

**The Parochial Church Council of the
Ecclesiastical Parish of Lichfield: Saint Michael and Saint Mary**

PCC Minutes

Date of Meeting: **Tuesday 26th February 2019** at 7.30pm in Church

Present:

Venerable Simon Baker	Lyn Shiel	Liz Clarke
Revd. Linda Collins	Sue Jones	David Easton
Revd. Mel Clark	Ted Green	June Frayn
Revd. Jeyan Anketell	Brenda Liptrot	Mike Godfrey
Revd. Ruth Bull	Ray Allen	Anne Lingwood
Lesley Allen	David Athersmith	Viv Oliver
Phil Clayton	Maureen Brand	Alison Staines
Trevor James	Kath Bird	
Alan Toplis		

Apologies: RB, MJ, SO

1. **Opening Prayer** led by SJ
2. **Apologies** were received and recorded.
3. **Minutes** of the meeting on 20th November 2018 were approved and signed [Proposed: JA, Seconded: SJ].
4. **Notification of Any Other (Relevant) Business.** Two items of business had been notified to the secretary before the meeting. PCC Volunteer for May 2019, Permission to bury Ray Allen Ashes in Churchyard.

5. **Matters Arising.**

There were no matters arising

6. **Ministry.**

- a) **Safeguarding.** Maureen reported that all except 2 PCC members have now completed C0 and C1. This was the same as at the last meeting

A number of DBS applications have been made. It is a requirement that anyone seeking election to the post of Churchwarden or re election to the post of Churchwarden requires a valid DBS check to be completed before the election at the APCM.

A number of the ministry team have completed C3 training or are booked on a course in 2019 to do this required training.

7. **Mission.**

- a) **Streethay.** There have not been many new occupations since the last PCC meeting. A consultation is currently underway for the addition of 200 new homes on the development making 1000 new homes in total.

Mel reported that she has been getting to know more and more families on the two developments Rowan Heights and Cathedral View. It is proposed that a leaflet drop should take place advertising Mothering Sunday, Palm Sunday and some of the Easter services. To do this volunteers would be required to help in the distribution of the drop as it will take some time to deliver to all the homes.

AT has a meeting tomorrow with the Parish Council regarding noticeboards. The Church is able to use these boards to publicise events. There has been some commercial land up for sale but it is thought that there has been little interest so far.

The discussion widened to the land north of the Streethay development. It is thought that this to may be used for housing developments. The Rector has asked the Rural Dean to convene a meeting of affected parishes. This meeting will be to look at maps and locations of the ecclesiastical parishes and to discuss whether the boundaries are appropriate. If need be some adjustments may need to be made. PCC will be kept up to date of any developments.

It was mentioned that the new homes currently being built at Darwin Park are in the Parish of Wall.

- b) **Inclusive Church.**

Linda advised that a small group of individuals [MC, LC, BL, SJ, RBr, EC] have met with the local ambassador for inclusive Church. They heard how other Churches had set about on the journey to becoming an inclusive Church. It became apparent that we, as a Church, are quite away along the road to becoming an inclusive Church. It was important to realise that becoming an Inclusive Church is about justice and not equality.

Linda will use scripture and her sermon on March 3rd to talk about inclusive Church to the congregation. The lent groups will also be looking at some of the areas of inclusivity. The idea of the groups will be to open our minds and form a strategy to move forward.

Linda suggested that we take our time to move forward. It is important that we do this so that becoming inclusive is habitual and not just a box ticking exercise. In addition to the opportunity to speak in group situations there will be a need to facilitate individual discussions with individuals as not everyone likes to speak up in groups. The aim is to go for an evolving strategy to move forward. It was agreed that as the body of Christ we will always be evolving.

As a congregation we will always be challenged. It will be necessary to find out what individual needs are. It was recognised that a similar strategy was used when it was decided to become a more welcoming Church. In the fulness of time we will identify a time when we feel ready to be assessed as an inclusive Church. However at this point it would not be the end of the journey.

Our journey will need to include our other community groups for example Messy Church and First Steps. Ted pointed out that when compiling some of his statistics for the Church there is a major growth in some areas of our worshipping community. This has been in the Messy church and First Steps groups.

