

Report for: ACTION



<b>Contains Confidential or Exempt Information</b>	NO - Part I
<b>Title</b>	Neighbourhood Participatory Budget Scheme - December 2016 Voting Round
<b>Responsible Officer(s)</b>	Russell O'Keefe, Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services
<b>Contact officer, job title and phone number</b>	David Scott, Head of Governance, Partnerships, Performance & Policy. 01628 796748
<b>Member reporting</b>	Cllr Samantha Rayner, Lead Member for Culture and Communities
<b>For Consideration By</b>	Cabinet Participatory Budgeting Sub Committee (CPBSC)
<b>Date to be Considered</b>	19 December 2016
<b>Implementation Date if Not Called In</b>	Immediately
<b>Affected Wards</b>	All

## REPORT SUMMARY

1. This report sets out the results of the Neighbourhood Participatory Budget (PB) scheme for projects voted for by the public during September, October and November 2016.
2. It recommends that Members consider awarding funds to one or more of the projects based on public voting and match funding as they consider appropriate. This is the third of four rounds (see paragraph 2.12) of voting for the 2016-17 financial year.
3. Although there is no dedicated match funding provision within the budget, Members have the option to allocate match funding from the budget should they choose to do so. In order to qualify for this award the project would need to demonstrate effort and/or success in securing funding from outside the Council.
4. These recommendations are being made to ensure the Council delivers on its Participatory Budgeting commitments.

## If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit	Dates by which residents can expect to notice a difference
Residents are offered the opportunity to determine where small amounts of Council funding is spent to benefit their local communities in areas and issues which are important to them.	Dependant upon when the money is allocated to a particular community group or upon implementation of a particular project.

## **1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION: That the Cabinet Participatory Budgeting Sub Committee:**

- i. **Considers allocating neighbourhood budget funds as they deem appropriate based on the results of the public voting.**
- ii. **Consider awarding funds to a project (or projects) which have demonstrated the highest level of match funding in their bid.**

## **2. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 2.1 The full breakdown of votes cast for the projects during September, October and November 2016 can be found in Appendix A.
- 2.2 1 new project was submitted, and 9 projects were carried forward from the previous round. A summary of all 10 projects together with details on funding amounts requested (including any match funding) is attached at Appendix B.
- 2.3 The projects with the highest number of votes were:
  - Salvation Youth Trust - Youth Archery Project, with a total of 60 votes. They have requested match funding of £4,806.
  - The East Berkshire Multiple Sclerosis Society, with a total of 23 votes. They have not requested any match funding.
  - Radian Group - Sawyers Close Upcycling Project, with a total of 17 votes. They have not requested any match funding.
- 2.4 Although it is made clear to projects - when submitting an application - that votes are invited from 'RBWM residents' and all voters are required to submit a postcode, votes continue to be received from out-of-borough residents (in this round a total of 23% - 10% fewer than the last voting round).
- 2.5 The project that received the most out-of-borough votes was Salvation Youth Trust - Youth Archery Project, which drew 12 out-of-borough votes from its total of 60. This was followed by Radian Group - Sawyers Close Upcycling Project, which received 7 out-of-borough votes from its total of 17. Individuals are able to cast votes for more than one project.
- 2.6 The total number of votes cast was 159. This is a reduction from the last round by 1,846 votes (a 92% fall).
- 2.7 Reasons for the drop could be that this voting round has included a selection of smaller, more specialist projects. 7 of the 10 projects have also previously participated in 4 or more voting rounds without success, suggesting that residents may have grown apathetic towards the current selection.
- 2.8 The Council will continue to make efforts to raise awareness and encourage participation. A marketing strategy has been devised to give publicity amongst residents for voting as well as to encourage projects to join and take part. This includes the use of social media specifically Facebook and Twitter, signposting groups who approach the Council for grants and other financial assistance back to the PB scheme and regular canvassing of Parish Councils and community groups

who are part of the One Borough Partnership. The Council is also able to publicise the scheme and encourage additional projects through the marketing channels available via Greenredeem.

- 2.9 Two new projects have so far been nominated to participate in the next round of voting. Since April 2016, school based projects no longer take part in the Neighbourhood Voting Scheme as proposals from state funded schools are now included in the Schools Participatory Budgeting Scheme.
- 2.10 2 of the 10 projects in the current round of voting have identified or anticipate other funding or support and have bid for a matched funding award.
- 2.11 One of the projects received less than 2% of the vote.
- 2.12 At the August 2016 meeting of the CPBSC, Members approved that the timetable of voting rounds would be revised. Four rather than six voting rounds were agreed, with £9,000 being made available for each round.
- 2.13 It was also requested at the August 2016 CPBSC that an appendix be included to remind Members which schemes had been allocated funds over the previous two years. This has been included in Appendix C.

