

Report Title: Metropolitan Care and Repair – Final funding decision 2011-12

Report of: Anne Lippitt, Interim Director Urban Environment

Signed :

Dated:

Contact Officer : Claire Kowalska, Community Safety Strategic Manager, Urban Environment

Wards(s) affected: **All**

Report for: **Key Decision**

### **1. Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek final approval from the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion in relation to funding decisions for 2011/12 for projects and services delivered in relation to Safer Communities. There is only one service, provided by Metropolitan Care and Repair. The final funding decision is based on scoring this organisation against a range of agreed criteria and follows a period of consultation with Metropolitan Care and Repair.
- 1.2 On 25 February 2011 the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion agreed criteria for future funding in relation to Safer Communities funding for 2011/12. These criteria were subject to consultation and this report seeks to confirm approval of the criteria as attached at Appendix 1.
- 1.3 These criteria were provisionally applied to assess the future commissioning of services from Metropolitan Care and Repair and these provisional decisions were subject to consultation. Following appropriate consideration of the responses to this consultation and having had due regard to the Council's equality duties as set out in the Equality Act 2010 this report seeks Cabinet Member approval to implement the final funding decision arising from the application of these criteria.

## **2. Introduction by Cabinet Member**

- 2.1 The funding cuts from Central Government have meant that all areas of support and budget commitment be reviewed. Whilst we wish to continue our valuable work in relation to anti-burglary support for vulnerable people, the reductions in funding have meant that we have had to make some very hard choices with our limited resources. However, by working with our partners in The Police we are confident that we are able to mitigate the worst impacts of the Government's spending cuts on this valuable area of work.
- 2.2 A Cabinet decision on the 8<sup>th</sup> February (Item 9. Medium Term Financial Planning 2011/12 – 2013/14) gave authority to the appropriate Cabinet Member to take the final decisions in relation to proposed reductions or cessations of funding to third sector (and private sector where relevant) organisations that were provisionally identified as part of the Council's budget setting process for 2011/12.
- 2.3 On 25 February 2011 the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion agreed criteria for future funding in relation to Safer Communities priorities for 2011/12. The Cabinet Member also approved a delegation to the Director of Urban Environment to provisionally apply these criteria and make in principle decisions in relation to funding reductions for Metropolitan Care and Repair, subject to consultation and proper equalities screening being undertaken.
- 2.4 Consultation with the provider has been carried out and their responses are attached to this report at Appendix 3. An equalities screening tool has been carried out on the service provided by Metropolitan Care and Repair and is attached at Appendix 4.

## **3. State link(s) with Council Plan Priorities and actions and /or other Strategies:**

### **3.1 Rethinking Haringey – Outcome 3: Safer**

Reducing the incidents and fear of crime and anti-social behaviour; safeguarding children and adults

### **3.2 Haringey Community Safety Strategy (2011-2014) (to be endorsed by Cabinet in early July 2011.)**

## **4. Recommendations**

- 4.1 It is recommended that the criteria attached at Appendix 1 for the future funding of Safer Communities services is confirmed in order for final decisions on funding to be made.

4.2 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member formally approves the recommendation to cease funding Metropolitan Care and Repair with effect from 1 July 2011. This cessation will follow the completion of the extension of the current contract from 1 April 2011 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011 (as agreed via Delegated Authority on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011 by the Director of Urban Environment.) The value of the contract was £35,000 per annum.

## **5. Reason for recommendation(s)**

5.1 In order to make informed and equitable decisions regarding proposed reductions, criteria were developed by council officers in conjunction with the legal department to assist in making decisions on future funding of organisations in relation to Safer Communities services.

5.2 These criteria (agreed at Cabinet on the 8<sup>th</sup> February and by the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion on the 25<sup>th</sup> February) formed the basis of provisional decisions on funding allocations to organisations. The criteria put greater emphasis on the need for projects and services to: fit with the Council's strategic priorities: be a statutory duty; demonstrate value for money; maximise performance outcomes; demonstrate effective service delivery; and have a local presence in Haringey. A minimum score of 35 was set in order to be eligible for any potential funding.

5.3 The provisional decision was notified to Metropolitan Care and Repair, as the only provider, and its users, on the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2011 to enable consultation to be undertaken. The criteria themselves were monitored throughout the consultation process in order to give due regard to its impact on protected groups under the equalities legislation. Consultees were advised that the criteria were subject to the consultation process and equalities impact assessments.

5.4 There were no consultation responses received on the criteria used. It is therefore recommended that the criteria as set out in Appendix 1 are approved.

5.5 During the consultation process Metropolitan Care and Repair were also given the opportunity to respond to the provisional application of the criteria, the scores given and the provisional decisions applied to their projects, in addition to being invited to put forward any other relevant information.

5.6 Metropolitan Care and Repair were advised that they needed to meet a minimum score of 35 out of a total of 45 to be eligible for any potential funding. The provisional score was 29. The breakdown of this score is provided at Appendix 2. Based on these scores, the provisional decision was to cease funding Metropolitan Care and Repair.

