

**OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER  
FOR HUMBERSIDE  
DECISION RECORD**

Decision Record Number: **17/2014**

Title: **Funding for Community Safety Partnerships**

**Executive Summary:**

To consider proposals and options in relation to the allocation of funding for Community Safety Partnerships in 2014/15.

**Decision:**

That approval be given to extending the current arrangements to allocate funding in 2014/15, based on 2012/13 allocations, for a further year with the conditions outlined at Appendix 1 to the report (option 5).

**Background Report:** Open

**Police and Crime Commissioner for Humberside**

I confirm I have considered whether or not I have any personal or prejudicial interest in this matter and take the proposed decision in compliance with my code of conduct.

Any such interests are recorded below.

The above decision has my approval.

Signature

*Matthew Grove*

Date 14.05.14

**POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER  
FOR HUMBERSIDE**

**SUBMISSION FOR DECISION**

**OPEN**

**Title:** Funding for Community Safety Partnerships

**Date:** 14 May 2014

---

**1. Purpose**

1.1 To consider proposals and options in relation to the allocation of funding for Community Safety Partnerships in 2014/15.

**2. Issue:**

2.1 In the last financial year you agreed to provide funding to the same level that CSPs received direct from the Home Office in 2012/13. This, together with other funding allocations, required you to use the whole of the Community Safety Fund Grant, £2.316m, which you received last year together with funds from your Partnership Reserve of £276k. Following various meetings with partners, you are now required to determine the arrangements for the allocation of funding for 2014/15.

**3. Recommendations:**

3.1 That consideration is given to extending the current arrangements to allocate funding in 2014/15, based on 2012/13 allocations, for a further year, together with the conditions that you may wish to attach to the funding.

**4. Background:**

4.1 In 2013/14 the Home Office provided you with a new grant called the Community Safety Fund Grant. It amounted to £2.316m. This was unringfenced and represented your share of £90m made available nationally to PCCs. At the same time the Home Office confirmed that it would stop paying grants from 31 March 2013 which totalled £123m in 2012/13. These grants included monies for Drug Intervention Programmes, Drug Testing on Arrest, Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) and Positive Futures as well as Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs).

4.2 After a series of meetings with partners you agreed to provide support at the same level as all of the partners received in 2012/13 direct from the Home Office. This amounted to £2.592m. It was financed by the grant together with £276k from your Partnership Reserve. The amount paid to the CSPs in 2013/14 was £537,774. This was made up of the following:-

<b>Community Safety Partnership</b>	<b>Amount £</b>
East Riding of Yorkshire	114,430
Hull	223,034
North East Lincolnshire	112,67
North Lincolnshire	87,623
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>537,774</b>

- 4.3 The Government indicated in 2013/14 that the Community Safety Fund Grant would be included in general grant in the Settlement for 2014/15 and this was confirmed in February 2014.
- 4.4 At the same time, permanent budget provision of £2.3m was incorporated into the budget for 2014/15 and later years in the Medium Term Financial Strategy approved alongside your precept proposal.
- 4.5 In February you considered funding in connection with Drug and Substance Misuse Services as per the table below:-

<b>Allocation</b>	<b>2014/15 £</b>	<b>2013/14 £</b>	<b>+/- change £</b>
Police – Drug Testing on Arrest	242,325	562,023	-319,698
East Riding of Yorkshire	120,000	70,030*	+19,070
Hull	462,476	462,476	0
North Lincolnshire	187,120	187,666	-546
North East Lincolnshire	291,024	291,024	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,302,945</b>	<b>1,573,219</b>	
<b>Saving</b> <i>*excluding amount allocated by the Police Authority</i>			<b>270 274</b>

- 4.6 You have yet to make a decision on the funding for 2014/15 for YOTs and Positive Futures, administered by Catch 22. These were £258,470 and £222,840 in 2013/14 respectively.
- 4.7 As previously reported, the CSPs are not only resourced by the Police and Crime Commissioner. Each partnership is funded differently, with essentially the Local Authority, the responsible authorities, and the health sector providing significant contributions, either in cash or 'in kind'.
- 4.8 Again as previously discussed, the transition to the new funding / governance arrangements in Policing brought with it uncertainty for community safety partners and the decision to continue support at previous levels was intended to provide some stability.
- 4.9 It was also intended to provide a platform for closer partnership working and a basis for working with partners to identify collectively how to get the best out

of the investment in addressing crime and community safety issues during this current and continuing period of austerity.