### **Greenredeem Participatory Budgeting**

- 2.14 Between 1 October and 30 November 2016, residents were able to donate their Greenredeem points to projects of their choice. The top five are shown below:
- Sequela Foundation: 358,808 points.
  - UP Depression & Anxiety Listening Group: 305,125 points.
  - Maidenhead Sea Cadets: 226,110 points.
  - Furze Platt Schools Association: 212,920 points.
  - Maidenhead Division Girl Guiding Activity Weekend: 212,429 points.
- 2.15 Voting rounds for Greenredeem are to become quarterly going forward. Results will be made available to Members at the next relevant meeting of the CPBSC.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Award funds to one or more of the projects and match funding as considered appropriate.	This is the third of four voting rounds for 2016-17. £32,250 is in the budget for the 2016-17 financial year and £9,960 (31%) has so far been allocated. Members have the option to allocate match funding from the main pot.
Do not award funds this voting round. Funds will instead be carried forward to the next voting round.	Due to the low turnout for this voting round, Members may wish to roll funds forward.

### **3. KEY IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Defined Outcomes</b>	<b>Unmet</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Exceeded</b>	<b>Significantly Exceeded</b>	<b>Date they should be delivered by</b>
No. of projects	0	1-2	3-4	>4	1 April 2017

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
awarded funding per round through the PB scheme					
% increase in no. of eligible projects participating in the PB scheme 2016/17	0	1-5	6-10	>10	1 April 2017

#### 4. FINANCIAL DETAILS

##### Financial impact on the budget

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	Capital £32,250	Capital £'000	Capital £'000
Allocated	£9,960	£0	£0

#### 5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None.

#### 6. VALUE FOR MONEY

6.1 Participatory Budgeting (PB) allows residents to influence how funding is allocated; ensuring the budget is spent to benefit their local communities in areas and on issues which are important to them. Voting is conducted online to minimise bureaucracy and cost.

#### 7. SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT APPRAISAL

7.1 None.

#### 8. RISK MANAGEMENT

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
1. Lack of voting to the online survey and a consequent failure to have enough resident contribution to the PB initiative.	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that each project is aware that they are responsible for their own marketing to ensure they receive enough votes to be awarded funds.</li> <li>RBWM marketing of the scheme highlighting the positive elements to the community.</li> </ul>	Low

<b>Risks</b>	<b>Uncontrolled Risk</b>	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Controlled Risk</b>
2. Insufficient choice is offered to residents to vote on/donate their points to	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular review of schemes being added, with marketing assistance to ensure that under-represented areas or projects in the community have an equal opportunity at attracting votes.</li> </ul>	Low

## **9. LINKS TO STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES**

9.1 If adopted, these recommendations will support the following strategic objectives:

### Residents First

- Support Children and Young People
- Encourage Healthy People and Lifestyles
- Improve the Environment, Economy and Transport
- Work for safer and stronger communities

### Value for Money

- Deliver Economic Services
- Invest in the future

### Delivering Together

- Enhanced Customer Services
- Deliver Effective Services
- Strengthen Partnerships

### Equipping Ourselves for the Future

- Changing Our Culture

## **10. EQUALITIES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY COHESION**

10.1 None.

## **11. STAFFING/WORKFORCE AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 None

## **12. PROPERTY AND ASSETS**

12.1 None.

## **13. ANY OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 None.

## **14. CONSULTATION**

14.1 None.

## **15. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

Date	Details
20/12/2016	Following approval, arrangements will be made to send the funding to the successful projects immediately.

## 16. APPENDICES

- 16.1 Appendix A - Geographical representation of voting.  
Appendix B - Summary of projects and funding requested.  
Appendix C - List of projects funded since 2014-15.

## 17. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 17.1 None.

## 18. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
Cllr Samantha Rayner	Lead Member for Culture and Communities	07/12/16	08/12/16	
Russell O'Keefe	Director of Corporate and Community Services			
David Scott	Head of Governance, Partnerships, Performance and Policy	05/12/16		

## REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Non-key decision	No

  

Report Author	Job title	Full contact no:
Anna Trott	Strategy & Performance Manager	01628 682953