5.7 The Metropolitan Care and Repair project has received funding from the Safer

Communities Partnership since 2007. The amount of funding was reduced from £40k to £35k during 2010-11. The service secures vulnerable properties and advises owners and tenants for those aged 55 and over in partnership with the police. The service is borough-wide and cross-tenure. Whilst the Metropolitan Care and Repair service has been high performing, it did not score highly enough against the specified criteria to be a priority for funding in 2011/12. In particular, they scored less favourably in the area of links to Council strategic priorities; contribution to performance indicators and maximising value for money.

- 5.8 As stated in para 5.4, there were no comments received on the criteria used. Metropolitan Care and Repair did respond in relation to the provisional scores. In relation to the scoring for 'Link to Strategic Priorities', they responded that the Acquisitive Crime Partnership Board agreed that burglary prevention would be a strategic priority and that this is also a key priority for the Safer Communities Executive Board (SCEB). On this basis they believed they should have scored 8 out of 10. In relation to 'Maximise outcomes – link into performance measures', they responded that they have been successful in reducing repeat burglaries and have contributed to section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act. On this basis they felt they should have scored 8 out of 10. In relation to 'Value for Money' they argued that the project has demonstrated excellent VfM as the funding for the project hasn't been increased since 2007 and their unit costs are low. On that basis they believed they should have received 5 out of 5. Their response states therefore that they should have received 37 out of 45 and therefore be eligible for continued funding.
- 5.9 Community Safety partners hold the work of Metropolitan Care and Repair in high regard. In response to the suggested re-appraisal of their score as in 5.8 above, this re-appraisal relates to three of the criteria in Appendix 1. The score of 6 out of 10 against their contribution towards wider Haringey priorities was given on the basis that whilst the work of Metropolitan Care and Repair supports a reduction in fear of crime, this is only one of three elements under the Safer Outcome. The others relate to anti-social behaviour and safeguarding of children and adults. On this basis the score will not be re-assessed.
- 5.10 The score of 5 out of 10 for Metropolitan Care and Repair 's specific contribution to performance indicators was given on the basis that whilst the LAA targets over the past 3 years did have a focus on residential burglary, the focus for the foreseeable future is now on curbing rising levels of street crime and on violent crime especially as it affects young adults. This emphasis is backed up by data and public consultation. On this basis the score will not be re-assessed.
- 5.11 The score of 2 out of 5 for maximising value was given further to discussion with the Project Manager in relation to the potential for expanding sources of funding for this project (e.g. the possibility of receiving funding from the Metropolitan Support Trust; potentially charging some clients a fee for their work). As this was an option this was reflected in the proposed decision to allow the project one further financial quarter of funding until 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011 in order to pursue these options.

## **6. Other options considered**

- 6.1 Throughout the process of considering the consultation responses and conducting the EqlAs, alternative sources of funding and / or means of delivery have been explored.
- 6.2 As part of the consultation process, Metropolitan Care and Repair proposed to investigate further sources of funding from the Metropolitan Support Trust as well as exploring whether the beneficiaries of the Metropolitan Care and Repair programme (i.e. the tenants and homeowners) can make a contribution to the works and whether funding may be available from the Metropolitan Police. This letter is attached as Appendix 3 as part of their consultation response.
- 6.3 An interim three month extension of their contract was agreed on the 30<sup>th</sup> March which provides the opportunity for Metropolitan Care and Repair to explore these options for alternative sources of funding as well as allowing time for further consultation, analysis of equalities impacts and ensuring continuity of service.

## **7. Summary**

- 7.1 Following the Government's comprehensive spending review (20<sup>th</sup> October 2010) many of the grants that used to come to local authorities have been either trimmed or cut completely. Specifically the Area Based Grant, which the Safer Communities service have used to commission an anti-burglary support project from Metropolitan Care and Repair.
- 7.2 Following the CSR, Cabinet agreed overarching indicative criteria for changes to funding for Third Sector organisations (and private organisations where relevant) on 8 February 2010. These criteria were developed to assist in making informed and equitable decisions on future funding of organisations and services across the Council. Urban Environment also developed detailed criteria based on the above that correspond with the priorities and frameworks of the Directorate and in relation to the Safer Communities Executive Board (SCEB). These were approved by the Director and Cabinet Member on the 25<sup>th</sup> February.
- 7.3 Metropolitan Care and Repair were advised that they needed to meet a minimum score of 35 out of a total of 45 to be eligible for any potential funding. They were informed of the scoring and the provisional decisions relating to funding for 2011/12 on 25<sup>th</sup> February. The initial provisional outcome following the scoring of their service indicated that the Council was minded to cease funding. As part of the formal consultation process, Metropolitan Care and Repair were invited to respond to the provisional scores and decisions, comment on the criteria being used, provide details on impacts on equalities groups from these provisional decisions and provide general representations on the provisional decisions. The response received is attached as Appendix 3. Our response to these comments is contained within paragraphs 5.9 to 5.11 above

7.4 After holding a focus group with service users, the Project Manager for Metropolitan Care and Repair responded on 17<sup>th</sup> March documenting successes, value for money and customer satisfaction. He also provided evidence of the cross-tenure nature of the service and requested a reduced contribution from Council sources (£20K annually) with continued subsidy from the Metropolitan Support Trust and some contribution, where appropriate, from beneficiaries.

