



Your Moray

REPORT TO: Community Planning Board – 7 August 2008

SUBJECT: Community Planning Budget

BY: Moray Council, Corporate Policy Unit Manager

1. REASON FOR REPORT

1.1 The Community Planning Board is asked to note the way current funding is agreed by individual partners for community planning.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Community Planning Board is asked to note the way current funding is agreed by individual partners for community planning.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 At the Community Planning Board meeting on 29 May 2008, the Board wanted clarification from each partner on how they allocated their funding to Community Planning.

3.2 Following the meeting each partner was asked how their organisation calculated its level of funding. Their responses are below.

3.2.1 NHS Grampian – NHS Grampian presently do not have an income stream for Community Planning. Locally funds have been identified to support the public participation aspect of Community Planning. Existing staff and general resources are in part directed on Community Planning themes as well as core business.

3.2.2 Grampian Fire and Rescue Services – Grampian Fire and Rescue Services have been contributing to Community Planning in Moray since 2006 and this happened to bring Moray command in line with Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen City command. No formula was applied to the process of calculating the funding amount.

3.2.3 Grampian Police – There is no formula. The budget is allocated according to need and there are no unallocated monies in the local budget. The local budget does not include any allocation for Community Planning. Therefore a bid needs to be made to Headquarters, finance for funding. This was done on the basis of a bid made some time ago, which was approved, for £10,000 to support Community Planning. This bid is continued to be submitted until a funding formula was agreed.

This has been highlighted to Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen City as they have been doing the same.

From the Police perspective a formula that all the partners stood by would have merit. They recognise that most of the funding in reality is staff time but it would save an annual debate if a formula could be agreed.

3.2.4 Moray Council – In addition to providing staffing support to Community Planning, the Council also provides a budget for Local Area Forums, Citizens' Panel and running costs of the Partnership. This money was found from the Chief Executive's office budget and allocated to projects such as the Citizens' Panel, to ensure that the Council could meet its funding obligations.

Previously, Quality of Life funding was used for supporting community planning. With the removal of ring fenced funding, these issues are now funded directly from the Council's budget.

3.2.5 HIE Moray – HIE does not see a role in funding the routine revenue costs of the running of the Community Planning Partnership in Moray. However, HIE will continue to consider funding towards ad hoc Community Planning projects that support HIE's Operating Plan and the Government Economic Strategy, e.g. whether this be work of the Citizen's Panel, a research study or studies, or some other item.

HIE considered their budget in Moray will largely be spent on projects identified within the SOA, notably under National Outcomes 1, 2 and 3; achievement of objectives and benefits set out in the SOA is how HIE will financially support the CPP in Moray.

3.2.6 Moray College - Moray College's contribution was calculated on the basis of what appeared to be commensurate with what was being contributed by the other partners. It is recognised that the budget has been arrived at on the basis of what was assumed to be the expenditure requirements of the Community Planning Partnership but this will need to be revisited in the context of the new arrangements. With this in mind, the College remains open minded to the possibility of contributing more to an enhanced budget if this can be seen to be of demonstrable benefit.

3.2.7 MVSO – MVSO is a voluntary organisation and its running costs are supported by financial contributions from the Moray Council. It would therefore not be appropriate to seek financial contributions back from them to assist the Council in delivering against community planning priorities.

3.3 There are mixed views about how funding is provided to the partnership with most partners supporting priorities though existing staff and resources.

3.4 How the funding contributions are calculated by each partner needs to be considered by each partner of the Board.

4. SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS

(a) Community Plan / Theme Plans / Partner Plans

Some funding is required to support the overall Community Planning Partnership as well as the themes to meet community planning priorities.

(b) Policy and Legal

The Council is required to lead on Community Planning and the other statutory partners are required to participate. There is no legal or policy requirements to provide a financial contribution to the Community Planning Partnership.

(c) Resources (Financial, Staffing and Risks)

The overall Partnership has been given funding from individual partners and has agreed its priorities within the budget available. Consultation needs to be given to whether there is a need for other areas to be funded which money is not available for and whether there should be a formula to calculate funding from each partner.

All partners provide existing staff and resources to community planning priorities within the themes.

Consideration of the risks should be given to the potential of alleviating partners by developing funding formula which may then be taken away from funding/resourcing theme priorities.

(d) Consultation

All statutory partners have been consulted and their comments are contained in this report.

5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1 The funding for Community Planning is based on historical levels of contribution and does not necessarily reflect the cost of administering or delivering outcomes that have been agreed by partners.**

Author of Report: Bridget Mustard, Corporate Policy Unit Manager

Ref: BM/jg