

METROPOLITAN FUNDING COMMITTEE AGENDA

**MONDAY 20 JULY 2009
AND TUESDAY 21 JULY 2009 (IF REQUIRED)**

AT 9AM

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, GROUND FLOOR, CIVIC OFFICES

Committee: The Mayor, Bob Parker (Chairperson),
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Ngaire Button, Barry Corbett, David Cox,
Yani Johanson, Claudia Reid, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Mike Wall, Sue Wells,
Chrissie Williams and Norm Withers.

Principal Adviser
Michael Aitken
Ph. 941-8607

Committee Adviser
Sean Rainey
Ph. 941-8536

INDEX

- 1. APOLOGIES**
- 2. METROPOLITAN STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUND 2009/10
(Decision Matrix separately circulated)**
- 3. METROPOLITAN DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND APPLICATIONS**
- 4. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

1. APOLOGIES

Councillor Sally Buck.

2. METROPOLITAN STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUND 2009/10

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Manager
Author:	Matthew Pratt, Team Leader Community Grants Funding

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Metropolitan Funding Committee to allocate the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund for 2009/10.
2. The Metropolitan Funding Committee decision-making meeting is scheduled for 20 and 21 July 2009. It will not be public excluded.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. This report provides information to Councillors on the applications received for the 2009/10 Strengthening Communities Fund and includes updated information following Councillors' discussions at the Metropolitan Funding Committee Seminar on 9 June 2009.
4. In 2009/10 the total pool available for allocation, as proposed in the draft LTCCP is \$5,060,000. Application requests totalling \$9,388,140 were received.
5. **Attached** as Appendix A (separately circulated) is a decision matrix, which outlines the projects that funding is being sought for. Following staff collaboration meetings, staff have ranked all projects as either Priority 1, 2, 3 or 4 and have made funding recommendations.
6. Projects were prioritised as follows:

Priority 1 Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes significantly to Funding Outcomes and Priorities.

Highly recommended for funding.

Priority 2 Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities.

Recommended for funding.

Priority 3 Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities but to a lesser extent than Priority 2 applications.

Not recommended for funding.

Priority 4 Meets all eligibility criteria and has minimum contribution to Funding Outcomes and Priorities; or

Insufficient information provided by applicant (in application and after request from Adviser); or

Other funding sources considered more appropriate.

Not recommended for funding.

2 Cont'd

7. The Metropolitan Funding Committee seminar on 9 June 2009 gave Councillors the opportunity to review the applications received, to seek further information and to clarify issues or questions arising from applications. Original staff recommendations are listed in black and suggested changes from the seminar are noted in green.
8. Two additional applications have been added to the matrix since the Metropolitan Funding Committee seminar. Staff have assessed these applications and have made recommendations (refer to paragraph 25).
9. Three new Key Local Projects (KLPs) totalling \$72,320 have been recommended by Community Boards. KLPs are local projects that are funded from the Metropolitan funding pool.
10. There are also pre-existing commitments that the Metropolitan Funding Committee must continue. These include the 14 KLPs that were agreed to in the 2008/09 funding round, totalling \$476,930, as well as other commitments (totalling \$421,750) for multi year funding:
 - Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust, \$50,000 year 3 of a three year commitment;
 - Community House, \$161,750 until 30 June 2011 (resolved on 27 September 2001)
 - OSCAR Network, \$40,000 until 30 June 2012 (resolved on 8 April 2002 and 16 July 2002);
 - Spreydon Youth Community Trust, \$80,000 year 2 of a three year commitment;
 - Sumner Lifeboat Institution Inc, \$20,000 year 2 of a three year commitment;
 - Youth and Cultural Development, \$70,000 until 30 June 2010 (resolved on 15 July 2003).
11. Additionally, the Christmas Parade Trust has applied for \$70,000 through the Events Fund. The Trust has been funded from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund in previous years and was directed to the Events Fund this year on the understanding that, should events funding not be available, the Council could consider funding the Trust for the 2009 event from funds currently in the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund. For the purposes of this report, that \$70,000 has been considered to be committed.
12. In total, \$968,680 of the available \$5,060,000 has been committed, leaving \$4,091,320 to be allocated.
13. Total grant recommendations for funding from the 2009/10 Strengthening Communities Fund grants scheme totals \$4,959,170. Included in the total funding recommendation are existing grant commitments locked in for the 2009/10 year, three new KLP grants and the 2009/10 staff recommendations following assessment of applications received in the current round of the Strengthening Communities Fund scheme.

