

5. COMMUNITY FUNDING 2000/2001

Officer responsible Leisure Manager	Author Peter Walls, DDI 371-1777
-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------

The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the outcome of the main community funding round (2000/01) and to make recommendations in relation to the 2001/02 community funding process.

The principal funding round for 2000/01 has been completed and summary sheets and accountability forms have been forwarded to the Hillary Commission in respect of the Community Sport Fund.

Some Funding Committees have retained funds for late applications and subsidiary funding rounds, but the majority of the available resources have been allocated. The issue of unallocated resources at the end of the financial year needs to be closely monitored to ensure that the majority of these resources are allocated prior to the main funding round in the following year for which applications close at the end of March.

A full list of the successful applicants responded to by the Metropolitan Funding Committee will be tabled.

It is a requirement of the Hillary Commission that a list of successful applicants is made available to the local newspapers.

RESOURCES AVAILABLE UNDER THE VARIOUS SCHEMES

Scheme	Source of Funds	2000/01
Community Development Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$355,000
Community Sport Fund	Hillary Commission	\$372,945
Community Organisation Loans Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$300,000

The Community Development Scheme was originally based on \$1.00 per head of population. The Council later resolved to inflation-adjust this figure each year. For 2001/02 the Council resolved to base the allocation on \$1.30c per head of population (\$421,000). The Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund is based on \$1.15c per head of population (324,300).

ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

As Councillors will be aware, we have six funding committees based on Community Board areas and one Metropolitan Funding Committee. The funds are apportioned on the following basis:

Metropolitan Funding Committee

- (i) All loan funds
- (ii) 40% of the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund
- (iii) 45% of the Council's Community Development Scheme Funds

The Six Community Funding Committees

- (i) 60% of the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund
- (ii) 55% of the Council's Community Development Scheme Funds

Note: The allocation of funds to the six community funding assessment committees is apportioned according to each community board's population.

NUMBER OF PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Applications/projects were received as follows:

Community Funding Committee	Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund				
	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01
Hagley/Ferrymead	71	67	58	46	57
Spreydon/Heathcote	52	53	40	48	53
Riccarton/Wigram	95	75	57	42	45
Fendalton/Waimairi	65	80	75	51	39
Shirley/Papanui	43	51	59	40	36
Burwood/Pegasus	36	71	63	43	43
Metropolitan	199	190	170	187	166
Totals	561	587	522	457	439

Community Funding Committee	Community Development Scheme				
	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01
Hagley/Ferrymead	51	35	45	45	52
Spreydon/Heathcote	30	35	52	50	55
Riccarton/Wigram	20	27	35	45	60
Fendalton/Waimairi	26	25	36	35	31
Shirley/Papanui	27	26	25	28	23
Burwood/Pegasus	25	50	43	48	55
Metropolitan	124	135	154	131	137
Totals	303	333	390	382	413

Percentage Breakdown of Applications

	Community Funding Committees				
	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01
Community Sport Fund	65%	68%	67%	59%	62%
Community Development Scheme	59%	59%	61%	66%	67%

	Metropolitan Funding Committee				
	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01
Community Sport Fund	35%	32%	33%	41%	38%
Community Development Scheme	41%	41%	39%	34%	33%

Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund

The basis for apportioning the resources available under the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund (60% community funding committees and 40% metropolitan) would appear to better meet the needs of applicants in this area.

The Hillary Commission provides guidelines and priorities for the allocation of their resources and the top priority is for volunteer development (courses for coaches etc) and the Metropolitan Funding Committee allocates a greater proportion of its resources to the top priority than do the Community Board based funding committees which tend to provide a greater level of support to equipment etc for clubs and other local organisations.

Community Development Scheme

The Community Development Scheme (55% community funding committees, 45% metropolitan) while not proportionate in respect of the number of applications that are received, better reflects requested amounts with the Metropolitan Committee dealing with significant city-wide organisations which in general request larger amounts.

The Community Development Scheme funds are, in theory, inflation-adjusted each year and based on population but for ease of explanation the figure has been shown as an amount per head of population, i.e. \$1.30 per head for 2001/02. Several (3 of the 6) Community Boards provided extra funds for this scheme and in general demand is increasing in this area across the city.

This year, the Council's Community Policy has been used to set priorities and guidelines for the consideration of applications under the Community Development Scheme, and this is working well.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES ON THE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

The 2000/01 funding round was the second round of a three-year term for the community representatives on the various funding committees.

The three year term for these representatives is designed to link with the Council's triennial elections and the timing means that in a worst case scenario only half of the committees could change at any one time, thus providing continuity in the process of assessment and allocation of resources under these schemes.

MULTIPLE FUNDING ROUNDS

With the allocation of resources under both the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund and the Council's Community Development Scheme better reflecting the demand from applicant organisations and to reduce confusion for applicant organisations it would be beneficial to have only the one main advertised funding round calling for applications under these schemes.

In the past some Community Board funding committees have held advertised second funding rounds because they have either had significant funds left over from the first round or they have planned a subsequent round and have held back funds for this. This has led to considerable confusion amongst applicant organisations. Many of the groups that apply in second rounds have already applied in the first round so the funding committees are not necessarily getting exposure to a different group of applicant organisations.

