

REQUEST FOR DMPC DECISION – PCD 79**Title: London Crime Prevention Fund – 2017/18 to 2020/21****Executive Summary:**

MOPAC has powers under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 to award crime and disorder reduction grants. The London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) was established in 2013, bringing together a number of funding streams that had existed before MOPAC was set up. The fund ran from 2013/14 to 2016/17 in line with the Police and Crime Plan (DMPCD 2013/96). These arrangements end on March 2017.

The purpose of this decision is to sustain the current London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) budget, with a number of key changes to the overall approach, for a further four years (2017/18 to 2020/21) in line with the next Police and Crime Plan which will come into effect in April 2017.

This decision confirms the specific funding allocations to each of the 32 boroughs for 2017/18 and 2018/19. A further DMPC decision will be made in 2018/19 to finalise the allocations for 2019/20 and 2020/21.

Recommendation:

The DMPC is asked to agree:

- The continuation of the LCPF budget for four years from 2017/18 to 2020/21.
- To commit the direct borough funding for 2 two year periods (2017/18-18/19 and 2019/20-20/21), affording boroughs the flexibility to apportion spend over a two year period.
- The borough funding allocations for 2017/18-2018/19 as set out in **APPENDIX A**.
- To uplift funding for the those boroughs which were previously allocated less than their share of the LCPF budget in year one (according to an assessment of current levels of need and demand in the first two years of the fund) then redistribute funding based entirely on a need and demand formula for the remaining three years of the fund.
- To apportion the LCPF budget between direct borough funding (70%) and funding for co-commissioned services (30%) starting in year 2 of the fund, from 2018/19 to 2020/21. Boroughs will be core partners in the development and use of the new co-commissioning funding pot which accounts for 30% of the LCPF budget from 2018/19 onwards.

Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime

I confirm I have considered whether or not I have any personal or prejudicial interest in this matter and take the proposed decision in compliance with the Code of Conduct. Any such interests are recorded below.

The above request has my approval.

Signature**Date**

9/11/2016

PART I - NON-CONFIDENTIAL FACTS AND ADVICE TO THE DMPC

Decision required – supporting report

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1. The role of MOPAC is broader than policing — it has overarching responsibility for crime reduction, and significant powers to commission services and assign budgets.
- 1.2. Section 9 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 gives the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime the power to award a crime and disorder reduction grant to any person in order to secure or contribute to securing crime and disorder reduction in the police area. The grant may be subject to any conditions that the Mayor (or Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) may deem appropriate.
- 1.3. In 2013/14 the Home Office allocated an unringfenced Community Safety Fund to each Police and Crime Commissioner and MOPAC. For 2013/14 this fund sat alongside the Main Policing Grant. From 2014/15 these two funds were merged into one unringfenced funding pot.
- 1.4. In June 2013 the DMPC approved the provisional annual budget for the London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) to run from 2013/14 to 2016/17 in line with the Police and Crime Plan (DMPCD 2013/96). This funding was reconfirmed at the start of each financial year by a DMPC decision. These arrangements end on 31 March 2017.
- 1.5. This decision sets out MOPAC’s approach to the future of the LCPF from 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2021.

Continuation of the LCPF for four years

- 1.6. The continuation of the LCPF budget for four years from 2017/18 to 2020/21.
- 1.7. In 2017/18, individual borough funding remains at 2016/17 levels except for fourteen boroughs who will see an increase in funding in order to bring their share of the LCPF budget in line with a new assessment of local need and demand.

2 two year commitment on funding

- 1.8. Under the previous arrangements for the LCPF, local commissioning plans were aligned with the annual confirmation of the LCPF borough funding allocation which meant some boroughs were unable to commission services for more than one year. This approach to the LCPF commits funding for 2 two year periods, with the allocation for each two year period being committed irrespective of the outcome of the yearly policing grant. This offers local authorities greater flexibility in utilising the new LCPF budget over a two year period.

