

CABINET

THURSDAY, 9 FEBRUARY 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Dudley (Chairman), Phillip Bicknell, David Coppinger, Carwyn Cox, Geoff Hill, MJ Saunders, Natasha Airey, Derek Wilson, Samantha Rayner and Jack Rankin

Principal Members also in attendance: Christine Bateson, Stuart Carroll, Lisa Targowska and David Evans

Deputy Lead Members also in attendance: Councillors David Hilton and Ross McWilliams

Also in attendance: Councillor Jones

Officers: Mary Kilner, Rob Stubbs, Alison Alexander, Louisa Dean, Russell O'Keefe, David Scott, Karen Shepherd and Andy Jeffs

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None received

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i) The Part I minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2017 be approved.**
- ii) The Part I minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Prioritisation Sub Committee held on 18 January 2017 be noted**

APPOINTMENTS

None

QUESTIONS FROM COX GREEN PUPILS

Cabinet received questions from pupils at Cox Green School.

Matthew Mundy, joint Head Boy, asked the following question:

More than 50,000 teachers left the profession before retirement last year, with the government failing to meet its targets for recruitment levels of teachers in the past five years. Maidenhead is an area that struggles with the competition from London schools and the extra pay these schools provide; are there any plans to try and encourage more teachers to the secondary schools in the area?

The Lead Member for Children's Services responded that there were all types of schools in the borough, from Maintained schools to Academies and Faith schools to Independent schools, and there was competition from the London area. Individual schools make local choices to make their roles more attractive, for example some Academies offered support with transport costs for staff who commuted while the council had a manifesto commitment to recognise great teachers which it did through a pay policy which rewarded the top performing teachers each year.

The borough was an expensive place to live which made it hard for teachers and other public sector workers to settle into the area. In response to this the local authority had set up a property company, called RBWM Property Services, which offered affordable rents to public sector workers. Therefore a number of different sectors contributed to help the situation.

The Chairman commented on the recent successful recruitment of an A-level Chemistry teacher at Holyport College; however there had only been one applicant. The council was looking to increase the amount of housing available in the borough including more affordable housing.

Matthew Munday asked what the council could do to help young people get on the housing ladder?

The Chairman commented that house prices in the south east had taken off in the last 15 years. The council's policy position was to ensure more new houses would be built, to help stop the inexorable rise in house prices.

Oliver Clements asked the following question:

The local council is providing extra funding for the expansion of secondary schools in the area, including Cox Green. Are there plans in place to help schools deal with the services these extra students will need, e.g. alternative provision, CAHMS, etc?

The Lead Member for Children's Services responded that expanding schools came with additional needs, including infrastructure impacts. The council was providing almost half of the £30m capital investment in secondary school expansions which would create great spaces for young people to learn and grow. There were different streams of funding. The schools themselves would receive more money each year as the pupils took up places in the school. In addition the government also provided resources through other sources, such the High Needs grant and funding for the NHS to provide support services for young people in the borough. The local authority worked closely with the Health service to strengthen and grow the specialist support services such as CAMHS. This year there has been an increase in CCG funding to respond to the increase number of young people needing support. There continued to be a waiting list for CAMHS but the local health service was working hard on reducing this.

Jessica Arnold asked the following question:

The Government is advocating the expansion of grammar schools, with a particular focus on the Maidenhead area. If this is a good way of supporting the top students, how are lower income students supported, where will all the lowest performers go and how does this support the schools they attend?

The Lead Member for Children's Services responded that it was important to separate the concept of income and academic performance. The local authority had prioritised school improvement resources to help all schools, maintained or Academy, focus on the success of lower income pupils to overcome obstacles, regardless of the school they attended. The council was really ambitious for the young people of the borough and had clearly set out the expectation that any selective school that wished to open in the borough would have to have a concrete plan to support the success of lower income pupils to get a place at the school and to achieve academically.

Pupils of all abilities chose the comprehensive system and these schools were an essential and valued part of the education system. There would be no return to the old grammar/secondary modern split. The council was investing heavily in the expansion of these schools so that every pupil could make the progress they were capable of and have the best chance to secure a successful future.

