



# DEEPING ST JAMES PRIORY CHURCH

## Minutes of a meeting of the Parochial Church Council held on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2021 at 7.30pm by Zoom Call

**Present:** Revd Mark Williams Chairman (**MW**), Simon Marshall (**SiM**), Revd Sonia Marshall (**SoM**), Vicky Billyard (**VB**), Lisa Goodchild (**LG**), Kate Drewett (**KD**), Ted Fisk (**TF**), Jan Fisk (**JF**), Philip Astle (**PA**), Niccy Fisher (**NF**), Nick Drewett (**ND**), Martin Jones – secretary (**MJ**) Victoria Worthington (**VW**), Caroline Herron (**CH**)

**Apologies for Absence** were received from: None

The meeting opened with prayers and began at 7.30 pm.

<b>21.27</b>	<p><b>Minutes of the previous meeting:</b> Corrected Minutes had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The Minutes were accepted.</li><li>b. The Minutes can be published.</li><li>c. Matters Arising:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>21.24. <b>VW</b>, who could not attend the last meeting, requested that the comment regarding Mission Matters allocation of funds in 21.24 be recorded as stating; <b>PA</b> spoke for <b>VW</b> to say that the Mission Committee, as a fundraising committee, have decided that they will continue to give primarily to charities outside the church.</li> <li>21.19 Architect. <b>ND</b> has rung the Diocesan office twice to ask for advice about a new architect and is still waiting. <b>NF</b> offered to assist him in this matter.</li> <li>Lighting. <b>SiM</b> stated that he cannot progress researching funding for the lighting upgrade until we have a scope, specification and quotation to request funding against. <b>ND</b> replied that the contractor has now reported that there is a way to control the LED light without going through the dimmer relays, which would have required replacing, and significantly increase the cost. He hopes to have the quotation and specification in the next week to 10 days.</li> <li>Leaking roof. It has been noted that 3 or 4 louvres in the bell tower were broken or missing. <b>PA</b> commented that louvres have been broken or missing for several years. <b>CH</b> reported that there has been water ingress into the tower. One of the bells (No5 bell) had a cracked stay which had swollen and jammed. The stay on No5 has now been removed and replaced. There was also an issue with the clapper on No6. Taylor's (the foundry company) came and removed the clapper and it has gone for repair.</li></ul></li></ul>	<b>ND and NF</b>
--------------	--	------------------

