CSRFF Small Grant Applications
July 2018

Spalding Park Tennis Club	
Reference	
Organisation	Spalding Park Tennis Club
Project Title	Surface Replacement and Fencing replacement
Funding Requested	$17,250 ex GST
Total Project Cost	$64,000 ex GST
Application TRIM Reference	D-18-062520

PURPOSE OF PROJECT AND FUNDING

The Spalding Park Tennis Club Inc. application proposes the resurfacing of two tennis courts and replacement of the perimeter fencing at the facility.

The fencing replacement and resurfacing will assist the club to continue to run its competitions and training whilst providing a safe place for members to play.

They are requesting $17,250 ex GST from the City of Greater Geraldton towards project costs.

PANEL'S COMMENTS ON APPLICANTS PROJECT

Sport & Leisure Planner: The Club has identified a project that meets their users' needs without over committing themselves financially. Resurfacing 2/5 courts in a stages approach will allow the club to continue to play, whilst saving into the future to replace the remaining three.

Project Officer MWSF: The application clearly demonstrated the Club's need for new fencing as a priority and resurfacing of the 2 x courts in worst condition.

PANEL'S COMMENTS ON FUNDING & BUDGET

Sport & Leisure Planner: The scope and size of this project is appropriate for the current financial position of the club, their capacity to generate revenue streams in comparison to their membership base.

Project Officer MWSF: I commend the Club on their efforts in increasing their usage rates by partnering with other user groups and their consideration of a staged approach to this renewal process.

APPLICANT'S FUNDING HISTORY

Project Name	Year	Amount	Comments
Nil			

COMPLETED BY:	ORGANSIATION	SCORE RANKINGS	
Sue Patman	MWSF	1	Very Poor
Jack Little	CGG	2	Poor
		3	Average
		4	Strong
		5	Excellent

CSRFF Small Grant Applications
July 2018

Spalding Park Tennis Club

CRITERIA	*WEIGHT %*	City of Greater Geraldton		Mid West Sports Federation	
		SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE
Community Impact	25	3	18.75	4	20
Level of Usage	25	3	18.75	4	20
Life Expectancy	20	4	20	4	16
Detail of Application	10	4	10	4	8
Strategic Alignment	20	3	15	3	12
Overall Score	**100**	**17**	**82.5**	**19**	**95**

SELECTION CRITERIA
Community Impact (25%)
1. Not having project would have little to no impact on clubs and user groups.
2. Not having project would impact clubs and users, however alternatives could be considered that would still allow them to function.
3. Not having project would hinder clubs and user groups functionality,
4. Not having project would significantly hinder clubs and user group functionality, however not in entirety.
5. Not having project would cause the clubs and user groups to not function in entirety.
Level of Usage (25%)
1. Facility is used 1-2 days a week by a small variety of community groups.
2. Facility is used a couple of days a week by a small variety of community groups.
3. Facility is used 2 -3 days a week by a medium variety of community groups.
4. Facility is used most days of the week by a large variety of community groups.
5. Facility is used every day of the week by a large variety of community groups.
Life expectancy (20%)
1. 0 years - Asset is expected to require replacement in 0 years.
2. 1-2 years - Asset is expected to require replacement in 1-2 years.
3. 5 years - Asset is expected to require replacement in or after 5 years.
4. 10 years - Asset is expected to require replacement in or after 10 years
5. 20 years - Asset is expected to require replacement in or after 20 years.
Detail of Application (10%)
1. Application is completed in no detail and meets few of the funding requirements.
2. Application is completed in a lack of detail and meets only a few of the funding requirements.
3. Application is completed and meets some of the funding requirements.
4 Application is completed in detail and meetings majority of funding requirements.
5 Application is completed in great detail and meets all funding requirements.
Strategic Alignment (20%)
1. Very limited alignment.
2. Low alignment. Marginally supports our Strategic Community Plan.
3. Aligns well with one or more strategies. Modestly supports our Strategic Community Plan.
4. Aligns very well with one or more strategies. Directly supports Strategic Community Plan with at least one strategy.
5. Aligns very well with two or more strategies. Directly supports Strategic Community Plan with at least two strategies.