

3. COMMUNITY FUNDING 1997/98

RR 8110

Officer responsible Leisure Manager	Author Peter Walls
Corporate Plan Output: Grants Administration	

The purpose of this annual report is to inform the Council of the major details in respect to the main community funding round and to make recommendations in relation to the 1998/99 community funding process.

The principal funding round for 1997/98 has been completed and summary sheets and accountability forms have been forwarded to the Hillary Commission in respect of the Community Sport Fund.

Some funding committees have retained funds for late applications and subsidiary funding rounds, but the majority of the available resources have been allocated. The issue of unallocated resources at the end of the financial year needs to be closely monitored to ensure that the majority of these resources are allocated prior to the main funding round in the following year for which applications close at the end of March.

Tabled is a full list of the successful applicants responded to by the Metropolitan Funding Committee.

It is a requirement of the Hillary Commission that a list of successful applicants is made available to the local newspapers.

RESOURCES AVAILABLE UNDER THE VARIOUS SCHEMES

Scheme	Source of Funds	1997/98
Community Development Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$330,000
Community Sport Fund	Hillary Commission	\$425,409
Community Organisation Loans Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$360,000

The Community Development Scheme is based on \$1.07c (for 1998/99) per head of population and this is inflation adjusted each year. The amount that is budgeted for in 1998/99 is \$337,000. The Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund is based on \$1.35c per head of population (315,118 population).

ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

As Councillors will be aware, we have six funding committees based on Community Board areas and one metropolitan funding committee and the funds are apportioned on the following basis:

Metropolitan Funding Committee

- (i) All loan funds
- (ii) 30% of the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund
- (iii) 50% of the Council's Community Development Scheme Funds

The Six Community Funding Committees

- (i) 70% of the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund
- (ii) 50% of the Council's Community Development Scheme Funds

Note: The allocation of funds to the six community funding assessment committees is apportioned according to each community board's population.

NUMBER OF PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Applications were received as follows:

Community Funding Committee	Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund				
	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98
Hagley/Ferrymead	60	57	64	71	67
Spreydon/Heathcote	74	53	42	52	53
Riccarton/Wigram	65	80	81	95	75
Fendalton/Waimairi	54	56	63	65	80
Shirley/Papanui	46	64	29	43	51
Burwood/Pegasus	66	70	57	36	71
Metropolitan	188	128	155	199	190
Totals	553	508	491	561	587

Community Funding Committee	Community Development Scheme				
	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98
Hagley/Ferrymead	26	44	41	51	35
Spreydon/Heathcote	35	31	31	30	35
Riccarton/Wigram	32	22	26	20	27
Fendalton/Waimairi	16	17	25	26	25
Shirley/Papanui	21	37	27	27	26
Burwood/Pegasus	22	42	23	25	50
Metropolitan	143	138	110	124	135
Totals	295	331	283	303	333

Percentage Breakdown of Applications

Community Funding Committee	Community Funding Committees				
	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98
Community Sport Fund	66%	75%	69%	65%	68%
Community Development Scheme	52%	58%	61%	59%	59%

Community Funding Committee	Metropolitan Funding Committee				
	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98
Community Sport Fund	34%	25%	31%	35%	32%
Community Development Scheme	48%	42%	39%	41%	41%

The basis for apportioning the resources available under the Hillary Commissions Community Sport Fund (70% community funding committees and 30% metropolitan) still seems appropriate. The Community Development Scheme (50% community funding committees, 50% metropolitan) is not proportionate in respect of the number of applications that are received but because metropolitan organisations tend to apply for greater amounts to provide city-wide service the 50:50 split still seems appropriate.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES ON THE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

The 1997/98 funding round was the second round of a three year term for the community representatives on the various funding committees.

The three year term for these representatives is designed to link with the Council's three year elections and the timing means that in the worst case scenario only half of the committees could change at any one time thus providing continuity in the process of assessment and allocation of resources under these schemes.

