

CONFIRMED PCC MINUTES FOR THE PARISH OF ST MICHAEL'S PLAS NEWTON, CHESTER

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 16 November 2020 via Zoom

| | | |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Present | Peter Rugen (Chair) | John Stockdale |
| | Ruth McKew | Andy Thorne |
| | Steve McKew | Gill Miller |
| | David Blackmore | Estelle Byrne |
| | John Allan | Stu Davies |
| | Martin Smith | Andrew Davies |
| | Magdy Fahmy | Fiona Prichard (Secretary) |
| | Steve Powell | |
| | Ali Gibbons | |
| | Peter Webster | |
| | Anne de Reybekill | Apologies |
| | Anne Stockdale | No apologies were received |
| | Ken Ball | |
| | Phil Roberts | |

| Ref | Item | Notes | Action (what) | Who and by when |
|-----|--|--|---------------|-----------------|
| | Welcome and Prayer | Pete welcomed everyone to the meeting. He said that he had briefly welcomed the new members at the previous PCC meeting but would like to formally welcome them again and he also thanked all those present who had taken on a role within the PCC. He then opened the meeting with a reading from Luke, Chapter 18. He followed the reading with a prayer. | | |
| | Minutes from September and October Meetings | <p>No amendments were required to be made to the minutes from either the September or the October PCC meetings.</p> <p>The approval of the minutes for the September meeting was proposed by Steve McKew and seconded by John Stockdale and the minutes were approved by all present.</p> <p>The approval of the minutes for the October meeting was proposed by Magdy Fahmy and seconded by Anne de Reybekill and the minutes were approved by all present.</p> | | |



| Ref | Item | Notes | Action (what) | Who and by when |
|------|------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------|
| | Matters Arising | <p>Pete said that the matter concerning the CDs was in hand and CDs were being sent out.</p> <p>A member of the Mission Committee commented that with reference to Item 2045 of the September minutes, most of the Mission payments had already been sent out, a month early, following a Mission Committee Meeting.</p> | | |
| 2055 | Finance Report | <p>Phil Roberts had circulated the Finance Report prior to the meeting and he had invited comments via email. It was suggested that rather than the Report being discussed via email, any matters arising should be discussed at the meeting. Phil, therefore, outlined the comments he had received and his responses to them (see attached).</p> <p>Phil was asked how Mission giving for 2021 was calculated and he explained that it was a total of giving to Mission in 2019 plus 10% of General Fund giving for 2019.</p> <p>He was also asked to clarify the error which had been highlighted regarding the Kings Way loss for 2019. He said that the figure included the church depreciation when it should have included the Kings Way depreciation. Consequently, the loss was much less than in his Report (ie around £3k).</p> <p>A further discrepancy was pointed out regarding the loss for 2020. Phil accepted that it was an error and said he would correct it.</p> <p>Phil was asked if Mission giving was still made up of donations to the Mission Fund with the shortfall being made up from the General Fund and Phil confirmed that this was still the case. There was a note at the end of the Annual Accounts to this effect.</p> <p>A query was made as to how much the drop in open plate giving due to the Covid crisis had been offset by an increase in online giving. Phil said it was not possible to calculate this.</p> <p>Phil was asked about state of the cash reserves in relation to the financial outcome predicted for 2021. Phil said that at the end of 2020 the cash reserves were likely to be around £75k and in 2021 they were likely to drop to around £50k. He explained that the £36k loss figure projected for the end of</p> | | |



