

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder

**For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Public Protection and Safety
PDS Committee on**

Date: 10th September 2013

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: BUDGET MONITORING 2013/14

Contact Officer: Claire Martin, Head of Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4286 E-mail: Claire.martin@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

This report provides an update of the latest budget monitoring position for 2013/14 for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio based on expenditure and activity levels up to 31st July 2013. This shows a projected underspend of £10k.

It reports the level of expenditure and progress with the implementation of the selected project within the Member Priority Initiatives and provides details of the latest expenditure within the Community Safety Budget as set out in Appendix 3.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 The Portfolio Holder is requested to:

2.1.1 Endorse the latest 2013/14 budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

2.1.2 Note the progress of the implementation of the targeted Neighbourhood activity project.

2.2 The PDS Committee is asked to comment on the allocation of Community Safety expenditure as set out in Appendix 3.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Sound financial management
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Public Protection & Safety Portfolio Budgets and earmarked reserve for Members Priority Initiatives
 4. Total current budget for this head: £3.5m and £150k
 5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budgets 2013/14 and the earmarked reserve for Member Priority Initiatives
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 59 ftes
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: The statutory duties relating to financial reporting are covered within the Local Government Act 1972; the Local Government Finance Act 1998; the Accounts and Audit Regulations 1996; the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government Act 2002
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The services covered in this report affect all Council Taxpayers, Business Ratepayers, those who owe general income to the Council, all staff, Members and Pensioners.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The 2013/14 projected outturn is detailed in Appendix 1, with a forecast of projected spend for each division compared to the latest approved budget and identifies in full the reason for any variances.
- 3.2 Costs attributable to individual services have been classified as “controllable” and “non-controllable” in Appendix 1. Budget holders have full responsibility for those budgets classified as “controllable” as any variations relate to those factors over which the budget holder has, in general, direct control. “Non-controllable” budgets are those which are managed outside of individual budget holder’s service and, as such, cannot be directly influenced by the budget holder in the shorter term. These include, for example, building maintenance costs and property rents which are managed by the Property Division but are allocated within individual departmental/portfolio budgets to reflect the full cost of the service. As such, any variations arising are shown as “non-controllable” within services but “controllable” within the Resources Portfolio. Other examples include cross departmental recharges and capital financing costs. This approach, which is reflected in financial monitoring reports to budget holders, should ensure clearer accountability by identifying variations within the service that controls financial performance. Members should specifically refer to the “controllable” budget variations relating to portfolios in considering financial performance. These variations will include the costs related to the recession.
- 3.3 Council on 26th March 2012 approved the setting aside of £2,260k in an earmarked reserve for Member Priority Initiatives. The Public and Protection and Safety Portfolio is responsible for the delivery of one of the projects – Targeted Neighbourhood Activity with an allocation of £150k.
- 3.4 Appendix 2 has the details of the progress of this scheme.
- 3.5 Within the 2013/14 Community Safety Budget there are a number of budgets that are subject to Portfolio Holder authorisation and for information these budgets are listed below: -

Expenditure requiring Portfolio Holder approval

	2013/14 Budget £	Allocation Agreed to Date £	Current Bids £	Balance of Budget Unallocated £
Portfolio Holder Initiative Fund Grants	53,530	20,000	0	33,530
Youth Diversion Expenditure	58,250	44,835	0	13,415
Safer Neighbourhood Development Grants	40,000	8,845	2,000	29,155
Operation Payback	8,400	0	0	8,400
	160,180	73,680	2,000	84,500

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Resources Portfolio Plan includes the aim of effective monitoring and control of expenditure within budget and includes the target that each service department will spend within its own budget.
- 4.2 Bromley’s Best Value Performance Plan “Making a Difference” refers to the Council’s intention to remain amongst the lowest Council Tax levels in outer London and the importance of greater focus on priorities.
- 4.3 The four year financial forecast report highlights the financial pressures facing the Council. It remains imperative that strict budgetary control continues to be exercised in 2013/14 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.
- 4.4 Chief Officers and Departmental Heads of Finance are continuing to place emphasis on the need for strict compliance with the Council’s budgetary control and monitoring arrangements.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The latest projections from managers show that a projected underspend of £10k is expected for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio for 2013/14.
- 5.2 The projected variance has arisen due to an underspend within the staffing budget of £24k which is offsetting the projected shortfall of income from the provision of CCTV services to registered social landlords of Dr £14k. More details of the reasons for the variances are included in Appendix 1.
- 5.3 It should be noted that the Youth Service budget will be included in the next budget monitoring report for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio. A balanced budget is currently being projected for this service which is currently split over two other Portfolios – Care Services and Education.
- 5.4 Appendix 2 shows that an amount of £39k has been spent/committed for the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity project. Officers are currently investigating whether gating is required in some areas within Mottingham.
- 5.5 To date, a total of £73,680 has been committed/spent from the community safety budgets as detailed in Appendix 3, leaving an unspent balance of £86,500. A bid of £2,000 for a dog microchip service has been submitted to be considered by the Portfolio Holder. Elsewhere on this agenda is a report requesting the Portfolio Holder to agree that £20,000 is allocated for additional enforcement activities from the Safer Neighbourhood Grant budget.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal, Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	2013/14 budget monitoring files within ECS finance section