

GRANTS SUBCOMMITTEE 25 MARCH 2010

REPORT 2

(1215/52/03/IM)

C.H. IZARD BEQUEST

1. Purpose of Report

This report provides recommendations for the distribution of the C. H. Izard Bequest.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Grants Subcommittee:

- 1. Receive the information.
- 2. Agree to the allocation of funding as contained in Appendix Two and recommend them to the trustees of the C. H. Izard Bequest.

3. Background

The Council has administered the C.H. Izard Bequest funds since 1925. The capital is managed by trustees, Macalister, Mazengarb, Solicitors.

The trustees of the C.H. Izard Bequest have advised that up to \$30,000 is available from the trust fund for allocation to suitable projects recommended to them by the Grants Subcommittee.

Specific criteria relating to C. H. Izard Bequest:

- Charitable and/or educational purposes only. All projects must fit the charitable mould, and may or may not have an educational purpose.
- Charitable is interpreted as "needy" in the social welfare sense, not simply as a charitable trust.
- Wellington rate paying area projects only.
- Projects need to fit the Council's general grants criteria (attached as appendix 1), though less emphasis on Council's strategic priorities is required.

4. Discussion

Officers' recommendations regarding the applications submitted are attached as Appendix 2. The original information provided by applicants has been forwarded to Subcommittee members in a separate book. If members of the Subcommittee require more information on applications prior to the grants meeting, they can contact the grants team, who will work on providing this in time for the meeting.

The recommendation sheet gives each applicant's organisation name, a brief project description, the total project cost, amount requested, criteria and strategic fit reference (which includes any concerns about criteria fit and risk management issues), and recommended funding.

The recommended amounts are the result of an assessment process which includes consultation with all or some of the following; the applicant, persons or organisations referred to in the application and Council officers. The assessment process may result in the applicant providing revised or extra material (most commonly relating to accounts or budgets) that will be presented at the meeting in support of officers' recommendations.

Applicants are generally given ten working days where possible to respond to a request for more information, so some recommendations may be subject to change depending on responses received after this report has been written.

5. Conclusion

The Subcommittee is asked to consider the applications received for the C.H. Izard Bequest and decide whether or not it is appropriate to recommend the applicants for funding and for what amount.

Contact Officer: Mark Farrar, Grants Team Leader

Supporting Information

1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome

WCC General grants are allocated to support outcomes from the Cultural, Social, Economic and Environmental strategic areas. C.H. Izard Bequest recommendations take into account Social strategic outcomes.

2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact C.H. Izard Bequest is held by Macalister Mazengarb Solicitors. Projects approved for funding under this scheme are paid directly by the Trustees.

3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations

Any grants application that could have implications for Maori are referred to WCC Treaty Relations Office for recommendations. The Treaty Relations Office is sent the full list of applicants and projects for comments.

4) Decision-Making

This is not a significant decision.

5) Consultation

a)General Consultation

The Grants Team sends the full list of applicants and projects for comment to appropriate Council officers prior to presentation to the Subcommittee. Applicants and persons or organisations referred to in the applications and others may be spoken to for comments where appropriate.

b) Consultation with Maori

The WCC Treaty Relations Office is sent the full list of applicants and projects for comment prior to presentation to committee.

6) Legal Implications

N/A

7) Consistency with existing policy

N/A