



Te Kaunihera-ā-Rohe o Ngāmotu

**New Plymouth
District Council**

**COMMUNITY FUNDING
INVESTMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA**

**Wednesday 21 September 2022
at 1pm**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER
LIARDET STREET, NEW PLYMOUTH**

Chairperson:	Cr Amanda Clinton-Gohdes
Members:	Cr Tony Bedford
	Cr Gordon Brown
	Cr Anneka Carlson
	Cr Harry Duynhoven
	Cr Dinnie Moeahu
	Mayor Neil Holdom

COMMITTEE PURPOSE

Purpose of Local Government

The reports contained in this agenda address the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 in relation to decision making. Unless otherwise stated, the recommended option outlined in each report meets the purpose of local government and:

- Promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future.
- Would not alter significantly the intended level of service provision for any significant activity undertaken by or on behalf of the Council, or transfer the ownership or control of a strategic asset to or from the Council.

END

OPENING KARAKIA

Kia uruuru mai	I draw in (to my being)
Ā hauora	The reviving essence
Ā haukaha	The strengthening essence
Ā haumāia	The essence of courage
Ki runga, ki raro	Above, below
Ki roto, ki waho	Within, without
Rirerire hau paimarire	Let there be peace



Te Kaunihera-ā-Rohe o Ngāmotu

**New Plymouth
District Council**

Health and Safety Message

In the event of an emergency, please follow the instructions of Council staff.

Please exit through the main entrance.

Once you reach the footpath please turn right and walk towards Pukekura Park, congregating outside the Spark building. Please do not block the footpath for other users.

Staff will guide you to an alternative route if necessary.

If there is an earthquake – drop, cover and hold where possible. Please be mindful of the glass overhead.

Please remain where you are until further instruction is given.

APOLOGIES

- Mayor Neil Holdom

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

1. People who fill positions of authority must undertake their duties free from real or perceived bias. Elected members must maintain a clear separation between their personal interests and their duties as an elected member. Failure to do so could invalidate a Council decision and leave the elected member open to prosecution and ouster from office.
2. An elected member is entitled to interact with the Council as a private citizen. However, they cannot use their position as an elected member to gain an advantage not available to the general public.
3. Elected and appointed members will:
 - Declare any interest whether pecuniary or non-pecuniary at a meeting where the interest is relevant to an item on that agenda.
 - Exclude themselves from any informal discussions with elected members relating to a matter they have an interest in.
 - Seek guidance from the Chief Executive if they are unclear of the extent of any interest.
 - Seek guidance or exemption from the Office of the Auditor General if necessary.

ADDRESSING THE MEETING

Requests for public forum and deputations need to be made at least one day prior to the meeting. The Chairperson has authority to approve or decline public comments and deputations in line with the standing order requirements.

PUBLIC FORUM

Public Forums enable members of the public to bring matters to the attention of the committee which are not contained on the meeting agenda. The matters must relate to the meeting's terms of reference. Speakers can speak for up to 5 minutes, with no more than two speakers on behalf of one organisation.

- None advised

DEPUTATIONS

Deputations enable a person, group or organisation to speak to the meeting on matters contained on the agenda. An individual speaker can speak for up to 10 minutes. Where there are multiple speakers for one organisation, a total time limit of 15 minutes, for the entire deputation, applies.

- None advised

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Recommendation

That the minutes of the Community Funding Investment Committee, 8 December 2021 (ECM8679449), and the proceedings of the said meeting, as previously circulated, be taken as read and confirmed as a true and correct record.

END

REPORTS

ITEMS FOR DECISION BY COMMITTEE

- 1 Community Funding – Rural Hall Development Grant
- 2 Heritage Protection Fund – 90 Pendarves Street
- 3 Heritage Protection Fund – Sacred Heart Cathloic Church
- 4 Community Funding Report 2022/2023

END

COMMUNITY FUNDING REPORT - RURAL HALL DEVELOPMENT GRANT 2022 - 2023

MATTER

1. The matter for consideration by the Community Investment Funding Committee (the Committee) is applications to the rural Hall Development Grant that exceed Officer Delegation of \$10,000 and are outside the Policy and therefore require approval for funding from the Committee.
2. Applications that fall within officer delegation and do not require approval from the Committee are also summarised to provide an overview of the entire budget to the Committee.

RECOMMENDATION FOR CONSIDERATION

That having considered all matters raised in the report, the Committee:

- a) **Notes that available funding in the Rural Hall Development Fund for the 2022-2023 financial year is \$66,769.00 + GST.**
 - b) **Notes that ten halls submitted applications for the 2022-2023 financial year, totalling \$77,602.91 + GST including one retroactive application for the 2021-2022 financial year for the amount of \$1,929.94 + GST.**
 - c) **Agrees to fund Tongaporutu Hall the amount of \$16,969.19 + GST towards the cost of replacing the roof and installing an under bench instantaneous hot water boiler unit (noting that the total amount requested was \$19,969.19 + GST).**
 - d) **Agrees to fund Hillsborough Hall the amount of \$8,678.26 + GST towards the cost of installing heatpumps (noting that their application was for \$13,661.13 + GST).**
 - e) **Agrees to fund Mangorei Hall the amount of \$7,753.46 + GST towards the cost of replacing an electrical sub main and replacing the fascia and gable ends of the roof (noting that their application was for \$12,916.00 + GST).**
 - f) **Agrees to fund Ratapiko Hall the amount of \$14,820.00 + GST towards the cost of materials to replace the roof.**
 - g) **Agrees to fund Tikorangi Hall to a total amount of \$1,930.21 + GST towards the cost of emergency work carried out in 2021 (ie the previous funding year).**
-

- h) Notes that a further five applications, totalling \$14,949.00 + GST received for Rural Hall Development Grants are summarised in the report. Because they are within delegated authority of Council Officers, they have not been presented for approval by the Committee.**
- i) Agrees to leave the Rural Hall Development Grant open for new or emergency applications for the remaining \$1,811.34 + GST of the fund until 30 June 2023 (or unless allocated earlier).**

COMPLIANCE	
Significance	This matter is assessed as being of some importance.
Options	<p>This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for addressing the matter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fund the following Rural Halls for the amounts below – Tongaporutu Hall \$16,969.19 + GST Hillsborough Hall \$8,678.26 + GST Mangorei Hall \$10,253.00 + GST Ratapiko Hall \$14,820.00 + GST Tikorangi Hall \$1,930.21 + GST 2. Declines to fund the Halls the amounts recommended in Option 1 and instead fund each Hall an amount to be determined by the funding committee.
Affected persons	The persons who are affected by or interested in this matter are Rural Hall Committees who rely on funding to undertake maintenance and developments of their halls. Additionally, community members throughout the district who benefit from the use of the Halls.
Recommendation	This report recommends option one for addressing the matter.
Long-Term Plan / Annual Plan Implications	No
Significant Policy and Plan Inconsistencies	No

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The Rural Hall Development Fund is an amount set aside annually for contestable funding for Rural Hall Maintenance and Development. The 2022-2023 applications exceed the amount budgeted for the fund, and four applications exceed Officer Delegation therefore requiring Committee approval. In addition, Committee approval is required for work that was undertaken in the previous financial year, and has been applied for retroactively which is outside of the Policy.
4. Officers have recommended the amount to be granted to each applicant, however the Committee may choose to grant additional funds or decline applications in order to balance the available funds if they believe it would be more beneficial to other applicants.

BACKGROUND

Rural Hall Development Grants support maintenance and development of the District's Rural Halls.

5. There are 21 rural halls within the New Plymouth district. They are generally managed as incorporated societies, with a volunteer committee under a defined set of society rules.
6. Rural halls perform an important role for rural communities as they enable a community gathering place through provision of facilities that is used for many community purposes. There is a strong history associated with rural halls within the New Plymouth district. Rural halls often operate on a venue for hire basis, which contributes towards running costs.
7. The purpose of the Rural Halls Development Grant is to support funding for the maintenance and development of the district's rural halls. Grants may be sought for the following purposes:
 - External works
 - Health and Safety
 - Hygiene
 - Interior Structure
 - Accessibility
 - Aesthetic and Capital Projects

Applications for Rural Hall Development Grants are assessed according to Eligibility Criteria

8. Applications are considered from hall societies for capital improvements and preventative maintenance works on a priority needs basis. Priority needs are:
 - a) halls with more than 30 hours per month demonstrated average use (excluding school holiday weeks);
 - b) where the lack of maintenance would constitute a health, safety or fire risk or compromise weather tightness. (Halls that meet both category i) and ii) have first priority);
 - c) those halls that have less than 30 hours per month use but who can demonstrate that work will increase hall hire.

Approval of Funding Allocation

9. It was resolved at the Council meeting on 24 May 2016, that the delegations for community funding investment applications, including the Rural Hall Development Grant, be amended so that only applications greater than \$10,000 need approval from the Committee.

SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS 2021-2022

10. The Rural Hall Development Grant for the 2021-2022 financial year has a value of \$66,769. Applications for Rural Hall Development Grants have been received from 10 Rural Halls, the value of these applications totals \$77,602.91.

Applications that exceed \$10,000

11. Officers have tried to "triage" the applications and rank them in accordance with the criteria outlined in paragraph 8, whilst also considering the level of grants to Halls in the previous three years and their available bank balances.