	<p>Boilers. <b>ND</b> informed the PCC that one boiler in the church is now working and the other is awaiting a new gas valve, which is due on the weekend of 27<sup>th</sup>/28<sup>th</sup> November.</p>	
<b>21.28</b>	<p><b>Clergy Report:</b>  <b>MW</b> had circulated his report to the PCC and asked for comments and questions. There being none he went on to inform the PCC that during the continued discussion in the Synod the mood is positive and energised. In contrast <b>MW</b> has been feeding back that in the parish, and other parishes, there is stress, concern and even fear. He had managed to speak to both Bishop David and Nigel Bacon to give him this feedback directly and ask him to make it understood.</p> <p><b>SoM</b> reported that she has conducted one funeral and that the family she saw last month is now attending church again.</p>	
<b>21.29</b>	<p><b>Resourcing Sustainable Church Update:</b>  <b>MW</b> reported that we are further along in our RCS journey than some other parishes. In discussions there have been questions about where we stand as we straddle the proposed Deanery Partnerships based on South Kesteven (SK) and South Holland (SH). He understood that, historically, we have felt more drawn to SK than SH but reported that both the Ness Group, and Market Deeping (MD) felt more comfortable with SH.  <b>NF</b> gave the opinion that we should consider aligning with SH as we have now been part of that Deanery for some time and that it would not make sense to differ from MD and the Ness Group.  <b>NF</b> proposed that we align with SH for RSC. After discussion this was unanimously <b>AGREED</b>.</p>	
<b>21.30</b>	<p><b>MAP Update:</b>  <b>MW</b>, had circulated a draft MAP grid and asked the PCC to review it and give comments. <b>NF</b> had added notes in red, specifically posing the question “why” in conjunction to “what”. <b>MW</b> asked that the PCC review the grid and that <b>MJ</b> would add a specific agenda item for next meeting and commented that it would be important to take small steps.</p> <p>In a slight digression from the agenda item, there having been reference to the Standing Committee (SC) during this discussion, <b>CH</b> stated that it was her understanding that the SC was only intended to make decisions on urgent matters that occurred between PCC meetings which could not wait. <b>PA</b> and <b>VW</b> joined in voicing concerns about the role of the SC in holding planned meetings outside of the full PCC. <b>PA</b> felt that the SC might be a dominant group and <b>CH</b> was worried that, for example, decisions on options may be being made and only selected options brought to full PCC. <b>MW</b> stated that, in his experience, the purpose of an SC was;</p>	<b>All and MJ</b>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To bring together a small number of people, from the larger PCC group</li> <li>2. It would only act after discussion with the PCC</li> <li>3. The role was strategic and the SC should not take decisions outside of the PCC.</li> </ol> <p><b>MW</b> also stated that the SC was a committee of the PCC, and that the PCC was the ultimate governing body. Notes of SC meetings are sent to PCC. He also looked up the definition in 'Practical Church Management' by James Behrens, and found;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A nominated group from within a larger PCC who would meet outside of the full PCC meeting. A sub-group, who would decide what from a specific subject would be discussed during the full PCC meeting.</p> <p><b>NF</b> offered to add the TOR for the SC to the TOR review that she is conducting and will report back that the next PCC. To be added as an agenda item.</p> <p><b>SiM</b> asked if the PCC should decide how often all of the groups meet and who is responsible for reporting. <b>MW</b> replied that it is in the TOR for the groups and this will be covered under the agenda item for next meeting.</p>	<b>NF and MJ</b>																								
<b>21.31</b>	<p><b>Treasurers Report: Balances at 24 November 2021</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Current acct</td> <td style="width: 15%;">£7172</td> <td style="width: 15%;"></td> <td style="width: 15%;"></td> <td style="width: 15%;"></td> <td style="width: 15%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reserve acct</td> <td>(deposit) £17</td> <td>(investment) £22742</td> <td></td> <td>total of £22759</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fabric acct</td> <td>(deposit) £1780</td> <td>(investment) £11522</td> <td></td> <td>total of £13302</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Organ acct</td> <td>(deposit) £3255</td> <td>(investment) £4441</td> <td></td> <td>total of £7696</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>In the current account there is the Mission Matters monies and wedding deposits etc of £1793. After adjusting for these items the current account becomes £5379</p> <p>The Chancel trust (deposit) £3865 (investment £12965 total of £16830</p> <p>It was proposed to pay £3500 to Parish share. This was agreed by all. This brings the total paid for the year to £32000 compared with £25500 paid at this time last year.</p> <p><b>SiM</b> reported that he has completed the forms for setting up the digital Planned Giving Scheme. A SC meeting has been arranged for 3pm on 13<sup>th</sup> December, to which all PCC members are also invited, with Hugo Cobham to receive advice about the stewardship programme to precede the roll out.</p> <p><b>SiM</b> also reported on some interesting research he has done using CofE data on parish giving. In England the average donation per person per week in 2019 was £14.18. The lowest donations were from the Lincoln diocese at £8.10. Our parish is £7.88 per person per week.</p>	Current acct	£7172					Reserve acct	(deposit) £17	(investment) £22742		total of £22759		Fabric acct	(deposit) £1780	(investment) £11522		total of £13302		Organ acct	(deposit) £3255	(investment) £4441		total of £7696		
Current acct	£7172																									
Reserve acct	(deposit) £17	(investment) £22742		total of £22759																						
Fabric acct	(deposit) £1780	(investment) £11522		total of £13302																						
Organ acct	(deposit) £3255	(investment) £4441		total of £7696																						

	<p><b>NF</b> stated that this has been a pattern for a long time and had previously been masked by funds from assets held by the diocese. This is no longer the case.</p> <p><b>MW</b> stated that there were two approaches to the issue of funding:  Stewardship, the process by which money is raised  Covenant Pastors, which will help initiate the process of the replacement of the Parish Share for money going to the diocese.</p> <p>These two are related, but have different foci.</p> <p><b>NF</b> asked about the Chancel fund and if any money has been paid out for painting in the Chancel. <b>CH</b> stated` no, and that the painters have taken samples to see what product would be suitable but have not reported back yet. The results were promised for 8 to 10 weeks and that was approximately 9 weeks ago.</p>	
21.32	<p><b>Reports from Teams:</b></p> <p><b>Mission Matters (MM)</b>  Minutes of the last meeting had been circulated with the agenda.</p> <p><b>VM</b> stated that Christmas cards are sent out, but asked how we decide who to send them to. <b>MW</b> said that the MM should take the lead on who to send the cards to in order to avoid more than one card being sent or no card being to someone who we would wish to have one.</p> <p><b>NF</b> added that small cards should be used for cards with one signature and large cards are used where a large number of signatures are appropriate. Discussion followed and it was commented that, amongst other recipients, the local schools and other community groups should be on a list, which is then maintained and kept for next year.</p> <p><b>Eco Church (EC)</b>  <b>KD</b> had sent out the 2019 survey and report and also a blank survey for review.</p> <p><b>NF</b> congratulated <b>KD</b> for her diligent work on EC.</p> <p><b>KD</b> stated that, for EC to succeed, there needs to be input from groups and individuals who have an interest in the 5 areas that the survey is based on. She asked that the PCC review the survey and feedback their thoughts on how to make it work. <b>NF</b> suggested that once the Church groups are established they could be asked to take on EC roles. She also suggested that if we are clear about what is being asked for we would be better able to ask for community partners to support.</p> <p><b>LG</b> suggested that Judy Stevens would be a good local contact and <b>KD</b> agreed, stating that she has already provided the bulbs for Friday Knights' use in wilding.</p> <p><b>TF</b> thanked <b>KD</b> for her support and stated that the Land section of EC is the area that the youth would focus on and they could use this, additionally, as</p>	ALL