8. Resources

- a) **Church Hall.** AT reported that he had heard from RBr that there are 2 questions that need answering to complete the preparation of the Sales Packs for the Church Hall site. The pack in its current form extends to 65 pages long. The price indicated in the packs is for bids over £475,000.

There has been some interest in the packs already and new interest is also being registered. Details of the sale and where to obtain a pack will be advertised in the local press.

AT also reported that there is still some crockery and parish records to be emptied from the hall and that SB, PC and AT will need to meet to do this. 2 cupboards have now been located in the garage of Shirley Trelfa. These are locked cupboards and contain 10 years of financial records.

- b) **Health and Safety.** AT reported in the absence of RBr. We still need to obtain specialist holders for the various fire extinguishers on the Church site. RBr need to speak to the company that we use to test the fire extinguishers to obtain these. An inventory is to be taken of all extinguishers on the Church site also.
- c) **Churchyard.** Ray reported that the DAC (Diocesan Advisory Committee) had approved the shed build. The PCC will also need to obtain planning permission from Lichfield District Council. This will cost about £300. To make the planning application some 1:1500 scale plans are required and the Church architect will be asked to provide these.

Ray thanked everybody for their contributions on the interpretation board proposal. A final version of the design had been circulated to all PCC members prior to the meeting. A proposal was made and agreed that the design of the interpretation board be accepted and that Shelly Signs be appointed to produce this for the churchyard. [Proposed: RA, seconded: BL].

SB informed the meeting that a list B application would be necessary to the Chancellor. This would now be organised.

The meadow that has been previously agreed is to be located near the millennium oak tree that was planted for the Queens Jubilee. This is well away from the snowdrops. Initially it was thought that we would be allocating an area of about 25m² but it has been found that we can allocate in this position an area of about 50m². The position and area was agreed by PCC. [Proposed: RA, seconded: SJ].

The survey days are still scheduled to take place in May and June. Please watch for further announcements of the dates. Ray has been asked to apply for a grant of about £1500 for a further year and he is in the process of doing this. The money would go towards the cost of the meadow area.

Elizabeth Allen has asked for a tree to be planted in memory of her late husband Ray Allen. A Rowan Tree Mountain Ash has been identified and a position close to the millennium oak has been identified as a suitable location. This was agreed by PCC. [Proposed: RA, seconded: AT].

It was noted that although there are a number that are being lost in the churchyard for a variety of reasons PCC were please that new trees were also being planted.

Ray was thanked for his comprehensive report.

A detailed drawing has been obtained from the architect together with a specification for the additional parking in the churchyard. This should create parking for an additional 10 cars. If the area has marked out spaces there will be less than 10 spaces and it was reported that the DAC were not keen on marked out spaces. It was therefore agreed only to mark out the corners of the parking area.

A quotation for the work has been received for £8500 plus VAT from Sean Hutchins. This amount includes a contingency of £1200 plus VAT. A faculty application will be necessary for this work to be carried out. One of the reasons for this is that the work will need to remove the stones from a grave that is not tendered. Efforts were being made to see if the family of the deceased can be traced.

It was reported that if the application for a faculty is granted then there will be notional parking for 36 cars on the Church site. This will be helpful in the application for the new hall. TJ thinks that the work in the churchyard may be eligible for a grant of up to £2000 from the Tesco Community Fund and he agreed to look into this.

The cost of this work will be funded from the churchyard restricted fund.

PCC agreed the proposal to go ahead with the work with Sean Hutchins and apply for a faculty. [Proposed: SB, seconded: LS]

SB also reported that some work had been looked at with regards to the churchyard drive which has deteriorated significantly. The cost of the work required would be in the order of £31,000 plus VAT. The finance group had met to discuss this quote and decided it would not propose that this work was done at PCC. This is because if the new hall work goes ahead the drive would almost certainly be damaged so it was felt it was more appropriate to complete this work after the new hall construction.

Thanks were expressed to AT and his son Michael who have filled in one of the major potholes.

The community payback team have recently worked on the roundabout to scrape back to reveal a bit more tarmac. It is proposed to ask the payback group to do the same down the main drive especially at the entrance near the gates.