SUMMARY OF RESOURCES ALLOCATIONS AND BALANCES

The following table outlines the situation for each funding committee as at 30 June 1998. It should be noted that some Community Boards use their discretionary funds to add to the available resources and this is indicated in the comments column.

Assessment Committee	\$ Carry Forward 1996/97	Less Late 96/97 Allocations	Funds Available 1997/98	Funds Allocated 1997/98	Balance as at 30/6/98	Comments
Metropolitan HC CDS	200 4345.76	1350 2500	126473 168845.76	126470 163562	3.0 5283.76	
Fendalton/ Waimairi HC CDS	990 781	1990	80528 36196	74557 30136	5971 6060	+28500 from Com Bd +7500 from Com Bd
Burwood/ Pegasus HC CDS	21120.37 2562.31	18616	51163.71 29619.31	42039 29322	9124.71 297.31	
Shirley/ Papanui HC CDS	18629.82 6252.33	12764 3972	56043.91 31210.33	27955 23898	28088.91 7312.33	
Hagley/ Ferrymead HC CDS	13563.5 -(60)		62698.5 57474.99	60092 55999	2606.5 1475.99	+30,000 from Com Bd
Riccarton/ Wigram HC CDS	-(700) 3736.20	1000 3728	53597.46 38223.20	52399 38107	1198.46 116.20	+\$10,000 from Com Bd
Spreydon/ Heathcote HC CDS	28660 10322	26387 10322	51478.55 27225	27182 14162	24296.55 13063	
TOTALS						
HC	82463.69	62107	481983.13	410694	71289.13	
CDS	27939.60	20522	388794.59	355186	33608.59	

Funds available include the following returned cheques/funds where projects did not proceed or did not use all of the funds that were allocated:

Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund

Burwood/Pegasus	\$120.34
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$70.55
Fendalton/Waimairi	\$3000
Riccarton/Wigram	\$4376.46
Shirley/Papanui	\$150.09
Total	\$7717.44

Community Development Scheme

Metropolitan	\$2000
Burwood/Pegasus	\$162

Shirley/Papanui	\$1210
Hagley/Ferrymead	\$309.99
Fendalton/Waimairi	\$195
Total	\$3876.99

LOANS

Eleven loan applications were received of which ten were approved in full or part and a total of \$289,900 of loan funding has been allocated/committed. These funds are currently loaned out over a five year term (some exceptions go to ten years) at 4% interest per annum.

FUNDING DATABASE

This funding round has been the second to utilise the funding database which has been developed over the past two years. The database has proved very successful and we have only encountered minor problems in terms of its operation. The benefits will compound so that in future years the time spent in administration and staff inputting will be significantly reduced.

It is proposed in the next few months to add major grants, events seeding funding and core funded events to this database which will once again provide significant staff time savings over future years once it is established.

GENERAL

The overall procedures for operating the community funding schemes now in place appear to be working successfully.

More organisations are taking a responsible attitude in respect of the allocations that are made and hence the increase in the number of cheques returned if projects do not utilise all the resources or if for any reason, they are not able to undertake the project. This process is encouraged by all those involved in administering the schemes and results in the maximum benefit being obtained from the resources available.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

This year has been the first when the Council's community development and social well-being policy has been used to set priorities and guidelines for the consideration of applications under the Community Development Scheme and this has worked very well.

As can be seen by the previous charts several of the Community Boards still provide additional resources to go towards Community Development applications and there is considerable pressure on this fund to meet the communities needs.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be received.
 2. That to adjust for inflation the contribution for the Community Development Scheme be increased to \$1.09c per head of population for the 1998/99 financial year.

3. That the Community Development Scheme resources be split 50% to the community funding committees and 50% to the metropolitan committee for the 1998/99 funding round.
4. That the split of 30% to metropolitan and 70% to the community funding committees remain in place in respect to the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund.
5. That the interest rate for the Community Organisations Loan Scheme remain at 4% per annum for the 1998/99 funding round.