7.5 The Council's letter of response dated 30<sup>th</sup> March is attached at Appendix 5. The Council proposed a one-off, three month extension to allow time for Metropolitan Care and Repair to prioritise the current caseload and seek future support for a more sustainable service. It was agreed that a contribution of £4,000 would enable this and Metropolitan Care and Repair returned a signed and dated acceptance of the proposal on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 (Appendix 6). It was made clear that a final decision would rest with the Council following the conclusion of the consultation period.

7.6 Following the conclusion of the consultation period and an evaluation of the response received from Metropolitan Care and Repair, the final recommendation is to cease funding this service. This is based on the criteria based scoring and the reasons outlined throughout this report.

## **8. Chief Financial Officer Comments**

8.1 The Chief Financial Officer has been consulted in the preparation of this report and comments that the proposed saving set out through the cessation of funding to Metropolitan Care and Repair is consistent with the savings proposals provisionally agreed by Cabinet on the 8<sup>th</sup> February and support the achievement of the overall budget strategy agreed by the Council.

## **9. Head of Legal Services Comments**

9.1. The decisions by the Cabinet Member concerning the recommendations set out in the report must be informed by and take into account the outcome of the consultation with service users and the provider, which is set out in Appendix 3 to this report.

9.2. In reaching their decisions the Cabinet Member must also have due regard to the authority's public sector equality duty and thus should take into account the attached equality screening tool included at Appendix 4 to the report. The Cabinet Member should take account of the impact identified in relation to young and older members of the community in Section 5 of the screening tool and the mitigation proposed in Sections 7 and 9. It is noted that a further consideration of the authority's public sector equality duty may be required if the steps outlined in

mitigation are not successful. The extent of the duty on the authority is set out in Appendix 7 to this report.

- 9.3 This report is seeking the cessation of funding to Metropolitan Care and Repair with effect from 1 July 2011. Power for the Cabinet Member to take these decisions is contained within the Council's Constitution (Part 3, Section D paragraph 2.2 (d)).

## **10. Head of Procurement Comments**

- 10.1 Not applicable

## **11. Equalities & Community Cohesion Comments**

- 11.1 An Equalities Impact Screening Tool is provided at Appendix 4. It was agreed that no Equalities Impact Assessment was required on the provisional decision to cease funding this service.

- 11.2 In summary, the key points to note from the Screening Tool are:

- 11.3 The vast majority of the service is unsurprisingly spread across the more deprived east of the borough. A high proportion of beneficiaries are home owners

- 11.4 This is by definition a security and advisory service aimed at those of 55+ so older residents will be affected by any eventual loss of service should alternative funding not be secured. Experience and research show that older people are more prone to distraction burglary and can suffer higher fear of crime levels (see Equalities Screening Tool at appendix 4)

- 11.5 Haringey has successfully reduced acquisitive crime and burglary through a range of methods including crime prevention awareness and advice and through the police rapid response team

## **12. Consultation**

- 12.1 **8 February 2011:** High level criteria, developed by Council Officers and agreed by Legal Services, agreed at Cabinet

- 12.2 **25 February 2011:** Letter sent from Head of Safer and Stronger Communities Service outlining background, consultation process, scoring criteria and score relative to the project in question.

**12.3 17 March 2011:** Letter of representation from Project Manager at Metropolitan Care and Repair with performance and client data and letters of support and satisfaction. A reduced annual amount was recommended along with suggestions of possible alternative funding

**12.4 30<sup>th</sup> March:** Letter from Director to Project Manager stating that the Council were provisionally still minded to cease funding this service but proposing a contract extension for Q1 2011-12 of £4,000 to deliver on the agreed milestones and pending attempts to agree alternative funding

**12.5 5<sup>th</sup> April:** Project Manager, Steve Fallon, returned signed letter of approval and thanked the Community Safety Manager in person

### **13. Service Financial Comments**

13.1 There are no specific financial implications included in this report..

### **14. Use of appendices**

14.1 Appendix 1. Criteria used for decision making

14.2 Appendix 2. Scoring for Metropolitan Care and Repair

14.3 Appendix 3. Consultation response received from Metropolitan Care and Repair

14.4 Appendix 4. Equalities Screening Tool

14.5 Appendix 5. Letter to Metropolitan Care and Repair 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011

14.6 Appendix 6. Signed letter from Metropolitan Care and Repair 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011

14.7 Appendix 7. The Public Sector Single Equality Duty

### **15. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

15.1 Not applicable