
*Committed growth agreed on an annual basis, therefore future years are included as indicative figures to aid medium term financial planning

## DESCRIPTION \& JUSTIFICATION

This proposal demonstrates the Council's continued commitment to addressing residents' key concerns around crime and ASB while counteracting cuts to local policing levels imposed at regional level.

Growth Calculation: [ Use this box to illustrate the empirical assumptions built into this bid and how they relate to historic/ developing trends]

According to discussions with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) £200,000 will buy 5 Police Constables and one Sergeant, based on a 2 year contract agreement.

## 1. RISKS AND IMPLICATIONS:

Why is this expenditure inescapable and what are the consequences/ risks if funding is not approved? If it is demandled provide details of the increase in client numbers and the basis of any projections.

For the 2014/15 MTFP the agreement is to retain PTF 1 ( 21 officers; 16 funded by LBTH and 5 by the MET) to the end of April 2015. PTF 2 (19 officers) will continue until the end of December 2015 at full capacity. With the introduction of the additional 20 officers under a new section 92 agreement called PTF 3, (Under PTF 3 the officers will be attached to each of the 20 electoral wards in Tower Hamlets) the number of police officers will peak to a total of 60 officers up to April 2015. The termination of PTF 1 at the end of April 2015 will mean

## Item Ref. No:
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$$
\text { a drop of } 21 \text { officers from the period commencing May until December 2015. The conclusion of PTF } 2 \text { in }
$$ December 2015 will mean a drop of a further 19 officer. The approval of PTF 4 will enable the purchase of an additional 1 sergeant and 5 PCs. If PTF 4 is introduced from April 2015 this will increase the number of officers to 66 in April reducing to 45 from May to December 2015 and further reducing to 26 officers being retained from January 2016 (PTF 3 a total of 20 officers and PTF 4 a total of 6 officers). However, this will be dependent on the availability of the Police to mobilise officers into the borough.

The key risks will be the ability of MPS to recruit and train additional police officers quickly

## 2 VALUE FOR MONEY/EFFICIENCY

Provide evidence that the proposed expenditure will offer value for money. Where the expenditure is additional to existing budgetary provision for this service, evidence should also be provided of the value for money of the base provision. Evidence should be drawn from BVPls, unit costs comparisons, benchmarking exercises or audit/ inspection judgements

In so far as the MOPAC subsidy arrangements allow the Council to secure additional police at reduced rates this can be argued as being value for money.

That said the initiative does require the Council to divert resource previously spent on local services to the Police Service that has formerly been solely funded by the GLA at a time when local resources are under significant pressure and the GLA are reducing funding for the Police. Arguably this puts further pressure on already stretched local authority budgets and takes responsibility for funding a service which should be funded at regional level. This is likely to be unsustainable in the medium term.

However, with the Councils commitment to community safety, funding additional police officers through Council resources gives the authority greater influence in being able to direct these resources to Council Priorities. The MET police are the sole provider of policing services so there is no alternative option to increase the police presence on the street.

Ongoing commitments to use Local Authority funding to buy additional police will need to be kept under review.