	Average Hall Use	Work will increase Hall use?	Health & Safety/ Weather tightness	Status	TOTAL SCORE	Bank Balance	Funding Provided over last 3 years	Grant Requested	Grant Recommended
Tongaporutu Hall	30	0	20	0	50	\$2,500	\$1,000	\$19,469.19	\$16,969.19
Hillsborough Hall	30	0	20	0	50	\$11,817	\$19,803	\$13,661.13	\$8,678.26
Mangorei Hall	20	0	20	0	40	\$13,123	\$1,625	\$12,916.20	\$7,753.00
Ratapiko Hall	10	20	20	0	50	\$53,000	\$0	\$14,820.00	\$14,820.00

Figure One: Summary Table of Scoring, Recent Grants, Grant Requested and Grant Recommended for Applications exceeding \$10,000

Tongaporutu Hall

12. The Tongaporutu Hall Society has requested \$19,469.19 + GST in order to fund two projects.
13. The first funding requested is \$10,000 towards the cost of replacing the roof. The Hall Society intends to accept a quote of \$36,419.05 + GST. The Hall Society has successfully applied for funding from the Toi Foundation (\$20,000) and Lotteries (\$18,000). When Officers questioned the application to the Council for \$10,000, the committee advised it was for contingency to cover unexpected building work that might be required (eg if rot is found in the roof structure) and towards the GST costs (the total project is \$41,881.91 incl GST).
14. The second project is the supply and installation of an under bench hot water cylinder. The Hall Society has identified this project as beneficial due to potential power savings from a small unit instead of heating a "traditional" hot water cylinder to wash just a few dishes. Officers note that the Hall Society were only able to obtain one quote due to difficulties in finding contractors prepared to travel to quote.
15. The application scores relatively highly in the assessment criteria because this project is related to weather tightness and the hall has high use of approx. 46 hours per month. Excluding the Toi and Lottery grants, the Society has just over \$2,000 in the back and over the last three years, the Hall has only received small grants from the Council in the order of \$500 per year.

16. Officers recommend that the Tongaporutu Hall Society be granted \$16,969.19 + GST. It's uncertain if the full \$10,000 will be needed towards the roof project, and the Society may be able to obtain an alternative, cheaper quote for the under bench hot water cylinder meaning they might still be able to achieve both projects with slightly less funding.

Hillsborough Hall

17. Hillsborough Hall submitted an application for \$13,661.13 + GST. This was for three projects, installing heatpumps in the main hall (\$8,739.13 + GST), supply and install of a range hood in the kitchen including supply, electrical work and roof flashings (\$2,737.00 + GST) and replacement of lighting and installation of a heater in a side room (\$2,185 + GST).
18. In relation to the assessment criteria, the Hall scores highly because of its high use. However, they do have in the order of \$12,000 of available funds and have received a grant from the Council every year for at least the last 10 years. Officers recognise that an extraction fan would make the kitchen more pleasant for users and reduce possible condensation and mould which has a Health and Safety benefit. Additional heating would make the Hall more pleasant for the users, but none of these projects score highly under the criteria.
19. On balance, Officers recommend that the Hillsborough Hall Society be granted \$8,678.26 + GST. This would allow the Hall to either accept the cheaper of the two quotes for the heatpumps but note that the Hall may wish to prioritise and instead undertake the range hood project and installation of a single heat pump.

Mangorei Hall

20. The application submitted by Mangorei Hall was for the amount of \$12,916.00 + GST for two projects. These were running a new sub main power supply and replacement of the soffits and gable ends of the Hall.
21. When assessing the application, Officers noted two quotes were received for each project and each value was significantly different. The Hall Committee, requested funding for the highest building quote. Officers queried the difference in price with the Hall Committee who confirmed both contractors were provided with the same information and scope of work. They requested funding for the highest quote because it is from a larger firm who *"will be able to attend site and complete work in one visit. The other builder works alone and may be taken away from this job to do others. Also he did not get up on the roof and ascertain the amount of work to be done. I queried his quote also. All companies who quoted were advised of the asbestos and the report is kept on site as required. Also employees of the larger firm can deal with asbestos if it is found as they are qualified."*
-

22. Mangorei scores highly on the basis that the usage is medium – high and the work is needed for exterior maintenance and health and safety. The Hall has just over \$13,000 in their account. Officers recommend that Mangorei Hall be granted \$7,753.46. This would cover the lowest of the electrical and building quotes, or the Hall may wish to obtain additional building quotes to check the prices already quoted or delay the electrical work.

Ratapiko Hall

23. Ratapiko Sports Club Inc has applied for a Rural Hall Grant towards the cost of materials to replace the roof at Ratapiko Hall. They have applied separately to the Toi Foundation for the labour costs. The Council application is for the amount of \$14,820.00.
24. The Club has low to medium use, and significant funds invested (\$50,000), however replacement of the roof is vital to maintain weather tightness. For that reason and because they have received no grants from the Council for the last 10 years, and are also likely to receive a grant from TOI, Officers recommend granting the full amount requested.

Tikorangi Hall

25. Tikorangi Hall has asked the Council to consider a retroactive grant to reimburse them for funds spent for urgent works, replacing a hot water cylinder and emergency lights and batteries. The amount is only \$1930.21 + GST which is within Officer delegation however, grants for work already undertaken falls outside of the policy. Nonetheless. Officers are recommending approving the grant.

Applications less than \$10,000 (under Officer Delegation)

26. Hall development funds requested that are less than \$10,000 and recommended for approval under Officer Delegation are shown in the summary table below (provided purely for the Committee's information).

Rural Hall	Project	Funds Requested (+ GST)
Durham Hall	Repairs to Fire	\$3,288.00
Norfolk Hall	Roof Repairs	\$1,082.54
	Upgrade ladies bathroom	\$3,330.00
Omata Hall	New Trestle tables	\$3,375.00
	Repairs to Entry Roof	\$614.32
Upper Mangorei Hall	Materials to repaint exterior of Hall	\$1,106.01
	New toilet cisterns and cistern taps	\$491.31
Waitoitoi Hall	Replace Oven	\$1,519.00
TOTAL		\$14,806.18

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT AND CONSIDERATIONS

27. No climate change implications have been identified. The grants are to be carried out at existing sites and generally involve maintenance and upgrades rather than any new development.

NEXT STEPS

28. Letters will be written to applicants confirming their 2022-2023 Rural Hall Development Grant and outlining the process they should follow in order to receive the Grant.
29. All other rural hall committees will be advised that the grant will remain open for further applications on a "first come first served" basis until either 30 June 2023, or the fund is exhausted.

SIGNIFICANCE AND ENGAGEMENT

30. In accordance with the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, this matter has been assessed as being of some importance. The budget for the Rural Hall Development Grants is funded from the LTP 2021-2031.
-

OPTIONS

Option 1

31. Fund the following Rural Halls for the amounts below –

- a) Tongaporutu Hall \$16,969.19 + GST
- b) Hillsborough Hall \$8,678.26 + GST
- c) Mangorei Hall \$10,253.00 + GST
- d) Ratapiko Hall \$14,820.00 + GST
- e) Tikorangi Hall \$1,930.21 + GST

Financial and Resourcing Implications

32. The Rural Hall Development Grant is budgeted and approved in the Long Term Plan 2021-2031. Council Officers have tried to level to applications in order to provide support to all halls that applied for grants.

Risk Analysis

33. There is a risk that by only part funding some of the Halls, some projects may not proceed unless the hall committee can either find alternative (cheaper) quotes or secure additional funding.

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

34. Supporting the rural halls through the provision of Development Grants supports the Council's strategic priority of Community.

Statutory Responsibilities

35. Halls are required to comply with all relevant acts and bylaws relating to their projects. There are no Statutory Responsibility for the Council.

Consistency with Policies and Plans

36. This grant is consistent with the Community Funding Investment Policy (Rural Hall Grants).

Participation by Māori

37. As the matter for consideration by the Council is limited to allocation of the Rural Hall Development Fund, specifically set aside within the Long-Term Plan for the purpose of development of rural halls and does not relate to ancestral land, water, waahi tapu, valued flora, fauna, and/or other taonga, no specific consultation has been undertaken with iwi.

Community Views and Preferences

38. Applications for the Rural Hall Development Grants have come directly from rural hall committees who represent the communities that they serve and who benefit from the hall.

Advantages and Disadvantages

39. The advantage of this option is that it shares the distribution of the Rural Hall Development Grant across all halls that submitted applications, and potentially, also allows for additional applications from the remaining halls that did not submit an application. The disadvantage is that the full amount to fund some of the projects is not recommended in all cases which puts the completion of the projects at risk.

Option 2

Declines to fund the Halls the amounts recommended in Option 1 and instead fund each Hall an amount to be determined by the funding committee.

Financial and Resourcing Implications

40. If it wishes, the Committee may wish to grant additional funds or change the allocations above those recommended by Officers.

Risk Analysis

41. Should additional funds be granted to some Halls, it follows that others would have their funding reduced which may impact on their projects.

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

42. Additional funding could result in a better community outcome for some of the Halls at the detriment to others.

Statutory Responsibilities

43. As above.
-

Consistency with Policies and Plans

44. This grant is consistent with the Community Funding Investment Policy (Rural Hall Grants) and specifically, the requirement for the Funding Committee to approve grants over \$10,000 + GST.

