

5. COMMUNITY FUNDING 1999/2000

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 of the main community funding round and to make recommendations in relation to the 2000/01 community funding process.

The principal funding round for 1999/00 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

Scheme	Source of Funds	1999/00
Community Development Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$349,000
Community Sport Fund	Hillary Commission	\$396,921
Community Organisation Loans Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$384,000

The Community Development Scheme was based on \$1.10c (for 1999/2000) per head of population and this is inflation-adjusted each year. The amount that is budgeted for in 2000/01 is \$355,000 based on 1.10c/head of population. The Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund is based on \$1.23c per head of population (322,700 population).

ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

As Councillors will be aware, we have six funding committees based on community board areas and one metropolitan funding committee. 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/projects were received as follows:

Community Funding Committee	Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund				
	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00
Hagley/Ferrymead	64	71	67	58	46
Spreydon/Heathcote	42	52	53	40	48
Riccarton/Wigram	81	95	75	57	42
Fendalton/Waimairi	63	65	80	75	51
Shirley/Papanui	29	43	51	59	40
Burwood/Pegasus	57	36	71	63	43
Metropolitan	155	199	190	170	187
Totals	491	561	587	522	457
	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00
Hagley/Ferrymead	41	51	35	45	45
Spreydon/Heathcote	31	30	35	52	50
Riccarton/Wigram	26	20	27	35	45
Fendalton/Waimairi	25	26	25	36	35
Shirley/Papanui	27	27	26	25	28
Burwood/Pegasus	23	25	50	43	48
Metropolitan	110	124	135	154	131
Totals	283	303	333	390	382

Percentage Breakdown of Applications

	Community Funding Committees				
	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00
Community Sport Fund	69%	65%	68%	67%	59%
Community Development Scheme	61%	59%	59%	61%	66%

	Metropolitan Funding Committee				
	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00
Community Sport Fund	31%	35%	32%	33%	41%
Community Development Scheme	39%	41%	41%	39%	34%

Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund

The basis for apportioning the resources available under the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund (currently 70% community funding committees and 30% metropolitan) would appear to need further consideration.

The Hillary Commission provides guidelines and priorities for the allocation of its resources and because its top priority is for volunteer development (courses for coaches etc) the Metropolitan Funding Committee allocates a greater proportion of its resources to the top priority than do the Community Board Funding Committees.

In the 1998/99 funding round 48% of the resources from the metropolitan committee went to priority one and only 26% of community boards resources went to priority one.

In addition, over past years some of the Community Board Assessment Committees have carried forward significant resources under the Community Sport Fund as at March 2000, (i.e. going into a new funding round).

Metropolitan	\$624.38
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$13,900.11
Burwood/Pegasus	\$9,071.92
Riccarton/Wigram	\$4,374.80
Fendalton/ Waimairi	\$2,880.50
Hagley /Ferrymead	\$12,453.50
Shirley/ Papanui	\$2,494.91
Total	<u>\$45,800.12</u>

In conclusion it would appear that the percentages should be adjusted to better meet the needs of sport, fitness and leisure groups in the community.

If the resources were split 40% to Metropolitan and 60% to the Community Board based Assessment Committees it would mean about a 14% drop in resources for the Community Board based Committees, or between \$6,000 and \$7,000 each. Over all the Metropolitan Committee would have \$39,000 to \$40,000 of additional resources to allocate.

Community Development Scheme

The Community Development Scheme (50% community funding committees, 50% metropolitan) is not proportionate in respect of the number of applications that are received, and because of the increasing demands on the Community Board Funding Committees these percentages need adjusting.

As Councillors will be aware, several community boards requested additional resources for this fund when Financial Plan submissions were heard and also some community boards are using their discretionary funds to top up this scheme.

