

## **Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Community Investment Funding Panel**

**Held in Ruma Marama, Level 2A, Civic House, 110 Trafalgar  
Street, Nelson**

**On Friday 23 October 2015, commencing at 1.00pm**

---

Present: Chris Ward (Chairperson), Susan Hawthorne, Katy Steele,  
Graeme Thomas and Patricia Webster

In Attendance: Manager Community Partnerships (Shanine Hermsen)  
Administration Adviser (Julie Young)

Apologies: Nil

Chris Ward welcomed everyone and thanked them for their participation in the new process.

### **1. Interests**

Ms Steele advised an interest in Volunteer Nelson, and both Ms Steele and Mr Thomas advised an interest in the Nelson Tasman Housing Trust. Mr Ward asked Ms Steele and Mr Thomas to leave the meeting at the appropriate times.

### **2. Terms of Reference**

Document number A1381696

The Terms of Reference were noted.

### **3. Community Investment Agreement Summary and Applications**

Document numbers A1440013 and A1438615

Mr Ward outlined broad considerations for the applications. He noted that priority was to be given to projects completed in June 2015 with a cost over \$2,500, and with a distinct social wellbeing focus. He said that clear reasons for decisions would be provided to applicants.

It was noted that it was not a requirement that all funding be allocated today, and that the total amount available could not be exceeded. He noted that all decisions would be provisional until the final tally was confirmed.

### 3.1 Beneficiaries and Unwaged Workers Trust

The Panel discussed the application, and noted the increased demand for this service within the community. It was noted that a clearer definition of outcomes would have been preferable.

An agreement allocation of **\$7,000** was approved.

### 3.2 Community Art Works

Panel members expressed concern at the lack of definition in the application. In answer to a question, Manager Community Partnerships, Shanine Hermsen, spoke about the organisation's connections with the Ministry of Justice and the positive feedback received from the Rata Foundation. It was noted that governance issues were currently being addressed and it was suggested that funding be approved on condition that Council identify the specific governance issues lacking, provide assistance with those matters, and ensure a succession plan was being developed.

An agreement allocation of **\$10,000** was approved, with conditions noted.

### 3.3 Life Linc Nelson Inc

Following discussion, an agreement allocation of **\$6,000** was approved.

### 3.4 Male Room Incorporated

Panel members discussed the application. The difficulty in assessing outcomes and predicting number of persons assisted was noted and it was suggested that feedback signal for the need for greater clarity in future applications.

An agreement allocation of **\$6,000** was approved.

### 3.5 Neighbourhood Support Nelson

The organisation's linkage with community constables, and the benefits of that, were noted.

An agreement allocation of **\$9,900** was approved.

### 3.6 Nelson Community Christian Night Shelter

The Panel discussed the application and noted the essential service being offered to the community.

An agreement allocation of **\$3,000** was approved.

### 3.7 Nelson Tasman Housing Trust

Attendance: Ms Steele and Mr Thomas declared an interest and left the meeting for the duration of the item.

The Panel noted the specific figures and measurable outcomes supplied and discussed whether the number of beneficiaries met the 'wider community' criteria. It was noted that more background on the demand would have been helpful.

An agreement allocation of **\$10,500** was approved.

### 3.8 St Barnabas Church

The Panel noted that the applicant was seeking to engage with small numbers, and had included insufficient detail on what it was achieving. In answer to a question, Ms Hermsen acknowledged the applicant had been unable to continue providing services to the same level since funding ended in June 2015.

It was agreed that partial allocation of \$15,000 be awarded, with further work required as to whether this was the best delivery model for services. It was further noted that feedback to the applicant should note the Panel's concern that the numbers catered for were the bare minimum.

An agreement allocation of **\$15,000** was approved, with conditions noted.

### 3.9 Tahunanui Community Centre

In answer to a question, Ms Hermsen explained that additional funding was being provided by the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA), and that the DIA was also offering to assist with non-financial support. She advised that the applicant was about to take over an adjacent building which would increase its potential and Mr Ward suggested it would be good to have Council involvement at an early stage.

An agreement allocation of **\$12,000** was approved, contingent on the balance of project funding being secured.

### 3.10 Victim Support

The Panel discussed the application. It was noted the applicant was dependent upon recruiting volunteers, and engaging with the community to do so.

