



# DEEPING ST JAMES PRIORY CHURCH

## Minutes of a meeting of the Parochial Church Council held on 8 July 2021 by Zoom video conferencing

### Special meeting to discuss Rose and Sweet Pea Show and Resourcing Sustainable Church

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

**Apologies for Absence** were received from:

None

The meeting opened with prayers and began at 7.35 pm.

21.06	<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: There were no matters arising</li> </ul>	
21.07	<p><b>AOB:</b> AOB was requested to be discussed first in order to focus on the two key agenda items.</p> <p><b>SiM</b> informed the PCC that the CCLA investment fund requires updating. The names and addresses of PCC members are required to be registered and the signatory list contains names of people who are no longer active with the account. The proposed signatories were; SiM, ND, JF, CH and John Worthington (it not being a requirement to be a PCC member to be a signatory). <b>Agreed.</b></p> <p><b>ND</b> responded to a question from <b>JF</b> about the sound system, specifically the hearing loop. He informed the PCC that this was being looked into and any action required that is beyond a simple fix will be reported.</p> <p><b>MW</b> also noted that <u>someone eg churchwarden should be on hand to adjust sound levels to individual readers. He will explain how to do this.</u></p>	<b>MW</b>
21.08	<b>Rose and Sweet Pea Show update:</b>	

	<p><b>JF</b> gave an update on the opening times of the church for entrants. Unfortunately some publicity had been released prior to the change in time for exhibits to be handed in on Saturday. The time shown there gave up to 11.30 for entrants but it has been arranged for judging to take place between 11.00 and 12.00. <b>JF</b> stated that we would have to allow entrants up to 11.30 as it would be unfair on anyone who came at that time in good faith having seen it printed.</p> <p><b>KD</b> informed the PCC that there would be a children’s art exhibition and asked if there could be some form of music to add atmosphere. It was agreed to see if wither recorded to live music (piano, organ etc) could be arranged.</p> <p><b>JF</b> stated that all trophies bar one had been returned and the previous winner was searching for it. <b>VW</b> then stated that she also had another trophy, a rose bowl, and would return it before the event.</p> <p><b>ND</b> requested additional volunteers to cover the church from 3pm to 4pm and 4pm to 5pm.</p> <p><b>JF</b> informed the PCC that the Deepings magazine had also incorrectly advertised a teddy bear drop, which could not now take place, and advised people to be aware that there may be some disappointed teddy bear dropping activists.</p>	
<p><b>21.09</b></p>	<p><b>Resourcing Sustainable Church:</b>  A lengthy and detailed discussion was held on this agenda item. These minutes contain a summary of the discussion including agreed actions.</p> <p><b>MW</b> started by stating that, as we emerge from the Covid restrictions there are 3 major reviews to be undertaken. Resourcing Sustainable Church (RSC), Covenant Partners (pertaining to the giving scheme) and Living in Love and Faith (LLF). RSC and Covenant Partners are interlinked and will be discussed here under this item.</p> <p>The question posed is, where do we see ourselves as a church and where do we think that we want to go as a church? <b>MW</b> has produced a grid to try and help answer these questions which is aimed at promoting discussion.</p> <p>The RSC document proposes that churches, in general, fall into one of five types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Type 1 = Key Mission Church (KMC)</li> <li>Type 2 = Local Mission Church (LMC)</li> <li>Type 3 = Community Church (CC)</li> <li>Type 4 = Festival Church/Celebration Church (FC)</li> <li>Type 5 = Churches temporarily or permanently closed (Closed)</li> </ul>	

The general impression from the discussion was that LMC seems to be a best fit for our church. This then leads to it being closely linked to the Mission Action Plan (MAP) and the discussion continued with the two in parallel with the MAP process helping to define our purpose.

**MW**, in response to a question from **SiM**, stated that this meeting is the first step in the process.

**ND** stated that it was more important to consider where we want to be in five years, and it was agreed that this is a key element of RSC.

**NF** commented that it is not feasible for any church to try and fulfil all of the aspects of RSC and that we should concentrate on two or three and do well in one or two. This depends on the depth and breadth of the experience within the parish and on the willingness of parishioners to come forward and offer their services. She believes that this is where RSC and MAP are closely linked.

**CH** commented that it is vital that the congregation were kept fully informed at the earliest opportunity as, otherwise, it might appear to be PCC lead and nothing to do with them. They may also feel alienated if it appeared that such an important change in church life was being decided in isolation. There was wide concurrence with this and **VB** particularly voiced here support. **SiM** also commented that the PCC should form their initial ideas and then put those to the congregation.

**SiM** commented, and there was wide agreement, that there was no point sending the 71 page document to all congregation members. Without meaning any disrespect, he stated that people will simply not take the time to read such a long document. It was agreed that a suitable summary, free from church jargon and acronyms should be produced and **MW** agreed to do this.

**SoM** suggested that the media available for communication was; from the pulpit and in the church magazine. Other suggestions were the website and the Vicar's newsletter. The summarised RSC document could be made available/distributed and **MW** agreed that it was important to get this rolled out asap.

**NF** commented that we need to understand how our neighbours in both South Kesteven and towards Stamford were approaching RSC as this would influence our decision on where to align our Ministry resources.

There was mixed opinion on the subject. To the West and Stamford there are significant resources to join in with, but we would be a very small

**MW**

partner. To the East and Deeping St Nicholas there are churches in similar positions to ourselves, and we would be a more significant/equal partner. It was generally agreed that our aim is to ensure that we keep our own Vicar to enable us to drive forward with both RSC and MAP initiatives.

**MW** commented that we are one of the lowest Parish Share target contributors and that will have a bearing on the amount of ministry available. **SiM** commented that our record of meeting target was due to the current unrealistic target calculation and **MW** agreed but said that the CP initiative is in response to that.

**NF** stated that if we aspire to being a type 2, LMC, church we have to be realistic about how sustainable that would be. **SoM** added that we struggle to raise the funds to achieve that. **KD** noted that only 21 people attended that AGM but it was felt that Covid had a lot of influence in that.

**PA** asked if we had compared the activities of other, very successful churches to our own, mentioning ST Georges and City Church as examples. There was discussion on the dangers of trying copy other churches and lose being ourselves. **PA** stated, again, the importance of at least understanding what it is that makes them so popular and leads then to significant funding and causes people from DSJ to travel to them, and other churches, instead of coming here.

**KD** noted that there is a huge building programme in DSJ and no additional church resources are currently in prospect. **MW** agreed that it was important to make the correct CP choices with that in and MAP in mind.

**VB** and **SiM** commented on the importance of getting congregation feedback before the **next PCC meeting (Sep 1<sup>st</sup>)** in order to have an understanding of the general feeling prior to the wider congregation/parish meeting planned for **11<sup>th</sup> September**.

**MJ Sec** gave a point of information that there was a Whole Parish Audit conducted in 2008 and which was never acted upon. No one on the PCC had a copy of the report and **MJ** offered to ask the author.

Way forward:

**MW** proposed the following plan:

- There would be two Sundays in July where the subject would be discussed during the services (bearing in mind that holiday season)
- Information would be sent via the newsletter, the website and the August magazine, these would include the text from the services with links to the RSC summary document.
- Introduce the simplified MAP process and ask the congregation to

**MJ**