- 4.10 During the latter part of 2013/14, a series of meetings was held with key stakeholders within each of the CSP areas which are coterminous with the unitary authorities within the Humberside Force area. These meetings were aimed at securing support for pan-Humber working, where appropriate, and for the establishment of a strategic group with a corporate director level representative from each local authority and involving representatives from other key partner organisations to examine community safety issues.
- 4.11 The stated aim of the group would be to oversee and ensure that partnership resources available across all areas are identified and targeted to deliver the best outcomes for local people. This would be in terms of maintaining services, or if possible improving them, against the background of the financial challenges that all public sector agencies are facing. A feature of the approach would be to identify what is working and what is not working together with the things that might be done together collectively and what is best done individually.
- 4.12 Following the above meetings, the matter was referred to the Unitary Leaders' Group on 21 March 2014 after which efforts have been made to bring together the strategic group. However, it has not been possible to arrange the first meeting until July 2014.
- 4.13 Given this situation, it is recognised that interim measures are needed to provide reassurance regarding your continued commitment to support the CSPs. This is needed in order to give a degree of security and to avoid the potential unintended consequences that this uncertainty can have on decisions in relation to staff and the continued delivery of key activities and projects.
- 4.14 In view of this position, if you provide support, you may want to impose conditions in addition to the normal requirements for ensuring that the funding should be used/invested in initiatives/projects/existing work streams that contribute to the overall outcomes set out in the Police and Crime Commissioner in his Police and Crime Plan for 2013 – 2017.
- 4.15 The proposals set out in this report are aimed at securing commitment to the issues that have already been raised with partners in relation to the need to consider pan-Humber working, to identify value for money opportunities and for the establishment of the strategic group at corporate director level to examine community safety issues.
- 4.16 Details of suggested conditions are set out in Appendix 1.

## 5 Options / Risks / Implications:

### ***Option 1 – defer a decision on funding for 2014/15***

- 5.1 You could defer a decision on funding for 2014/15 until further discussions have been held with partners to establish arrangements for the strategic oversight of crime and community safety funding arrangements and to develop proposals to secure medium and long term support for CSPs.
- 5.2 However, following recent pressure from partners at the operational level, there are clearly concerns that the uncertainty could lead to precipitative action in relation to decisions on the future of staff and the cessation of existing projects and initiatives with detrimental impact on the outcomes set out within the Police and Crime Plan.
- 5.3 This option could have serious consequences for relationships and may well inhibit discussions around how the partners can assist in making a contribution to reducing crime and furthering your objectives.

### ***Option 2 – allocate a reduced level of funding compared with the amount made available in 2013/14***

- 5.4 This option would provide the opportunity to agree an allocation of a proportion of the amount made available last year.
- 5.5 This would not be in keeping with previous suggestions to allocate funding for a set period e.g. 3 to 6 months during which time efforts would be made to seek to obtain a better understand of the intentions of each partnership to assure you as to the right allocations to make in the future.
- 5.6 On the basis of previous discussions with partners, providing reduced or limited funding would create problems for CSPs, and could undermine their belief that the work they are undertaking is good value and is an efficient and effective use of the resources. Securing and ongoing dialogue with partners has already proved difficult and this would militate against achieving the objective of achieving the strategic overview arrangements that you are seeking to see established.
- 5.7 This option could sour relationships and get in the way of discussions around how the partners can assist in making an even greater impact in reducing crime and furthering your objectives.
- 5.8 A lower contribution would however enable you to protect your reserves which would then be available to address other financial pressures that will inevitably arise in the future.

### ***Option 3 – allocate funding for a limited period say 3 months or 6 months based on last year's allocations***

- 5.9 This option would hold with earlier suggestions to allocate only 3 or 6 months funding and during that period to strive to better understand the intentions of each partnership to assure you as to the right allocations to make in the future.

- 5.10 However, following previous partnership meetings this move could be against the wishes of CSPs, centred on their sincere belief that the work they are undertaking is good value and is an efficient and effective use of the resources. In addition, securing ongoing dialogue with partners has proved difficult and this may not allow sufficient time to achieve the strategic overview arrangements that you are seeking to see established.
- 5.11 This option could also sour relationships and get in the way of discussions around how the partners can assist in making an even greater impact in reducing crime and furthering your objectives.

***Option 4 – allocate funding at the same level as last year without conditions***

- 5.12 This would require you to make a further top up using funds from the Partnership Reserve if the total allocation for 2014/15, including that for drugs and substance misuse already agreed and future allocations yet to be considered for YOTs and Catch 22 exceed the total permanent budget provision of £2.3m. This could then limit the flexibility that you have to support your own initiatives, including making more money available for funding for victims services.
- 5.13 This option would continue to give the partners some comfort in your belief in their work and demonstrate a clear commitment of wanting to develop and maintain an effective relationship with them. Whilst it would fit with your strategic intention to work with partners to get ‘upstream’ of crime the basis for the allocation is becoming increasingly dated
- 5.14 It must also be recognised that some of the major potential contributors to supporting your intention to get ‘upstream’ are not directly part of the community safety partnerships e.g. health and well being boards and children’s trusts (or equivalent bodies). Therefore you will need to consider how you wish to influence these other contributors.
- 5.15 By topping up the allocation from the Partnership Reserve, you will still be carrying significant risk of future pressure on your reserves as the budgets of all public sector partners come under pressure.