Participation by Māori

45. As above.

Community Views and Preferences

46. As above.

Advantages and Disadvantages

47. An advantage of this option is that an increase in funding may increase the chance of a successful project for some of the Halls. The disadvantage is that other Rural Halls may have their funding reduced.

Recommended Option

This report recommends option one, for addressing the matter - Fund the following Rural Halls the amounts below –

Tongaporutu Hall \$16,969.19 + GST
Hillsborough Hall \$8,678.26 + GST
Mangorei Hall \$10,253.00 + GST
Ratapiko Hall \$14,820.00 + GST
Tikorangi Hall \$1,930.21 + GST

Report Details

Prepared By: Charlotte Dunning (Property Management Lead)
Team: Property
Approved By: Callum Williamson (Community Partnerships Lead)
Ward/Community: New Plymouth District Wide
Date: 9 September 2022
File Reference: ECM 8833432

-----*End of Report*-----

REPLACEMENT OF ROOF, INCLUDING GUTTERING, AT 90 PENDARVES STREET, NEW PLYMOUTH

MATTER

1. The matter for consideration by Council is the allocation of funding from the Built Heritage Protection Fund to contribute to the replacement of the roof, including the guttering, at 90 Pendarves Street, New Plymouth.

RECOMMENDATION FOR CONSIDERATION

That, having considered all matters raised in the report, Council grants Mr Aaron Kreisler \$20,000 excluding GST to contribute to the replacement of the roof, including the guttering, at 90 Pendarves Street, New Plymouth subject to the following conditions:

- a) **The roof is to be replaced with Coloursteel Endura .40G corrugate profile and Coloursteel Maxx .55G flashings, in Gull Grey;**
- b) **The guttering is to be replaced with Coloursteel Gutter, in Gull Grey;**
- c) **The work is to be completed to the satisfaction of Council prior to the release of any funds;**
- d) **The funding be available until 31 December 2023;**
- e) **If the work is not completed to Council's satisfaction and the grant not paid by that date, the grant shall cease to be available under this decision unless applications for time extensions are made to, and approved by, the Manager Planning or nominee; and**
- f) **Upon release of funding, a plaque provided by Council acknowledging the financial contribution by the fund shall be fixed and displayed to the exterior or interior of the building in a position viewable by those using or visiting the building.**

COMPLIANCE	
Significance	This matter is assessed as being of some importance.
Options	This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for addressing the matter: 1. Approve funding. 2. Do not approve funding.
Affected persons	The persons who are affected by or interested in this matter include Mr Kreisler, Hen and Chicken building owners, Heritage Taranaki and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
Recommendation	This report recommends Option 1 for addressing the matter.
Long-Term Plan / Annual Plan Implications	No.
Significant Policy and Plan Inconsistencies	No.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Built Heritage Protection Fund was established by Council to help private landowners manage, maintain and preserve the heritage values of their properties. It provides a partial contribution towards the cost of a specific heritage project or work.
3. A grant from the Built Heritage Protection Fund is being sought by Mr Kreisler to contribute to the replacement of the roof, including the guttering. Based on the information provided, the cost is estimated to be approximately \$50,000 – \$60,000 including GST.
4. It is recommended that Council grant funding in order to maintain the building’s integrity. The funding will help prevent heritage from being lost to the community and ensure that heritage is actively used and maintained.

BACKGROUND

Site Significance

5. The Operative District Plan classifies more than 800 heritage buildings, items and areas in the New Plymouth district into three categories:

Category A: Buildings, items and areas of great cultural heritage value (103 in total);

Category B: Buildings, items and areas of considerable heritage value (560 in total); and

Category C: Buildings, items and areas of some heritage value (140 in total).

Only Category A's are subject to rules, whereas Category B's and C's are not.

6. The building is identified as a Category A in the Operative District Plan. The schedule of Category A heritage buildings and items was rolled over into the Proposed District Plan that was notified in September 2019, so the building continues to be subject to heritage protection. Council's heritage record for the building is attached as Appendix 1.
7. The building is one of the "chickens" in the "Hen and Chickens" group of houses which play an important role in New Plymouth's sense of place by contributing significant architectural, historical, social and townscape value. The "hen" is known as Willowfield. It was occupied by Thomas and Grace Hirst and is located at 37 Cameron Street, New Plymouth. The five "chickens" were built for the Hirst children by Thomas and Grace Hirst and are located along Pendarves Street (84, 90, 94, 98 and 102 Pendarves Street).
8. These well-known group of houses are registered as a historic area on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero, a national advocacy and information tool rather than a regulatory tool.
9. The building was built circa 1864, is a single storey cottage and belongs to a significant architectural period in the New Plymouth district, that of the Victorian-Edwardian era. It has a board and batten exterior with a corrugated iron roof. Like the other "chickens," the exterior is painted in a distinctive colour scheme with the main body in white and the trims in black or grey.

Current Usage

10. The building is a private residence and is currently occupied by tenants.

Proposed Works

11. The owner, Mr Kreisler, plans to replace the existing roof, including the guttering, to protect the long term integrity of the building. The current roof is beyond a temporary fix, which has been done over the years.
 12. The current corrugated iron roof is to be replaced with Coloursteel Endura .40G corrugate profile and Coloursteel Maxx .55G flashings, in Gull Grey. The current guttering is to be replaced with Coloursteel Gutter, also in Gull Grey.
-

13. The proposed works do not trigger resource consent because reroofing is considered maintenance and repair, similar materials will be used and the existing form, proportions, finishes and characteristics of the roof will be retained.
14. The quote supplied is from DK Roofing for \$51,131.22 including GST and is made up of the following:
 - a) Coloursteel Endura roofing, underlay and flashings (\$32,651.93 including GST);
 - b) Purlin timber (\$300 including GST);
 - c) Coloursteel gutter and downpipes (\$5,160 including GST); and
 - d) Cunninghams working platform (\$6,350 including GST).
15. The quote includes removal and disposal of the existing roof.
16. Mr Kreisler has had difficulties obtaining the required two quotes because companies are either too busy or are unwilling to quote due to fluctuations in the prices of building materials at present. However, he has supplied a cost estimate from Bruce the Builder Limited for \$55,000 – \$60,000 including GST for materials, labour and full scaffold.
17. Based on the information provided, the cost is estimated to be approximately \$50,000 – 60,000 including GST.
18. Mr Kreisler seeks \$35,000 from the Built Heritage Protection Fund. The remaining balance will be funded by Mr Kreisler.
19. The amount recommended from the Built Heritage Protection Fund is \$20,000 excluding GST, noting that recommendations are generally around a quarter to a third of the total cost of the work.

Assessment

20. Using the assessment criteria and various matters set out in Appendix One of the Community Investment Policy Funding Schedules, an item must score 50 points or more to be considered for assistance.
-

21. If an application meets the minimum points required, various matters are taken into account such as significance of the item from a heritage point of view, the degree to which the work is necessary, and the degree to which the work aligns with Council strategies, policies and plans.

Assessment Criteria

22. The building has been assessed as follows:

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	POINTS	SCORE
<i>Significance of item from a heritage point of view</i>	Category A – 20	20
	Category B – 10	
	Category C – 5	
<i>Degree to which the proposed work is necessary to ensure the maintenance or preservation of the item</i>	Essential work – 20 (i.e. unless work carried out future integrity of item in doubt, e.g. replace leaking roof, repiling, replacing rotten timbers, etc.)	20
	Desirable work – 10 (regular/ongoing maintenance required to keep item in good order, e.g. repainting)	
<i>Degree of public access or use</i>	High degree of public access – 20	5
	Medium degree of public access – 10	
	Low degree of public access – 5	
	No public access – 0	
<i>Level of prominence</i>	Located in CBD/Commercial Centre – 20	5
	Located on high volume traffic road – 10	
	Located on low volume traffic road – 5	
<i>Total</i>	Maximum total – 80	50

23. Traditionally residential houses score 0 points in the *Degree of public access or use* category because they are private residences with no opportunity for public access. This can be a contributing factor as to why residential houses do not meet the threshold for funding. Mr Kreisler has stated in his application that access has been discussed with the current tenants and that as part of their tenancy the building must be available for public access on heritage events (such as heritage week) and if interested parties make contact with the Council about visiting the site. Mr Kreisler has advised that this would continue in the future and is happy to discuss further opportunities with Council officers over future use/access for the public.