| Ref | Item | Notes | Action (what) | Who and by when |
|-----|------|---|---------------|-----------------|
| | | <p>the current year included depreciation and he further outlined the items of equipment that depreciation was calculated on (eg the boiler).</p> <p>A member of the PCC commented that the deficit was not as bad as had been anticipated when the decision had been taken to employ Rob Kophamel. If that risk had not been taken then the church would have not had the benefit of his expertise during the Covid crisis, in particular, in putting the services on line. Furthermore, financially, the risk had paid off as, as soon as he commenced his employment, Sas went on maternity leave and then was furloughed. It was suggested that we should remind ourselves that we should trust in God and his Plan for us.</p> <p>It was suggested that a deficit budget should only be agreed for a medium term (say 4-5 years). Phil explained that there was so much uncertainty it was not advisable to be limited by such guidelines. He said that the Café was forecast to make a loss of £20k due to the Covid situation but it was possible it would bounce back to near breakeven in 2022 providing it could return to pre-Covid income. If the Café did not bounce back we could be out of cash in 2 years.</p> <p>It was suggested that there was an agreed level below which the reserves could not fall but Phil said that there is already a policy in place.</p> <p>A suggestion was made that, if the financial situation necessitated it, one of the church owned properties could be sold. There was a discussion as to whether the property represented a restricted fund but it was suggested that it had only been the fund which had been set up to finance the purchase which was restricted, not the property itself.</p> <p>A comment was made that although there may be grants which could be applied for, it was not safe to assume that these would be granted and the application process was often very long and time consuming.</p> <p>The consensus of opinion was that the church needed to grow its income base to match its vision and, therefore, needed to articulate its Godly vision to encourage the church members to resource the vision.</p> | | |



| Ref | Item | Notes | Action (what) | Who and by when |
|-----|------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| | | <p>Pete said that there was to be a review by the Finance Committee in January with regard to giving. There followed a discussion as to whether January was the best time of year to have a drive to increase giving and it was agreed that autumn might be a better time to have a campaign.</p> <p>Pete cautioned that the Covid crisis may have had repercussions on the financial situation of many church members and any giving campaign needed to be sensitive to this.</p> <p>Pete thanked Phil for his Report and for answering the queries raised.</p> <p>Phil then moved onto the proposals set out in his Financial Report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The Gas and Electricity Contracts TGP through Energy Basket</u>: Phil proposed that the church remain with Parish Buying for a further 12 months. All agreed. 2. <u>Renewal of Insurances for 2020-21</u>: Phil proposed that the insurance contracts for the Church properties and the Café be changed from Ecclesiastical to Trinitas. All agreed and Phil said that he would notify Trinitas accordingly. <p>Phil then went onto propose the budget for 2021. A discussion ensued regarding the budget and how much of it was already committed to (eg salaries) and how much could be subject to amendment should the financial situation dictate. A member of the Mission Committee said that some of its mission partners were being supported on terms exceeding a year. It was advised by a member of the meeting that, where there is a commitment of financial support exceeding a year, that this should be reflected in the accounts and appear as a liability. Pete said that there needed to be further clarity on the financial commitments of the Mission Committee and the terms of the Mission Committee needed to be looked at. He added that any long term financial commitments needed the prior agreement of the PCC.</p> <p>Phil proposed that the budget be accepted on the understanding that there was flexibility, and that pending a review, it could be amended should the need arise. Andrew</p> | Trinitas to be notified | Phil |



| Ref | Item | Notes | Action (what) | Who and by when |
|------|-----------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|
| | | <p>Davies seconded it. It was put to a vote and the outcome was as follows:</p> <p>Votes for = 16 Votes against = 0 Abstentions = 4</p> | | |
| 2056 | Sub-Committees | <p>Pete explained that a regular review of the committees within a church was good practice. He had already circulated a paper on the matter and the general model he was proposing was to split the groups into essential groups and working groups with a fixed tenure to ensure that the personnel within the groups would be revised on a regular basis.</p> <p>It was argued that, contrary to Pete’s proposed breakdown of groups, Health and Safety be kept separate from Safeguarding. A discussion ensued and the consensus of opinion was that the two groups should be kept separate, to which Pete agreed.</p> <p>There was a discussion regarding the titles of essential and working groups. It was suggested that another way of looking at the titles was with regard to the legal requirement ie we are required by law to have those in the Essential Group but there is no such obligation regarding the working groups.</p> <p>It was queried as to why there was not an HR Group but Pete said that he relies on the Diocese to provide advice regarding this matter. Any decisions needed are put before the Standing Committee.</p> <p>It was suggested that the Buildings Committee should be changed to the Buildings and Grounds Committee.</p> <p>Concern was expressed regarding that the working groups might be regarded as non-essential as they were not in the Essential group. Concern was expressed that the church would have lost its way if certain core elements such as evangelism, mission support and worship were no longer at the heart of its activities. It was argued that there was no</p> | | |