The Chairman commented on the change in tone by the current Prime Minister in relation to grammar schools. The previous Prime Minister had focussed on pupil premium, whereas the focus now was on a broader concept of those 'just about managing' (JAMs). It was estimated that 30% of families in the borough could be defined as JAMs.

Seran Yucel asked the following question:

The new housing development on the golf course area means that the town of Maidenhead is going to expand, how does the council plan to deal with the increased number of young people both in terms of facilities and school placements that does not lead to segregation?

The Lead Member for Children's Services responded that the local authority had a duty to ensure that there were sufficient school places for the children and young people that lived in the borough now as well as those that would live in the borough through housing growth. To ensure choice the council was committed to have additional capacity in the school sector of 10% extra in school places so that pupil choice had a reasonable chance of operating effectively.

The golf course development was expected to require both a new primary and secondary school and the council was planning the space needed into the overall development plan. The Lead Member commented that she would like to hear feedback from young people as to how they would like the borough to look when they were adults.

Jed Thirlby asked the following question:

The town has undergone some recent development, however a growing concern amongst younger people is the lack of activities for young people to engage with or activities which are affordable. For example, the cost of cinema tickets is extremely high. Are there any plans to provide greater leisure activities for younger people in the town?

The Lead Member for Culture and Communities responded that there were a number of activities currently on offer to all young people including:

- The youth centre on Marlow Road was open three evenings a week with a specialist evening dedicated to music production and a range of activities on offer with entry at only 50p.
- The youth centres located in Larchfield and Pinkneys Green were now providing a range of activities for young people from 8 to 18 years.
- The vibrant holiday programme on offer.

There were many discounts available to residents through the Advantage card and this would continue to grow, taking into account what had been said. The Lead Member had visited both the leisure centre and library on the Cox Green site and had been impressed with the student volunteers. The council was investing £29m in a new leisure centre, which was a great opportunity to revamp the sports offer. In addition, the council had purchased Thriftwood Farm in 2016 which would be a fantastic asset. A new cultural and leisure hub was planned as part of the town centre regeneration.

The Principal Member for Maidenhead and Maidenhead Regeneration highlighted that for only £2 young people could learn to fly a Spitfire in a simulator at the Maidenhead Heritage Centre. The Lead Member for Highways and Transport commented that the council gave grant funding to numerous organisations in the borough that provided services for young people.

Jed Thirlby asked what facilities would be available in the new leisure centre?

The Lead Member for Culture and Communities responded that the new leisure centre was expected to open in March 2019 and would be much bigger than the Magnet, with facilities for different sports and a bigger pool.

Megan Scott asked the following question:

The council has recently discussed the CCTV usage in the town. This led us to discuss issues about safety within Maidenhead. There are several areas of the town which students feel threatened by, in particular by the area around the local McDonalds. Much of this threatening behaviour comes from young people, is there any provision for these young people which could get them 'off the streets' aside from the leisure activities previously discussed?

The Lead Member for Environmental Services responded that he would ask that the Community Wardens paid particular focus to this area when they were undertaking patrols of the town centre, and talk to the young people to direct them to meaningful activities. The youth service ran targeted groups such as Esteem and worked with particular young people when referrals come through to the service.

Megan Scott stated that she did not feel CCTV did not make her feel safe or more comfortable.

Rayan Akkache asked the following question:

Will there be the possibility of an increase in CCTV/Police presence to make young people feel safer in the town? Are there any initiatives to promote further engagement between the police and young people in Maidenhead?

The Lead Member for Environmental Services responded that the council was undertaking a full technological review of its entire CCTV estate. This would explore options for using modern technology including digital and wireless cameras with a view to ensuring CCTV was used in the appropriate places to protect residents.

The council had little control over Thames Valley Police operations, however, it understood that the Police were actively recruiting Police Cadets at the moment. The borough's Community Wardens had worked with Police Cadets on a number of occasions to deliver community based projects or initiatives.

Previous consultations with young people had not identified this as an area to address, however given safety was a large focus for Youth Services and the council was always looking for ideas that supported better ways of working together it would revisit this with young people.