Various Matters

24. The building has been assessed as follows:

VARIOUS MATTERS
<p><i>The significance of the item from a heritage point of view</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in Operative District Plan – Category A (Site ID 21). • Listed in Proposed District Plan – SCHED1 (Site ID 21). • Listed as a historic area on New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (ref 7202).
<p><i>The degree to which the work is necessary to ensure the sustainable management, maintenance or preservation of the item</i></p> <p>A site visit was undertaken by Senior Planning Adviser Lauren O’Byrne on 12 August 2022 where it was observed that the roof is in poor condition. The roof is rusting in many places. It has been patched, notably on the front verandah above the porch steps and to the right of the front gable in the valley. The paint on the fascia is peeling and moss and lichen are present. On the far left of the roof, the guttering is not level with the roof. Photos showing the condition of the roof are attached as Appendix 2.</p>
<p><i>Whether funding from other agencies is being sought for the item</i></p> <p>No funding is being sought from other agencies.</p>
<p><i>The degree to which the work is in accordance with the principles of the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value</i></p> <p>The degrees of intervention for conservation purposes are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Preservation through stabilisation, maintenance or repair; ii) Restoration through reassembly, reinstatement or removal; iii) Reconstruction; and iv) Adaptation. <p>The proposed works align with the Preservation degree of intervention.</p>
<p><i>The amount of money in the fund and the need for equitable distribution</i></p> <p>The current balance is \$97,214.81.</p>
<p><i>Whether the item has received funding previously or not</i></p> <p>The item has not received funding previously.</p>
<p><i>The responsibilities of other statutory bodies or organisations in protecting or maintaining the item</i></p> <p>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga made a submission to the Proposed District Plan seeking that the Hen and Chickens be added as a heritage character area.</p>

The prominence of the item, i.e. its location and number of viewers

The building contributes positively to the streetscape of the area. Whilst not on a high volume road, the group of houses are located next to the Pendarves/Eliot Street intersection and can be viewed by many pedestrians and motorists. This includes motorists travelling along Eliot Street and people on their way to nearby schools, the race course, TSB Stadium and Pukekura Park.

The degree to which the work aligns with Council strategies, policies and plans

The work is consistent with the New Plymouth District Blueprint, Annual/Long Term Plan, Operative District Plan and Proposed District Plan.

25. It is noted that the condition of the exterior of the building as a whole is of a lower standard compared to the other houses in the group. It is important that the integrity of the Hen and Chickens are maintained because of their significance and collective value in the New Plymouth District.
26. The issue of exterior painting has been discussed with Mr Kriesler. He intends to do this in the future but wishes to address the most pressing issue first, that being the roof and guttering. It is likely that he will make an application for exterior painting to the next funding round opening in March 2023.
27. A condition of the Built Heritage Protection Fund is that only one application per item will be accepted every three years. However, given that Mr Kreisler is focussing on the most pressing issue first, it is recommended that any future application within the next three years be considered favourably. The collective qualities of the Hen and Chickens and their settings are a rare asset in the New Plymouth District and it is important that all are maintained for current and future generations to enjoy.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT AND CONSIDERATIONS

28. There are no impacts on climate change adaptation and mitigation regarding this matter.

NEXT STEPS

29. If the grant is approved the owner will have until 31 December 2023 to uplift the grant.

SIGNIFICANCE AND ENGAGEMENT

30. In accordance with Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, this matter has been assessed as being of some importance because it is crucial to retain the building and ensure it is actively used and maintained. Evidence of heritage in our community provides us with a sense of time, of where we have been and where we are now, and gives us the opportunity to shape our future. A grant
-

will not only support Mr Kreisler but will contribute to the social, cultural and economic needs of current and future generations.

31. Council is required under section 6 (f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance. Accordingly, Council has identified heritage items and the Built Heritage Protection Fund helps to financially assist private landowners so that these aspects of our heritage and culture remain to be appreciated by current and future generations.

OPTIONS

Option 1 Approve funding

Financial and Resourcing Implications

32. The Built Heritage Protection Fund is allocated \$150,000 a year and rolls over if it is unspent. It currently has a balance of \$97,214.81. Applications under \$10,000 can be considered under delegated authority whereas applications over \$10,000 must be considered by the Community Funding Investment Committee.
33. In the past five years, grants over \$10,000 have been given to these buildings:
- a) Val Deakin Dance Centre \$15,000;
 - b) Red Post Building \$50,000;
 - c) Colliers Building \$18,000;
 - d) St Andrew's Presbyterian Church \$25,000;
 - e) White Hart Hotel \$25,000;
 - f) St Aubyn Chambers \$50,000;
 - g) ANZ Bank \$25,000;
 - h) King's Building \$25,000; and
 - i) St Mary's Vicarage \$75,000.
34. All of these buildings are Category A heritage buildings except for the Val Deakin Dance Centre which is a Category B.
-

Risk Analysis

35. It is considered that there are no risks associated with granting funding. Council is required to protect historic heritage as a matter of national importance and has established a Built Heritage Protection Fund aimed at supporting private landowners of heritage items that are listed in the District Plan. This helps Council to meet its obligations to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage in the New Plymouth District.

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

36. This option promotes all of the Community Outcomes:
- a) Partnerships – It will build a partnership between a private landowner and Council to improve public good outcomes;
 - b) Delivery – It will assist the applicant to tenant the building whilst maintaining its heritage values;
 - c) Community – It will provide a heritage experience for people visiting or passing by the building; it will contribute to a strong and connected community through the provision of liveable environments; and it will ensure that the highly-regarded Taranaki lifestyle is maintained, supported by our unique rich culture and history;
 - d) Sustainability – It will protect heritage for current and future generations; and
 - e) Prosperity – It will support the economy through the use of local trades.

Statutory Responsibilities

37. Council is required under section 6 (f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance. This option is in alignment with this legal requirement.

Consistency with Policies and Plans

38. This option aligns with the following:
- a) New Plymouth District Blueprint – It meets the Communities key direction about strengthening and connecting local communities and it meets the Talent key direction about growing and diversifying new economies that attract and retain entrepreneurs, talented workers and visitors;
-

- b) Annual Plan/Long Term Plan – Funding is set aside to assist with maintaining heritage buildings and items;
- c) Operative District Plan – Issue 11 identifies the degradation of heritage resources as a resource management issue, the building is identified in Appendix 8 of this plan and is subject to provisions to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage; and
- d) Proposed District Plan – The strategic direction in the Proposed District Plan recognises that heritage and cultural values contribute to the district’s sense of place and identity which require protection. The building is identified in SCHED1 – Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items of this plan and is subject to provisions to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage.

Participation by Māori

- 39. This option does not relate to tangata whenua participation in Council’s decision-making process because the funding helps maintain an existing building within the parameters set in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.

Community Views and Preferences

- 40. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga made a submission to the Proposed District Plan seeking that the Hen and Chickens be added as a heritage character area. Two of the “chicken” owners made a further submission supporting this concept. Heritage Taranaki, a local advocacy group, also made a submission to the Proposed District Plan seeking that areas recognised by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, including the Hen and Chickens, be listed. A recommendation was made to the Hearings Panel that the Pendarves Street heritage area, which includes the Hen and Chickens, be further investigated to determine its appropriateness for listing as a heritage character area. Decisions on submissions are expected to be released early next year.

Advantages and Disadvantages

- 41. An advantage of this option is that it will assist in protecting and maintaining heritage for current and future generations.

**Option 2
Do not approve funding**

Financial and Resourcing Implications

- 42. There will be no budgetary or resource implications.
-

Risk Analysis

43. Council's reputation is at risk if it does not provide some level of funding and if the deteriorating roof compromises the integrity of the building. This would fail to meet the strategic approach in the Operative and Proposed District Plans that aims to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage.

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

44. This option will not promote any of the Community Outcomes:
- a) Partnerships – It will not build a partnership between a private landowner and Council to improve public good outcomes;
 - b) Delivery – It will not assist the applicant to tenant the building whilst maintaining its heritage values;
 - c) Community – It will not provide a heritage experience for people visiting or passing by the building; it will not contribute to a strong and connected community through the provision of liveable environments; and it will not ensure that the highly-regarded Taranaki lifestyle is maintained, supported by our unique rich culture and history;
 - d) Sustainability – It will not protect heritage for current and future generations; and
 - e) Prosperity – It will not support the economy through the use of local trades.

Statutory Responsibilities

45. Council is required under section 6 (f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance. This option is not in alignment with this legal requirement.

Consistency with Policies and Plans

46. This option is inconsistent with the following:
- a) New Plymouth District Blueprint – It will not meet the Communities key direction about strengthening and connecting local communities and it will not meet the Talent key direction about growing and diversifying new economies that attract and retain entrepreneurs, talented workers and visitors;
 - b) Annual Plan/Long Term Plan – Funding is set aside to assist with maintaining heritage buildings and items;
-

- c) Operative District Plan – Issue 11 identifies the degradation of heritage resources as a resource management issue. The building is identified in Appendix 8 of this plan and is subject to provisions to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage; and
- d) Proposed District Plan – The strategic direction in the Proposed District Plan recognises that heritage and cultural values contribute to the district’s sense of place and identity which require protection. The building is identified in SCHED1 – Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items and is subject to provisions to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage.

Participation by Māori

- 47. This option does not relate to tangata whenua participation in Council’s decision-making process because the funding helps maintain an existing building within the parameters set in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.

Community Views and Preferences

- 48. This option will not align with the views and preferences of the community. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, two of the “chicken” owners and Heritage Taranaki seek that the Hen and Chickens be added as a heritage character area in the Proposed District Plan. A recommendation was made to the Hearings Panel that the Pendarves Street heritage area, which includes the Hen and Chickens, be further investigated to determine its appropriateness for listing as a heritage character area. Decisions on submissions are expected to be released early next year.

Advantages and Disadvantages

- 49. Council already has a Built Heritage Protection Fund so a disadvantage of this option is that it will be going against its own policy resulting in a negative result for the district. The only advantage is that money could be saved for future heritage applications.