	<p>an opportunity to make reports and ask for support (a request coming from children/youth is less easy to ignore).</p> <p>KD said that the children and youth groups are, and have been, key in this and Friday Knights have focused on EC matters this week. <b>TF</b> stated that they would like to make plans for projects they would undertake but some project would require approval and he wanted to be sure that they did not start anything only to find that they cannot then execute it. Examples are meadowing and wildlife areas/bug hotels etc. <b>MW</b> suggested that Friday Knights submit a list of projects that can be reviewed in advance. As an example, the idea of a wildlife pond is excellent, but even 6 inches of water is deemed a risk to a small child and protection would have to be included.</p> <p><b>Children's Group</b>  <b>MW</b> had circulated the report of the last meeting.  <b>JF</b> has circulated the report from the Light Party and Firework Night.</p>	
<p><b>21.33</b></p>	<p><b>Safeguarding (Including Youth Work contact database):</b>  <b>TF</b> stated that Lin Witherington has her advanced DBS checks completed. Chris Brown gives private piano lessons and has an Enhanced DBS. For private lessons brokered from our parish it will be a requirement that parents remain in attendance.  Pam Brown is DBS registered through the Methodist church but will need to complete another for our church.</p>	
<p><b>21.34</b></p>	<p><b>Covid Update:</b>  Our area has a very high covid rate compared to national average and, thus, we are continuing with protective measures despite there being no specific diocesan or CoE guidance to take the measures that we are doing.  <b>TF</b> was concerned that we are taking measures in church but then relaxing in the hall, and it is face to face interaction that is a known spreading mechanism.</p> <p><b>CH</b> asked if we can start re-introducing singing parts of the service, e.g. Gloria, to bring back some of the solemnity and to have the choir process in and out of church behind the vicar. Also, could bringing forward the offertory plate be considered safe again? <b>NF</b> agreed that the choir leaving was a signal that the service was over, particularly for anyone who is new to the church or visiting.</p> <p>It was then mentioned that some concerns had been expressed privately regarding a range of issues. <b>MW</b> expressed concern that nothing had been raised with him personally. It is important not to allow them to fester, and encouraged people to speak to him. CWs are there specifically to help with this.</p>	

	<p><b>MW</b> stated that there has already been some discussion regarding the specific points <b>CH</b> raised. This will be addressed very soon.</p>	
21.35	<p><b>AOB:</b></p> <p><b>TF</b> reminded the PCC that it had been agreed that we would invite Ryan to come to a PCC and talk about the new website. He will show a demo website he has created. <b>MW</b> asked that Ryan and <b>TF</b> also give us a cost comparison from what we are doing now to the new website. He asked that an agenda item be included for next meeting.</p> <p><b>CH</b> asked about the portable wi-fi for streaming services and events from the hall. <b>MW</b> said that he has a router and EE or Vodafone will provide the best service at approximately £15.00/month for 10Gb.</p> <p><b>CH</b> asked why we are still holding meetings on zoom and <b>MW</b> explained that the PCC members who work in schools, where rates are at their highest amongst pupils and staff, are not comfortable meeting in enclosed spaces. <b>LG and TF</b> agreed with this and <b>VB</b> added that it was as much out of concern for school staff transmitting to PCC members as vice versa.</p> <p><b>MW</b> mentioned that he had has a contact from someone in Priory Close asking what we thought about the pigeon problem. He said that they were not suggesting that it was a church problem, but rather asking what could we all do. A discussion followed where many PCC members voiced concerns over pigeons as vermin and such methods as hired falconry to remove them, which <b>ND</b> said has seen used at the cathedral. <b>SiM</b> did voice that they are also God's creatures and <b>KD</b> stated that, with her EC hat on, any method of removal should be humane.</p>	<b>MJ</b>
	<p><b>Date of Next Meetings:</b> 15 Dec, 19 Jan</p>	
	<p><b>The Meeting Closed at 9.18pm with MW giving thanks to PCC members, especially those on the front line in schools</b></p>	