1 The proposals contained in this report will enable SSSP and/or other suitable local organisations to submit projects that support the County Council's strategic goal of enhancing resident experience.

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

### **8.1 Crime and Disorder implications**

The committee's funding for local community safety projects enables SSSP 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 SSSP will be advised of the funding process agreed by the Joint Committee and invited to access this funding.

### **Contact Officer:**

Carys Walker, Partnership Committee Officer (Spelthorne), Telephone 01932 794081

### **Consulted:**

Surrey's local and joint committee chairmen and local and joint committee members.

### **Annexes: None**

### **Sources/background papers:**

Not applicable.