Recommended Option

This report recommends **Option 1**: Approve funding for addressing the matter.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Council Heritage Record for 90 Pendarves Street, New Plymouth
(ECM8814914)

Appendix 2 Photos Showing Condition of Roof at 90 Pendarves Street, New Plymouth
(ECM8818499)

Report Details

Prepared By:	Lauren O'Byrne (Senior Planning Adviser)
Team:	District Planning
Approved By:	Callum Williamson (Community Partnerships Lead)
Ward/Community:	City Ward
Date:	5 September 2022
File Reference:	ECM8814791

-----*End of Report*-----

Heritage Buildings and Items Report

Site ID: 19

Building/Site Name: House (90 Pendarves Street, New Plymouth)

Address: 90 Pendarves Street NEW PLYMOUTH 4310

Legal Description: SEC 1646 NEW PLYMOUTH TN

Category: A

District Plan Item: 19

District Plan Map No: C25

Heritage New Zealand Reference: 7202

Heritage New Zealand Category:



Date of Construction: Circa 1864

Style: Victorian cottage

Materials: Board & batten, corrugated iron roof.

Integrity: Very Good

Condition: Very Good

Architect:

Engineer:

Builder:

Significant Elements:

History: One of the "Chickens" houses in Pendarves Street built for the Hirst children by Thomas and Grace Hirst who lived in "Willowfield", the "Hen" of "Hen and Chickens" houses.

Themes in History:

Reference Sources: Moorhead M Tales of Old North Taranaki 1991; Taranaki Daily News July 1992; Bibliography files - Taranaki Museum.

Statement of Significance: This house is associated with the Hirst family; is an important element in the community's consciousness; has aesthetic appeal; has architectural merit, belongs to an important group of buildings and is one of the best examples of its type in the New Plymouth district; belongs to a significant architectural period in the New Plymouth district, that of the Victorian-Edwardian era; is well-crafted and demonstrates technical accomplishment; has a good level of integrity; has a setting which contributes to its cultural heritage value and has architectural, historical, social and townscape value for present and future generations.

Disclaimer: New Plymouth District Council does not warrant the accuracy or completeness in this report. Please note that the information in this report may be updated subsequent to the date it was printed.

APPENDIX 2: PHOTOS SHOWING CONDITION OF ROOF AT 90 PENDARVES STREET, NEW PLYMOUTH





**EXTERIOR PAINTING OF SACRED HEART CATHOLIC CHURCH,
INCLUDING THE PARISH CENTRE, AT 21 STANDISH STREET,
INGLEWOOD**

MATTER

1. The matter for consideration by Council is the allocation of funding from the Built Heritage Protection Fund to contribute to the exterior painting of Sacred Heart Catholic Church, including the parish centre, at 21 Standish Street, Inglewood.

RECOMMENDATION FOR CONSIDERATION

That, having considered all matters raised in the report, Council grants Sacred Heart Parish, Inglewood \$25,000 excluding GST to contribute to the exterior painting of Sacred Heart Catholic Church, including the parish centre, at 21 Standish Street, Inglewood subject to the following conditions:

- a) **The exterior of the buildings be painted "like for like" using the existing colours;**
- b) **The work is to be completed to the satisfaction of Council prior to the release of any funds;**
- c) **The funding be available until 31 December 2023;**
- d) **If the work is not completed to Council's satisfaction and the grant not paid by that date, the grant shall cease to be available under this decision unless applications for time extensions are made to, and approved by, the Manager Planning or nominee; and**
- e) **Upon release of funding, a plaque provided by Council acknowledging the financial contribution by the fund shall be fixed and displayed to the exterior or interior of the building in a position viewable by those using or visiting the building.**

COMPLIANCE	
Significance	This matter is assessed as being of some importance.
Options	This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for addressing the matter: 1. Approve funding. 2. Do not approve funding.
Affected persons	The persons who are affected by or interested in this matter include Sacred Heart Parish, surrounding property owners, Heritage Taranaki and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
Recommendation	This report recommends Option 1 for addressing the matter.
Long-Term Plan / Annual Plan Implications	No.
Significant Policy and Plan Inconsistencies	No.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Built Heritage Protection Fund was established by Council to help private landowners manage, maintain and preserve the heritage values of their properties. It provides a partial contribution towards the cost of a specific heritage project or work.
3. A grant from the Built Heritage Protection Fund is being sought by Sacred Heart Parish, Inglewood to contribute to exterior painting of the church and parish centre. Based on the information provided, the cost is estimated to be approximately \$70,000 – \$80,000 including GST.
4. It is recommended that Council grant funding in order to maintain the integrity of the buildings. The funding will help prevent heritage from being lost to the community and ensure that heritage is actively used and maintained.

BACKGROUND

Site Significance

5. The Operative District Plan classifies more than 800 heritage buildings, items and areas in the New Plymouth district into three categories:

Category A: Buildings, items and areas of great cultural heritage value (103 in total);

Category B: Buildings, items and areas of considerable heritage value (560 in total); and

Category C: Buildings, items and areas of some heritage value (140 in total).

Only Category A's are subject to rules, whereas Category B's and C's are not.

6. The church is identified as a Category A in the Operative District Plan. The schedule of Category A heritage buildings and items was rolled over into the Proposed District Plan that was notified in September 2019, so the church continues to be subject to heritage protection. Council's heritage record for the church is attached as Appendix 1.
7. The church is registered on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero, a national advocacy and information tool rather than a regulatory tool.
8. The church was built in 1889 in the English Gothic style. It has a weatherboard exterior with a corrugated iron roof. The church plays an important role in New Plymouth's sense of place by contributing significant aesthetic, architectural, historical, spiritual and townscape value.
9. The church is immediately adjacent the parish centre and they are connected by a covered walkway with glass walls. This extract from the website of DLA Architects Ltd provides background about redevelopment of the church and the new parish centre:

"The original Sacred Heart Church in Inglewood was built in 1899. Since that time, there had been two significant alterations but it had largely remained unchanged since 1957. A Conservation Plan was commissioned and prepared by Salmond Reed Architects in 2009. In response to this Conservation Plan, DLA were engaged to provide a concept plan to the Parish which would meet the needs of the modern liturgy, whilst being respectful to the existing building, its history and context. The design that was put forward included minor alterations to the existing Church, which were in keeping with the original aesthetic of the church. Alterations to the existing sanctuary were also incorporated to provide a Blessed Sacrament Chapel and allow the Sanctuary to move forward into the main body of the Church. In addition to the alterations of the existing church, DLA designed a new Parish Hall Centre to incorporate its other activities, which were previously taking place in four separate buildings. A new Church Hall with office, meeting and toilet facilities were provided within the new building, ensuring that not only were the philosophies of the new Liturgy regarding entry and exit to the Church including 'gathering' activities following Mass achieved, but also the unification of all parish activities into one building."

10. The setting of heritage items is important. This is the area surrounding the item that helps retain and interpret its heritage significance. It includes features such as buildings, structures (e.g. fences, walls and gates), gardens, lawns, mature trees, landscaping, walkways, paths, paving and open space.
11. Whilst the parish centre is not regulated as an individual heritage item in the Operative and Proposed District Plans, it does form part of the mapped extent for the church that has been recommended to the Hearings Panel for inclusion in the Proposed District Plan. This is shown in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1: Extent Recommended to Hearings Panel for Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Inglewood

Current Usage

12. Mass is held within the church four times a week. The average count on a Sunday is 100 people.

Proposed Works

13. The owner, Sacred Heart Parish, Inglewood, plans to clean, sand, prime and paint all four external sides of the church, including the parish centre.
14. The buildings will be painted "like for like" using the existing colours.

15. The proposed works do not trigger resource consent because repainting is considered maintenance and repair and the existing form, proportions, finishes and characteristics of the buildings will be retained.
16. The quotes supplied are as follows (reported with GST included):
 - a) Spurdle Painting and Decorating (includes washing down, sanding, priming bare patches and two top coats of paint) - \$68,770.00 (labour, paint and materials); and
 - b) Greg Brown 2018 Limited (includes applying a pre-paint solution, waterblast, sand and spot prime bare timber and two coats of paint) - \$83,110.50 (materials, labour and equipment).
17. Sacred Heart Parish, Inglewood has advised that because of the size of the church, particularly the height, their parishioners cannot paint the exterior so they need professional assistance to do this.
18. Based on the information provided, the cost is estimated to be approximately \$70,000 – \$80,000 including GST.
19. Sacred Heart Parish, Inglewood seeks \$68,770 from the Built Heritage Protection Fund. The remaining balance will be funded by donations from parishioners.
20. The amount recommended from the Built Heritage Protection Fund is \$25,000 excluding GST, noting that recommendations are generally around a quarter to a third of the total cost of the work.