The Lead Member for Children's Services suggested the issue be discussed with the Youth Ambassadors to consider further consultation.

Isaac McCann asked the following question:

Council tax is reported in the cabinet papers as increasing in cost. For some families, this will come as a burden and in some cases inhibit their ability to provide for their families. Are there any plans in place now or in the future to help these lower income families as one third were considered 'JAMs'?

The Lead Member for Finance responded that councils had some freedom to set the level of contribution for those on low incomes. The minimum was generally 10% but could be as high as 25%. The council had chosen to continue to set its level at 10%, which represented a very small pence increase per week. Over the last eight years there had been a real term cut in council tax of 32.6%. This was a result of consistently delivering efficient services, allowing council tax in the borough to be significantly lower than it's neighbours.

The Chairman explained that council tax was a regressive tax; there was an argument that funding for adult social care should be undertaken at the national level where taxes were progressive.

Isaac McCann commented that with Crossrail, there would be great development and an impact on services, along with the ageing population. How could the council guarantee costs would not increase?

The Lead Member for Finance responded that the council had to keep an eye on how demographics were likely to evolve and to seek to ensure the dynamics remained in balance so capacity remained to fund ever increasing demands. This would only be possible by building more houses. The Chairman commented that the amount of additional council tax from a new property was on average greater than the cost of council services, therefore a broader range of services could be supported.

Vlad Teisanu asked the following question:

£170,000 was recently spent on the removal of a travelling community. What plans are there to support young people and their education from these travelling communities

now they have been removed, and how can the council combat future costs with such community problems?

The Lead Member for Planning responded that over the last seven years the council had spent £160,000 on legal fees to take action in relation to an unauthorised development site. On 18 January 2017 the Cabinet Prioritisation Sub Committee agreed to give the travellers 14 days to leave the site; they had since done so voluntarily therefore the cost of direct action was zero. The council had a responsibility to ensure adequate site provision in the borough. The current sites were located in Waltham St Lawrence and Datchet. A separate local plan for the gypsy and traveller community would be developed due to changes in legislation.

The Lead Member for Children's Services explained that the council undertook welfare assessments for any traveller group that encamped on public or council owned land. Checks identified educational and health requirements of individuals. Many traveller families chose to home educate their children, therefore the local authority had limited involvement unless there was a wellbeing issue. Traveller children were allowed more time out of school to enable them to travel for cultural development.

The Principal Member for Maidenhead and Maidenhead Regeneration commented that he had been impressed with the way colleagues at the Cabinet Prioritisation Sub committee had spent a great deal of time going through the detail of each family on the site and their particular circumstances. Members had insisted that if children were moved off the site, they should still be able to attend their current school. The council would therefore have paid for home to school transport. The Lead Member for Environmental Services also commented on the council's focus on the welfare needs of the travelling community during the 8 years they had been on the site.

Matthew Bourner, joint Head Boy, asked the following question:

In addition to the rise in council tax fees, does the council provide assurances that there is a sufficient budget to cope with the increased pressure on services and facilities that the planned redevelopment will bring to the town?

The Lead Member for Planning responded that discussion had already taken place about the need to replace the leisure centre. A continuous approach would be taken so that the new leisure centre would open before the old one closed. There were a number of ways that facilities could be increased through redevelopment for example a new community centre funded by developers.

The Chairman commented that the Eton College Holyport College investment club, which raised real money and invested in the finance markets, would welcome Cox Green pupils from September 2017 when Holyport College opened its 6th form.

Matthew Bourner asked Members to explain the recent headline in the Maidenhead Advertiser that related to a £13m 'black hole' in core budgets.

The Lead Member for Finance commented that he believed he had presented a prudent, balanced budget and would welcome a discussion with the journalist so he could understand why it was thought £13m was missing.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

A) BUDGET 2017/18

Members considered the council's budget for 2017/18, for recommendation to Full Council.

The Lead Member explained that the majority of councils were opting for the default position of increasing council tax by 4.99% (3% adult social care precept and 1.99%, the highest increase without the requirement for a referendum). The borough was proposing an increase of 3.95% (3% adult social care precept and 0.95% increase in core council tax). The Lead Member highlighted that 0.95% was broadly half of the reference inflation figure for September 2016.