A question was also asked about the reference to the need to pay for the community payback team in the Standing Committee notes. The reply indicated that it was not our intention to engage in conversation about payment at present. The rationale for payment was to provide tools for the team to work with. PCC were told that we currently provide the tools for the team to work with and there were no plans to change this arrangement.

d) **Finance.**

(i) **Outturn 2018.** Viv distributed a spreadsheet that showed a number of columns. The first column was the budget that had been agreed. The second column was the 2018 expenditure without allowing for any accruals or prepayments. The final column was the actual expenditure with a few adjustments made. This showed that the excess expenditure over income was around £13,500.

Income was lower than expected and PCC looked at some of the reasons for this. Plate giving was lower. The talent scheme was not as successful as in previous years. Fundraising was also lower. Fee income for weddings and funerals is also significantly reduced.

Expenditure had also increased and was higher than predicted. A single item of £9,382 for roof repairs had not been expected and accounted for much of the loss. However, other items of expenditure had increased and it was difficult to reduce many of these items. Some of the increase in costs is due to the Church being used more now the hall is closed. The balance in the hall fund will now be transferred to the general fund.

PCC agreed that income needed to be increased. The big question was how was this going to be achieved. Whilst a general appeal to increase giving to the Church would happen some members of PCC felt that this was difficult as many pension incomes were not keeping pace with inflation.

The situation at St Michael's is replicated at many other Churches. Much of the giving is at the lower end of the giving graph. This is typical of many congregations.

The Rector is going to get more involved in the finance group of the Church and a more rigorous budget setting will be conducted for 2019. Ways of generating more income would be examined.

- (ii) **Contactless Payment System.** The present contactless terminal has been in operation over the past few months and generated over £200 of additional income. The terminal has over these months for free by the diocese. From January 2019 the cost will be 5% of income with a minimum monthly charge of £7.50 and maximum of £25. This will cover the cost of the terminal and the merchant bank fees. The parish will also claim the tax relief that is given to charities on this income.

After discussion it was agreed to keep the terminal at the costs indicated above.
[Proposed: AT, seconded: TJ]

There was further discussion on when the terminal should be made available for donations as it is only used at weddings funerals and special services. It was decided that the terminal should be out in the Church whenever possible. A suitable site near the fairtrade cupboard has been identified. This enabled the terminal to be constantly charged so was always ready to receive donations. A suitable sign is to be put up.

The ministry team is going to look at a form of words that can be used at the variety of services we have. The leaders of some of our groups would also be able to draw attention to the terminal. If it is thought that it is not appropriate for the terminal to be out then it can easily be put away. The default amount is set at £5 and other amounts can be donated in £5 steps up to £20. This is because gift aid can be claimed up to this amount.

Alan was thanked for his work in organising the terminal.

It was agreed to take item 10 on the agenda

9. **New Hall.** SB introduced this item to PCC. The previous work on the hall was explained and the design that was discussed at the end of our first phase was on display. The Rector divided PCC into 5 groups and asked each group to come up with questions in 5 categories. Who? Why? What? When? How?

The questions raised are presented in an appendix to these minutes.

10. **Grave Reservation Application**

SB introduced this item by explaining the current situation in the approval of grave reservations in the new churchyard.

There are currently a large number of reserved plots in the new churchyard. There is space for about 60 new single graves. At the present rate of burials this will only enable burials to take place for 7 or 8 years. A recent application for a faculty for a grave reservation resulted in the Chancellor asking a number of questions of PCC and he also asked PCC to consider its policy on grave reservation applications.

Simon indicated that PCC would always be consulted regarding a grave reservation application to see if it agreed with the application but it was the Chancellor who made the final decision and would grant or not grant a faculty. Grave reservations for only for a period of 50 years. It was also possible that some of the reservations made by individuals may not be needed as the applicant may have been buried elsewhere. Some research would be required to find out if all the plots were needed. The churchyard could not close until all the plots were used including the reservation plots.

In addition to a faculty reservation it was also possible that a plot would be reserved when one person of a couple was buried. This is so that the couple can be buried side by side as it is not possible to have double depth graves in the churchyard. This is because of the geology of the churchyard.

Any person who resides in the parish whether they attend Church or not and whatever their religion has the legal right to be buried in the churchyard. Individuals that live outside the parish who are on the electoral roll also have the legal right to be buried in the Churchyard. However to be on the electoral roll you need to be a member of the Church of England and habitually (regularly) attend Church.

