

**9. SPREYDON-HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY  
FUNDING COMMITTEE**

RR +

|                                                                                 |                                                                       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Officer responsible</b><br>Community Advocate, Beckenham                     | <b>Writer</b><br>Ollie Clifton, Asst Community<br>Development Advisor |
| Corporate Plan Output: Public Accountability - Community Activities 3.1 text 23 |                                                                       |

The purpose of this report is to inform the Board of the deliberations of the Spreydon-Heathcote Community Funding Committee.

**Funding Allocations**

The Spreydon-Heathcote Community Funding Committee met on 23 November 1999 to consider applications for both the Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund and the Christchurch City Council Community Development Scheme.

A total of 53 applications were received with over \$56,000 requested to help fund over \$203,000 worth of community sport and community development projects. The funds allocated by the Committee are outlined in the attached summary sheets, with a total of \$27,885 allocated.

The second community development funding round of 1999 again showed an increase in the number of applications. You will note from the attachments that 14 community development applications were declined, mainly due to funding constraints, and the adoption of more specific community development funding criteria (attached).

**Staff Comment**

There was some staff concern that one of the highest priority community development applications was referred to the Spreydon-Heathcote Community Board for consideration from their Discretionary funds. It has become quite obvious that the funding available to community organisations via the community development funding scheme is nowhere near sufficient to meet local needs.

In comparison the greater amount of funding available from the Hillary Commission scheme meant only one application was declined (it did not meet the criteria). Unspent funds of approximately \$13,500 will be carried over to the next Hillary Commission funding round in March 2000. This highlights the disparity between the two schemes, and the need for more proactive promotion of the Hillary Commission funding scheme.

**Recommendation:** That the information be received.

**Chairman's**

**Recommendation:** That community groups be encouraged to develop proposals for youth activities which would meet the criteria for the Community Sport Fund.