

TEST VALLEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Date: 19th July 2007

Title of paper : 2007/08 Community Safety Budget		
Prepared by: Jamie O'Reilly		
Present at meeting: Yes		
Leading partner/s: All		
Summary of content and issues raised: The report sets out the financial position and key proposals		
Recommendations: i) That the Board approve the recommendations as outlined.		
Financial and HR Implications – None		
Promotion of Equality & Diversity – None		
Purpose of paper (tick)	Decision	√
	Discussion & comment	
	Information	

TEST VALLEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP
19th July 2007

REPORT OF COMMUNITY SAFETY MANAGER

THE 2007/08 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP BUDGET

1 BACKGROUND

At the last meeting of the 25th April 2007, the Community Safety Partnership Board approved a report which set out the framework for the Partnership's 2007/08 budget.

Since this meeting the Government have advised the County Council that this year's Home Office partnership funds will be subject to a 14.06% cut to the revenue element of their funds. This applies to all Safer Stronger Communities funds including the £25,000 'ASB top-up' allocated as a contribution towards the ASB Officer post. This has an effect on the plans as outlined in the budget report approved at the last meeting.

Since then it has emerged from discussions with the County Council that as the SSCF funds are in effect absorbed into a single LA Apot, there is not an automatic obligation to pass this 14.06% cut in full to all CDRP's. At the community safety practitioner's group meeting it was suggested that perhaps if district CDRP's offered to absorb half of the 14.06% cut, then other LAA partners could be invited to volunteer to absorb a contribution towards the cuts.

2 THE IMPACT OF A 14.06% CUT HERE AT TEST VALLEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

2007/2008-£83,950+25,000ASB uplift=£108,950-14.06%=£93,632		
		Revenue
Scheme		£
Pooled budget		25,045
CDRP Chairmanship		5,850
ASB Officer post		25,000
Funding shortfall V Davies		12,000
Total		67,895

Total available		93,632
Difference (available for FTAP)		25,737

The impact of a 14.06% cut to the revenue budget is to reduce the funds available for FTAP actions, which were budgeted as follows:

Project	Annual cost	What is now feasible? (Realistic estimate for 07/08)	Why?
Alcohol brief interventions	20k	14k	Possible move to only Andover wide project.
ASB Mediation project	5k	5k	Not feasible this year.
YISP expansion across Borough	4k	0	Late start in role out.
Family based early intervention	10k	5k (+7k capital)	Managed to shift split, to favour capital.
Expansion of IDVA across whole Borough	8K	£4k	Delay in delivery owing to restricted delivery options.
Secure perpetrator program places	5k	0	Can't do this alone – no partners.
Role out of targeted work with young men at risk of becoming future perpetrators.	5K	0	No provider secured.
Total	57k	28k	

Besides this direct impact on our budgets, there has been an indirect impact owing to our having been developing an alcohol arrest referral project with our neighbouring CDRP's New Forest and Eastleigh, both of whom have withdrawn citing these cuts as the cause.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is recommended that we do not significantly change the overall budget, but that we continue to fund activity through the Floor Target Action Plan as managed by the Delivery group, who will attempt to use further slippage and transfer of funded activities from revenue streams to available capital streams where possible

APPENDIX1

OTHERPARTNERSHIPFUNDS

SSCFCapital

Amountavailable=£31,000

Project	Annualcost
Family based earlyintervention	7,000
Prime: security +environmental	10,000
Community engt + cohesion activities+priority crime+asbc.devt (CDAG)	10,000
Total	27,000
Difference	4,000

TheBCUFundValue=£50,000revenue(notaffected bycuts)

Project	Annualcost	What is now feasible?
OCU Taskingand Co-ordination	20,000	20,000
Analyst	15,000	15,000
Prime	10,000	10,000
AMEC	5,000	5000
Total	50,000	50,000

The ASB uplift is not included in the total fund in g available to each CDRP

BSCF	Area	den	DIP	Bobby Trust	Alcohol Co-ord	Winchjester Prison	DV Co-ord	Caddie	YISP	total CDRP contribution	% contribution to LAA
144869	Basingstoke CDRP	0.1091	8182.5	4364.0	4582.2	4364.0	2849.9	3636.4	9000.0	36979.0	25.5%
100851	EHants CDRP	0.076	5700.0	3040.0	3192.0	3040.0	1985.3	3636.4	9000.0	29593.6	29.3%
124890	Eastleigh CDRP	0.0941	7057.5	3764.0	3952.2	3764.0	2458.1	3636.4	9000.0	33632.1	26.9%
112973	Fareham CDRP	0.0851	6382.5	3404.0	3574.2	3404.0	2223.0	3636.4	9000.0	31624.0	28.0%
115934	Gosport CDRP	0.0873	6547.5	3492.0	3666.6	3492.0	2280.5	3636.4	9000.0	32114.9	27.7%
89880	Hart CDRP	0.0677	5077.5	2708.0	2843.4	2708.0	1768.5	3636.4	9000.0	27741.7	30.9%
145782	Havant CDRP	0.1098	8235.0	4392.0	4611.6	4392.0	2868.2	3636.4	9000.0	37135.2	25.5%
163130	New Forest CDRP	0.1229	9217.5	4916.0	5161.8	4916.0	3210.4	3636.4	9000.0	40058.1	24.6%
101503	Rushmoor CDRP	0.0765	5737.5	3060.0	3213.0	3060.0	1998.3	3636.4	9000.0	29705.2	29.3%
115056	Test Valley CDRP	0.0867	6502.5	3468.0	3641.4	3468.0	2264.8	3636.4	9000.0	31981.0	27.8%
112434	Winchester CDRP	0.0848	6360.0	3392.0	3561.6	3392.0	2215.1	3636.4	9000.0	31557.1	28.1%
1327302										362122.0	
Totals		1	75000.0	40000.0	42000.0	40000.0	26122.0	40000.0	99000.0	362122.0	

115056	Test Valley CDRP	0.0867	6502.5	3641.4	2264.8	3636.4	9000.0	25045.0	21.8%
--------	------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------	-------