

**Decision Maker:** Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder

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

**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> June 2014

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

**Title:** Provisional Outturn 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 Environment and Community Services

**Ward:** Boroughwide

---

1. Reason for report

This report provides the Portfolio Holder with the provisional final outturn position for 2013/14. This shows an underspend of £114k.

It also reports the level of expenditure during 2013/14 for the selected project within the Member Priority Initiatives and provides details of the provisional outturn within the Community Safety Budget.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 **The Portfolio Holder is requested to:**

2.1.1 **Endorse the 2013/14 provisional outturn position for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.**

2.1.2 **Note the outturn position in respect of the targeted neighbourhood activity project.**

2.1.3 **Note the final 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: £2.860m 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): 58ftes
  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 provisional outturn for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio shows an underspend of £114k against a controllable budget of £2.452m, representing a 4.65% variation. The detailed variations are shown in Appendix 1 with a summary included in Section 5.
- 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 26<sup>th</sup> 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 actual expenditure incurred during 2013/14 for 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 the outturn position for these budgets are listed below: -

#### Expenditure that required Portfolio Holder approval

	2013/14 Budget	2013/14 Spend	2013/14 Balance
	£	£	£
Portfolio Holder Initiative Fund Grants	62,640	62,641	1
Youth Diversion Expenditure	53,690	53,687	-3
Safer Neighbourhood Development Grants	38,250	38,154	-96
Operation Payback	5,600	5,600	0
	<b>160,180</b>	<b>160,082</b>	<b>-98</b>

### 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 total variation for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio is an underspend of £114k. Some of the major variations are summarised below with more detail included in Appendix 1.
- 5.2 There is an underspend of £44k within the staffing budget mainly due to the secondment of the Head of Public Health Nuisance to the Executive Assistant.
- 5.3 Other variations include an underspend of £28k across various CCTV budgets and the stray dogs kennelling contract achieved an underspend of £28k due to a reduced number of dogs being kept in kennels and less medical costs incurred during the winter months. Other net variations across the Portfolio totalled Cr £8k.
- 5.4 There is a net variation of Cr £6k for the mortuary/coroners service.
- 5.5 Appendix 2 shows that £44k has been spent up to 31 March 2014 for the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity project, leaving a balance of £106k.
- 5.6 Appendix 3 provides information on the 2013/14 expenditure within the Community Safety Budget that required the authorisation of the Portfolio Holder. A total of £160,082 was spent from the available budget of £160,180.

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