The council was committing to substantial and meaningful investment in areas of importance to residents, including:

- £1m for adult social care additional demand
- Meeting increased costs such as National Minimum Wage: £350,000
- Increasing costs in residential care homes: £200,000
- More children's social workers to reduce work loads: £180,000
- Rising home to school transport for special needs pupils: £330,000
- Increasing early years pupil premium spend: £120,000 over 3 years
- Expanding the practical support for homeless Residents: £400,000
- Expanding the planning team's expertise and capacity: £196,000
- Increasing the care and maintenance of public trees: £100,000
- More grants for voluntary organisations: £160,000

Band D council tax would be set at £961.46. In 16/17 this was £373 less than the average unitary, £213 less than any other Berkshire unitary and £189 less than any other unitary. The 3% adult social care precept at band D of £27.75, added to the 2% in 16/17 of £18.14. The 0.95% increase in council tax at band D, added £8.62 to the £906.95 which did not increase from 15/16 to 16/17. Fees and charges were either not increased, or were increased at or below 2.0%, or were aligned to other councils.

The Lead Member explained that over recent years the council had chosen to fund capital projects from cash balances avoiding £200,000 in interest fees. However, cash reserves were not a bottomless pit. In anticipation of substantial capital receipts from the five development sites in which the council had a controlling interest, the council would borrow up to £73m in the short term to fund capital projects including:

- Consolidating the St Clouds Way development site: £4.5m
- Stage one expansion Broadway Car Park: £9.4m net: total £17.8m
- Stage one new leisure centre: £14.5m: total £29.0m
- Other property and parking improvements: £8.3m

The Lead Member thanked all officers and Members involved in putting the budget together.

The Lead Member for Highways and Transport highlighted details of spending in his area, totalling £5.438m:

- £1,65m - resurfacing roads

- £1.6m - replacement LED street lights
- £450,000 - bridge works
- £400,000 - flood prevention and drainage
- £400,000 - traffic management and road safety
- £285,000 – cycling, reducing congestion and the Thames Flood Alleviation Scheme.
- £60,000 – public transport
- £80,000 – Pave Dedworth scheme.

The Lead Member proposed an additional recommendation to agree the final element in relation to 'Pave Dedworth'.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health highlighted that the 3% precept for 17/18, combined with the 2% the previous year enabled him to confirm that there would be no cut to services in his area. The increase equated to less than £1 per week for a Band D property. He highlighted the imminent move to a shared adult social care services company with Wokingham. This had been embarked upon, not to save money but to get better services through scale.

The Head of Finance confirmed that it was not legally possible to set a deficit budget.

The Lead Member for Economic Development and Regeneration highlighted that the council had some discretion in setting business rates discounts. The successful retail re-occupation relief scheme would be extended to commercial and industrial premises in 17/18.

The Principal Member for Maidenhead and Maidenhead Regeneration commented that he was pleased to see that charges at the Nicholson's car park had not been increased; the council had listened to local businesses. A Development Manager had been appointed so plans to redevelop the car park could get underway.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services highlighted that he had taken a report on parking provision to Cabinet the previous month, which demonstrated that the council was looking at parking provision across the borough, but in particular the need for parking during the regeneration phase.

The Lead Member for Culture and Communities highlighted the extension of the car park at Ockwells park, investment in Datchet, Eton and Old Windsor libraries and the delivering differently programme that would include £50,000 investment to put service hubs in the three main libraries. The new leisure centre at Braywick had already been referred to; in addition £400,000 had been allocated for the borough's other leisure centres. The amount of funding available for grants to voluntary organisations had also been increased.

The Lead Member for Customer and Business Services highlighted that the council was number one in the country for the processing of new benefits, which helped the most vulnerable residents. Council tax collection rates were above 99%; debt had been reduced by £10m in the last 18 months. There was continued investment in IT security and the digital channel.