Assessment

21. Using the assessment criteria and various matters set out in Appendix One of the Community Investment Policy Funding Schedules, an item must score 50 points or more to be considered for assistance.
 22. If an application meets the minimum points required, various matters are taken into account such as significance of the item from a heritage point of view, the degree to which the work is necessary, and the degree to which the work aligns with Council strategies, policies and plans.
-

Assessment Criteria

23. The church has been assessed as follows:

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	POINTS	SCORE
<i>Significance of item from a heritage point of view</i>	Category A – 20	20
	Category B – 10	
	Category C – 5	
<i>Degree to which the proposed work is necessary to ensure the maintenance or preservation of the item</i>	Essential work – 20 (i.e. unless work carried out future integrity of item in doubt, e.g. replace leaking roof, repiling, replacing rotten timbers, etc.)	10
	Desirable work – 10 (regular/ongoing maintenance required to keep item in good order, e.g. repainting)	
<i>Degree of public access or use</i>	High degree of public access – 20	10
	Medium degree of public access – 10	
	Low degree of public access – 5	
	No public access – 0	
<i>Level of prominence</i>	Located in CBD/Commercial Centre – 20	10
	Located on high volume traffic road – 10	
	Located on low volume traffic road – 5	
<i>Total</i>	Maximum total – 80	50

Various Matters

24. The church has been assessed as follows:

VARIOUS MATTERS
<p><i>The significance of the item from a heritage point of view</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in Operative District Plan – Category A (Site ID 45). • Listed in Proposed District Plan – SCHED1 (Site ID 45). • Listed on New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (ref 874, cat 2).
<p><i>The degree to which the work is necessary to ensure the sustainable management, maintenance, or preservation of the item</i></p> <p>A site visit was undertaken by Senior Planning Adviser Lauren O’Byrne on 12 August 2022 where it was observed that the church looks tired in places and would benefit from a clean. Lichen and general grime is present, particularly on the window arches and ledges. The paint has bubbled, cracked and peeled in places. Rust drips from nails are present. The parish centre is in better condition given it is a newer building but it does show signs of wear and tear. Photos showing the condition of the church are attached as Appendix 2.</p>
<p><i>Whether funding from other agencies is being sought for the item</i></p> <p>No funding is being sought from other agencies.</p>
<p><i>The degree to which the work is in accordance with the principles of the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value</i></p> <p>The degrees of intervention for conservation purposes are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Preservation, through stabilisation, maintenance or repair; ii) Restoration, through reassembly, reinstatement or removal; iii) Reconstruction; and iv) Adaptation. <p>The proposed works align with the Preservation degree of intervention.</p>
<p><i>The amount of money in the fund and the need for equitable distribution</i></p> <p>The current balance is \$97,214.81.</p>
<p><i>Whether the item has received funding previously or not</i></p> <p>The item has not received funding previously.</p>
<p><i>The responsibilities of other statutory bodies or organisations in protecting or maintaining the item</i></p> <p>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga made a submission to the Proposed District Plan supporting the inclusion of a schedule for heritage buildings and items as well as information in it about items on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero.</p>

The prominence of the item, i.e. its location and number of viewers

The church is located on the corner of Carrington and Standish Streets. It contributes positively to the streetscape due to its size and design, as well as its placement on the lot meaning that there is spaciousness around it. It is passed by a considerable number of motorists and pedestrians every day. This includes those on their way to TET Stadium & Events Centre located at the end of Standish Street, home of Inglewood United Rugby Football Club, Inglewood and Taranaki Athletics.

The degree to which the work aligns with Council strategies, policies and plans

The work is consistent with the New Plymouth District Blueprint, Annual/Long Term Plan, Operative District Plan and Proposed District Plan.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT AND CONSIDERATIONS

25. There are no impacts on climate change adaptation and mitigation regarding this matter.

NEXT STEPS

26. If the grant is approved the owner will have until 31 December 2023 to uplift the grant.

SIGNIFICANCE AND ENGAGEMENT

27. In accordance with Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, this matter has been assessed as being of some importance because it is crucial to retain the buildings and ensure they are actively used and maintained. Evidence of heritage in our community provides us with a sense of time, of where we have been and where we are now, and gives us the opportunity to shape our future. A grant will not only support Sacred Heart Parish, Inglewood but will contribute to the social, cultural and economic needs of current and future generations.
28. Council is required under section 6 (f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance. Accordingly, Council has identified heritage items and the Built Heritage Protection Fund helps to financially assist private landowners so that these aspects of our heritage and culture remain to be appreciated by current and future generations.

OPTIONS

Option 1 Approve funding

Financial and Resourcing Implications

29. The Built Heritage Protection Fund is allocated \$150,000 a year and rolls over if it is unspent. It currently has a balance of \$97,214.81. Applications under \$10,000 can be considered under delegated authority whereas applications over \$10,000 must be considered by the Community Funding Investment Committee.
30. In the past five years, grants over \$10,000 have been given to these buildings:
- a) Val Deakin Dance Centre \$15,000;
 - b) Red Post Building \$50,000;
 - c) Colliers Building \$18,000;
 - d) St Andrew's Presbyterian Church \$25,000;
 - e) White Hart Hotel \$25,000;
 - f) St Aubyn Chambers \$50,000;
 - g) ANZ Bank \$25,000;
 - h) King's Building \$25,000; and
 - i) St Mary's Vicarage \$75,000.
31. All of these buildings are Category A heritage buildings except for the Val Deakin Dance Centre which is a Category B.

Risk Analysis

32. It is considered that there are no risks associated with granting funding. Council is required to protect historic heritage as a matter of national importance and has established a Built Heritage Protection Fund aimed at supporting private landowners of heritage items that are listed in the District Plan. This helps Council to meet its obligations to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage in the New Plymouth District.
-

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

33. This option promotes all of the Community Outcomes:
- a) Partnerships – It will build a partnership between Sacred Heart Parish, Inglewood and Council to improve public good outcomes;
 - b) Delivery – It will assist the applicant to continue to utilise the buildings whilst maintaining their heritage values;
 - c) Community – It will provide a heritage experience for people visiting or passing by the buildings; it will contribute to a strong and connected community through the provision of liveable environments; and it will ensure that the highly-regarded Taranaki lifestyle is maintained, supported by our unique rich culture and history;
 - d) Sustainability – It will protect heritage for current and future generations; and
 - e) Prosperity – It will support the economy through the use of local trades.

Statutory Responsibilities

34. Council is required under section 6 (f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance. This option is in alignment with this legal requirement.

Consistency with Policies and Plans

35. This option aligns with the following:
- a) New Plymouth District Blueprint – It meets the Communities key direction about strengthening and connecting local communities and it meets the Talent key direction about growing and diversifying new economies that attract and retain entrepreneurs, talented workers and visitors;
 - b) Annual Plan/Long Term Plan – Funding is set aside to assist with maintaining heritage buildings and items;
 - c) Operative District Plan – Issue 11 identifies the degradation of heritage resources as a resource management issue, the church is identified in Appendix 8 of this plan and is subject to provisions to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage; and
-

- d) Proposed District Plan – The strategic direction in the Proposed District Plan recognises that heritage and cultural values contribute to the district’s sense of place and identity which require protection. The church is identified in SCHED1 – Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items of this plan and is subject to provisions to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage.

Participation by Māori

36. This option does not relate to tangata whenua participation in Council’s decision-making process because the funding helps maintain an existing building within the parameters set in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.

Community Views and Preferences

37. Submissions were made to the Proposed District Plan regarding SCHED1- Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items (which includes Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Inglewood). Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga supports having a schedule as well as information in it about items on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (which includes Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Inglewood). Sarah Buist, Hamish Crimp and Heritage Taranaki support the items listed in the schedule but seek that more items be listed. A recommendation was made to the Hearings Panel that the schedule be retained as notified but that if any buildings and items are added, a full study would need to be undertaken first requiring funding as part of the Long Term Plan process, the establishment of a methodology for identifying sites, site visits, heritage assessments, consultation with affected landowners and public notification of a variation/plan change. Decisions on submissions are expected to be released early next year.

Advantages and Disadvantages

38. An advantage of this option is that it will assist in protecting and maintaining heritage for current and future generations.

**Option 2
Do not approve funding**

Financial and Resourcing Implications

39. There will be no budgetary or resource implications.

Risk Analysis

40. Council’s reputation is at risk if it does not provide some level of funding and if the deteriorating exterior compromises the integrity of the church. This would fail to meet the strategic approach in the Operative and Proposed District Plans that aims to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage.
-

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

41. This option will not promote any of the Community Outcomes:
- a) Partnerships – It will not build a partnership between Sacred Heart Parish, Inglewood and Council to improve public good outcomes;
 - b) Delivery – It will not assist the applicant to continue to utilise the buildings whilst maintaining their heritage values;
 - c) Community – It will not provide a heritage experience for people visiting or passing by the buildings; it will not contribute to a strong and connected community through the provision of liveable environments; and it will not ensure that the highly-regarded Taranaki lifestyle is maintained, supported by our unique rich culture and history;
 - d) Sustainability – It will not protect heritage for current and future generations; and
 - e) Prosperity – It will not support the economy through the use of local trades.

Statutory Responsibilities

42. Council is required under section 6 (f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance. This option is not in alignment with this legal requirement.

Consistency with Policies and Plans

43. This option is inconsistent with the following:
- a) New Plymouth District Blueprint – It will not meet the Communities key direction about strengthening and connecting local communities and it will not meet the Talent key direction about growing and diversifying new economies that attract and retain entrepreneurs, talented workers and visitors;
 - b) Annual Plan/Long Term Plan – Funding is set aside to assist with maintaining heritage buildings and items;
 - c) Operative District Plan – Issue 11 identifies the degradation of heritage resources as a resource management issue. The church is identified in Appendix 8 of this plan and is subject to provisions to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage; and
-

- d) Proposed District Plan – The strategic direction in the Proposed District Plan recognises that heritage and cultural values contribute to the district’s sense of place and identity which require protection. The church is identified in SCHED1 – Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items and is subject to provisions to recognise, protect and maintain historic heritage.

