



**REPORT TO: COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD – 30 OCTOBER 2008**

**SUBJECT: COMMUNITY PLANNING BUDGET**

**BY: MORAY COUNCIL, CORPORATE POLICY UNIT  
MANAGER**

## **1. REASON FOR REPORT**

- 1.1 The Community Planning Board is invited to consider how other Community Planning Partnerships are provided with funding to cover their administration costs and whether any of the approaches outlined might be appropriate for adoption in Moray.

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Board considers the approaches taken by other Community Planning Partnerships to fund their administration costs and whether any of the approaches outlined might be appropriate for adoption in Moray.

## **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 At its meeting on 7 August 2008, the Community Planning Board was asked to note the current method of agreeing core funding from individual partners for Community Planning in Moray. It was also agreed that further information would be sought from other Community Planning Partnerships as to how partners contribute to funding the core costs of Partnerships.
- 3.2 An approach was made to all 32 Community Planning Partnerships to seek information about Partnership core funding – 8 Partnerships responded to the approach.
- 3.3 In two of the Partnerships (Orkney and East Lothian) the Council meets all of the core costs, although this year Orkney has seconded a Community Planning Officer from a partner organisation with funding split 50:50 between NHS and the Fairer Scotland Fund.

- 3.4 In other three (Aberdeen City, Aberdeenshire and Angus) the Council meets the bulk of core costs with smaller contributions from NHS and the Police – Grampian Fire & Rescue and NESTRANS also make small contributions in Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire.

Aberdeen City is the only Partnership, of those who replied, to consider a budget formula in respect of partner contributions. The proposal is to start with a flat rate contribution from all partners (eg £10k) and then adopt a percentage formula thereafter based on the total budgets of the partners added together – contributions to the Police and Fire Boards would be deducted from the Council's total budget.

- 3.5 North Ayrshire Partnership and Glasgow Community Planning Ltd are meeting the bulk of this year's core costs from the Fairer Scotland Fund, while East Ayrshire Partnership has no standing contributions from partners to core costs – it jointly commissions projects, which are then paid for by the partners.

- 3.6 The current situation in Moray is that the majority of partners make small ad hoc contributions towards meeting the core costs of Community Planning, but the bulk of these costs continue to be met by the Council.

- 3.7 It should be noted that at present there are no plans to adopt a pan-Grampian formula for Community Planning partner funding contributions to the three north east Community Planning Partnerships.

- 3.8 The possible future options for the Board to consider in respect of meeting Community Planning administration costs are:

- (i) Continue the current arrangements with partners being invited to contribute, as they are able, towards meeting core costs identified through the budgetary process.
- (ii) Adopt some form of budget formula, similar to that being considered by Aberdeen City Alliance (Community Planning Partnership).
- (iii) Seek a proportion of future funding from external sources, such as the Fairer Scotland Fund.

- 3.9 During the development of the SOA (2009-10) work can be carried out to identify budget from partners against particular actions. This would allow the Partnership to see the fuller contribution of individual partners, delivering against agreed outcomes.

#### **4. SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS**

- (a) **Community Plan / Theme Plans / Partner Plans**  
Funding is required to support the core costs of the Community Planning Partnership in order to meet priorities identified through the Community Plan and the Single Outcome Agreement.

**(b) Policy and Legal**

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

**(c) Resources (Financial, Staffing and Risks)**

The Partnership has always been given funding from individual partners and agreed its priorities within the budget available. Consideration is now being given to the need for additional funding to meet future priorities and whether a budget formula could be adopted to specify contributions from each partner.

All partners also provide existing staff resources to support the Community Planning process and contribute to meeting its priorities.

The risk of developing a funding formula for core costs, which diverts partner funding from resourcing theme priorities, should also be considered.

**(d) Consultations**

Other Community Planning Partnerships have been consulted about how core Partnership costs are currently funded.

**5. CONCLUSION**

**5.1 The Board is invited to consider how other Community Planning Partnerships are provided with their funding to cover administration costs and whether any of the approaches outlined might be appropriate for adoption in Moray.**

**Author of Report: Roy Anderson, Community Planning Officer**

**Background Papers:**

**Ref:**