

CABINET

THURSDAY, 27 MAY 2021

PRESENT: (in person) Councillors Andrew Johnson (Chairman), Stuart Carroll (Vice-Chairman), David Cannon, David Coppinger, Samantha Rayner, David Hilton, Gerry Clark, Donna Stimson and Ross McWilliams

Also in attendance: (virtually unless specified) Cllr Jones, Cllr Bhangra (in person), Cllr Werner, Cllr Baldwin, Cllr Tisi, Cllr Brar, Cllr Singh, Cllr Larcombe, Cllr Price.

Officers: (virtually unless specified) Duncan Sharkey, Hilary Hall, Emma Duncan, Adele Taylor (in person), Ian Mourtal, Louisa Dean, Andrew Durrant, Andrew Vallance and David Cook (in person).

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 April 2021 were approved.

APPOINTMENTS

None

FORWARD PLAN

Cabinet considered the contents of the Forward Plan for the next four months and noted the changes made since last published, including:

- Sufficiency Strategy for Children added to June Cabinet.
- Asset Review and Disposal added to June Cabinet.

YOUTH COUNCIL WORKING GROUP UPDATE

Cabinet received a presentation on the progress of the development of a RBWM Youth Council.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health informed Cabinet that Cabinet had previously approved the creation of a Youth Council, one of the recommendations was to establish a working group. The presentation was to provide an update on the progress of this group, he welcomed Imogen Cobbold (RBWM Youth Ambassador) and Catie Holden (RBWM Girls Forum Member) who were presenting on behalf of the working group.

The girls informed Cabinet that the working group had been established to plan the governance and the structure and accountability of the Youth Council. Looking at processes

that allowed consultation on issues that affected young people and a process of communication and question sessions with Cabinet members.

The working group was driven by young people with the assistance of Cllrs Carroll and McWilliams, Karen Shepherd (RBWM Head of Governance) and excellent support from Elaine Keating.

The had drafted 18 rules and regulations. Each meeting would have standing items including looking at the Cabinet Forward Plan and scrutiny Panel's work programmes so they could see if there are item they wish to comment upon.

Cabinet Members and other councillors would be invited to their meetings to help develop policy and enhance the council's aims and objectives. This can include Q&A sessions on pre-arranged topics.

The Youth Council can raise any problems or concerns with Democratic Services and challenge the administration on areas that affect young people.

The working group had advertised the Youth Council using the council's social media channels, had press releases and been in the RBWM residents newsletter.

There was still more work to be done and they would be responding to all applications to join, 18 so far, continue to promote the council and establish a work programme and manifesto.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health thanked the young ladies for their comprehensive update and work of the working group. There was a clear blueprint and structure that was being lead by young people.

The Chairman also thanked the girls for their presentation and that he was please to see them having a flying start with 16 applicants to join the council.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Ascot made reference to the five objectives highlighted within the letter contained in the presentation and highlighted the one about producing campaigns and projects. He was informed that this could include issues such as climate change and that they would be trying to get representatives from all secondary schools so there would be a broad range of issues and topics.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Environmental Services, and Maidenhead informed that he had a paper later on the agenda regarding the Maidenhead Vision and he would be looking to engage with the Youth Council to get young peoples views on the future of the town.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Corporate & Resident Services, Culture & Heritage, and Windsor said it had been an excellent presentation and she looked forward to working with the Youth Council. She asked how often they planned to meet and how many members were planned. She was informed that it had not yet been decided how often they would meet but at least one per month and maybe every two weeks. There was currently no limits on membership but at least one from every borough school and other appropriate groups such as Kickback.

Cllr Tisi said that it was striking to see that the working group had three young women on it which was fantastic to see women interested in politics as the Council was dominated by men. She asked what they were doing to make sure minority groups and ethnic backgrounds were included and feel safe.

She was informed that they would be working to make the Forum diverse and inclusive, young people from different groups would be encouraged to join. Getting representatives from as many schools as possible would help.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health said that he would make sure the Youth Council was published widely including faith groups and stakeholders. This would be open to everyone and encouraged those interested to apply. He again thanked the working group for getting us to this point.