| Ref | Item | Notes | Action (what) | Who and by when |
|------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>suggestion that the groups were temporary in any way and the names were labels which would not change the purpose of the church. Pete emphasised that all groups were of equal status.</p> <p>It was noted that some areas were not included in the groups (eg Pastoral, Readers and New Building groups) but Pete said that these groups would continue to be under his area of responsibility. It was suggested that an Environmental Group be added to the working groups.</p> <p>It was also suggested that young people could be part of the groups to involve them in the running of the church and this was greeted with enthusiasm.</p> <p>It was suggested that the PCC members should spend the following week praying and then submit a list of suggested names of people who should chair each committee. Pete encouraged PCC members to be part of the committees.</p> <p>It was agreed in principle to reconstitute the small groups of the PCC and with this aim the PCC members would pass their suggestions for people to chair the different groups. Pete would then draw up a list to be put before the next PCC meeting. The motion was proposed by Steve McKew and seconded by Andy Thorne. All were in agreement.</p> | <p>Names to be submitted to Pete</p> <p>A list to be drawn up</p> | <p>PCC Members</p> <p>Pete</p> |
| 2057 | Vicar's Report | <p>Pete said that the period between the lockdowns had been a good time regarding the services and the Harvest Service and the Remembrance Service had both been well received.</p> <p>With regard to Advent and Christmas, Pete said it was difficult to plan because of the lockdown situation as we didn't know when it would be lifted. He had, therefore, decided not to plan for any congregational services, with the exception of Christmas Day (if it was permitted). He had the following plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Gilbertson, the Archdeacon, was starting an advent course on Zoom on Wednesday. Details would be sent out; • There was to be a drive to help Food Bank with an idea for a donations advent calendar; | | |



| Ref | Item | Notes | Action (what) | Who and by when |
|-----|------|--|---------------|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Christmas quiz was planned, run by Rob and Em on 12th December; • There would be a Bake Off competition whereby photos of Christmas cakes could be sent in; • There would be a Christmas Tree competition whereby photos of Christmas Trees could be sent in and then made into a collage of photos; • On 20th December there would be an online All Ages Carol Service, geared towards families and young people; • There would be a Nativity Trail like the Light Trail Sas had organised for Halloween. It was a venture linked with the Hub and would be called a Christmas Community Trail. People would be encouraged to put nativity scenes in their windows and outside their houses. Pete was going to have make one in his garden. • If permitted, there would be a communion service in church on Christmas Day but if this was not permitted, it would be online. • The Church of England had said that it was not necessary to hold services on 27th December. | | |



| Ref | Item | Notes | Action (what) | Who and by when |
|------|---------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|
| 2058 | AOB | <p><u>Operation Christmas Child</u>: Pete asked for the views of PCC Members on this charity which the church had been supporting for a number of years. He said that the charity had been set up in Wrexham with very good intentions but it had now been taken over by Franklin Graham, son of Billy Graham, who had acquired a questionable reputation. The matter was discussed and it was suggested that next year another charity initiative would be chosen for church members to support. Gill Miller proposed that another charity initiative be found and Ruth McKew seconded it. All were in favour except for 1.</p> <p><u>Christmas Communication with the Parish</u>: It was suggested that, instead of Christmas Cards, CDs costing £1 each be sent to a selection of people in the Parish. A discussion ensued and some concerns were raised (eg Covid risk, environmental credentials, how much it would communicate about St Michael's). It was suggested that a Christmas card would be a better way of communicating with the Parish. A decision regarding whether to send cards was deferred to the staff team.</p> | | |
| | Prayer | The meeting closed with saying the Grace. | | |
| | Next Meeting | PCC on Monday, 18 th January 2021 at 8.00pm via Zoom. | | |