The Community Development Scheme funds are, in theory, inflation-adjusted each year and based on population but for ease of explanation the figure has been shown as an amount per head of population, i.e. \$1.10 per head for 2000/01. In view of the demands put on this fund it would seem appropriate to increase the contribution. If the per head rate were \$1.20 then this would mean an extra \$32,240 in the fund (an extra \$2,500 to \$3,000 for each community board); and \$1.30 per head would equal an extra \$64,500 (approximately) or an additional \$5,000-\$6,000 for each community board. If the fund were just inflation-adjusted as has occurred in the past it would equate to \$1.12 per head (an extra \$6,500 approx to the total fund).

If the percentage split were adjusted to give 55% to the Community Funding Committees and 45% to the Metropolitan Funding Committee, along with the increase to \$1.30 per head of population, this would result in additional funds to each community boards funding committees of between \$9,100 and \$9,600 approximately.

This year has been the third year that 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 well. This policy is currently under review and it may well impact on the future basis for evaluation of the Community Development scheme applications.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES ON THE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

The 1999/00 funding round was the first 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 a 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 2000. 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 1998/99	Less Late 98/99 Allocations	Funds Available 1999/00	Funds Allocated 1999/00	Balance as at 30/6/2000	Comments
Metropolitan HC CDS	877.37 5,343.34	1,000 2,000	119,700.38 178,843.34	119,700 179,116	.38 -272.66	
Fendalton/ Waimairi HC CDS	1,955 442.10		49,558.50 30,494.39	44,668 42,475	4,890.50 13,019.39	\$25,000 from Com Bd
Burwood/ Pegasus HC CDS	21,323.92 966.82	12,702 -	54,360.92 29,705.69	35,115 29,700	19,245.92 5.69	
Shirley/ Papanui HC CDS	6,263.91 7,650.33	3,769 5,691	49,172.91 31,275.33	22,333 24,452	26,839.91 20,250.33	\$13,427 from Com Bd
Hagley/ Ferryhead HC CDS	10,253.50 308.49	- -	58,297.50 29,101.49	42,125 40,295	16,172.50 -1,193.51	\$10,000 from Com Bd
Riccarton/ Wigram HC CDS	14,947.80 2,943.03	11,553 2,137	51,886.80 31,345.03	30,789 27,980	21,097.80 8,365.03	\$5,000 from Com Bd
Spreydon/ Heathcote HC CDS	29,017.22 12,450.87	15,450 12,435	59,744.11 29,644.57	35,596 19,429	24,148.11 12,057.57	\$1,842 from Com Bd
TOTALS						
HC	84,638.72	44,474	442,721.12	330,326	112,395.12	
CDS	30,104.98	22,263	360,409.84	363,447	52,231.84	

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	\$450.00
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$332.89
Metropolitan	\$747.01
Riccarton/Wigram	\$980.00
Hagley/ Ferryhead	\$2,200.00
Fendalton/ Waimairi	\$925.50
Total	\$5,635.40

Community Development Scheme

Metropolitan	\$1,000.00
Burwood/Pegasus	\$295.88
Riccarton/Wigram	\$700.00
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$835.70
Fendalton/Waimairi	\$736.29
Total	\$3,567.87

LOANS

Nineteen loan applications were received of which fourteen were approved in full or part and a total of \$419,000 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.

Note: The additional \$35,000 will be allocated when the Coastguard repays a further instalment of the loan they received last year.

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.

It is anticipated that the database will be further expanded to include grants made by Community Boards to community organisations from their discretionary funds. It is also planned to provide application forms and details on the Internet at some time in the future.

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.

Recommendation:

1. That the information be received.
2. That the Annual Plan Working Party be requested to increase the contribution for the Community Development Scheme to \$1.30 per head of population for the 2001/02 financial year.
3. That the Community Development Scheme resources be split 55% to the Community Funding Committees and 45% to the Metropolitan Committee for the 2000/01 funding round.
4. That the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund resources be split 40% to the Metropolitan Funding Committee and 60% to the Community Funding Committees.
5. That the interest rate for the Community Organisations Loan Scheme remain at 2% per annum for the 2000/01 funding round.