

Being Transformed by Jesus to see the Kingdom come

Minutes of Meeting

Approved by PCC on 1st June 2015



Date: Monday 18th May 2015
Time: 7.30pm
Venue: Linden Gate Meeting Room
Chair: Paul Langham
Present: Erica Bebb, Brendan Biggs, Patrick Bolster, Leighton Carr, David Daniels, Alice Denyer, Janet Lee, Sian Lowe, Val Moore, Andy Murray, Mark Parsons, Graham Stuart, Granville Sykes, Sara Wadsworth, Rosemarie Hall (Minutes), Jill Garfitt (arrived at 20.08pm)

Apologies: Tim Meathrel, Derek Hadden, Melanie Griffiths.

Conflict of Interest: Lindsey Cutter for aspects of RENEW (in connection with Pre School)

Alice Denyer was welcomed to her first meeting.

Patrick and Rosemarie were welcomed to the meeting as elected members of the PCC.

Bible Reflection: Acts 2-1-8/42-end. A time of quiet reflection followed. Mention was made of the hospitality shown at the 9.15 services lunches which took place on 17th May in various homes. The place of leadership is in order to see an "Acts 2 church". A time of prayer followed for those absent.

MAIN ITEMS FOR DEBATE AND DECISION

1. RENEW Update, Presentation and Proposals

PL expressed thanks to Leighton and the RENEW team for the work they have undertaken.

LC gave a brief reminder of progress to date and the over-arching goal of RENEW. 200 responses were received to the questionnaire that was circulated some months ago and meetings have taken place with representatives of church activities with a cross section of ages. There is a need to wrap up the Vision in the work of the building. Starting to consider what if CC became the centre of the community/village centre on the green?

LC advised that a professional team is being assembled.

Appendix B – looking for team to help write brief and to liaise with other people and report back.

Architects – Benjamin and Beauchamp were interviewed for a second time. The RENEW team had a good meeting with Architects asking how they do their work and looking at their charges. A reply has not yet been received but the RENEW group are looking at how to redesign the team around them.

Short Term Programme (Appendix C) - LC gave overview.

Routes A and B were outlined – detailing when to start fundraising/work etc.

Questions were invited from the group:-

Have we costed in the factor of being out of the building? LC advised that more work on this needs to be done but acknowledged this detail is needed.

Expected time out of the church building has changed from the originally advised 6 months – why LC advised that experience suggests that 6 months is tight.

LC advised that the outstanding work on the door in the side chapel is underway at a cost of £1,630 +VAT (as agreed)

RENEW fund current balance = £711,500

Major Points:-

Pre School – Proposal for fundraising for Preschool. Application for funding from Bristol Council was submitted but the bid was unsuccessful. Details of the reasons are awaited. However, the RENEW team feel the proposal still has merit. A general discussion was invited as to whether these works should still be considered together with a fundraising strategy.

LC advised the meeting of Mike Innes's view which briefly was that the proceeds of the sale of 62 Clifton Park Road are still in the bank and building costs are increasing.

There is a need to show momentum /when will something get done?

Budget £300k – at least 4 ways of reducing:-

- Reductions in rates of VAT
- Redesign and value engineering

Economies of scale from tendering the work fundraising £300k taken out of current money (£700k) Aim to get as much back as possible. Mostly by reclaiming VAT. If this was agreed Mike Inness would be prepared to go out and seek funding.

Questions were invited from the meeting:-

Is it possible to fundraise from other bodies? We would identify that we have under-written the work.

It was acknowledged that the Crypt proposal became the sole focus of the team for a period of months and therefore the "big project" got held back. How do we avoid a big project getting behind? It was noted that gaining permission from the Diocese took longer than envisaged. MP and LC to discuss issues that developed.

Is there a reason why the projects (church/preschool) are being dealt with separately? Why were these proposals not part of the big plan? LC advised that the local authorities were allocated money and work was done to put together a brief to invite funds.

What are the benefits to other groups? Front door should just go ahead??

Graham Stuart proposed that Council should support the proposals as long as no works were undertaken that would have to be reversed or altered as part of the bigger works in due course.

Concern was expressed on fundraising for pre-school - will it take away from Renew/ cause confusion?

How much would it cost to do everything we would like to the crypt (including these proposals? Could we complete the work in the crypt to such an extent that we could move downstairs when doing work on the church? LC advised that the West End of crypt would need extensive work upstairs first – would need to design upstairs first including significant structural work.

After discussion the meeting were asked to consider the proposal from the RENEW team *“We propose that the PCC agree that the RENEW team should investigate a fundraising strategy to fund the most essential preschool works. A summary of the works with costs was included in the paper provided” (Appendix D)*

Proposed by Leighton Carr, seconded by Graham Stuart, 13 in favour, 2 against and 2 abstentions.

There are concerns that the emergency staircase from the crypt, currently used by Pre-school as the most direct route from their rooms to their garden area, is not really suitable for small children. This will be discussed further with Pre-school.

Interim proposal to improve the back of church (Appendix A). There are congestion issues between the two main morning services each Sunday and the current arrangements for serving refreshments are less than satisfactory. LC took responsibility of looking at solving the problem. It is clear that the area at the back of church is not big enough. It is suggested that 5 rows of back pews and cupboards in the bookstall area should be taken out to improve the area around the entrance etc. (Layout plans circulated). Removal of the pews would lose 60 seats but using replacement chairs (already purchased) would increase seating capacity.

