

## Parochial Church Council for the Parish of St David with St Michael and All Angels Exeter

Agreed Minutes of the additional meeting of the PCC for the parish of St David with St Michael and All Angels Exeter held at St David's Church on Monday 31<sup>st</sup> October 2016 at 7.00pm.

<b>Attendance:</b>	Dave Allin	Avril Pattinson
Bill Pattinson	Elizabeth Hughes	Stephanie Aplin
Richard Parker	Mary Kirkland	Samantha Wellbelove
Sarah Black	Charlotte Townsend	Emma White
Hilary Todd	Roger Beer	Hilary Frances
Adrian Hewitt	Lizzy Hewitt	Chris Heaven
Richard Barnes	Keith Postlethwaite	Rev Tom Honey (Chair)

George Hexter (in attendance)

### Minutes

	<p>The meeting began with prayers and Bible readings led by Rev Honey.</p> <p>Rev Honey explained that the meeting, known in some earlier correspondence as an Extraordinary Meeting, should not be so called, as that term has a specific meaning in Diocesan regulations. It was agreed that the meeting was an additional meeting.</p> <p>He also welcomed George Hexter to the meeting but pointed out that, as George had now retired as Chapel Warden, he was not now a member of the PCC. George was assured that his presence, and any points he wished to make were most welcome, but that he was not a voting member of the meeting.</p> <p>The secretary apologised for the fact that, while the correct time of the meeting was stated on the email announcing the meeting, an incorrect time was stated on the Agenda.</p>	
1.	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b></p> <p>The secretary reported that apologies had been received from Rev Christopher Durrant. There were no other apologies for absence.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Declarations of interest</b></p> <p>There were none.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Clarification of use of Finance based on papers provided by Chris Heaven, David Allin, Rev Tom Honey</b></p> <p>The meeting first discussed the paper provided by Chris Heaven and Richard Parker on behalf of the St Michael's DCC, and the paper provided by Dave Allin.</p> <p>Richard Parker explained that the first paper represented the view that the curate's house, 44 Wreford's Close was a parish asset, that there was no evidence that it was restricted to the sole use of St David's. The paper accepted the difficult choice that was made to sell to help to fund the essential repair work on St David's, but explains that some find it difficult to understand that St Michael's has no share of the property: St Michael's has its own needs. Adrian Hewitt confirmed that there were no written restrictions on the deeds of 44 Wreford's Close and reminded the meeting that the PCC has responsibility to consider the needs of both churches.</p>	

Dave Allin responded by outlining the arguments developed in the second paper. He fully accepted the need to support St Michael's from PCC funds but argued that this could not be taken from the Wreford's Close sale or income as Wreford's Close was restricted by history, decision and action. Many years of accounts, that have been approved by the PCC, make clear that the old rectory and its garage were part of the St Michael's accounts and that Wreford's Close, its expenses and income were part of St David's accounts. On this basis we had made bids to grant-making bodies and had filed annual returns to the Charity Commission. If, at this meeting, we were to reverse the view that Wreford's Close was a St David's asset, we would have signed off inaccurate accounts, would have incorrectly filed returns to the Charity Commission, and would have misled funding agencies. This last point was important as some of the agencies (notably Pennon) were very particular about the extent of the 'partner funding' that we were able to provide, so the availability of the Wreford's Close funds to the St David's project was clearly an influence on their decision making.

The meeting discussed these points and their implications at some length. Rev Honey asked that the proposal contained within the Heaven/Parker paper be put to the meeting: Richard Parker proposed; Chris Heaven seconded. The proposal read:

We propose that it be acknowledged by this PCC that money received by St David's over 2/3rds of the combined sale figure realised from the sale of the Curate's House at No. 44 Wreford's Close and the accrued rental income, has been so received by the generosity of the people of St Michaels and, accordingly, a commitment to assist financially with St Michaels current repair and redecoration project be made.

7 voted in favour;

13 voted against.

The proposal was defeated.

The meeting then considered the paper from Rev Honey. By way of introduction, Rev Honey explained that the paper made a concrete proposal about the support of St Michael's from funds linked to the St David's Institute. He explained that these funds had previously been used to support work at St David's. The paper acknowledged the pressing need for additional work at St Michael's and the difficulty of attracting grant income for the kind of work required. Rev Honey clarified that these funds were managed by trustees and therefore that the formal proposal in the paper should be redrafted to say:

That the PCC consider asking the trustees to make a grant of £20,000 to St Michael's from the unrestricted St David's Institute Fund for the purpose of the necessary redecoration of the interior of St Michael's Church.

In the final section, the paper went on argue that St Michael's be charged with raising additional funds to complement any grant form the St David's Institute Fund.

The meeting discussed the proposal at length. Adrian (one of the trustees) felt that it would put them in a difficult position. Richard Barnes questioned the meaning of the final section of the paper: it was agreed that St Michael's always expected to fund raise to meet a proportion of the costs of the project and that the final section was unnecessary. Rev Honey withdrew this part of his paper. Lizzy Hewitt questioned the use of the income from Wreford's close but the inclusion of this in the history, decisions and action discussed above was reaffirmed. Sarah Black asked

	<p>about income from the St David’s Institute funds and noted that if she were a trustee, she would not give away half of the funds to any one project. Adrian explained that in current stock market conditions the trustees had decided that there should be no income distribution at present. Keith Postlethwaite argued that his vote against the Heaven/Parker proposal was based on the importance of recognizing the financial agreements signaled by our signing off on accounts and bids. This wasn’t consistent with the first part of the proposal which he therefore couldn’t support in its entirety. However he felt that the second part, calling for funds to help St Michael’s had his full support and that as a whole PCC we now needed to find the best ways of moving forward from our earlier decision to secure this outcome. Richard Barnes raised a question about access to the bridging loan that had been arranged with the Diocese but Dave explained that this was only available to bridge any gap between completion of the sale of Wreford’s Close and the need to settle bills from the contractors. Since, the house sale had been quite speedy and no such gap had existed, no bridging loan was available.</p> <p>Rev Honey put the proposal (modified as stated earlier in this minute) to the meeting.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">11 voted for 2 voted against 2 abstained</p> <p>The proposal was carried.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Procedural clarification</b></p> <p>Dave explained that the draft minutes of the December 2015 meeting contained what he thought was an error. He identified this issue in January 2016 and immediately raised it with the secretary asking that a revised version of the minute be put to the next meeting (which he was unable to attend). For several complex reasons this was not put to the meeting, which accepted the draft. We were therefore in a position where the formal record did not reflect any discussion of the error that Dave had identified and sought to bring to the meeting’s attention. There was discussion of this unusual situation. Adrian argued that minutes that have been approved cannot be changed but that a subsequent meeting can always revisit the issue. Sarah argued that our first vote overrides the minute that had been questioned by Dave – a point supported by Bill. It was agreed that no further action was needed on this point.</p> <p>Richard Barnes noted that our website contained a version of the minutes of the Dec 2015 meeting that included Dave’s amendment and asked that this be corrected. Dave and Rev Honey fully supported that request and Dave apologized for the problem, noting that he had not been aware of it, nor was he clear how this had come about. Dave assured the meeting that he would ensure that the version of the minute that had been approved by the subsequent meeting was placed on the web.</p> <p>Sarah emphasized that we need tightened procedures so that we are very clear about what we have decided.</p> <p>Hilary Todd asked that we be very clear that we all support St Michael’s in whatever way possible. Keith added that we should recognize that the fund raising for each church is something that the whole PCC should engage with.</p> <p>Rev Honey asked for a show of hands to support these views – and this was unanimous. He asked St Michael’s DCC to produce costed and prioritized proposals to be considered at the next PCC. Richard Parker explained that funds were needed now to pay for redecoration and that</p>	

	<p>as much of the work as possible should be done at one time to avoid duplication of the high costs of scaffolding.</p> <p>Adrian argued that the meeting should modify Rev Honey's proposal (see Item 3 in these minutes) so that it reads:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">St Michael's DCC should produce costed proposals that the PCC should draw on when asking the trustees to make a grant to St Michael's from the unrestricted St David's Institute Fund for the purpose of the necessary redecoration of the interior of St Michael's Church.</p> <p>Rev Honey put this to the meeting which voted:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">19 for 1 against</p> <p>This proposal was carried.</p> <p>Emma pointed out that the meeting clearly demonstrated that the cost of upkeep of our buildings was becoming very problematic. In these circumstances it was important to take note again of our mission. We need to return to that drive for mission and may need to think well beyond our existing plans for finance.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Confidentiality</b></p> <p>The meeting agreed to review the status of the minutes after they had been drafted, then considered and accepted at the next PCC meeting.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Forthcoming meetings</b></p> <p>Rev Honey informed the meeting that the date of the next PCC meeting had been changed to Thursday Dec 1<sup>st</sup> at 7.30pm (to avoid a clash with a St Michael's Lecture).</p> <p>He also announced that, as a result of his forthcoming move from the parish, there would be a meeting of the PCC, DCC and St David's Committee with the Archdeacon at St David's on 20<sup>th</sup> December at 7.30</p>	
Closing Prayer		

PCC secretary, Keith Postlethwaite 6<sup>th</sup> December 2016