Allocation based on need and demand

- 1.9. Introducing a new formula for the allocation of direct borough funding will ensure that changes in demographics, crime patterns and more broadly need/vulnerability are better reflected in the level of local funding provided by MOPAC. These indicators are aligned to the core values and priorities within the future Police and Crime Plan.
- 1.10. In 2017/18, there are no reductions to the 2016/17 borough allocations of LCPF funding and for 13 boroughs there will be an uplift in funding in order to support a gradual transition to the redistribution

of the direct borough funding according to need and demand. From 2018/19 the LCPF budget for direct borough funding will be apportioned for all 32 boroughs according to the need and demand formula.

- 1.11. In 2019/20 and 2020/21, 70% of the LCPF budget will be apportioned to boroughs in accordance with a refreshed calculation of the borough funding formula. This formula will be reviewed in year 2. Please see Appendix B for the need and demand indicators.

LCPF Budget – direct funding to boroughs and a co-commissioning fund

- 1.12. This decision splits the use of the LCPF budget between direct borough funding (70%) and funding for co-commissioning services (30%) over the course of 2018/19 to 2020/21. Splitting the budget in this way acknowledges the important role this funding now plays in supporting local community safety and prevention services while also recognising that some London challenges relating to future PCP priorities can be better addressed through either regional or sub-regional commissioning arrangements.
- 1.13. The framework for the use of the co-commissioning fund will be developed in consultation with London Councils, boroughs, and wider partners under the leadership of the London Crime Reduction Board in 2017/2018. The funding for co-commissioning will be utilised from 2018/19 to 2020/21.

Next Steps

- 1.14. Following the publication of this decision MOPAC will inform borough Leaders, Chief Executives, and Heads of Community Safety of their borough allocation, the indicators under the new funding formula as it relates to their borough, and an explanation of the process for providing information to MOPAC on the proposed uses of their funding. MOPAC will hold a meeting for local Heads of Community Safety to support them in putting forward proposals to use the funding. MOPAC will endeavour to ensure that all projects which Local Authorities wish to continue to utilise LCPF funding for are protected from involuntary de-commissioning as a result of implementing this new approach by March 2017.
- 1.15. MOPAC will work closely with London Heads of Community Safety in developing the process by which boroughs can utilise this funding as well as systems for performance monitoring. Performance monitoring for the future of the LCPF will be more reliant on annual reviews that align with assessing the progress on Police and Crime Plan commitments as opposed to the administratively burdensome quarterly returns of the previous iteration of the fund.

2. Issues for consideration

2.1. Links to Police and Crime Plan and MOPAC priorities:

- A decision on the future of the LCPF is being made prior to the publication of the Police and Crime Plan because local authorities require an early decision on the future of the LCPF to safeguard the interests of service users and allow enough time to effectively commission/de-commission services.
- The Police and Crime Plan will provide a performance framework by which local commissioned services can be measured.

2.2. Consultation:

- The current decision on the future of the LCPF was developed in full consultation with London Councils.

- The process for submitting proposals for spend and quarterly monitoring is being developed with borough Heads of Community Safety.
- The formula for borough funding allocations will be consulted on before it is applied to the budget for 2019/20 and 2020/21.

2.3. Impact assessments / implications:

- An equality impact assessment was undertaken.

2.4. There is a risk that changes to MOPAC funding by central government may reduce the resources available for future years.

3. Financial Comments

3.1. This decision paper will commit MOPAC to providing £32,407,878 to Local Authorities over the course of 2017/18 and 2018/19.

3.2. Through the existing LCPF budget and re-allocation of funds held for Police and Crime Plan priorities, this cost can be met from within the current overall MOPAC budget.

3.3. While the LCPF only accounts for a small portion of the Main Policing Grant (1%), there is a risk that committing funding over a two year period affects MOPAC's ability to mitigate the potential impact of planned reforms to the police funding formula in 2018/19.

4. Legal Comments

4.1. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act (s9) states:

- (1) The elected local policing body for a police area may make a crime and disorder reduction grant to any person.
- (2) A crime and disorder reduction grant which, in the opinion of the elected local policing body, will secure, or contribute to securing, crime and disorder reduction in the body's area.
- (3) The elected local policing body may make a crime and disorder reduction grant subject to any conditions (including conditions as to repayment) which the body thinks appropriate.