Faculty – recommend applying for an Archdeacons Licence to take out 5 pews and then apply for a faculty to take out the remainder of the pews. These measures would provide a sense of momentum. Costs estimated at £5,000 - £7,500. Concern was expressed around serving food near a disabled toilet and there are envisaged storage issues with the removal of the cupboards. The meeting asked if a way of making coffee etc. upstairs could be investigated with the acknowledgement that latitude in the cost would be allowed to achieve this. A question was raised if we need drawings to apply for Archdeacons licence? LC to check. The meeting were advised that the original proposal discussed at SC was costed at approx. £25k but SC vetoed some of the costs.

LC proposed the reorganisation of the back of the church as identified above, seconded by David Daniels; carried unanimously.

Renew Team Structure – Pastoral Co-ordinator

A Draft Move out programme was circulated.

It was important not to under-estimate the amount of work involved in preparing for and facilitating the move out of the church and back in again after works have been completed. The RENEW team were asked by the Churchwardens about pastoral care and it was clear that arrangements would need to be made in the short term. Details of the scope of work for a Pastoral Co-ordinator were circulated.

Tenure costs. The proposal was for a fixed term post – possibly part time to begin with but becoming full time as the project progresses. This post should be considered as part of the professional team. It was proposed that the post should run until 1 year after the church family moves back into new building. Structure was outlined.

Pastoral co-ordinator works with the RENEW team and the congregation.

Questions were invited from the meeting:-

Is it appropriate to make new appointments so soon after a redundancy process?

Pastoral problems are potentially most likely from older people; would this appointment not ignore Nelly? LC responded that there is appreciation of the difficulty after making redundancies but we will need to leave that behind at some point. Money is specifically for RENEW and would be funded in the same way as an Architect etc. If we do RENEW everything changes and whilst it is appreciated that there are issues a time will come to make changes. This post is about someone who would ensure that home group leaders etc. burden is not too great – a distinct role. Clergy workload is already over stretched and they could not give the time needed to managing storage/move out programme etc.

PL advised that in 2013 the SC looked at the next potential need for an appointment of staff and the post discussed was a Church Pastor. Christ Church has historically employed pastoral workers. PL has seen the impact of someone whose sole remit is visiting etc. Currently a project is being done to identify how clergy time is spent which will be published in due course. The meeting were advised that Andy Murray has taken the biggest workload ever assigned to any Curate at Christ Church. After Andy leaves, Tim Meathrel will step into liaising with Christ Church Primary School. The situation with the school has changed dramatically in 5 years and they currently want to fund an extra day of the Children's Pastor role when appointed. All of the Clergy do pastoral work but do not have the time to focus on it sufficiently. There is a feeling of a lack in pastoral care and there is a need for someone whose focus is on visiting etc. PL suggested that the post should be full time from the onset and believes that the post will pay for itself in the next couple of years. An aspect of the role specification would be making contact with those who have left Christ Church and not settled elsewhere. We are beginning to see growth which could be at risk as there is nobody on the team with the capacity to systematically visiting and getting alongside people; being a chaplain to volunteers etc.

Questions were invited from the meeting: –

Could the role be done by a skilled volunteer? No

Sounds bigger than RENEW? If the post was full time from the onset it would allow the person the get to know the church family.

Two roles in one – Strategic - management based/ pastorally supporting church family?
The management side of the role may be pastoring those doing the work with supervision. Pastoral worker would have some management skills, but the primary focus is pastoral – with RENEW as a priority.

Expression of discomfort after the painful redundancy process. Perception then was that a big staff team had to be reduced. If we are a family that doesn't care for each other we are dysfunctional. Do the clergy need to re-assess what they are doing to ensure the pastoral aspect of the church is being dealt with and address pastoral emphasis within the church? PL responded that the clergy don't have the time and this was an historic problem, hence the appointment of Sue Saville. Potentially there is a greater risk in not appointing this post as house group leaders may not all be confident in pastoral care.

Jill Garfitt advised that she had spoken to the RENEW team about managing change as moving out of the church will be a huge process. May be under-estimating the issue of moving out for a year.

The meeting were advised that Andy Murray is not being replaced in the short term and there is no guarantee for a Curate in Summer 2016/17.

Looking at two possible proposals 50/50 Renew /Legacy or totally funded from Renew. A draft job description and clergy roles outlined were also requested.

After much discussion it was clear that more time was needed to consider the matter and come to a decision. It was agreed that an Extraordinary PCC Meeting would take place on 1st June at 7.30pm for 1 hour. A more detailed paper would be worked up and sent out in advance of the meeting.

Thanks were expressed to Leighton and team for all the work undertaken to date.

Safeguarding – The meeting were advised that Sarah Valentine has resigned as a Safeguarding Officer and replacement is now being sought.

The meeting closed with prayer at 22.33pm

Items not discussed due to time constraints – carried over to 1st June:-

Governance – Review of function and composition of Standing Committee Possible

Elections to Deanery Synod

STANDING ITEMS

1. Minutes – RH

- PCC Minutes–16th March – (attached) - for approval.
- SC Minutes – 2nd March (attached) – for noting

2. Matters Arising

3. Sub-group reports

GMT – monies for Francesca (Janet/Sara)

4. Paul's Points

5. Wardens Points