2 Cont'd

BACKGROUND

Strengthening Communities Strategy

14. The Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy on 12 July 2007. The Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme comprises four funding schemes:
 - (a) Strengthening Communities Fund
 - (b) Small Projects Fund
 - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
 - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme.

15. The following funding outcomes have been used to evaluate and assess applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund:
 - Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups
 - Increase participation in and awareness of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups, programmes and local events
 - Increase community engagement in local decision making
 - Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
 - Provide community based programmes which enhance basic life skills
 - Reduce or overcome barriers to participation
 - Foster collaborative responses to areas of identified need.

16. The following funding priorities have been taken into consideration when assessing applications:
 - Older Adults
 - Children and Youth
 - People with Disabilities
 - Ethnic and Culturally Diverse Groups
 - Disadvantaged and / or Socially Excluded
 - Capacity of Community Organisations
 - Civic Engagement.

17. The following criteria must be met by all applicants:
 - A community based not-for-profit community, recreation, sporting, arts, social service, environment or heritage organisation.
 - All groups applying for more than \$2,000 must be incorporated under the Incorporated Societies Act 1908 or the Charitable Trusts Act 1957
 - Be based in the Christchurch City Council area with funded programmes or services being provided primarily for Christchurch City Council residents.
 - Must have provided accountability reports for all previous Council funding and have no unresolved or outstanding accountability issues including outstanding debt to Council.
 - Must have had the funding application approved at a properly convened committee meeting and in writing.
 - Must provide evidence of the need for the project.
 - Have appropriate financial management, accounting, monitoring and reporting practices.
 - Have sound governance and appropriate operational capability and capacity to deliver to the level as agreed.
 - Be able to commit to collaboration and partnering, where appropriate.
 - Groups receiving Council funding at a metropolitan level may only apply for local funding if the project is specifically local and no portion of it has been funded at the metropolitan level.
 - Community Boards may decide in conjunction with Council Units to deliver activities to their local communities.

2 Cont'd

18. Councillors have the option to give multi-year funding to projects that demonstrate competency, have a track record of operating and delivering projects according to the above criteria, and have a business or strategic plan for the length of the funding agreement (two or three years).

The Decision Matrix

19. Information on the projects is presented in a decision matrix, attached as Appendix A. To ensure consistency, the same decision matrix format and presentation will be provided to Community Boards at their local Strengthening Communities Funding seminars and decision making meetings.
20. Applications are project-based; information is provided that relates specifically to the project that funding is being sought for, not the wider organisation.
21. Staff held cross-unit collaboration meetings to ensure that projects were assessed and prioritised consistently. The meetings included staff members from Community Development, Safer Christchurch, the Art Gallery and the Recreation and Sport Unit.
22. All applications appearing on the decision matrix have been assigned a Priority Rating. The Priority Ratings are:

Priority 1 Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes significantly to Funding Outcomes and Priorities.

Highly recommended for funding.

Priority 2 Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities.

Recommended for funding.

Priority 3 Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities but to a lesser extent than Priority 2 applications.

Not recommended for funding.

Priority 4 Meets all eligibility criteria and has minimum contribution to Funding Outcomes and Priorities; or

Insufficient information provided by applicant (in application and after request from Advisor); or

Other funding sources more appropriate.

Not recommended for funding.

23. Staff have used the following criteria to determine whether an application is a Priority One:
 - Impact the project has on the city
 - Reach of the project
 - Depth of the project
 - Political sensitivity
 - Value for Money
 - Best Practice
 - Innovation
 - Strong alignment to Council Outcomes and Priorities
 - Noteworthy leverage or partnership/match funding from other organisations or government departments.
24. During the assessment process, it was identified that there were a large number of Priority Two (P2) applications. To assist in decision-making, staff have further split Priority Two applications into Priority 2A and Priority 2B recommendations.