***Option 5 – allocate funding at the same level as last year with conditions***

- 5.16 As in Option 4, depending on other decisions, this could require you to make a further top up using funds from the Partnership Reserve which could then limit the flexibility that you have to support your own initiatives, including making more money available for funding for victims service’.
- 5.17 This option would continue to give the partners comfort in your belief in their work and demonstrate a clear commitment of wanting to develop and maintain an effective relationship with them. Whilst the basis of allocation is dated, it would fit with your strategic intention to work with partners to get ‘upstream’ of crime and also enable you to secure your wider aspirations

regarding the strategic oversight of investment in crime and community safety initiatives and also to progress initiatives on a pan-Humber basis where appropriate.

5.18 It must be still recognised that some of the major potential contributors to supporting your intention to get 'upstream' are not directly part of the community safety partnerships but the establishment of a strategic group would provide an opportunity for this to be addressed.

5.19 Once again as in Option 4, by topping up the allocation from the Partnership Reserve, you will still be carrying significant risk of future pressure on your reserves as the budgets of all public sector partners come under pressure.

## **6 Financial Comments:**

6.1 The information in the report sets out the context for the financial implications of the options detailed above. It must be recognised that there may be further calls on you Partnership Reserve and that these resources can only be used once.

## **7 Legal Comments:**

7.1 There are no legal issues to consider, other than the need to have binding agreement in relation to the conditions proposed. It must also be noted that partners will be under pressure already in relation to meeting the contractual and employment obligations in light of any delay in making a decision.

## **8 Equality Comments:**

8.1 There are no equality issues in the context of this report.

## **9 Summary**

9.1 The work of community safety partners remains critical to the achievement of your vision. In 2013/14 the transition to the new governance arrangements created tension and uncertainty for partners. Efforts to bring them together have proved difficult and time consuming.

9.2 Your decision to continue to fund CSPs last year at the same level as in 2012/13 provided certainty for partners and was welcome. However, given the pressure on the budgets of all partners future funding at current levels will be unsustainable and plans need to be made as to how to address this. You have identified the clear need therefore to establish a strategic group to oversee spending on community safety initiatives to gain a wider perspective, to assess where you can ensure consistent services pan-Humber, to ensure that your investment is achieving value for money and to have a medium term financial strategy.

9.3 There are other pressures on the resources that you have available, including the need to commission new services, the prospect of partners withdrawing

support as they address their own financial challenges. It is also inevitable that there will be new initiatives that you identify to best deliver the Police and Crime Plan which will add to these pressures.

- 9.4 In view of the need to continue to develop your own plans, a co-ordinated and strategic approach to crime and community safety activity across the four CSPs, Option 5 is recommended as the preferred option in relation to your decision to allocate resources in 2014/15 as this provides a basis for achieving this objective.

## **10 Next steps**

- 10.1 Once you have made your determination, including your decision in relation to the conditions to be applied to any offer of support in 2014/15, it will be appropriate to forward a letter of intent to the CSPs, seeking their acceptance of the terms.
- 10.2 When this has been obtained, the normal arrangements including these conditions and the general terms associated with any grant can be progressed prior to payment of the monies approved.

## **11 Background/Supporting Papers: JB/ File: Partnerships 2014/15**

**John Bates**  
**Deputy Chief Executive and Treasurer**  
**Office of Police & Crime Commissioner**



## **Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Funding 2014/15 – Conditions**

The Commissioner has no desire to introduce the concept of a pan-Humber CSP and fully supports the continuation of local CSPs. However, there are efficiencies and opportunities to spread good practice that he would like to see exploited across Authority boundaries. Therefore, the following conditions of community safety funding for 2014/15 are to be agreed from members of the CSPs:

### **Condition 1**

Funding should be used/invested in initiatives/projects/existing work streams that contribute to the overall outcomes set out by the Police and Crime Commissioner in his Police and Crime Plan for 2013 – 2017, these being:

#### **1. Reduce Crime**

- Reduce violent crime
- Target resources at drugs, alcohol and mental health
- Target offenders and places (such as crime and ASB hotspots)
- Increase visibility, availability and accessibility of police and other services

#### **2. Protect the Public and Improve Safety**

- Manage dangerous offenders
- Meet obligations to national threats
- Protect children, youth and vulnerable adults
- Empower and enable local communities to work together with the police and other agencies to solve problems locally

#### **3. Improve the Quality of Services for Victims**

- Reduce repeat victimisation
- Support victim recovery
- Expand restorative justice and community payback so that offender are seen to pay for their crimes in local communities
- Ensure a prompt and effective response from the police and others to calls for service

### **Condition 2**

CSPs are to provide current cross authority sharing mechanisms and systems, which demonstrate effective and efficient use of resources. Where appropriate, CSPs should work together to maximise the return on the investment made by the Police and Crime Commissioner. This may include (although is not limited to) the sharing of resources, considering and implementing pan-Humber solutions to crime and

community safety, developing projects and initiatives that work across local authority boundaries.

**Condition 3**

CSP Managers and Chairs are to commit to supporting the development of a Humber-wide strategic group to consider wider CS Funding and investments, linking with the Strategic Co-ordination Group of Corporate Directors.

**Condition 4**

CSPs to provide quarterly returns on investment to the Chief Financial Officer (OPCC) evidencing spend against the Police and Crime Plan priorities. The returns are to include both financial detail and progress against the shared/collaborative services across Authority boundaries