

St David's Committee

Tuesday 17 February 2015

Present at the meeting:

Canon Rev Tom Honey (Chair)
Roger Beer
Richard Johnson
Keith Postlethwaite
Emma White

Dave and Barbara Allin
Hilary Francis
Avril and Bill Pattinson
Hilary Todd

Apologies: Sarah Black, Chris Gill, Steph Hills, Mary Kirkland, Nigel Walsh

1. Minutes of the last meeting

These were accepted, proposer: Dave Allin, seconder: Roger Beer. They will be published on the website.

2. Matters arising:

Fabric – the DAC had given approval for the gates, but a Faculty was still needed and also a planning application (cost £195.50) because the external face of the building would be affected. It was not anticipated there would be any difficulty and approval should be given within six weeks – just a frustrating delay.

3. Accounts

Information was provided to Sarah Watts three weeks ago but no response had been received so far.

The Committee looked at the information provided – taking away £31k received for projects, the overall surplus for the year was just £6k.

Trends noted – reduction in planned giving, increase in tax reclaimed, small fall in trading, utility bills up but suppliers were being changed. Investments did well – thanks to Ian Cartwright and also to Barbara for all the work she has done on the finances.

Accounts as presented were received, proposer: Tom Honey; seconder: Emma White.

Action: Sarah Watts to be contacted to make sure all will be ready for the PCC on 9 March.

4. Transformation Project

4 a) Feedback from Vision Day: notes had been typed up.

Key points:

- [there should be a reasonable balance of usage; full-day lets to be discouraged to allow for other users and for use by the church for eg funerals.
- [if use becomes heavy, glass doors and screens round the Lady Chapel to enable quiet worship should be considered.
- [The multi-purpose room to be sound proof and have secure storage built in.
- [Kitchen to be highest spec possible below commercial catering level.
- [Toilets – more generous layout favoured to enable assistance to wheelchair users. Fitting in a third toilet was still under discussion or possibly a urinal.

Action: a summary would be circulated to the Committee.

4 b) Developments: a summary document was received.

Key points:

Pews the two experimental samples had resulted in one that was noticeably more comfortable. Permission had been given by the Diocese to take apart two pews from which a prototype would be made for trial. The meeting was happy to proceed.

Action: drawings would be added to the website, and sent to English Heritage and DAC for info.

Kitchen – drawings were received showing its situation in the nave, and with hatch open and closed. Surplus wood from the pews would be used in its construction.

The idea of storage above the new kitchen was discussed and dismissed as impractical. The access door would be the existing Carew door relocated so it was not thought there would be any objection to it. The doors were wide enough to enable access.

A window in the old kitchen had been found that will allow ventilation to be installed.

Action: drawings would be sent to HLF, DAC and EH for comment and agreement to allow tendering.

Underpinning – drawings were received. The structural engineer would make more test bores on Friday to make sure of piling depths and the quality and direction of the bedrock.

Further details would be available next week on how to repair the West Arch.

Heating, lighting and sound – three submissions had been received re heating of which the most appropriate had been selected which was also the cheapest.

- [The boiler would be in the North West tower, it was hoped.
- [The biggest challenge would be whether there was sufficient radiator surface area. An additional fan may be necessary.
- [There would be under-floor heating under the new floor towards the rear of the church.
- [Usage patterns needed to be fed into the heating design to ensure it was fit for purpose – the more we use it the better, but it needs to cope when not being used much.
- [No asbestos had been found.

Grants – the decision from Pennon was still awaited as more information had been requested. Devon Contract Waste forms were different so needed more work. Applications to smaller bodies were needed.

Font – it was thought it could be safely moved.

Floor – A company had been found in Exeter that made tiles for English Heritage which are very close in shape and colour to those in St David's so it was hoped they would be acceptable.

A plan of the work to be done by members of the congregation would be necessary and factored into the Part 2 submission – eg with taking out the loos, taking up the floor etc.

4 c) Potential closure of the church building

There would be a lot of plant and equipment in the church when the work was being done and how to keep it secure would be an issue. It was unlikely the church could be left open while work was in progress. A plastic screen at the West end would be used to reduce the dust but it would not ensure security of equipment being left on site.

Experience elsewhere suggested it would be necessary to close the church for a period even for worship. Once the work had been completed there would then be a huge re-

opening. More thought and prayer was needed about the matter before decisions were made.

d) Reflection on how the church as a worshipping community can thrive during the building works

Key would be ensuring everyone shared the vision for the future and felt engaged with the process.

Share with St Michael's? Two worshipping communities to come together for the period of transformation?

Thought needed to be given to the reality post completion and the work required to keep it all going.

5. Worship

The first service with the new Family Service booklet had been held.

Comments:

- [Nearer an hour than 50 mins – perhaps better to say it would be under an hour
- [Most people liked the booklet and the pictures
- [The congregation needed to be encouraged to bring friends and family along.

6. Any Other Business

6.a *Minutes* were now being published.

6.b *Volunteers* – there was a need to involve more people in the running of St David's even now.

Thoughts:

- [Were four welcomers needed each week? Other churches manage with two.
- [There was a need to look at what was being asked of the members of the congregation, what we ought to be doing and don't such as organised lifts to church, keeping in touch with the sick (a Welfare Group?), as well as what we do do and whether it could be done differently and more effectively.

Agreed that the next Staff meeting would list who does what and consider what needed to be done.

Meeting ended at 9.25 pm with closing prayer.