

## 2. COMMUNITY FUNDING 1998/99

RR 10337

<b>Officer responsible</b> Leisure Unit Manager	<b>Author</b> Peter Walls
Corporate Plan Output: Grants Administration	

The purpose of this annual report is to inform the Council of the major details in respect of the main community funding round and to make recommendations in relation to the 1999/00 community funding process.

The principal funding round for 1998/99 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.

A full list of the successful applicants responded to by the Metropolitan Funding Committee is tabled.

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

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Source of Funds</b>	<b>1998/99</b>
Community Development Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$337,000
Community Sport Fund	Hillary Commission	\$394,215
Community Organisation Loans Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$280,000

The Community Development Scheme was based on \$1.07c (for 98/99) per head of population and this is inflation adjusted each year. The amount that is budgeted for in 1999/00 is \$349,000 based on 1.09c/head of population. The Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund is based on \$1.23c per head of population (320,500 population).

### ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

As Councillors will be aware, we have six funding committees based on Community Board areas and one Metropolitan Funding Committee. 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				
	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Hagley/Ferrymead	57	64	71	67	58
Spreydon/Heathcote	53	42	52	53	40
Riccarton/Wigram	80	81	95	75	57
Fendalton/Waimairi	56	63	65	80	75
Shirley/Papanui	64	29	43	51	59
Burwood/Pegasus	70	57	36	71	63
Metropolitan	128	155	199	190	170
Totals	508	491	561	587	522

Total Project Costs	\$1,945,657
Requested	\$800,435
Granted	\$355,877

Community Funding Committee	Community Development Scheme				
	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Hagley/Ferrymead	44	41	51	35	45
Spreydon/Heathcote	31	31	30	35	52
Riccarton/Wigram	22	26	20	27	35
Fendalton/Waimairi	17	25	26	25	36
Shirley/Papanui	37	27	27	26	25
Burwood/Pegasus	42	23	25	50	43
Metropolitan	138	110	124	135	154
Totals	331	283	303	333	390

Total Project Costs	\$4,865,787
Requested	\$1,281,670
Granted	\$378,727

### Percentage Breakdown of Applications

Community Funding Committee	Community Funding Committees				
	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Community Sport Fund	75%	69%	65%	68%	61%

Community Development Scheme	58%	61%	59%	59%	61%
------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Community Funding Committee	Metropolitan Funding Committee				
	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Community Sport Fund	25%	31%	35%	32%	33%
Community Development Scheme	42%	39%	41%	41%	39%

The basis for apportioning the resources available under the Hillary Commission's 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 citywide service the 50:50 split still seems appropriate.

#### **COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES ON THE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**

The 1998/99 funding round was the third and final round of a three year term for the existing community representatives on the various funding committees.

New community representatives will be called for in November of this year.

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 1999. 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 1997/98	Less Late 97/98 Allocations	Funds Available 1998/99	Funds Allocated 1998/99	Balance as at 30/6/99	Comments
Metropolitan HC	3.00	-	119,977.37	119,100	877.37	
CDS	5283.76	450	174,743.34	169,400	5343.34	
Fendalton/ Waimairi HC	5971	3321	56541	54586	1955	7532 from Com Bd
CDS	6060	6000	50,978.10	50536	442.10	22468 from Com Bd
Burwood/ Pegasus HC	9124.71	-	56,993.92	35,670	21,323.92	
CDS	297.31	-	30,024.81	29,058	966.81	+2000 from Com Bd
Shirley/ Papanui HC	28088.91	21778	52669.41	46406	6263.91	
CDS	7212.33	-	36295.33	28645	7650.33	+675 from Com Bd
Hagley/ Ferrymead HC	2606.50	-	48138.50	37,885	10,253.50	
CDS	1475.99	-	59278.49	58970	308.49	+30,000 from Com Bd
Riccarton/ Wigram HC	1198.46	1340	48289.80	33342	14,947.80	
CDS	116.20	1500	29311.03	26368	2943.03	
Spreydon/ Heathcote HC	24296.55	11690	58405.22	29388	29017.22	
CDS	13063	13063	28200.87	15750	12450.87	
TOTALS						
HC	71289.13	38129	441015.72	356377	84638.72	
CDS	33608.59	24543	408831.97	378727	30104.97	

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	\$2889.21
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$266.67
Metropolitan	\$1709.37
Riccarton/Wigram	\$1243.34
Total	\$6108.59

## **Community Development Scheme**

Metropolitan	\$1409.58
Burwood/Pegasus	\$262.00
Riccarton/Wigram	\$1881.33
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$395.37
Fendalton/Waimairi	\$142.10
Total	\$4090.38

### **LOANS**

Sixteen loan applications were received of which ten were approved in full or part and a total of \$280,000 of loan funding has been allocated/committed. These funds are currently loaned over a five year term (some exceptions go to ten years) at 2% interest per annum.

### **FUNDING DATABASE**

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.

Both major grants and events seeding funding has been added to the database which will once again provide significant staff time savings over future years.

### **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 second year when the Council's Community Development and Social Wellbeing Policy has been used to set priorities and guidelines for the consideration of applications under the Community Development Scheme and this is working very well.

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

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be received.
  2. That, to adjust for inflation, the contribution for the Community Development Scheme be increased to \$1.10c per head of population for the 2000/2001 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 1999/2000 funding round.
  4. That the split of 30% to Metropolitan and 70% to the Community Funding Committees remain in place in respect of the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund.
  5. That the interest rate for the Community Organisations Loan Scheme remain at 2% per annum for the 1999/2000 funding round.