Simon explained that the Chancellor may not grant any further permissions for grave reservation with the churchyard so full. It was therefore necessary to consider as a PCC whether we wish to refrain from supporting any further applications for grave reservation.

There was considerable discussion on whether PCC would consider if grave reservations were no longer possible. PCC felt that they needed time to prayerfully consider this decision and it was agreed that a decision would be made on this policy at the March PCC meeting on 26th March.

PCC recognised that in making a decision on whether to accept grave reservations was not taking away the right of individuals to be buried at St Michael's. However, individuals could only be buried there if space was available. It would therefore be necessary to establish if all the reservations were still current and if the applicant is still alive.

PCC resolved not to support any more requests for grave reservation until PCC decide on what the future policy is to be. [Proposed: SB, seconded: AT].

As a result of the resolution made a decision on the application made to the PCC was deferred until the policy decision has been made. The Rector would communicate the deferment to the applicant.

11. **Standing Committee matters not already considered in the agenda.** No items were discussed

12. **AO(R) B**

a) **PCC Volunteers 2019.** Liz Clark volunteered to write the report for the May meeting. The volunteers for the rest of 2019 are as follows.

March 26th	Prayers Lesley Allen	Report Richard Brooks
April 28th (APCM)	Prayers Mel Clark	Report Mike Godfrey
May 21st	Prayers Jeyan Anketell	Report Liz Clarke
July 23rd	Prayers Ruth Bull	Report Mel Clark
October 8th	Prayers Brenda Liptrot	Report Alison Staines
November 26th	Prayers June Frayn	Report Mike Jones

b) **Burial of Ashes in Closed Churchyard.** An application has been received to inter the ashes of Ray Allen in the closed churchyard near the location of the memorial tree that is to be planted for Ray.

PCC agreed to support this request. [Proposed: SB, seconded: AT].

13. **Deemed Business.** There were no items of deemed business.

14. **Closing Prayer.** SJ closed the meeting with prayer.

The meeting closed at 21:46

Signed

The Venerable Simon Baker
26th March 2019

Appendix 1

Do we need to move office and create a new office?
Who is the new facility for? This leads to What to we want?
Who are we going to offer it to in the community?
Do we need a kitchen to facilitate larger groups of people?
What changes are going to be made to existing structures and windows?
Which Church activities will be moved to the new facility?
Which commercial activities will we offer the hall to?
Financial income stream?
How is the new facility going to be accessed? (Separate entrance/exit?)
How much will the proposals cost?
Do we need more parking?
Do we need a Church hall or should we convert existing Church?

Where exactly will it be (footprint)?
Where should the office be?
Vestry not the most desirable location
How much storage do we need?
How much will we continue/want to use Church for non worship events?
Will we use the Church for café facilities
Who are the hall users?
Is it intended to be an income generator?
When will it be open/accessible?
Where is the entrance to the hall?
Will there be an external entrance/exit?
How much parking do we realistically have?

Who?
Church
School
Uniformed organisations
Package for funerals; weddings etc
Hirers?
Occasional?

Why?
Outreach for the Church
Sunday school / junior Church
Storage
Meetings

What?

Consultation with the whole congregation

Kitchen

Toilets

Material of build

Size

Sympathetic to the Church

Cloister garden?

External and internal entrance

Secure building

When?

5 year plan

How?

Finance

Funds / grants

Fundraising events

Who?

Who will want to use it

Who do we want to hire it to (eg political groups)

Big groups – small groups

Social uses (eg homeless)

Why?

Outreach

Non Church events

What?

Flexibility

Size of hall

Range of facilities

Dividing

Range of facilities must suit users eg kitchen and number of loos

How?

Discussion re aesthetics

Materials

With professionals

When?

?

What are we going to do to make it environmentally friendly?
How do we make the building sympathetic to the Church?
How do we ensure the architects reflect our needs / wishes / budget?
Who is the building for?
Should it generate income?
Who has priority? A paid booking or the Church?
Who manages it? – the project team, building later
How do we make it acceptable to all
How do we plan it for future use? Eg changes of use?
What is the expected life span?
When do we want it by?
What might the school use it for?
How will it be attached to the Church?
How do we integrate the parish office?
How do we provide for youth organisations?