Cabinet noted the presentation.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

A) BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN - NEXT STEPS

Cabinet considered the report regarding an update on the Borough Local Plan.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Environmental Services, and Maidenhead informed that following the Stage 2 hearings held in late 2020, the Inspector had issued a post hearings advice letter. The Inspector had agreed with the council's proposals to amend some policies; had proposed that three allocations previously removed are reinstated and that one current allocation be deleted (Housing by Maidenhead Train Station). At every stage of the process the plan adds more weight to the planning system.

The plan did include sites that were in the green belt, that was not liked, however there was a need for family homes and 80% of the borough would remain green belt.

The next steps was the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications for public consultation. To reduce the risk of delay, delegated authority is sought for the Head of Planning in consultation with the Lead Member for Planning, Environmental Services and Maidenhead to agree the detailed wording of the schedule under the direction of the Inspector. The consultation would only be on the changes made by the Inspector and he was also recommending that the consultation be extended by one more week.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Ascot said that he was delighted to see that the BLP would soon be complete. The future of development within the Royal Borough needed a robust plan.

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside asked for clarification that the consultation would only be on the changes the Inspector had asked for and that the content would be discussed with Cabinet Members. The Cabinet Member responsible confirmed that this was correct and that there would be no change in policy.

The Chairman endorsed the necessity to get the BLP in place not only to protect from unwanted speculative development but also to provide the blueprint going forward. The impact of not having a BLP would be unwanted.

Cllr Baldwin mentioned that the report requested more key decisions being delegated to the Head of Planning and Cabinet Member, he asked what would be the alternative. He noted the long delay in getting the plan in place and asked how many speculative developments had been granted since 2013 without a BLP. He also said that between £25m to £75 million had been lost since 2016 without CIL being applied in Maidenhead Town Centre, how would needed infrastructure be paid for.

The Cabinet Member responded that as said there were no changes to policy and that the consultation was on amendments only. There were no sensible alternatives, if we were changing policy then the recommendations would be different. With regards to unwanted speculative developments he did not have the figures at hand but would ask for them to be provided. With regards to CIL there other funds available such as S106 and we were only talking about the centre of Maidenhead. There was no issue about raising money.

Cllr Werner mentioned that the climate change emergency was passed one year ago yet there was no mention of it in the BLP, this was a concern as planning was a major vehicle in dealing with the emergency. The Cabinet Member responded that the plan was set in stone and at this stage could only change areas set by the Inspector. We did have planning design statements in place for climate change. The Chairman also added that once the BLP had been adopted work could commence on the next one with enhanced focus on climate change.

Cllr Brar mentioned that one of her constituents, named in the Inspectors response, had shown why the plan was flawed especially in Cookham, he had not received any response to his letters. Concerns had been raised about congestion and not responded to. The Cabinet Member reiterated that the current plan was set in stone and only those areas raised by the Inspector could be considered. He was happy to meet with the resident mentioned.

Cllr Singh raised concerns about planned development in Maidenhead centre, policies on height were not adhered to, too much emphasis was placed on flats that there was not demand and what about employment. A lot of work was being carried out by the RBWM Property Company. He made reference to current live planning applications that Cabinet informed would not be discussed. The Cabinet Member also said that developers would not build properties if there was no demand. It was important to make Maidenhead attractive to employers. The Chairman said that as well as flats there was also affordable family homes.

Mr Hill addressed Cabinet and said that he would like to focus on paragraph 2.3 where it says the inspector had no concerns about the Golf Club development. Paragraph 29 of the inspectors report named Mr Hill where he said that based on the public information available there was a clear risk of the deliverability on the site. He said that contrary to paragraph 2.3 there was a risk.. the Council had said that the land was available and that the terms of the release of the land was confidential; withheld under FOI and denied to the planning, however it was lodged with the land registry and publicly available. The Golf Club had stated that under the agreement until the BLP the proposals could be rescinded. The Inspector has said the authority should inform her if there was something that she did not know at the time that may impact the plan. He asked why this had not been done due to the surrender agreement.