2 Cont'd

Additional Applications

25. Two additional applications have been added to the matrix since the Metropolitan Funding Committee seminar. Staff have assessed these applications and made recommendations. These additional projects are:

Name of Applicant	Project Cost	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended
Ferrymead Heritage Park	\$887,075	\$200,000	\$160,000
Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust	\$471,755	\$133,882 per year for 5 years	\$50,000 for one year (final year of existing three year agreement)

Key Local Projects

26. The decision matrix includes three new applications nominated by Community Boards as Key Local Projects (KLPs). These are:

Name of Group	Amount Recommended	Community Board
Project Employment and Environmental Enhancement Programme	\$28,000	Burwood Pegasus
Akaroa Resource Collective Trust	\$30,800	Akaroa Wairewa
Project Lyttelton Incorporated	\$13,520	Lyttelton Mt Herbert

27. An organisation is recommended as a KLP if it:
- Has a proven track record with Council in providing a high quality of service;
 - Provides a significant contribution towards the Council's Funding Outcomes and Priorities;
 - Demonstrates leadership and innovation;
 - Demonstrates best-practice and collaboration.
28. The agreed process to determine if a local funding application should be processed as a KLP was detailed in the report adopted by Council on 4 October 2007.
29. The process for considering KLPs is as follows:
- (i) Community Boards nominate and prioritise KLPs and make a recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Committee
 - (ii) The Metropolitan Funding Committee makes decisions on Board recommended KLPs
 - (iii) Successful KLPs are allocated funding from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund
 - (iv) Unsuccessful KLPs are returned to the Community Board for consideration under the local Strengthening Communities Fund
30. Community Boards have been advised that where candidates for KLP funding consideration are successful in receiving funding from the Metropolitan Funding Committee, then there can be no further funding from the Board for that project.
31. Groups that receive funding from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund may only receive local level funding if the project is specifically local and no portion of it has been funded at the Metropolitan level.

2 Cont'd

Existing Commitments

32. There are also a number of KLPs that received funding in 2008/09 for multiple years. These groups are:

Name of Group	Amount Funded	Community Board
Aranui Community Trust	\$31,000	Burwood Pegasus
Cross Over Trust	\$47,000	Spreydon Heathcote
Rowley Resource Centre	\$30,000	Spreydon Heathcote
Spreydon Youth Community Trust	\$27,000	Spreydon Heathcote
Shirley Community Trust	\$22,880	Shirley Papanui
St Albans Residents' Association	\$40,000	Shirley Papanui
Papanui Youth Development Trust	\$27,000	Shirley Papanui
Shoreline Youth Trust	\$16,000	Hagley Ferrymead
Te Whare Roimata Trust - (Older Persons)	\$27,000	Hagley Ferrymead
Te Whare Roimata Trust - (Bromley Community Development)	\$27,000	Hagley Ferrymead
Te Whare Roimata Trust - (Community Gardens)	\$27,000	Hagley Ferrymead
Te Whare Roimata Trust - (Linwood Community Arts)	\$52,000	Hagley Ferrymead
Te Puawaitanga ki Otautahi Trust (Community Development Worker)	\$51,800	Riccarton Wigram
Te Puawaitanga ki Otautahi Trust (Community Facilities Coordinator)	\$51,250	Riccarton Wigram

These groups do not appear on the decision matrix.

33. There are also pre-existing commitments that the Metropolitan Funding Committee must continue.
- Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust, \$50,000 year 3 of a three year commitment;
 - Community House, \$161,750 until 30 June 2011 (resolved on September 27 2001)
 - OSCAR Network, \$40,000 until 30 June 2012 (resolved on 8 April 2002 and 16 July 2002);
 - Spreydon Youth Community Trust, \$80,000 year 2 of a three year commitment;
 - Sumner Lifeboat Institution Inc, \$20,000 year 2 of a three year commitment;
 - Youth and Cultural Development, \$70,000 until 30 June 2010 (resolved on 15 July 2003).
34. Additionally, the Christmas Parade Trust has applied for funding through the Events Fund. However, if successful the money for the application may come from the Strengthening Communities Fund for this year only. The application is being recommended for \$70,000.
35. In total, \$968,680 of the available \$5,060,000 has been committed, leaving \$4,091,320 to be allocated.