4.2. The recommendations in this decision are in line with the legislation.

4.3. Under MOPAC's Scheme of Delegation, approval of the strategy for the award of individual grants and the award of all individual grants (for crime reduction or other purposes) is a matter generally reserved to the DMPC (paragraph 4.8). The release of funding in accordance with the proposals set out in this decision form is accordingly to be approved by the DMPC. The delegation of responsibility for the finalisation of planning and contractual/grant arrangements, including relevant terms and the signing of agreements, to the Chief Operating Officer is in accordance with the general power of delegation in paragraph 5.4.

5. Equality Comments

5.1. MOPAC is required to comply with the public sector equality duty set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This requires MOPAC to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations by reference to people with protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

5.2. An Equality assessment has been undertaken for the London Crime Prevention Fund.

6. **Background/supporting papers**

- 6.1. APPENDIX A – LONDON CRIME PREVENTION FUND – BOROUGH ALLOCATIONS
- 6.2. APPENDIX B – FUNDING FORUMLA

APPENDIX A – London Crime Prevention Fund – Borough allocations for 2017/18 and 2018/19

	London borough	2017/18 allocation	2018/19 allocation	Combined 2 year allocation
1	Barking and Dagenham	£644,362	£451,054	£1,095,416
2	Barnet	£461,555	£323,088	£784,643
3	Bexley	£352,506	£246,754	£599,260
4	Brent	£695,799	£487,059	£1,182,858
5	Bromley	£401,731	£241,699	£643,430
6	Camden	£633,714	£423,033	£1,056,747
7	Croydon	£833,527	£583,469	£1,416,996
8	Ealing	£699,789	£452,937	£1,152,726
9	Enfield	£609,256	£420,581	£1,029,837
10	Greenwich	£678,868	£475,208	£1,154,076
11	Hackney	£1,118,076	£560,774	£1,678,850
12	Hammersmith and Fulham	£530,814	£357,105	£887,919
13	Haringey	£781,000	£518,108	£1,299,108
14	Harrow	£266,252	£186,376	£452,628
15	Havering	£368,826	£258,178	£627,004
16	Hillingdon	£490,468	£343,328	£833,796
17	Hounslow	£563,556	£356,218	£919,774
18	Islington	£772,000	£519,048	£1,291,048
19	Kensington and Chelsea	£485,714	£165,565	£651,279
20	Kingston upon Thames	£167,550	£109,875	£277,425
21	Lambeth	£974,281	£681,996	£1,656,277
22	Lewisham	£942,000	£561,872	£1,503,872
23	Merton	£259,939	£181,957	£441,896
24	Newham	£922,050	£642,368	£1,564,418
25	Redbridge	£502,690	£313,157	£815,847
26	Richmond upon Thames	£169,102	£76,368	£245,470
27	Southwark	£901,000	£520,680	£1,421,680
28	Sutton	£255,428	£178,800	£434,228
29	Tower Hamlets	£947,123	£662,986	£1,610,109
30	Waltham Forest	£645,995	£452,197	£1,098,192
31	Wandsworth	£696,223	£340,074	£1,036,297
32	Westminster	£1,071,006	£473,766	£1,544,772
TOTAL		£19,842,200	£12,565,678	£32,407,878

APPENDIX B - London Crime Prevention Funding Formula

LCPF Funding Indicator Scores - Data ranges period Nov 15 - Oct 16 unless stated

- Proportion of the working-age population who claim out-of-work benefits (%) - (Aug-2015)
- Population density (per hectare) – (2016)
- Modelled Household median income estimates - (2012/13)
- Achievement of 5 or more A* - C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths, - (2013/14)
- ASB
- Gang Flagged Offences
- Non DA Knife Crime (U25s)
- Number of youth reoffenders - (Oct 13 - Sep 14)
- Children who were the subject of a Child Protection Plan -Rate per 10,000 children aged under 18 years (Calendar year 2015)
- DA Offences
- Sexual Offences
- Number of adult reoffenders - (Oct 13 - Sep 14)
- Prolific Offenders - (July 15)
- Hate Crime
- Victim Based Crime

LCPF Funding Indicator Scores - Data ranges period Nov 15 - Oct 16 unless stated

The above table visualises the pre normalised scores for each borough; this table looks at a number of different measurement types and is not standardised in any way. We can see where boroughs differ but cannot allocate funding using these measures in this format.

