



**Christchurch City Council**

**SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD  
AGENDA**

**EXTRAORDINARY MEETING**

**MONDAY 8 MAY 2006**

**AT 5.00PM**

**IN THE BOARDROOM,  
SOUTH LIBRARY, SERVICE CENTRE AND LEARNING CENTRE,  
66 COLOMBO STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

**Community Board:** Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Barry Corbett, Paul de Spa, Chris Mene, Sue Wells and Megan Woods.

**Community Board Principal Adviser**  
Lisa Goodman  
DDI: 941-5108  
Email: [lisa.goodman@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:lisa.goodman@ccc.govt.nz)

**Community Secretary**  
Peter Dow  
DDI: 941-5105  
Email: [peter.dow@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:peter.dow@ccc.govt.nz)

- PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**
- PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**
- PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

**INDEX**

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES**
- PART C 2. PROJECT FUNDING 2006/07 - ALLOCATIONS**

## 1. APOLOGIES

Chris Mene.

## 2. PROJECT FUNDING 2006/07 – ALLOCATIONS

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI: 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Anusha Guler, Secretariat Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Peter Dow, Community Secretary

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to outline the process for allocation of the Board's Project (and Discretionary) funding for the 2006/07 year, and for the Board to make decisions on the funding applications received.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The key milestone for allocation of the 2006/07 funding is 18 May 2006; the date by when all Boards are to have made their decisions on the allocation of their project funding. This date (which is later than required in previous years) is based on requirements to meet both internal accounting and LTCCP processes and timeframes.
3. To meet the date of 18 May, Boards have held preliminary, non-decision making meetings (seminar format or otherwise) to give initial consideration to all of the funding applications received, and to seek any further information from staff as required. A Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board Seminar was held for this purpose on 10 April 2006 (report **attached**).
4. Staff have evaluated all applications and completed the **attached** matrix document, which provides the Board with comprehensive information to enable efficient and effective decision making. Staff evaluation is based on standard criteria and then entered into the matrix for comparative purposes with other applications.

<b>Group</b>	The name of the Unit or the Group responsible for the project or service.
<b>Project/Service</b>	A brief description of the project or service.
<b>Amount</b>	The amount of funding requested by the group/unit.
<b>Board Objectives</b>	Board objectives to which the project/service can be linked.
<b>Expected Outcome of the Project</b>	Whether the project/service will have a positive or negative affect on social, economic, environmental or cultural wellbeing.
<b>Policy/Strategy</b>	The policy or strategy to which the project/service can be linked.
<b>Need Supported By</b>	Any relevant research or other evidence that identifies a need for the project/service.
<b>Financial Risk</b>	Assessment of the project's/service's viability and sustainability eg unlikely to be viable as there are insufficient funds available to complete the project.
<b>Delivery Risk</b>	This section reports on an assessment of the unit's/group's ability to complete the project or supply the service.
<b>Funding History</b>	Outlines whether the unit/group has received funding from the Board before or other Council funding; and whether accountability reports are on file.
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	Describes the precise decisions that staff are recommending.

## 8. 5. 2006

- 3 -

<b>Priority</b>	Staff have determined a priority rating for each request.  The following grading criteria has been used by staff: 1. Meet Board objectives/community outcomes – priority to fund: major contribution to social need and development. 2. Meet Board objectives/community outcomes – require a funding contribution. 3. Meet criteria to a lesser degree but more suitable for group to seek funding elsewhere – board funding support not needed or could be funded from another scheme eg Metropolitan. 0. Did not meet any of the above mentioned criteria – staff recommend not to fund.
-----------------	--

5. Projects on the matrix have come from community groups, Board members and staff.
6. The 2006/09 Board Objectives are also relevant for reference purposes. Members are asked to bring their copy to the meeting.

### FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. The Board has funding available of \$390,000 for 2006/07, that comprises:
  - up to \$60,000 discretionary funding to be allocated by resolution of the Board during the year
  - up to \$40,000 strengthening communities funding (SCAP)
  - \$290,000 for allocation to local projects or activities.
8. The total amount of funding requested through the 54 applications is \$440,300.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) That the Board considers the attached matrix of requests for 2006/07 Project and Discretionary Funding.
- (b) That the Board confirms its allocation of the Project and Discretionary Funds for 2006/07.

### CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendations be supported.