The Principal Member for Neighbourhood Planning and Sunning & the Ascots commented on the roundabout that had been put in after 20 years at the Berystede crossroads, which had been welcomed by all. The regeneration of Ascot high street

was a key issue. The delivering differently project would see increased services at Ascot library. Following the Cabinet meeting at Charters where issues of road safety were highlighted, she was pleased to see funding included for a footbridge over the Windle stream and pedestrian lights at a narrow bridge.

The Lead Member for Planning highlighted continued investment in the planning function which would be important as new developments were brought forward.

The Lead Member for Children's Services explained that every single recipient of home to school transport for Special Educational Needs had been reviewed to ensure appropriate provision was in place. An additional £330,000 had been added to the budget for 17/18 as a result. The Lead Member highlighted that £762,000 of savings had been identified and approved at Cabinet in 2016; she assured Members that there was no cut to frontline services. In the main the savings had been achieved through the deletion of vacant posts and better value commissioning.

The Deputy Lead Member for Ascot Regeneration he highlighted that the council collected council tax and business rates totalling £160m. The cost of collection was £500,000 supported by government grant, totalling £1.3-1.5m, which represented less than 1% of the amount collected. This was indicative of the efficient and effective services lead by the Lead Member for customer and Business Services.

Councillor Jones welcomed the investment in toilets at Old Windsor library.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that the £80,000 for the Pave Dedworth project would be an addition to the capital programme. The Lead Member also confirmed that the proposed budget covered all known estimated costs for service provision.

Councillor Jones commented that she had asked at several of the Overview & Scrutiny Panels for sight of the trend evidence over the last five years for the 3% adult social care precept. She requested this be provided before full Council on 21 February 2017. The Lead Member responded that he had received the data himself earlier that evening and intended to forward it to Councillor Jones in the next few hours. If Councillor Jones had any questions as a result, she was directed to contact the Managing Director.

Councillor Jones registered her concern about some of the operations savings. She had been looking for comparative cost data per team, including lot 1, to enable analysis of the savings and future monitoring. She had not yet received this information and requested it be provided to her prior to Full Council on 21 February 2017. Councillor Jones also raised a concern about resourcing at the Customer Service Centre as she had recently had to wait some time on the phone, in some cases up to 10 minutes.

The Interim Strategic Director for Operations and Customer Services agreed to provide the information requested in relation to lot 1. He confirmed that the staffing in the CSC was sufficient for the call coverage. Details of phase 2 of the new Customer Experience model would be reported to Cabinet in early autumn.

The Chairman commented that the proposed budget protected the vulnerable, particularly in a time of growth in demand. The council had no wish to increase council tax and it had in fact been reduced in real terms over the previous seven years. The

change in direction was a result in a reduction in government grant funding and growth in the needs of the most vulnerable. He highlighted that the borough had the lowest council tax outside London. He thanked officers and Lead Members for their work on the budget.

The Lead Member for Finance commented that he had been involved in numerous big budgetary processes in his professional life; this budget had been one of the most competent and focussed experiences of his career. In a BBC Radio Berkshire interview it had been commented that the council had only increased council tax because it had not charged enough in the past. The Lead Member questioned why the council would take money off people in the past when it did not need to do so? Tax should only be taken when it was truly needed. The fact it had been increased this year by 3.95% was a direct and legitimate response to service needs in the current year.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet recommend to Council that they note the report and approve the:

- i) Detailed recommendations contained in Appendix A which includes a Council Tax at band D of £915.57, including a 0.95% increase of £8.62.**
- ii) Adult Social Care Precept of 3% (an increase of £27.75 on the £18.14 precept included in the 2016/17 budget) to be included in the Council's budget proposals, making this levy the equivalent of £45.89 at band D.**
- iii) Fees and Charges contained in Appendix D are approved.**
- iv) Capital Programme, shown in appendices F and G, for the financial year commencing April 2017.**
- v) Prudential borrowing limits set out in Appendix L.**
- vi) Business rate tax base calculation, detailed in Appendix O, and its use in the calculation of the Council Tax Requirement in Appendix A.**
- vii) Head of Finance in consultation with the Lead Members for Finance and Children's Services is authorised to amend the total schools budget to reflect actual Dedicated School Grant levels.**
- viii) Head of Finance in consultation with the Lead Member for Finance is authorised to make appropriate changes to the budget to reflect the impact of the transfer of services to Achieving for Children and Optalis.**
- ix) Responsibility to include the precept from the Berkshire Fire and Rescue Authority in the overall Council Tax charges is delegated to the Lead Member for Finance and Head of Finance once the precept is announced.**
- x) £80,000 to be added to the capital programme for the 'Pave Dedworth' project**