Borough	Proportion of the working age population who are of working age (2012/13)	Proportion of the working age population who are of working age (2012/13)	Modelled household median income estimates (2012/13)	Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent (includes English and Maths) 2013/14	DA Differences	ASB	Hate Crime	Sexual Offences	Victimisation Crime	Number of youth offenders (Oct 13 - Sep 14)	Number of adult offenders (Oct 13 - Sep 14)	Problems Offenders	Non-FA Knife Crime (11/25/1)	Tragically Hoped Offences	Children who were the subject of a Child Protection Plan Rate per 10,000 children aged under 16 years (Calendar year 2015)
Barking and Dagenham	11.7	57	£34,080	58	2446	6242	370	468	16027	102	613	117	58	66	60
Barnet	6.7	44	£54,530	67.3	2518	9063	636	542	23361	80	667	66	62	60	27
Barnley	7.3	40	£44,430	60.3	1792	4912	267	362	18366	60	515	57	55	2	52
Bentley	9.0	76	£39,630	60.1	2759	10589	640	570	24469	146	1230	167	89	47	31
Bromley	8.4	52	£55,140	68	2426	65140	451	448	8528	100	633	86	30	22	31
Camden	9.2	110	£67,990	62.7	1673	10471	771	604	27506	65	723	93	52	40	51
Croydon	9.1	44	£45,720	57.7	3816	10058	626	839	27466	217	1211	241	84	37	38
Edgware	8.6	64	£45,650	62.1	2962	10846	797	570	25491	93	570	114	88	36	45
Enfield	10.1	41	£41,250	59.9	2309	9087	401	545	21286	140	836	90	53	82	31
Greenwich	10.4	59	£44,370	58.8	3139	7278	532	562	21451	117	890	160	61	75	42
Hackney	11.7	141	£42,690	60.6	2701	9141	746	676	26300	83	904	147	72	153	36
Hammersmith and Fulham	9.0	112	£62,310	60.5	1587	6532	567	440	18782	71	749	113	34	19	50
Haringey	10.6	50	£45,660	59.7	2519	8641	700	604	25276	102	1016	142	92	71	42
Harrow	8.0	50	£49,060	66.4	1661	5251	366	301	20677	75	903	42	28	17	30
Havering	7.5	22	£44,430	59.8	2228	9903	377	357	16034	59	488	79	24	6	40
Hillingdon	7.2	26	£44,950	62	2616	9008	544	444	20708	84	677	121	44	4	46
Hounslow	7.5	49	£44,490	63.2	2688	8248	632	536	20801	91	863	117	51	11	37
Islington	11.6	153	£54,950	69.9	2292	7127	790	520	25120	131	84	132	84	68	44
Kingston and Chelsea	7.8	129	£76,950	68.7	325	5244	522	320	17973	21	353	86	41	11	22
Kingston upon Thames	9.1	46	£56,920	68.6	1031	4172	234	251	924	35	345	40	14	3	40
Lambeth	9.8	121	£48,610	57.1	2745	16803	746	877	31462	192	1219	200	115	87	57
Lewisham	10.9	65	£43,360	56.3	3176	7721	551	696	22188	163	1061	196	71	39	39
Merton	6.9	56	£57,180	67.8	1433	4269	129	102	12351	49	42	70	32	13	39
Newham	9.2	94	£34,260	55.7	3333	10339	626	602	27739	168	1558	267	33	15	41
Redbridge	6.6	53	£45,380	68.7	2248	6812	438	571	18480	111	751	106	56	15	38
Richmond upon Thames	4.7	34	£76,610	70.5	1043	4053	271	270	10532	38	235	57	14	0	36
Southwark	10.2	100	£48,000	61.2	2866	9358	665	718	23765	130	946	181	107	36	29
Sutton	6.2	46	£49,170	67.4	1317	5113	227	304	9699	58	390	88	16	6	50
Tower Hamlets	9.4	150	£45,720	53.2	3116	17982	875	697	27337	99	596	141	104	171	55
Waltham Forest	6.9	71	£39,460	58.3	2809	8056	488	493	19700	92	894	155	54	66	51
Wandsworth	8.5	94	£66,220	63	2171	6679	521	660	22827	78	685	102	94	55	36
Westminster	8.4	110	£80,760	65.7	1520	10027	1324	936	46341	58	769	115	49	28	32

LCPF Funding Indicator Scores - Data ranges period Nov 15 - Oct 16 unless stated

How I do it	Proportion of the working-age population who claim state benefits (2015/16)	Median household median income excluding ZUPPI	Percentage of 5-year olds at risk of equipment including English and Maths	ASB	Home Time	Gender Differences	Vacant/Excess Capacity	Number of youth offenders (Oct 13 - Sep 14)	Number of adult offenders (Oct 13 - Sep 14)	Police Offenders	Non-PA Youth Cases (02/15)	Crimes Flagged	Children who were the subject of a Child Protection Plan (also per 1000 children aged under 16 years) (England average 2015)	Min. Max Index Score	% Of total funding
Barking and Roperham	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	7.39	3.6%
Barnet	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.1	5.30	2.6%
Barnley	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	2.02	1.0%
Brent	0.8	0.4	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.2	3.98	1.9%
Bromley	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	3.98	1.9%
Camden	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.4	6.93	3.4%
Croydon	0.8	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.5	1.0	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.4	3.98	1.9%
Ealing	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.6	7.42	3.6%
Enfield	0.8	0.1	0.9	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	6.89	3.3%
Greenwich	0.8	0.3	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	7.78	3.8%
Hammersmith and Fulham	1.0	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.4	3.19	1.5%
Harrow	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	5.85	2.8%
Havering	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.5	8.49	4.1%
Hillingdon	0.4	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	3.05	1.5%
Hounslow	0.4	0.0	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.5	4.23	2.1%
Hounslow	0.4	0.2	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2	5.63	2.7%
Islington	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.5	5.84	2.8%
Kensington and Chelsea	0.4	0.9	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.2	6.31	3.1%
Kingston upon Thames	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.0	2.71	1.3%
Lambeth	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.80	0.9%
Leigham	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.9	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.5	1.0	11.8	5.8%
Merton	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.5	5.21	2.5%
Newham	0.6	0.5	1.0	0.8	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.4	2.98	1.4%
Redbridge	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.3	0.5	10.53	5.1%
Richmond upon Thames	0.8	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.4	5.13	2.5%
Southwark	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.25	0.6%
Sutton	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.9	0.2	0.1	8.53	4.1%
Tower Hamlets	0.7	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.93	1.4%
Waltham Forest	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.8	10.87	5.3%
Wandsworth	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.7	7.41	3.6%
Wynborough	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	5.57	2.7%
Wynborough	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	7.77	3.8%

The normalised data table above shows us the max-min scores for each of the indicators by each individual borough. The colour coding allows us to see that each borough retains its high to low value ratio however now each borough receives a normalised score across each indicator. Also note the total index score for each borough alongside the percentage of the total funding the borough will receive.

Public access to information

Information in this form (Part 1) is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and will be made available on the MOPAC website following approval.

If immediate publication risks compromising the implementation of the decision it can be deferred until a specific date. Deferral periods should be kept to the shortest length strictly necessary.

Part 1 Deferral:

Is the publication of Part 1 of this approval to be deferred? NO

Part 2 Confidentiality: Only the facts or advice considered as likely to be exempt from disclosure under the FOIA should be in the separate Part 2 form, together with the legal rationale for non-publication.

Is there a **Part 2** form – NO

ORIGINATING OFFICER DECLARATION:

	<i>Tick to confirm statement (✓)</i>
Head of Unit: Graeme Gordon has reviewed the request and is satisfied it is correct and consistent with the MOPAC's plans and priorities.	✓
Legal Advice: Legal advice is not required.	✓
Financial Advice: The Strategic Finance and Resource Management Team has been consulted on this proposal.	✓
Equalities Advice: Equality and diversity issues are covered in the body of the report. The Workforce Development Officer has been consulted on the equalities and diversity issues within this report.	✓

OFFICER APPROVAL**Chief Executive Officer**

I have been consulted about the proposal and confirm that financial, legal and equalities advice has been taken into account in the preparation of this report. I am satisfied that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

Signature *R. Lawrence*

Date *9/11/2016*