A partial agreement allocation of **\$5,000** was approved.

### 3.11 Victory Community Health

The Panel noted the number of people who benefited and the overall value of the project.

An agreement allocation of **\$3,820** was approved.

### 3.12 Volunteer Nelson

Attendance: Ms Steel declared an interest and left the meeting for the duration of the item.

The Panel noted the success achieved by the applicant in maintaining communication with Community and Whanau Network through the meetings organised.

An agreement allocation of **\$8,000** was approved.

Attendance: The meeting adjourned from 2.15 pm until 2.25pm.

Recommendation

***THAT the Community Investment Funding Panel decides on the allocation of funding for agreement allocations as discussed and set out in document A1440013.***

Ward/Thomas

Carried

## 4. Community Investment Grant Summary and Applications

Document numbers A1440780 and A1438567

Mr Ward clarified that Panel members needed to consider the merits of each individual project, as opposed to comparing projects with those of other organisations.

### 4.1 Age Concern Nelson Tasman

The Panel noted that there were other funding avenues available to applicants seeking funding for physical assets. The Council's social development criteria was noted, and it was suggested that this message be included in feedback to the applicant.

It was agreed that a partial grant of **\$1,000** be made, with feedback supplied as noted.

### 4.2 All Saints Anglican Church

The Panel discussed the application, and acknowledged the modest social benefit gained. It was suggested the applicant consider collaboration with other organisations whose projects possibly

overlapped, such as Victory Community Centre and YMCA's Out of School Care and Recreation (OSCAR) programme.

It was agreed that a partial grant of **\$1,500** be made, with feedback supplied as noted.

#### 4.3 Arthritis Foundation of NZ Inc

During discussion, Panel members questioned whether community need had been assumed, rather than identified, based on national figures. The method of delivery to Nelson was discussed.

It was noted that the Christchurch-based manager worked comprehensively with volunteers within Nelson.

It was agreed that a partial grant of **\$1,750** be made, subject to the applicant successfully sourcing the remaining 50%, and providing proof of Nelson community need in the form of a letter from local volunteers.

#### 4.4 Bhutanese Society of Nelson

The benefits from the community radio programme were discussed.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made.

#### 4.5 Chin Community of Nelson

The Panel discussed the current noncompliant status of the applicant. It was noted that a new organisation was to be formed and registered as a charity with proper governance in place. It was noted the applicant was eligible as a not-for-profit organisation, and delivered a valuable service.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made, but be held until the applicant has demonstrated that the governance issues had been addressed.

#### 4.6 City of Nelson Highland Pipe band

Following discussion, it was agreed that the application be **declined**. The Panel considered the application:

- Did not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria, and
- Did not demonstrate wide community benefit.

#### 4.7 Enner Glynn School

Following discussion, it was agreed that the application be **declined**. The Panel considered the application:

- Did not demonstrate wide community benefit.

#### 4.8 Health Action Trust - for COMPASS

The application was discussed, and it was agreed that a grant of **\$2,100** be made.

#### 4.9 IHC New Zealand Inc

The application was discussed, and it was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made.

#### 4.10 Male Room Inc

The Panel discussed the application and noted that the need had been clearly established for integrated educational resources.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made.

#### 4.11 Neighbourhood Support Nelson

The Panel discussed the application, and noted the potential for further development of this organisation. The wider community benefit and social aspect of this project was recognised as meeting the criteria.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$1,000** be made

#### 4.12 Nelson Bays Community Law Service

The Panel discussed the application and noted the importance of the service offered. Concerns regarding sustainability were considered.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made.

#### 4.13 Nelson Community Foodbank Trust

The value of this Trust's work was acknowledged by all.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made.

#### 4.14 Nelson Community Toy Library

The Panel discussed the application, and noted the importance of the development opportunities it offered to children and their families.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made.

#### 4.15 Nelson Multicultural Council Inc

The Panel acknowledged significant changes made within the organisation. It was noted that the application included no mention of numbers benefiting from the course.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made, conditional upon the applicant securing additional funding.

#### 4.16 Nelson Multiple Sclerosis Society

The Panel discussed the application, and queried whether there was potential for District Health Board funding. It was noted that the application did not demonstrate the need for an increase on last year, and should include more details if a similar application was to be made next year. The possibility of coordinating use of vans with other agencies was raised.

It was agreed that a partial grant of **\$1,200** be made, with feedback as noted.

#### 4.17 Nelson Playcentre Association

The Panel noted the aims of this event-based application. It was recommended the applicant consider in more depth the social development benefits around networking and family awareness in any future applications.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$1,500** be made, with feedback as noted.

#### 4.18 Nelson Railway Society Inc.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the application be **declined**. The Panel considered the application:

- Did not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria, and
- Did not demonstrate wide community benefit.

#### 4.19 Nelson Tasman Region Hospice Trust

Following discussion, it was agreed that the application be **declined**. The Panel considered the application:

- Did not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria, and
- Did not demonstrate wide community benefit.

#### 4.20 Nelson Women's Support Inc.

The value of the organisation and the workshop it proposed was acknowledged by the Panel.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$1,500** be made.

#### 4.21 Post Natal Depression Support Network Nelson Inc

The application was discussed, and it was agreed that a grant of **\$1,000** be made.

#### 4.22 Q -Youth Inc

The Panel discussed the application and noted the plans for a community development programme needed further definition. It was considered appropriate to grant \$500 initially, to assist with additional project planning, with the remaining \$2,000 to be granted upon evidence of a suitable outcome-related project being developed.

It was agreed that a partial grant of **\$500** be made initially, with a further grant of **\$2,000** being made on meeting the conditions noted.

#### 4.23 Stoke Community Centre

The application was discussed, and it was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made.

#### 4.24 Tahunanui Community Centre

The Panel noted a correction to the report, which stated that Tahunanui Community Centre had received a grant last year of \$7,640. The figure should have read '0'.

During discussion, it was noted that the applicant should get advice on budgeting for promotion and advertising of its new community hub. Panel members considered that the engagement aspect of the application met the social development criteria, while the signage did not.

It was agreed that a partial grant of **\$2,000** be made, to be directed toward engagement activity in the project.

Attendance: The meeting adjourned from 3.50pm until 3.59pm.

#### 4.25 Te Ataarangi ki Te Tauihu o Te Waka-a-Maui Inc

The Panel discussed the application. It was noted that the current financial status had been impacted by an over-payment error which was being repaid.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made.

#### 4.26 The Ecomoon Collective

Following discussion, it was agreed that the application be **declined**. It was noted the applicant was neither a registered charity, nor not-for-profit and was therefore ineligible. The Panel considered the application:

- Did not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria, and
- Did not demonstrate wide community benefit.

#### 4.27 The Order of St John Nelson Area Committee

The application was discussed, and it was agreed that a grant of **\$1,000** be made.

#### 4.28 The Tasman Broadcasting Trust T/A Fresh FM

Following discussion, it was agreed that the application be **declined**. The Panel considered the application:

- Did not demonstrate a high enough community need for the project/service/activity; and
- Did not demonstrate wide community benefit.

#### 4.29 Victim Support in Nelson

The Panel discussed the application. There was concern that funding would go toward travel of volunteers from other regions.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$1,000** be made, with the stipulation that it be directed toward the training of Nelson-based volunteers.

#### 4.30 Victory Community Health

The Panel raised concerns regarding the affordability to run, and energy efficiency of the style of heater being proposed in this application. It was acknowledged that there could be some duplication with the Warmer Homes Programme, which Council supports.

A discussion was held around how the Panel determined the success or benefit of any project after funds were granted. A suggestion was made to include on the application a question: "How will you know you have helped?". It was agreed the Community Investment Funding process should facilitate the opportunity to ask questions of applicants.

It was agreed that a grant of **\$2,500** be made, together with an offer of Council advice regarding energy efficient heating sources.

#### 4.31 Victory Playcentre

Following discussion, it was agreed that the application be **declined**. The Panel considered the application:

- Did not closely align with its priorities and funding criteria.

The meeting adjourned at 4.18pm and resumed at 4.21pm.

Recommendation

***THAT the Community Investment Funding Panel decides on the allocation of funding for grant applications as discussed and set out in document A1440780.***

Webster/Steele

Carried

There being no further business the meeting ended at 4.22pm.

Confirmed as a correct record of proceedings:

\_\_\_\_\_ Chairperson \_\_\_\_\_ Date