



Christchurch City Council

SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD SEMINAR AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 11 APRIL 2007

AT 5.00PM

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

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

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

Acting Community Secretary
Carole Tobin
DDI: 941-5105
Email: carole.tobin@ccc.govt.nz

INDEX

1. APOLOGIES
2. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE PROJECT FUNDS 2007/08 – ALLOCATION

1. APOLOGIES

2. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE PROJECT FUNDS 2007/08 – ALLOCATION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Carole Tobin, Acting 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 on Monday 7 May 2007.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The key milestone for allocation of the 2007/08 funding is 18 May 2007; the date by when all Boards are to have made their decisions on the allocation of their project funding. This date 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	Name of the unit or group responsible for the project or service.
Project/Service Description	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	What the project is expected to achieve.
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 financial risk. Shown by a high/medium/low rating.
Delivery Risk	Assessment of the unit's/group's ability to complete the project or supply the service. Shown by a high/medium/low rating.
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.

2 Cont'd

Staff Priority	<p>Staff met to determine a staff priority rating for each request.</p> <p>The following grading criteria has been used by staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meets Board objectives/community outcomes - priority to fund, major contribution to social need and development. 2. Meets Board objectives/community outcomes - requires a funding contribution. 3. Meets 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 funding. 0. Does not meet any of the above criteria - staff recommend not funding.
-----------------------	---

6. The individual applications have come from various sources – community groups and/or individuals, board members and staff. A city-wide, publicly-advertised request for applications was carried out in late 2005/early 2006 for all community boards.
7. The 2006/09 Board Objectives are also attached for reference purposes.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The Board has funding available of \$390,000 for 2007/08, that can comprise:
 - 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)
 - the remaining funding for allocation to local projects or activities.

9. A total of 44 project applications has been received. A summary of the staff recommendations and funding implications is as follows:

Total funding available for project/discretionary funding	\$390,000
Total funding requested from applications received for project funds	\$510,295

10. Clearly there is a shortfall of \$27,220 even before any funds are set aside for discretionary or SCAP Committee funding. Taking this into account, staff recommendations are as follows:

Total recommended for retaining as Discretionary Fund	\$ 50,000
Total recommended for consideration for Project Funding (comprising: Priority One: \$338,970; Priority Two: \$29,000)	\$367,970
<i>Potential Shortfall</i>	\$ 27,970

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

2 Cont'd

SCAP Committee

12. In order to accommodate the large oversubscription of funds, and given the number of high quality applications for funding currently presented, staff are not recommending that funds be set aside for allocation by the Board's SCAP Committee throughout the year. There are many projects contained in the attached matrix that meet SCAP-related objectives. Further initiatives related to SCAP objectives could be considered under the Board's Discretionary Fund for 2007/08.

Social Initiatives Fund

13. Currently there are three year funding agreements with metropolitan and local community organisations whose community development and social services meet the specific criteria of the fund. These contracts finished this financial year. In the Spreydon/Heathcote area, this affects three groups' contracts:
- Cross Over Trust \$25,000 (Rowley Youth Worker's salary)
 - Rowley House \$15,000 (Community Development salary)
 - Sydenham Community Development Trust \$25,000 (Community Development salary).
14. The implications for the Board are that these groups are now applying to the Board's project funding, which has added significant pressure on funds that are already oversubscribed. Previously the Board has also topped up the Sydenham Community Development Trust project from the Board Project Funding.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. 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.