Ineligible Applications

36. In total, six ineligible applications were received. They are as follows:

2 Cont'd

Name of Applicant	Project Cost	Amount Requested
Canterbury Car Club Incorporated	\$6,100	\$3,000
Canterbury Softball Association	\$30,000	\$15,000
Garden City Model Railroad Club Inc	\$8,471	\$6,000
Queen Elizabeth II National Trust (QEII) - North Canterbury area	\$202,000	\$150,000
SPELD Canterbury (Inc)	\$20,000	\$10,000
Tramway Historical Society Inc	\$12,463	\$12,463

SEMINAR FOLLOW-UP

37. A seminar was held on 9 and 10 June 2009 for Councillors to have to opportunity to go through the applications received to clarify any issues or questions about applications. Suggested changes to recommendations have been incorporated in the final matrix. Original staff recommendations are listed in black and suggested changes from the seminar are written in green.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

38. The pool of funding available for the 2009/10 Strengthening Communities Fund scheme is a potential area which the Council could resolve to reduce as part of the requirement to make the saving of \$750,000 to reduce the rates funded discretionary grants in the 2009/10 year as resolved by the Council in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

39. None. The Metropolitan Funding Committee has the delegated authority from the Council to make the final decisions on these applications.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

40. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

41. Aligns with Community Support Activity.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

42. Yes – Community Grants.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

43. Strengthening Communities Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

44. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

45. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Metropolitan Funding Committee consider and approve the recommendations contained in the attached Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund Decision Matrix.

3. METROPOLITAN DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND APPLICATIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Manager
Author:	Matthew Pratt – Community Grants Team Leader

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Metropolitan Funding Committee to consider an application, requesting a total of \$35,346.83, from the 2009/10 Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2009/10 the total pool available for allocation for the Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund, as in the LTCCP, consists of \$170,000.
3. The purpose of the Fund is to assist community groups where the project and funding request falls outside other Council funding criteria and/or closing dates. This fund is also for emergency funding for unforeseen situations.
4. Applications requesting over \$15,000 require consideration by the Metropolitan Funding Committee.
5. To date, four applications to the Discretionary Response Fund have been received. Three of these applications are requesting over \$15,000 and therefore require a decision from the Metropolitan Funding Committee. This report deals with one of the three requests.
6. A decision matrix is **attached** as Appendix A to assist the Committee members in their deliberations. The decision matrix details the funding request from the applicant organisation and provides information, commentary and recommendations from staff.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. As per the 2009-19 LTCCP, there is currently \$170,000 available to allocate in the Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund. In the \$750,000 reduction in grants that the Council has decided for the 2009/10 year, it has been proposed by the Grants Working Party that the amount in the Discretionary Fund be reduced to \$150,000. A decision on this will be made at the 23 July 2009 meeting of the Council. If it is agreed there is a reduction, there will still be enough in the Discretionary Fund to fund this application if the Committee wish to do so.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. None.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

10. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Yes, Community Support.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

12. Yes, Community Grants.

3 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Strengthening Communities Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes, Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Metropolitan Funding Committee consider and approve the recommendation contained in the attached Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund Decision Matrix (July Round 2009/10).

4. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.

**MONDAY 20 JULY 2009
AND TUESDAY 21 JULY 2009 (IF REQUIRED)**

METROPOLITAN FUNDING COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely item 5.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED	REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER	GROUND(S) UNDER SECTION 48(1) FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION
5. METROPOLITAN DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND APPLICATIONS) GOOD REASON TO WITHHOLD EXISTS UNDER SECTION 7	SECTION 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Item 5 Commercial Activities (Section 7(2)(h))

Chairman's Recommendation: That the foregoing motion be adopted.

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

"(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

- (a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
- (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority."