

MINUTES

MEETING:	St Thomas of Canterbury Parish Council Meeting
DATE OF MEETING:	6 th March 2017
LOCATION:	Becket Centre
CHAIR:	Kit Tranmer
MINUTES:	Kit Tranmer
ATTENDEES:	Fr. Quentin Mike Eggleton Mathew Ives Jonathan McGuire Paul Turpin William Yeung Michelle Spears Finance Committee – Jim Hoban, Brian Martin
APOLOGIES	Michael O’Sullivan, Isabel Evans/Parker, Sue Musiu, Lesley Maeda

MINUTES & ACTIONS

REF:	DESCRIPTION:	OWNER:	TARGET DATE:
1.	Agenda Approved		
2.	Minutes of meeting 6 th February approved		
1.	Finance Committee		
1.1	Jim and Brian – explained how the FC sees itself. They feel the FC should always tend to be looking backward at events that have taken place and the job of the Parish Council is to be looking forward. It advises the Parish Priest. KT asked why the FC was always looking backward and not being pro-active in looking at contracts such as issues related to the Quinquennial. As regards the Quinquennial Survey – work commenced will have an impact on the Parish funds but until they know exactly what works are intended it will be difficult to predict exactly how much money will be required. Only when this is known can they make a decision about fundraising.	KT/JH/BM	
1.2	FQ – pointed out that in the past the FC had been constrained historically by previous clergy and perhaps not been allowed to act to its full capabilities. He also drew attention to	FQ/JH/BM	

	<p>the issue of Woodford being anomalous in that we were the only Parish that, in financial matters was not under the auspices of the diocese. Other Parishes had passed their monies over to Brentwood for investing and as a result of this the accounts were not being audited.</p> <p>WY asked if the FC could produce each year an annual budget and it was agreed that this would be produced</p>		
1.3	<p>Some discussion then ensued when it became clear that all parties felt that they were not being fully informed and consulted regarding Quinquennial work.</p> <p>BM pointed out that most of the Parish did not know about the report and were unaware of its potential financial implications. Perhaps this is subject that the PPC should make parishioners aware of.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Chair should write to the Custos expressing in clear terms that both the FC and the PPC need to be involved in the decision making process of Quinquennial projects at an early stage and not simply be asked to pay the Parish share of any bill when the work had been completed</p>	KT	
1.4	<p>KT also brought up the issue of the future of the Parish should the Friars be unable to continue at Woodford. What would be the situation of the Church, Friary and the grounds?</p> <p>WY pointed out that the Bishops questionnaire had asked people what they saw as a future for the parish and this issue was relevant to the above.</p> <p>It was decided to write to the Custos on this subject and invite him to the PPC to discuss this issue.</p>	KT	
2.0	Church and Friary Heating		
2.1	<p>It had been intended that we would invite Gerry Curran to update us on this topic but due to some confusion this had not been done</p> <p>Fr Quentin updated us on some issues. Peter French seems to be doing a good job in trying to keep things on the move. So far three expert consultants have been brought in to look at the heating and have submitted reports. The system is now 80 years old and although the boilers have been maintained the amount of heating produced has deteriorated.</p> <p>The most recent decision has been to flush out the heating system in the Church and if this has an effect to then proceed to do the same to the Friary / Becket area.</p>	KT	

2.2	<p>In addition to the above a feasibility study will be done looking at what heating is required and the best way for this to be provided it will also take into account the results of flushing the system as above.</p> <p>PT asked why the reports from the consultants had not been passed on to the PPC / FC for perusal</p> <p>RF said he had not had any information regarding the discussions from Gerry.</p> <p>KT said he would follow up these issues and they would be mentioned in the letter to the Custos</p>	KT	
3.0	Church Cleaning		
3.1	<p>ME – reported he had spoken to Pat Bell about the areas that were difficult to clean. This was really anything at high level plus the organ loft and stairs to it. Wax and chewing gum were issues they could not deal with also the confessionals. Much wax was present of some of the handrails on the benches. The large window between the nave and BS Chapel was cleaned by window cleaners but the glass Becket Centre doors were not. MS pointed out there was a lot of chewing gum under benches</p>	KT	
3.2	<p>CT pointed out that at a previous meeting there had been two types of cleaning mentioned. One was high level cleaning perhaps using a Cherry Picker and the other was low level cleaning but using specialised equipment to remove candle wax and chewing gum.</p> <p>PT pointed out that the former would require all the benches removed and would be very expensive.</p> <p>RF agreed to approach cleaners to look at the costs of both high level and low level cleaning and report in 2 months.</p> <p>JE discussed the difficulties of finding enough people to do the cleaning. After some effort she had managed to recruit 3 cleaners but needed at least 3 more</p>	RF	
4.0	Stewards of the Gospel		
4.1	<p>WY went over the timeline previously circulated for reporting the results of his Parish Survey and what happens subsequently. He requested that at the next meeting he would like to take up a large portion of the meeting discussing some of his survey results.</p> <p>JMcG pointed out that though we fully supported SotG taking up much of the next meeting might not be the best way to proceed.</p>		
5.0	Reporting Schedules of Groups		
5.1	<p>There was some discussion on this topic. JmG felt it was only necessary to report when they had something to say. ME pointed out that some groups were to report every two months and others at much less frequent intervals. It was finally agreed that:</p>	LM	

St Thomas of Canterbury Parish Council Meeting

	<p>a) All Groups would report every three months – regardless as to whether they had a lot to say or not.</p> <p>b) The report should be submitted to Lesley before the PPC meeting and be circulated together with the agenda. This would give everyone time to read it before the meeting.</p> <p>c) Lesley to draw up another timetable for this</p>		
6.0	Parish Council Constitution		
6.1	It was agreed that the new draft Parish Council constitution needed no further change and would be submitted to the Parish in advance of the AGM where it would hopefully be approved		
7.0	AOB		
7.1	<p>Quentin pointed out that with Easter approaching we were facing a similar situation to Christmas with two main issues.</p> <p>a) The Church being overcrowded and this being dangerous and a Health and Safety issue and he pointed out that he was in favour of tickets for some Services. CT pointed out that even if we wanted to go ahead with this it was very late to introduce this.</p> <p>b) The Car Park –was going to be crowded. GW volunteered to help with the car park on Easter Sunday and would liaise with Quentin. CT stressed that a note should be in the Newsletter before Easter to warn everyone to try and not use the car park. When this had been done at Christmas it had significantly reduced problems.</p>		

ACTIONS CARRIED FORWARD

REF:	DESCRIPTION:	OWNER:	TARGET DATE:
------	--------------	--------	--------------

Date of next meeting: Monday 3rd April at 8pm – Clare Room