COUNCIL FUNDING FOR LOCAL ORGANISATIONS 2017/18

Cabinet considered approval of recommendations from the Grants Panel for grants to voluntary organisations. Although the discussion took place in Part II, it was agreed that the decision should be minuted in Part I.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the applications listed below for the allocation of RBWM / '3' Grassroots Funding be approved and the decisions be minuted in Part I following Cabinet's confirmation of the Panel's recommended awards.

Organisation	£
1st Maidenhead Sea Scout Group	1,000
2nd Ascot Guides	800
4th Ascot Brownies	150
Berkshire Credit Union	3,000
Electric Eels	2,000
Family Friends in Windsor & Maidenhead	2,000
Maidenhead Sports and Social Club	550
Oldfield School Association	1,000
Re:Charge R&R	6,000
Smartworks	3,000
SportsAble	3,000
Windsor Boys' School Boat Club	2,500

The Chairman supported the proposal for a report to be presented to a future Panel meeting on the wider work of the Berkshire Community Fund in the Borough.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i) The grants as detailed below be approved, subject to:-**
 - a) The approval of the budget.**
 - b) The organisations receiving Capital Grants obtaining any requisite planning or building regulations consents and producing copies of audited accounts and evidence of the availability of finance for the remainder of the schemes.**
 - c) The organisations receiving Kidwells Trust Grants:-**
 - i) Providing suitable acknowledgement for the grant assistance in all publicity material.**
 - ii) Ensuring that there is adequate insurance cover for items purchased with grant assistance. Continuing to look for other forms of sponsorship for special events.**
 - d) Organisations in receipt of Revenue and SLA Grants being required to complete an Annual Return Form which should demonstrate written evidence that the money had been spent according to their application and to identify the specific outcomes achieved as a result of the grant awarded.**
 - e) Organisations should, wherever possible, seek funding from other sources to ensure that they were not solely reliant on funding through the Royal Borough and it be noted that those organisations would not necessarily be automatically awarded funding year on year.**

ii) That the following decisions be minuted in Part I following Cabinet's agreement of the budget:

Revenue Grants

Organisation	£
3M Residents Association	1,500
ABC to Read	1,500
Ascot Area Alzheimer's Support (Triple A)	4,000
Ascot Volunteer Bureau	800
Autism Berkshire	5,000
BCF	5,000*
CHIME	3,800
Colne Valley CIC	1,000
The Conservation Volunteers	4,200
Cruse Bereavement	1,000
Family Action	1,000
Friends of Maidenhead	4,000
Guru Nanak Sat Sang Sabha	1,200
Honeypot Children's Charity	1,000
Maidenhead & District Stroke Club	780
Maidenhead Festival	7,000
Maidenhead Heritage Centre	10,000
Maidenhead Music Society	500
Old Windsor Carnival	3,000
Revitalise	1,000
Thames Valley Mediation Service	3,000
WAMCF	4,500
Windsor & Maidenhead Symphony Orchestra**	4,000
Woodlands Park Youth Club	2,000
Windsor & Maidenhead CAB	15,700

*The Chairman requested that the remainder of the grant funding applied for (£9500 for the Mentoring Scheme) be deferred for consideration in a second round of Grants, date to be confirmed.

** The Chairman commented that the borough would be keen to work with the organisation to promote classical music to a wider audience

That with regret, the following applications were refused:

Beehive Pre-School (to be referred to Community Enterprise and WAM Get Involved)
Berkshire MS Therapy Centre (to be referred to CCG funding)
Crossroads Care (to be referred to Carers Strategy, Carers Partnership Board and Carers Payments)
Homestart Slough
Sequela Foundation

The following applications were deferred for consideration in a second round of Grants, date to be confirmed, for the following reasons:

Alexander Devine Children’s Hospice Service – The Chairman requested more information on which other Local Authorities were supporting the Children’s Hospice Service financially.