Participation by Māori

44. This option does not relate to tangata whenua participation in Council’s decision-making process because the funding helps maintain existing buildings within the parameters set in the Operative and Proposed District Plans.

Community Views and Preferences

45. This option will not align with the views and preferences of the community. Submissions were made to the Proposed District Plan supporting SCHED1- Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items (which includes Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Inglewood). A recommendation was made to the Hearings Panel that the schedule be retained as notified but that if any buildings and items are added, a full study would need to be undertaken first. Decisions on submissions are expected to be released early next year.

Advantages and Disadvantages

46. Council already has a Built Heritage Protection Fund so a disadvantage of this option is that it will be going against its own policy resulting in a negative result for the district. The only advantage is that money could be saved for future heritage applications.

Recommended Option

This report recommends **Option 1**: Approve funding for addressing the matter.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Council Heritage Record for Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Inglewood (ECM8818728)

Appendix 2 Photos Showing Condition of Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Inglewood (ECM8818772)

Report Details

Prepared By:	Lauren O'Byrne (Senior Planning Adviser)
Team:	District Planning
Approved By:	Callum Williamson (Community Partnerships Lead)
Ward/Community:	City Ward
Date:	5 September 2022
File Reference:	ECM8818621

-----*End of Report*-----

Heritage Buildings and Items Report

Site ID: 45

Building/Site Name: Sacred Heart Catholic Church

Address: 21 Standish Street INGLEWOOD 4330

Legal Description: Lot 1 DP 445817

Category: A

District Plan Item: 45

District Plan Map No: A51

Heritage New Zealand Reference: 874

Heritage New Zealand Category: 2



Date of Construction: 1899

Style: English Gothic

Materials: Timber weatherboard, corrugated iron roof

Integrity: Very Good

Condition: Very Good

Architect:

Engineer:

Builder:

Significant Elements: Lancet windows, buttresses. Interior

History: 1895 small band of Polish Catholic settlers arrived on ship Fritz Reuter. Landed at Hokitika but travelled to Inglewood. Built church.

Themes in History: Religion, immigration

Reference Sources:

Statement of Significance: This church has exceptionally important historical associations; is an important element in the community's consciousness; is a physical landmark; has symbolic value; has considerable aesthetic appeal; has considerable architectural merit; demonstrates a high quality of design and level of craftsmanship and technical accomplishment; and demonstrates an important application and high quality of building materials; has a high level of integrity; has a setting which adds to its cultural heritage value and has aesthetic, architectural, historical, spiritual and townscape value for present and future generations.

Disclaimer: New Plymouth District Council does not warrant the accuracy or completeness in this report. Please note that the information in this report may be updated subsequent to the date it was printed.

APPENDIX 2: PHOTOS SHOWING CONDITION OF EXTERIOR OF SACRED HEART CATHOLIC CHURCH, INGLEWOOD





COMMUNITY FUNDING REPORT 2022/23

MATTER

1. The matter for consideration by the Council is to decide, from the organisations that have applied for a Community Services and Programmes Grant, Strategic Community Partnerships Grant and the Community Events Grant, which to support, and for what funding amount.

RECOMMENDATION FOR CONSIDERATION

That having considered all matters raised in the report, Council decides which organisations to allocate funding to.

COMPLIANCE	
Significance	This matter is assessed as being of some importance
Options	This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for addressing the matter: 1. Decide which organisations to allocate funding to; or 2. Decide not to allocate funding.
Affected persons	The persons who are affected by or interested in this matter are community groups which rely on funding and the members of the community that benefit directly and indirectly from these organisations.
Recommendation	This report recommends option 1 for addressing the matter.
Long-Term Plan / Annual Plan Implications	No
Significant Policy and Plan Inconsistencies	No

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This report presents the organisations that have applied for Community Services and Programmes Grant, Strategic Community Partnerships Grant and the Community Events Grant, and requires Council to determine which organisations to allocate funding to.
-

3. The Long-Term Plan 2021-2031 allocates \$591,576 of funding in the 2022/23 financial year across three funding schemes. The schemes are Strategic Community Partnerships Grant (multi-year grants), Community Services and Programmes Grant (multi-year grants) and Community Events Grant (annual grants).
 4. During the previous funding round of 2020/21, the Community Funding Investment Committee (the Committee) agreed to carry over any unspent budget into the 2021/22 funding round. The total unspent budget for the last financial year was \$2,631.
 5. Accounting for current committed funds to existing Strategic Community Partnership Grants of \$177,000 the total remaining budget for allocation is \$417,207. Existing Strategic Community Partnerships Grant recipients are found as Appendix 1.
 6. In the recent review of the Community Funding Investment Policy, Council ring-fenced \$70,000 annually for the Community Events Grant, of which \$50,000 will be distributed in this round.
 7. This leaves \$347,207 for distribution for the Strategic Community Partnerships Grant and Community Services and Programmes Grant.
 8. Applications Summary:
 - a) The Strategic Community Partnerships Grant had a total of 10 eligible applications.
 - b) The Community Services and Programmes Grant had a total of 47 eligible applications.
 - c) The Community Events Grant had a total of nine eligible applications.
 9. Total funding sought by applicants (this information is in further detail in Appendix 2):
 - a) The 10 applications for the Strategic Community Partnerships Grant are seeking a cumulative total of \$1,240,000 over three years. The total amount of eligible funding over three years (costs that are able to be considered by the funding committee) sought is \$1,210,000. The total amount applicants are eligible for in the 2022/23 year is \$430,000.
 - b) The remaining 47 eligible applications for the Community Services and Programmes Grant are seeking a cumulative total of \$1,862,391 over three years. The total amount applicants are eligible for in the 2022/23 year is \$825,483.
-

- c) The remaining nine applicants for the Community Events Grant are seeking a cumulative total of \$89,513 and are eligible for a total amount of \$89,513.

80 applications received in total

- 10. Of these 80 applications, nine were withdrawn by council officers and transferred to another grant as they aligned with the criteria for another grant. A further three applications have been declined as they do not meet the criteria set out under the Community Funding Investment Policy.
- 11. The remaining 66 applications are seeking a total of \$1,344,996 in the 2022/23 financial year and a total of \$2,902,804 over three years (2022/2023, 2023/2024 and 2024/2025 financial years).

BACKGROUND

- 12. The Committee has delegated authority to allocate grants on behalf of the Council within the parameters of the Community Funding Investment Policy.
- 13. Under the Community Funding Investment Policy, funding is provided to support community-based agencies/organisations that provide services or undertake projects that benefit the wider community. The intent of the Community Funding Investment Policy is to provide investment into the community through the allocation of grants to support community outcomes and stated strategic priorities.

Budget for 2022/23 is \$417,207

- 14. This figure is the remaining amount from the following:
 - a) total budget for the 2022/23 financial year is \$591,576
 - b) plus unspent budget of \$2,631 in 2021/22 that was carried forward;
 - c) less funds already committed through previous Strategic Community Partnership Grants of \$177,000;
 - d) leaving a total amount of \$417,207 to allocate.

NEXT STEPS

- 15. Once funding decisions have been made, Council Officers will arrange funding agreements with recipients and arrange payments of the grants.
-

SIGNIFICANCE AND ENGAGEMENT

16. In accordance with the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, this matter has been assessed as being of some importance. Community Funding Investment Grants are rates funds allocated within the Long-Term Plan 2021-2031 for investment in the community. Grants are administered through the Community Funding Investment Policy under the Committee's delegated authority.

OPTIONS

Decision One – allocation of funding

Option 1

Decide which organisations to allocate funding to

Financial and Resourcing Implications

17. This funding has been budgeted for and approved through the Long-Term Plan 2021-2031.

Risk Analysis

18. There is a risk of funds being misappropriated by community organisations, however this is considered to be low. Council officers complete funding agreements with the recipients and all funding recipients are expected to complete a satisfactory acquittal form at the end of the funding period.

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

19. Applications are assessed and funded based on their alignment to Council outcomes and strategic priorities.

Statutory Responsibilities

20. None.

Consistency with Policies and Plans

21. This decision will be consistent with the Community Funding Investment Policy and also the Long-Term Plan 2021-2031.

Participation by Māori

22. Community groups and organisations that support iwi, hapū and whanau, including wider Māori communities have been given an opportunity to apply for funding through this avenue. Local hapū and iwi were contacted directly via email about all of the grants.
-

Community Views and Preferences

23. Funding decisions made and the Community Funding Investment Policy are in line with feedback from the wider community.

Advantages and Disadvantages

24. Funding will be allocated on how the initiatives meet funding criteria and contribute towards community outcomes.

Option 2
Decide not to allocate funding

Financial and Resourcing Implications

25. Not allocating funding would be in contradiction to the Long-Term Plan 2021-2031.

Risk Analysis

26. There is a perception risk that we are seen to be unsupportive of community groups, considering the current environment for particular community groups where there are funding gaps identified.

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

27. There would be no promotion or support of community outcomes.

Statutory Responsibilities

28. None.

Consistency with Policies and Plans

29. This decision would be inconsistent with the Long-Term Plan 2021-2031.

Participation by Māori

30. Community groups and organisations that support iwi, hapū and whanau, including wider Māori communities have been given an opportunity to apply for funding through this avenue. Local hapū and iwi were contacted directly via email about all of the grants.

