



PCC MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30pm on Monday 25th April 2022

STATUS

Approved
11.06.2022
(Public)

Present	Rachel Ambler, Chris Brown, Lucy D’Orton Gibson, Mark Ellis, Mei Yen Furey, Alasdair Groves, Jonathan Hendry, Susannah King, Paul Langham, Janet Lee, David Newton (DNe), Cluff Noon, Di Noon, Mark Orriss, Mark Parsons, Graham Stuart, Dave Vernon, Sara Wadsworth, Chris Whitwell, Anna Wright.
Observers	
Apologies	Malcolm Bourne, John Butler, Hannah Gibney, Peter Smithson, Tavi Price, Sara Wadsworth.
Minutes	Mark Ellis

Ref	Item	Notes	Action (what)	Who and by when
A		Main Items		
	Welcome	PL welcomed the meeting and introduced the agenda.		
A1	Finance Paper 1	<p>Annual Report and Accounts 2021</p> <p>MP explained the main intention of the meeting was to review and approve the Annual Report and Accounts for 2021. The Auditors had given a clean audit statement, but their sign-off was also subject to the PCC being satisfied with the Report and Accounts.</p> <p>MP noted that one issue had arisen within the audit; how to handle the Renew deficit (<i>Page 27 – “Appendix to the Financial Statements”</i>). He explained the difference between the General Fund, designated funds and restricted funds. The Renew project had been run through both a designated fund (largely from the sale of 62 Clifton Park Road) and a restricted fund (from the capital appeal).</p> <p>It was proposed, for this year only, to disclose the Renew designated fund with a negative closing balance of £103,224.19 to illustrate the deficit on the Renew Project against what was set aside for it and donated toward it. MP explained the Auditor would’ve preferred us to disclose this deficit in the General Fund (on the basis that you can’t designate money you don’t have) but was happy for us to do that, on the basis that the Trustees qualified it with a statement in the Accounts. The rationale behind this was to ensure people understood there was a deficit in the Renew project and it may be unidentified if absorbed into the General Fund.</p>		

		<p>JH asked whether there were any long-term implications of doing this and MP confirmed there were none.</p> <p>LDG asked whether there was any further news on the grant applications. MP replied that unfortunately the last grant body (Garfield Weston Foundation) had sadly declined to provide funding; there were so many other applications and so many other good causes. There was no reason why we could not apply again.</p> <p>PL clarified that there were 3 main options available to close the Renew Deficit: (1) Sale of Oakfield Road (2) additional fundraising (3) additional commercial loan.</p> <p>GS noted that a recent communication from the Church Office had indicated the Church Coffee Shop was to reopen soon. Whilst it was very positive that we are able to reopen the church building and welcome people in, GS observed that the 2021 accounts had indicated a deficit of approximately £20,000 for the Spire Coffee Shop last year and asked what was the strategy to ensure this was a more viable proposition going forward.</p> <p>MP clarified that we were not reopening The Spire Coffee Shop. Rather, we were partnering with Krystyna Zahid's <i>7 Cakes Café</i> and they will be operating their coffee shop inside the Church building.</p> <p>GS asked whether the PCC had been informed of this development and MP confirmed it had not. MP clarified there was another meeting tomorrow, to meet with Kamran and Krystyna and to develop a "Memorandum of Understanding".</p> <p>PL acknowledged that the PCC should have been informed prior to this being communicated to the church members and offered his wholehearted apologies. He reaffirmed that we are not reopening The Spire Coffee shop and the main driver was to open the church building to church members and our local community. PL confirmed that the PCC will receive details of the proposed partnership.</p> <p>AG stated that he was not satisfied with the proposal as it stood, and it did not appear to reflect a sharing of the risk and reward. LDG agreed.</p> <p>DV stated he couldn't fully comment, because it was an arrangement that has come up very quickly, without PCC involvement.</p> <p>MYF agreed there were likely a number of questions and logistical matters that would need to be explored.</p> <p>MP welcomed the questions. He reiterated that there was a desire to see the church building open and Kamran and Krystyna had come forward with a proposal</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>to run a coffee shop in partnership with the Church. This would be based on a 6-month trial, with a review after 3 months to see how it was going.</p> <p>GS suggested that this was not a Senior Leadership Team (or Standing Committee) decision, and it should have been a topic that was brought to the PCC for decision - it involves potential financial risk and contracts being drawn up. He clarified that his main motivation was to ensure that both Kamran and Krystyna and the PCC was appropriately supported and protected.</p> <p>MO suggested that the PCC should aim to keep this simple – and see where God takes it. Krystyna’s cakes are perceived very well and would likely sell and bring people through the door. There could be some contractual and insurance topics to work through, but he encouraged the PCC to keep this simple and give it a chance.</p> <p>RA referred to the Church Office email and noted that it had been made clear that the church was <i>partnering</i> with Krystyna’s cake shop, rather than the Spire Coffee Shop reopening.</p> <p>GP agreed that the PCC should not overthink this matter, but it should move forward in a clear and business-like manner, to ensure all are supported and protected. The division of responsibility remained unclear and there is legal and business expertise on the PCC to review this and we should use it.</p> <p>JL confirmed that the proposed opening date was - 16th May and the café would open from 9am to 4pm on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>After further discussion, PL summarised that the PCC is generally in favour of getting the church reopened to the public, and that the PCC wanted to take good care of a Church employee and a family member. The PCC, in order to give its full backing, will ask ME, MF and SK to work with MP and JL to review the Memorandum of Understanding and help ensure both Kamran and Krystyna have the best possible protection to support this venture, and bring a recommendation back to the PCC within 2 weeks.</p> <p>AW suggested that this review should also consider the Safeguarding Aspects and Lone Working Policy.</p> <p>LDG - Proposed.</p> <p>AW - Seconded.</p> <p><i>Unanimously carried.</i></p>	Review MoU	MP, JL, MO, MF, SK (two weeks)
--	--	--	------------	-----------------------------------

		<p>Proposal to Adopt the Annual Accounts</p> <p>Returning back to the Accounts, a proposal was made to adopt the the Annual Report and Accounts for 2021.</p> <p>DNe – Proposed.</p> <p>CN – Seconded.</p> <p><i>All in favour with one abstention (AG).</i></p> <p>AG noted that his abstention was due to him being late for the meeting and missing the initial discussion.</p> <p>Prayer and Thanksgiving</p> <p>PL led the PCC in scripture and prayer. He acknowledged and warmly thanked the service of those PCC members who were coming to the end of the final term of office: DN, PS and MO.</p> <p>He also sincerely thanked DNe who was leaving CCC for his service as Treasurer, and also JH who had decided not to stand for re-election to the PCC.</p> <p>The meeting prayed for those who were standing down and ended the evening with drinks and nibbles.</p>	Sign Report and Accounts	PL, DN (ASAP)
	B	Standing Items		
		There were no standing items discussed at this meeting.		
		Next meeting: Sunday 22 nd May APCM		

Future Meetings:

Friday & Saturday 10th/11th June (PCC Weekend Away)

Monday 27th June

Monday 18th July