Art Beyond Belief – The Chairman requested information regarding the percentage of residents within the Borough that would receive help through this organisation and also the viability of the activity if the award was less than applied for.

Maidenhead Cycle Hub – The Chairman requested information relating to any increased level of activity being undertaken by the organisation compared to that originally anticipated in the Social Enterprise Grant application and subsequent award.

Sebastians Action Trust – The Chairman requested more information on which other Local Authorities were supporting the Children’s Hospice Service financially and if their finances were sustainable.

N.B: Out of a total budget of £100,000, £86,480 was allocated which left £13,520 unallocated from the Revenue budget. The Panel agreed that this funding should be made available for allocation at future Grants Panels during 2017/18, and will identify the opportunities for grants made at future Panels to make full use of unallocated balances from either the Revenue and Capital budgets.

Capital Grants

Organisation	Description	£
Ascot District Day Centre	For works to prevent their driveway flooding during torrential rain.	10,440
Cordes Hall	To go towards replacing their flooring	14,000
Maidenhead Heritage Centre	To replace fluorescent light fittings with LED equivalents	739
Clewer Non Ecclesiastical Charities	To go towards the building of a sensory garden	4,500
Windsor & Eton District Scout Council (Bears Rails Campsite)	To go towards the demolition of the existing building and rebuilding of new building	15,000
Windsor Theatre Guild	To go towards equipment to improve the efficiency of running their shows	532*
Furze Platt Scouts	To go towards the total refurbishment and modernisation of their HQ building.	2,000
Maidenhead United FC Community Trust	To go towards the purchase of essential equipment and volunteering training	3,442
Norden Farm Centre for the Arts	To go towards the purchase of IT, studio sound desk, LED lighting, and refurbishment of toilets	15,750

*** The equipment must be made available for hire by other groups when**

not in use

That with regret, the following applications were refused:

**Beehive Pre-School
Windsor Horse Rangers**

The following applications be deferred for consideration in a second round of Grants, date to be confirmed, for the following reasons:

**Alexander Devine – The Panel agreed to defer this application in line with the deferral of the organisation’s revenue grant application.
Sawyers Close Residents – this was deferred pending information relating to the future of the site.**

N.B: Out of a total budget of £180,000, £66,403 was allocated which left £113,597 unallocated from the Capital budget. The Panel agreed that this funding should be made available for allocation at future Grants Panels during 2017/18, and will identify the opportunities for grants made at future Panels to make full use of unallocated balances from either the Revenue and Capital budgets

Service Funded Grants

Organisation	£
<u>Libraries, Arts & Heritage</u>	
Windsor Festival Society	15,000
Windsor Fringe	2,500
<u>Adult & Community</u>	
Maidenhead Mencap	6,000
Thames Valley Positive Support	13,500
Windsor Mencap Buddy Scheme	8,000
<u>Community Services</u>	
Bracknell CAB	8,000
Windsor & Maidenhead CAB	116,300

The Panel agreed that there would be no need for the SLAs to be presented to the Grants Panel for approval in future years; they would be agreed between Grants Officers and relevant Lead Members. Instead, a summary of all SLAs and any changes to the SLAs would be presented to the Grants Panel for noting.

Kidwells Trust Grants

Organisation	Description	£
Maidenhead Festival	To fund one of the attractions at the Maidenhead Festival	1,500

Organisation	Description	£
Norden Farm	To go towards their Jump In! event	2,000
Maidenhead Music Society	To engage more well-known artists for and for a broader advertising strategy.	400
Windsor Fringe	To promote the ever-expanding "Exhibition and Artists Open House".	250
Windsor & Maidenhead Symphony Orchestra	To cover the cost of hire of Eton College School Hall	1,850

N.B. Out of a total budget of £10,000, £6,000 was allocated which left £4,000 unallocated. The Panel agreed that this funding should be made available for allocation at future Grants Panels during 2017/18.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on items 7-8 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....