



Christchurch City Council

RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD SEMINAR AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 18 APRIL 2007

AT 8.30AM

IN THE BOARDROOM, SOCKBURN SERVICE CENTRE,
149 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH

*(Note: This forum has no decision making powers,
and is purely for the purpose of information sharing)*

Acting Community Board Principal Adviser

Clare Sullivan
Telephone: 941-6601
Fax: 941-6604
Email: clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz

Community Secretary

Emma Davison
Telephone: 941-5112
Fax: 941-5110
Email: emma.davison@ccc.govt.nz

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

INDEX

1. APOLOGIES
2. RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2007/08 PROJECT FUNDS - ALLOCATION

1. APOLOGIES

2. RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2007/08 PROJECT FUNDS – ALLOCATION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI: 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Emma Davison, 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 2007/08 year, and to provide all relevant information for the Board's preliminary discussion at a seminar on both the funding applications received, and staff recommendations on those applications.
2. The Board's decisions on allocation of the funding will be sought at an extraordinary Board meeting to be held in mid-May 2007.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The key milestone for allocation of 2007/08 funding is 18 May 2007; the date by when all Boards need 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 Annual Plan processes and timeframes.
4. To meet the date of 18 May, each Board is holding a preliminary, non-decision making meeting (seminar format) to give initial consideration to all of the funding applications received, and to seek any further information from staff as required.
5. 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.

Group	The name of the Unit or the Group responsible for the project or service.
Project/Service	A brief description of the project or service.
Amount Requested	The amount of funding requested by the group/unit.
Board Objectives, Community Outcomes, Council Strategies	Board objectives, community outcomes and Council strategies or policies to which the project/service can be linked.
Expected Outcome of Project	Whether the project/service will have a positive or negative affect on social, economic, environmental or cultural wellbeing.
Need Supported By	Any relevant research or other evidence that identifies a need for the project/service.
Financial Risk	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.
Delivery Risk	This section reports on an assessment of the unit's/group's ability to complete the project or supply the service.
Funding History	Outlines whether the unit/group has received funding from the Board before or other Council funding; and whether accountability reports are on file.
Staff Recommendation	Describes the precise decisions that staff are recommending.
Priority	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.

18. 4. 2007

- 3 -

	<p>2. Meet Board objectives/community outcomes – require a funding contribution.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>0. Did not meet any of the above mentioned criteria – staff recommend not to fund.</p>
--	--

- 6. Projects on the matrix have come from community groups and staff. A city-wide, publicly-advertised request for applications was carried out in late 2006/early 2007 for all community boards.
- 7. The 2006/09 Riccarton/Wigram Community Board Objectives are also attached for reference.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8. The Board has funding available of \$390,000 for 2007/08, that comprises:
 - up to \$60,000 discretionary funding to be allocated throughout the year at the Board’s discretion
 - up to \$40,000 for strengthening communities funding (SCAP)
 - A minimum of \$290,000 for allocation to local projects or activities.

- 9. A total of 60 applications for funding have been received. A summary of the staff recommendations and funding implications is as follows:

Total Funding **available** for project/discretionary funding **\$390,000.00**

Total Funding **requested** from applications received for project funds **\$518,983.52**

- 10. The Board in previous years has retained approximately \$70,000-100,000 of its project funds, so that the Board’s Committees could allocate that funding throughout the financial year. Staff recommend that the Board does not take this course of action, as:
 - (a) There should, in line with Council policy, only be one discretionary pool of up to \$60,000 for allocation throughout the year at the Board’s discretion – unallocated “committee” funds appear to be defacto discretionary funds.
 - (b) Having large sums of unallocated funding that are left as “committee” funds does not best meet the objective of transparency.
 - (c) In recent years, with retention of project funds for allocation by the Board’s committees throughout the year, there have been considerable sums of funding being unallocated until towards the end of the financial year – this has often led to advice being sought from staff and decisions being made by the Board under pressure within short timeframes, which is not in the interests of good decision-making.
 - (d) In recent months, considerable staff time and effort has been concentrated on assessing all of the 2007/08 applications received and providing advice on their priority, so that the Board is able to assess the relative merits of each application against the others received.

- 11. Staff recommendations are as follows:

Total recommended for retaining as Discretionary Fund **\$ 60,000**

Total recommended for consideration for Project Funding **\$302,050**
 (comprising: Priority One: \$250,850; Priority Two: \$51,200)

- 12. If the staff recommendations are adopted in principle, this would leave a remainder of \$27,950 to be allocated.

2 Cont'd

13. The recommendations contained in the attached matrix align with the 2006-16 LTCCP budgets (refer to page 103 of the LTCCP, Community Grants funding).

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

14. The Board's decisions on allocation of its project funding will be confirmed by the Council prior to inclusion in the Annual Plan 2007/08.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

15. The staff recommendations in the attached matrix support the Community Grants services on page 103 of the 2006-16 LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. The fourth column in the attached matrix identifies where the funding applications align with Council strategies and policies.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. No external consultation needs to be undertaken, although staff have discussed funding applications with those groups that have submitted the applications.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board gives initial consideration to the attached matrix of requests for 2007/08 Project and Discretionary Funding, and seeks any additional information from staff as required.