Community Views and Preferences

31. Community organisations would be in opposition towards no grants being awarded, as projects would be unable to be completed.
-

Advantages and Disadvantages

32. The disadvantage is that the requirements of the Long-Term Plan 2021-2031 would not be met, and community organisations would not be able to provide programmes or services to meet community needs..

Recommended Options

This report recommends Option 1: decide which organisations to allocate funding to, to address the matter.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Current Strategic Partnerships (ECM8830301)

Appendix 2 Community Investment Funding Applications 2022/23 (ECM8831255)

Report Details

Prepared By: Kate Duncan
Team: Community Partnerships Team
Approved By: Callum Williamson
Date: 7/09/2022
File Reference: EMC8831865

-----*End of Report*-----

Appendix 1:

Current Strategic Council Community Partnerships

Organisation	Funding Amount	Number of years left:
Taranaki Arts Festival Trust	\$100,000	Nil (Last year of funding)
Taranaki Garden Trust Incorporated	\$10,000	Nil (Last year of funding)
New Plymouth Mountain Bikers Incorporated	\$10,000	Nil (Last year of funding)
Taranaki Retreat Trust	\$25,000	Nil (Last year of funding)

Appendix 2: Community Investment Funding Applications 2022/23**Strategic Community Partnerships Grant Applications 2022/23:**

Application #	Applicant:	Reason for funding-	Total Asking amount:	Year 1 \$	Year 2 \$	Year 3\$	Total Eligible amount:
SCPG001	Taranaki Environmental Education Trust- Sustainable Taranaki	Programme Cost	\$150,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$150,000
SCPG002	Volunteering New Plymouth Trust	Operational Costs	\$150,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$150,000
SCPG004	New Plymouth Injury Safe	Operational Costs	\$150,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$150,000
SCPG006	Life Education Trust	Operational Costs	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$90,000
SCPG007	Toimata Foundation	Programme Cost	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$75,000
SCPG012	East Taranaki Environmental Trust	Programme cost	\$150,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$150,000
SCPG013	New Plymouth Operatic Society	Operational Costs	\$180,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$150,000
SCPG014	WISE Charitable Trust	Programme Cost	\$45,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$45,000

SCPG015	Conductive Education Taranaki	Operational Costs	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$100,000
SCPG016	Taranaki Futures Trust Inc	Operational Costs	\$150,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$150,000
Totals:			\$1,240,000	\$430,000	\$430,000	\$380,000	\$1,210,000

Community Services and Programs Grant Applications 2022/23

Application #	Applicant:	Reason for Funding	Total Amount Being Sought:	Year 1 \$	Year 2 \$	Year 3\$	Total Eligible amount:
CSPG002	The Young Men's Christian Association of Taranaki Inc	Operational Costs	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
CSPG003	Moraka Menstrual Cups	Project Costs	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
CSPG004	Taranaki Restorative Justice Trust	Project Costs	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
CSPG005	The North Taranaki Neighbourhood Support Trust	Operational Costs	\$20,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
CSPG006	Hearing Dogs for Deaf People NZ	Operational Costs	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$ 5,000	\$15,000
CSPG007	Dress for Success New Plymouth	Operational Costs	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
CSPG008	East End Surf Lifesaving Club	Operational Costs	\$14,500	\$14,500	\$0	\$0	\$14,500
CSPG010	Waitara Foodbank Pataka Kai	Operational Costs	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$75,000
CSPG011	Taranaki ADHD Charitable Trust	Operational Costs	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$72,500

CSPG012	Flourish Taranaki Community Trust	Operational Costs	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$0	\$0	\$35,000
CSPG013	New Plymouth Positive Ageing Trust	Operational Costs	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,000
CSPG014	Big Brothers Big Sisters of Taranaki	Operational Costs	\$30,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
CSPG015	Taranaki Gifted Community Trust	Operational Costs	\$11,356	\$ 5,728	\$5,628	\$0	\$11,356
CSPG016	Te Puna Trust	Operational costs	\$30,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
CSPG017	Taranaki Disability Information Centre Trust	Operational Costs	\$11,100	\$11,100	\$0	\$0	\$11,100
CSPG019	Okato and District Historical Society Inc.	Operational/Project Costs	\$7,880	\$ 2,880	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$7,880
CSPG020	New Plymouth Group Riding for the Disabled	Operational Costs	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,000
CSPG021	New Plymouth Bike Kitchen	Operational Costs	\$955	\$955	\$0	\$0	\$955
CSPG022	Pregnancy Help Taranaki	Operational Costs	\$21,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$21,000
CSPG024	Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind	Operational Costs	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$0	\$7,000

CSPG025	Horses Helping Humans Taranaki	Operational/Project Costs	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$90,000
CSPG026	Bellyful New Plymouth	Operational Costs	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,000
CSPG027	New Plymouth Emergency Shelter Trust	Operational Costs	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$90,000
CSPG028	Te Kawa o Rongo	Operational/Project Costs	\$96,600	\$36,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$90,000
CSPG029	New Plymouth MenzShed Incorporated Society	Operational costs	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$0	\$0	\$4,800
CSPG030	Taranaki Womens Refuge	Project Cost	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
CSPG031	Access Radio Taranaki	Operational Costs	\$60,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$60,000
CSPG032	Epilepsy Association of New Zealand Inc	Operational Costs	\$7,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$7,500
CSPG034	Taranaki Community Education	Operational Costs	\$32,004	\$10,668	\$10,668	\$10,668	\$32,004
CSPG035	New Plymouth Community Patrol	Operational Costs	\$58,400	\$24,000	\$17,200	\$17,200	\$58,400
CSPG037	Taranaki Young Peoples Trust	Operational/Project Costs	\$45,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$45,000

CSPG038	Seasons for Growth	Operational Costs	\$31,500	\$10,000	\$10,500	\$11,000	\$31,500
CSPG039	New Plymouth City Band	Operational Costs	\$45,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$45,000
CSPG042	Building Wellness Taranaki	Operational Costs	\$120,000	\$50,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$90,000
CSPG044	Taranaki Symphony Orchestra	Operational/Project Costs	\$69,000	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$69,000
CSPG045	Migrant Connections Taranaki	Operational/Project Costs	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$90,000
CSPG046	English Language Partners Taranaki Inc	Project Cost	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$0	\$0	\$3,700
CSPG047	Startup Taranaki	Operational Costs	\$300,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$90,000
CSPG048	Autism Connex Holiday Club Program	Operational/Project Costs	\$7,666	\$4,722	\$1,472	\$1,472	\$7,666
CSPG054	JTD Solutions	Operational Costs	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
CSPG056	Ars Nova Choir Inc	Project Cost	\$25,000	\$8,500	\$8,500	\$8,500	\$25,000
CSPG057	Taranaki Multiple Sclerosis Society Incorporated	Operational Costs	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
CSPG058	Girls Minds Matter	Operational/Project Costs	\$90,000	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$20,000	\$80,000
CSPG059	Age Concern Taranaki	Project Costs	\$22,430	\$22,430	\$0	\$0	\$22,430

CSPG060	Mahia Mai A Whai Tara Trust	Operational Costs	\$24,000	\$ 8,000	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$24,000
CSPG061	Music Therapy Taranaki	Operational Costs	\$ 10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
CSPG062	NZ Council of Victim Support Groups - New Plymouth	Operational Costs	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
Totals:			\$1,862,391	\$825,483	\$511,968	\$496,840	\$1,603,291

Community Events Grant Applications 2022/23

Application #	Applicant:	Reason for funding:	Total Asking amount:	Total Eligible amount:
CEG0004	He Rau Oranga Trust	Waitangi ki Whaitara	\$15,000	\$15,000
CEG0008	Taranaki Multi Ethnic Council	Taranaki Multi Ethnic Extravaganza	\$15,000	\$15,000
CEG0009	Maxine Lovell	Tongaporutu Summer Events	\$2,025	\$2,025
CEG0011	Christmas at the Bowl Trust	Christmas at the Bowl	\$5,000	\$5,000
CEG0012	Inglewood First Trust	Americarna	\$11,878	\$11,878
CEG0015	Taranaki Arts Trail	Taranaki Arts Trail	\$8,000	\$8,000
CEG0016	Makers and Creators Taranaki	Makers and Creators Taranaki	\$8,000	\$8,000
CEG0017	New Plymouth Indian Community	Indian Musical Harmony Night	\$19,610	\$19,610
CEG0020	Te Roopu Pukaka Kapahaka Society Inc	Taranaki Puanga festival	\$5,000	\$5,000
Totals:			\$89,513	\$89,513

CLOSING KARAKIA

Unuhia, unuhia, Unuhia i te uru tapu-nui Kia wātea, kia māmā te ngākau, te tinana Te Wairua i te ara takatū Koia rā e Rongo whakairihia ake ki runga	Draw on, draw on Draw on the supreme sacredness To clear, to free the heart, the body and the spirit of mankind Rongo suspended high above us (in heaven)
Kia wātea, kia wātea Ae rā kua wātea Hau Paimarire	To be cleared of obstruction It is cleared

This karakia is recited to close a hui or event. It takes us from a place of focus and releases us to be clear of all the issues or tensions that may have arisen during the hui. We are now free to get on with other things.