In response the Chairman said that there was no risk to the BLP due to the Golf Club proposals and the Inspector had been satisfied. A response to the Golf Clubs letter had been sent and he refuted that the Council had not engaged with them. The Golf Club site would be delivered even if this required compulsory purchase orders. We have a sound BLP that will meet required tests.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Delegates authority to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Lead Member for Planning, Environmental Services and Maidenhead, to publish the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications to be agreed with the Inspector for public consultation.**

B) 2020/21 DRAFT OUTTURN REPORT - REVENUE AND CAPITAL

Cabinet considered the report that set out the final outturn position of the Council in respect of the 2020/21 financial year.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Ascot informed that Cabinet Members to cast their minds back to June last year when in the face of the impact of Covid general reserves stood at less than £2 million and there were calls from some quarters for the director of resources to issue a section 114 notice. How this had changed as this outturn report is in a favourable variance with general reserves above £7 million. But these headline figures did not tell the full story of this administration's management of a very challenging financial year.

As a consequence of the impact of Covid a revised MTFS was published in October last year. This projected a need for savings of £8.7 million in 2021-22. With considerable foresight, in November last year the Director of Resources proposed establishing a Covid earmarked reserve to smooth any cost increases and income loss in 2021-22. The budget report to Council shows that £3.17M would be required from the reserve in order to balance this year's budget. The reserve stood at £3.8 million providing a buffer of just over £600k, although some of this is for specific newly acquired responsibilities.

There was also the opportunity to improve the resilience of our finances by adding to our reserves and provisions. Having funded some IT provision through existing budgets that was required due to COVID changes in working practices, £300k of funding was set aside to replace business as usual IT work that will be delivered during 21/22, and a £300K Optalis reserve is established to manage some uncertainties in overhead costs.

Provisions had also been increased with £400K set aside for potential redundancy costs related to the budget setting process, in conformance with prudential advice from our external auditors that the provision for debt should be reviewed an additional £1.7 million provision is made for Adult Social Care and Housing benefit bad debt provision that has been recognised as an area of risk throughout the financial year, and £393K is set aside for adult social care, a total upside approaching £7M.

The outturn report tells us that stripping out covid we would have achieved a favourable variance of £4.2M in service expenditure. Government have been helpful and funded all but £630K of Covid revenue losses so we were able to bank £3.6M of this. As a result of a capital slippage of £44M interest charges are £900K less than budget. There were several other upsides the most significant were the receipt of £500K compensation for loss of rent at Sienna Court and invaluable assistance from the Frimley CCG and better Care Fund with funding for Adult Social Care to facilitate hospital discharges and to prevent hospital admissions.

We have come through 2020/21 in much better shape than I thought possible. He acknowledged the support received from Government without which all Councils would have been in severe financial difficulties, but our administration's achievement was made possible by setting a robust budget and with great work from officers delivering services and our finance team capitalising on all opportunities to not only save money but opportunities for additional funding.

The administration's financial capacity and competence has grown and in a difficult year we have also been thinking and planning for next year and beyond, ensuring that whilst managing the immediate and urgent we have our eyes firmly fixed on the important, which augers well for the future. He thanked all Council Officers and specifically the Finance team for an incredible job well done.

On behalf of Government in the past year our Revenues and Benefits team have made financial awards totalling £46 million to small businesses from more than 30 different grants. They did so whilst being just marginally above target in their day job of processing a Covid driven surge in new and changed circumstance benefit claims.

Cllr Jones asked with regards to the revenue outturn statement there were some very large inward movements over the last two months. One of these was nearly £1 million from property services, this could be because an asset was sold or leases sold back. In the DSG there was also a significant amount that has come in over the last two month. Without these one-off payments the outturn would be worst. There was also a number of capital slippage and it was not known if this was due to poor monitoring.

The Cabinet Member responded that with regards to the property payment this was made up of payment from Sienna Court and companies buying out of their leases. It was not known which years budget these would have fallen into.

The Director of Resources reiterated that in terms of property it was not clear which year the money would fall into. Due to transparency we were showing the movements coming in even though some are set aside for future years. A tenant asking to walk away from a lease is not unusual. A property provision has been set up to recognise incoming funds that is used in other years. With regards to the DSG page 65 shows that the movement is the transfer in the reserves, this was money we were expecting in but are now only getting it in for 2021/22 and were only informed this in March. With regards to Capital there has been some slippage coupled with low borrowing / interest rates. The paper also showed the level of general reserves as well as other reserves put aside.

Cllr Jones asked if the money going into reserves had been allocated or if there was room to use some of it to offset savings within this year. She was informed that now was not the time to take money out to cover savings given the uncertainty of the future.

The Chairman endorsed what has been said many times that we need to build back our reserves. They were committed to do this and now was not the time to go soft on these plans. Having strong sustainable reserves was important.

Cllr Baldwin said he wished to thank the officers who had made the financial position happen especially during the difficult 15 months. Their demotion and commitment to residents should not be lost in the numbers. The Chairman agreed with this statement and said that is why they were backing staff with a pay rise.

Mr Wilson addressed Cabinet and said that the report showed that the Council had underspent by £4.2 million, he asked if this was due to better budgeting and financial controls or the council doing less due to Covid. There was an extra £6 million going into reserves. This was residents money, so if financial competence was improving why was some of this money not being used to re-introduce parking discounts that would help the highstreets. The Cabinet Member reiterated that now was not the time to spend this money as reserves needed to be built back up. It was important to get through the uncertainties in a good financial position.

Mr Hill addressed Cabinet and said that with regards to paragraph 6.9 facilities, it mentioned the £28k pressure on the Desborough Suite. He asked if this was linked to the vaccination roll out and if this could be recovered from the Government. Paragraph 13.26 says the general fund reserve starts at £8 million and goes down to £7 million, in the next five years will the reserves need to be prioritised over say a day centre. Paragraph 13.28 it mentions that the council was borrowing temporarily pending capital receipts, are these receipts from the golf club as he had already raised concern about the validity of that project. There was also reference to over £300k from the Nicholson's Centre and he asked what this was. There was also zero spending from CIL allocation.

The Cabinet Member responded by saying that £500k had been spent from CIL with further spend expected when appropriate, the reserves had reduced but this was to offset the budget, in terms of borrowing that was just a statement of fact and behind this was the capital cash flow that showed when we would be expecting capital receipts. The Director of Resources also mentioned that the pressure on the Desborough Suite was down to loss of income from hall hire where possible this has been recovered. With regards to reserves they can only be used as a one off spend and a minimal level does not equate to an optimal level.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet:

i) Notes the report including:

- a. The final Net Revenue Outturn position for the year showing an underspend of £1,043,000 including Sales, Fees and Charges compensation of £8,016,000 (Appendix A) and the implications for the authority's reserves position (Appendix H).**

- b. The delivery against the savings approved within the 2020/21 base budget (Appendix B)
 - c. Net Capital Outturn figures showing a net £44,890,000 underspend (Appendices C – E) and the subsequent impact on Borrowing (Appendix F)
 - d. The Outturn position on the Schools Budget (Appendix G)
 - e. The summary of the Covid-19 funding and expenditure during 2020/21 (Appendix I).
 - f. The level of Aged Debt as at 31 March 2021 (Paragraph 14.11 Table 25 within the report).
 - g. The in-year collection levels for both Council Tax and NNDR (Paragraph 14.3 Table 24 within the report).
 - h. The levels and return on the cash investments (Paragraph 14.28 Table 28 within the report).
- ii) Approves the following:
- a. Creation of new Earmarked Reserves totalling £3,485,000 reflecting the service underspends to be carried forward into 2021/22, as shown in Appendix A. This includes the earmarked reserve in relation to Covid-19 expenditure that will be utilised in 2021/22 as approved as part of the budget in February 2021
 - b. Movements in existing Earmarked Reserves following the review of the S151 Officer.
 - c. The Capital variances and slippage. Slippage will be carried forward into 2021/22.

c) MAIDENHEAD VISION CHARTER

Cabinet considered the report regarding the adoption of the Maidenhead Vision Charter and the recruitment of a Maidenhead Town Team.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Environmental Services, and Maidenhead informed that for every elected member there was one project that defined their career; he felt lucky as he had two, the BLP and this report. A town was defined by its people and not just its buildings. Unlike many towns Maidenhead was growing and attracting new residents. Examples of projects underway or planned were given but he also raised the importance of all residents having their say.

JTP Architects had been appointed to undertake consultation to capture all stakeholder and community views, and for them to have an input into the shape of the town going forward. Due to the pandemic there was the need for a placemaking vision demonstrating inspiration, ambition, and confidence in the future of our town centre has taken on the new significance, that of helping steer a course for the town centre's post-Covid recovery.

The document sets out the Vision for Maidenhead Town Centre for the next 15-20 years. The Maidenhead Town Team will be established by the council, with representations from a wide selection of groups, making it as inclusive as possible. The team will be supported by Andrew Durrant, the Cabinet Member, member of the opposition and five residents.

Maidenhead town centre will be our proud heart, a place of leisure, living and working. The Vision and Charter had 12 Charter points that had been agreed through the community and stakeholder engagement process. The Maidenhead Town Team would be monitoring and reviewing all activity for the Town Centre through these key points.

The Team will have five priorities, economic recovery, transport strategy, a green Maidenhead, maximising the waterways and the southern expansion providing much needed family homes. There would be a full communication plan.

The Town Team would work in partnership with the council and other key action groups, stakeholder, and community groups to ensure that all projects address the charter points where possible. The charter was not a planning document, but an aspiration of the town that our residents, and business have said they want to live in.

The Vision Charter has initially focused on Maidenhead due to the volume of regeneration activity that is underway and planned. Further down the line it may be appropriate to also consider a Vision Charter for other major towns such as Windsor and Ascot.

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside informed that the document was very important and came about with consultation of a wide variety of interested groups. It was positive to see resident involvement.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Corporate & Resident Services, Culture & Heritage, and Windsor said that Maidenhead had fantastic culture and heritage and diversity she was glad this had been picked up in the document. She looked forward for a similar engagement for Windsor.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Sport & Leisure, and Community Engagement informed that when he was first elected residents asked what was being done about the town centre, he was pleased to see that action was now being taken. We have already seen major developments being delivered and investment into the town. Engagement with residents had been fantastic and we will see a modern town respecting its history.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure, and Digital Connectivity expressed his support for this comprehensive piece of work especially as it included sustainable integrated transport, increased infrastructure and digital connectivity. He read out part of an email from a resident about the importance of regeneration for the future.

Mr Hill addressed Cabinet and said that this was a good positive piece of work and was pleased to see arts and culture included, he asked if the promised spend on the Desborough Theatre was still to be refurbished.

Mr Hill said that with regards to cars, everyone wants to move towards electric cars and walkable towns. However during the consultation there was talk about 20mph limits on the ring road, is this the plan. There needs to be a transition as people still need their cars. He asked if electric scooter lanes had been considered. With regards to the Team he asked if this would be a scrutiny panel, who were they, what will be the interview process, will it be the usual supporting people or critical friends. Will families be represented on the panel, we have already lost bowling and will soon lose our nightclub. Young people need to be involved. There is conflict between the document and tall buildings strategy, the Nicholson's development does not comply. You mention the importance of green and blue assets yet you are planning to develop on the gold club.

The reporting Cabinet Member responded that the team was being formed to reach out to every single group, there will be 8 people but the process had not been agreed. Their key role was to talk to groups in Maidenhead. We are not dictating we will be listening to what they say, we want this to be democratic in its truest sense.

Cllr Singh liked the document even if it was late. He has seen the effect of scruples development, the prison blocks being put up, there has been a big backlash with a live petition ongoing. Why would the council go ahead with a scheme with so many objections, the Chairman said we would not discuss live planning applications. Cllr Singh was concerned that

this was an aspiration not a planning document that could be enforced, was this to compensate for the lack of a neighbourhood plan.

The presenting Cabinet Member replied that this was not a planning document but allowed residents to have a say in the way the centre was going. This was recognising everyone's right to have a say. This will be driven by the people and not Cabinet.

The Chairman said that this was the start of a process for the long term aspirations for the town. He agreed that Cabinet did not want to see unscrupulous development or developers. This vision document was about raising standards. This would be going forward on a cross party basis.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- ii) **Approves and adopts the Maidenhead Vision & Charter document.**
- iii) **Delegates authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Lead Member for Planning, Environmental Services and Maidenhead, to set up a recruitment panel to establish the membership of the Maidenhead Town Team.**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public were excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion took place on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 3 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

A) COUNCIL FUNDING FOR LOCAL ORGANISATIONS 2021/22

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

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Ascot provided an overview of funds available and the amount the Grants Panel were recommended for approval. He thanked the officers for their work and recommendations made to the Panel.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- iv) **Approves the recommendations of the Grants Panel held on 11 May 2021, as detailed in the attached minutes (Appendix A).**
- v) **Approves the recommendation of the additional grant to Age Concern Windsor for £750.00.**
- vi) **That the Cabinet decision is minuted in Part I.**

BCF '3' FUND

(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 1, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)

Anita Herbert from BCF went through the five applications that they had considered and made recommendations for the award of a grant.

The Panel considered, for recommendation to Cabinet, noting of the award of BCF '3' Fund grants to local organisations for the forthcoming financial year.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the applications listed below for the allocation of RBWM / '3' Grassroots Funding be recommended for noting by Cabinet.

Organisation	£
Old Windsor District Guides	1,000
Chattertots	5,000
Windsor Horse Rangers	5,000
Maidenhead United Juniors FC	3,000
Clewer Scout and Guide Group	6,000
Total Proposed Awards	20,000

The remaining £5,000 would be available for allocation as interim payments.

COMMUNITY GRANTS

(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 1, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)

The Panel considered, for recommendation to Cabinet, the award of Council grants to local organisations for the forthcoming year.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the grants as detailed below be recommended to Cabinet for approval, subject to

- a) The organisations receiving the Community Grants for capital projects 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. Organisations receiving Community Grants for Revenue costs or Service Level Agreements 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.
- b) The organisations receiving Kidwells Trust Grants:-
 1. Providing suitable acknowledgement for the grant assistance in all publicity material.
 2. Ensuring that there is adequate insurance cover for items purchased with grant assistance.
 3. Continuing to look for other forms of sponsorship for special events.
- c) 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.

CAPITAL GRANTS

Organisation	£
19th Maidenhead Scout Group	400
Ascot District Day Centre Trust	1,750
Berkshire Lowland Search and Rescue	500
Boyn Grove Community Allotment	250
CAB East Berkshire	1,600
Champney Hall Management Committee	1,000
Cheapside Village Hall	500
Clewer Non-Ecclesiastical Charity	500
Cookham Dean Cricket Club	500

Cox Green Community Centre Pre School	500
Earleywood Scout Campsite part of South East Berkshire District Scout Council	750
*Eton Community Association	1,000 - The relevant Grants Officer to request the organisation share any learnings from this project
Furze Platt Senior School Parent Teachers and Friends Association	500
Holyport Community Trust	2,000
Holyport Football Club	500
Maidenhead Sea Cadets	500
Norden Farm Centre Replacements and Renewals	4,000
Oakley Green Fifield District Community Association Ltd	500
Pickles Hedgehogs	250
Public Hall (The Cordes Hall)	2,000
Samaritans Slough Windsor Maidenhead	1,500
South Ascot District Guide Association	216
St Marks Crescent Methodist Church	750
The Autism Group (TAG)	3,000
The Baby Bank	3,000
The Old Court CIC	3,500
The Parish of All Saints, Boyne Hill Maidenhead	6,000
Trevelyan Middle School PTA	500
White Waltham Village Association	350
Wickwood Campsite (Windsor Division Girlguiding)	500
Wild Eton & Eton Wick and Wild Windsor	1,000
WildCookham	500
WildCookham - Wildflowers	500
Windsor Festival Society Ltd – Youth Concert	1,000
Windsor Horse Rangers	500
Windsor Talking Newspaper	500
Wraysbury & Horton Voluntary Care	500
Wraysbury Matters	500
TOTAL RECOMMENDED TO CABINET	43,816

It is with regret that the following organisations were not awarded any funding:

- Clewer Scout and Guide Group
- The Sunninghill Reading Room Trust
- Windsor Festival Society Ltd – Grassroots Arts Session for young children

N.B: *Out of a total capital budget of £50,000, £43,816 was allocated which left £6,184 unallocated. The Panel agreed that this funding should be made available for allocation as interim payments under delegated authority during 2021/22.*

REVENUE GRANTS

Organisation	£
Adult Dyslexia Centre (Thames Valley)	1,000
Alexander Devine Children's Hospice Service	500
Assisting Berkshire Children to read	500
Autism Berkshire (Berkshire Autistic Society)	1,500
Berkshire County Blind Society (Berkshire Vision)	750
Chatterbox	1,000
Driven Forward	2,000
Elizabeth House Cookham	2,500
Eton Allotment Society - (note, the allotment is privately leased by a community group and is not the allotment supported by Eton Town Council)	475
Eton Wick Village Association	1,000
Family Action	5,000
Maidenhead & District Stroke Club	500

Maidenhead Choral Society	500
Maidenhead Community Book Festival	2,000
Maidenhead Drama Guild	1,000
More Than A Shelter (MTaS)	2,500
*Norden Farm Centre for the Arts	5,000 – The relevant Grants Officer to provide a detailed breakdown of how the Grant is to be spent
Re:Charge R&R	2,500
Slough Windsor & Maidenhead Theatre Company	1,000
*St Michaels School PTA	500 – The relevant Grants Officer to provide more information on funding for school and library
Sunningdale Bowling Club	1,000
*The Conservation Warriors	3,500 – The relevant Grants Officer to provide detail on where they operate and for how long
The Dash Charity	2,500
The Rotary Club of Maidenhead Bridge - Health Awareness day	250
The Rotary Club of Maidenhead Bridge - Summer Family Fun Day 2021	250
The Thames Valley & Great Western Omnibus Trust (TV&GWOT)	400
Windsor & Maidenhead Community Forum (WAMCF)	2,000
Windsor and Maidenhead SMILE Club	600
Windsor Old Peoples Welfare Association	2,500
TOTAL RECOMMENDED TO CABINET	44,725

It is with regret that the following organisations were not awarded any funding:

- 4Motion CIC
- Art Beyond Belief
- Aspire and Shine
- The Inner Wellness Project
- The Rotary Club of Maidenhead Bridge for Maidenhead Downhill races 2021

N.B: *Out of a total revenue budget of £50,000, £44,725 was allocated which left £5,275 unallocated. The Panel agreed that this funding should be made available for allocation as interim payments under delegated authority during 2021/22.*

KIDWELLS PARK TRUST GRANTS

(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 1, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)

Organisation	£
*The Old Court CIC	5,000 - The relevant Grants Officer to provide further detailed breakdown of how the grant would be spent
*Windsor Festival Society Ltd	2,000 - The relevant Grants Officer to provide further detailed breakdown of how the grant would be spent
TOTAL RECOMMENDED TO CABINET	7,000

N.B: Out of a total budget of £13,500 for Kidwells Park Trust, £7000 was allocated which left £6,500 unallocated. The Panel agreed that this funding should be made available for allocation as interim payments under delegated authority during 2021/22.

Councillor Baskerville requested that it be noted that although he had been able to hear the debate at the meeting, he had been unable to comment on a number of applications due to technical issues. He has confirmed he was in agreement with all the recommendations made above.

B) PROVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES

Cabinet considered the report that provided an update on the provision of legal services for the Royal Borough.

The report was noted.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 9.30 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....