

Report for: ACTION



<b>Contains Confidential or Exempt Information</b>	NO - Part I
<b>Title</b>	Neighbourhood Participatory Budget Scheme - August 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 and 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>	17 August 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 June, July and early August 2016.
2. It recommends that Members award up to £2,000 to one or more of the projects based on public voting and match funding as they consider appropriate. This is the second of six rounds 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. Allocate neighbourhood budget funds as they deem appropriate based on the results of the public voting, up to £2,000 per project.**
- 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 June, July and early August 2016 can be found in Appendix A.
- 2.2 4 new projects were submitted, and 9 projects were carried forward from the previous voting round. A summary of all 13 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:
  - Windsor Horse Rangers - New Tack Room/Tractor Shed, with a total of 1,018 votes. They have not requested any match funding.
  - Alexander Devine Children's Hospice Service, with a total of 273 votes. They have requested match funding of £2,848.
  - Family Friends in Windsor & Maidenhead, with a total of 272 votes. They have requested match funding of £5,000.
- 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 post code, votes continue to be received from out-of-Borough residents (in this round a total of 33% - 3% more than the last voting round).
- 2.5 The project that received the most out-of-borough votes was Windsor Horse Rangers - New Tack Room/Tractor Shed, which drew 339 out-of-Borough votes from its total of 1,018 votes (33%). This was followed by Alexander Devine Children's Hospice Service, which received 159 out of Borough votes from its total of 273 (58%). Individuals are able to cast votes for more than one project.
- 2.6 The total number of votes cast was 2,005. This is an increase from the last round of 948 votes.
- 2.7 As per previous voting rounds, the Council has made specific efforts to raise awareness and encourage participation. A marketing strategy has been devised to give this project publicity amongst the 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.

- 2.8 At the time of writing, no projects have so far been nominated for the next round of voting. As from April 2016, school based projects are now no longer eligible to take part in the Neighbourhood Voting Scheme as, proposals from state funded schools are now included in the new Schools Participatory Budgeting Scheme.
- 2.9 Four of the 13 projects in the current round of voting have identified or anticipate other funding or support and have bid for a matched funding award.
- 2.10 Two of the projects received less than 2% of the vote.

Option	Comments
Award up to £2,000 to one or more of the projects and match funding as considered appropriate.	This is the first of six voting rounds for 2016/17. There is £32,250 in the budget for the 2016/17 financial year. Members have the option to allocate match funding from the main pot.

### 3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
No. of projects awarded funding per round through the PB scheme	0	1-2	3-4	>4	1 April 2017
% 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	£3,960	£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

<b>Risks</b>	<b>Uncontrolled Risk</b>	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Controlled Risk</b>
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
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
18/08/16	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

### 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	10/08/16	10/08/16	
Russell O'Keefe	Director of Corporate and Community Services	10/08/16		
David Scott	Head of Governance, Partnerships, Performance and Policy	10/08/16	10/08/16	
Robert Stubbs	Head of Finance	10/08/16		
Michael Llewelyn	Policy Officer	09/08/16	10/08/16	

### REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Non-key decision	No

Full name of report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Andrew Scott	Interim Performance Manager	01628 796028