To the best of my knowledge only the Shirley/Papanui Community Board plan a second round this year.

If there were only the one round it would be beneficial for funding committees to hold back a small percentage of the funds for later and emergency applications that may be received during the year.

SUMMARY OF RESOURCES ALLOCATIONS AND BALANCES

The following table outlines the situation for each Funding Committee as at 30 June 2001. It should be noted that some Community Boards use their discretionary funds to add to the available resources and this is indicated in the comments column.

Assessment Committee	\$ Carry Forward 1999/00	Less Late 99/00 Allocations	Funds Available 2000/01	Funds Allocated 2000/01	Balance as at 30/6/2001	Comments
Metropolitan HC CDS	.38 -272.66		151,045.60 160,351.56	150,990 159,476	55.60 875.56	
Fendalton/ Waimairi HC CDS	4,890.50 13,019.39		43,388.50 46,004.89	40,103.00 42,859	3,285.50 28,145.89	\$25,000 from Com Bd
Burwood/ Pegasus HC CDS	19,245.92 5.69	18,490.00	39,227.92 31,831.69	32,032.00 35,185.00	7,195.92 -3,353.31	

Assessment Committee	\$ Carry Forward 1999/00	Less Late 99/00 Allocations	Funds Available 2000/01	Funds Allocated 2000/01	Balance as at 30/6/2001	Comments
Shirley/ Papanui HC CDS	26,839.91 20,250.33	1,955.00 19,100.00	62,477.91 33,907.33	21,264.00 24,207.00	41,213.91 9,700.33	
Hagley/ Ferrymead HC CDS	16,172.50 -1,193.51	850.00-	52,244.50 31,755.82	47,801.00 48,907.00	4,443.50 -1,651.18	\$15,500 from Com Bd
Riccarton/ Wigram HC CDS	21,097.80 8,365.03	16,774.00 6,178.00	45,333.77 35,799.03	32,965.00 47,073.00	12,368.77 8,726.03	\$20,000 from Com Bd
Spreydon/ Heathcote HC CDS	24,148.11 12,057.57	19,305.00 11,550.00	43,254.02 33,226.79	39,423.00 33,247.00	3,831.02 2,479.79	\$2,500 from Com Bd
TOTALS						
HC	112,395.12	57,374.00	436,972.22	364,578.00	72,394.22	
CDS	52,231.84	36,828.00	372,877.11	390,954.00	44,923.11	

Funds available include the following returned cheques/funds where projects did not proceed or did not use all of the funds that were allocated.

Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund

Burwood/Pegasus	\$1,998.00
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$1,489.91
Metropolitan	\$1,867.22
Riccarton/Wigram	\$2,745.97
Hagley/ Ferrymead	
Fendalton/ Waimairi	\$905.00
Shirley/ Papanui	
Total	\$9,006.10

Community Development Scheme

Metropolitan	\$874.22
Burwood/Pegasus	
Riccarton/Wigram	\$224.00
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$503.22
Fendalton/Waimairi	\$183.50
Hagley/ Ferrymead	\$733.33
Shirley/ Papanui	
Total	\$2,518.27

LOANS

Fifteen loan applications were received of which nine were approved in full or part and a total of \$300,000 of loan funding has been allocated/committed. These funds are currently loaned out over a five-year term (some exceptions go to ten years) at 2% interest per annum.

FUNDING DATABASE

The database has proved very successful and we have only encountered minor problems in terms of its operation. The benefits will compound so that in future years the time spent in administration and staff inputting will continue to be significantly reduced.

It is anticipated that the database will be further expanded to include grants made by Community Boards to community organisations from their discretionary funds. It is also planned to provide application forms and details on the Internet at some time in the future.

GENERAL

The overall procedures for operating the Community Funding Schemes now in place appear to be working successfully.

More organisations are taking a responsible attitude in respect to the allocations that are made and hence the increase in the number of cheques returned if projects do not utilise all the resources or if for any reason, they are not able to undertake the project. This process is encouraged by all those involved in administering the schemes and results in the maximum benefit being obtained from the resources available.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be received.
 2. That, in line with inflation, the contribution for the Community Development Scheme be increased from \$1.30 per head to \$1.33 per head of population for the 2002/2003 financial year.
 3. That the Community Development Scheme resources continue to be split 55% to the Community Funding Committees and 45% to the Metropolitan Committee for the 2001/2002 funding round.
 4. That the Hillary Commission's Community Sport Fund resources continue to be split 40% to the Metropolitan funding Committee and 60% to the Community Funding Committees for the 2001/2002 funding round.
 5. That the interest rate for the Community Organisations Loan Scheme remain at 2% per annum for the 2001/2002 funding round.
 6. That from the 2001/2002 March main funding round onwards, the Christchurch City Council's Funding Committees hold only the one main advertised funding round each year for the Community Sport Fund, Community Development Scheme and Community Organisation Loan Scheme to avoid confusion for applicant organisations and to minimise advertising and staff costs.
 7. That funding committees give consideration to holding back a small percentage of resources for later and emergency applications.

Chairman's

Recommendation: That the above recommendation be adopted.