

Partnership Meeting Minutes

Wednesday 23rd November St Martins Centre

Present: Clare Babbs (CB), David Boyce (DB), Angela Bright (AB), Neil Graham (NG), Nick Heard (NH), Sue Heard (SH), Ron Jones (RJ), Robert Macey (RM), Pat McGuinness (PM), Glenn Pennington (GP), Polly Smith (PS), Maggie Rowlands (MR), Paula Pugh (PP) and Bridget Laraway(BL).

Item	
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies for absence NH opened the meeting and welcomed Maggie Rowlands as a prospective new partner. Apologies for absence were received from Laurel Roberts and Steve Davenport.</p>
2	<p>Declarations of interest. RJ and RM declared an interest in item 8a – Big Grants Scheme follow up from Selattyn & Gobowen Parish Council. GP and PM declared an interest in item 8c – Big Grants Scheme application from St John’s Church.</p>
3	<p>Minutes of the meeting of 19th October These were confirmed as a true record of the minutes. <u>Matters arising</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RJ asked for an explanation of the decision relating the the Big Grants Scheme application from Selattyn & Gobowen Parish Council – NH gave an explanation. • PP reported that she had received an update from Fairshare regarding the 3 loans that were in arrears. Progress is being made with one loan and the other two are still being chased. • BL reported that she had spoken to the Partnership’s insurance company, Markel, and they had advised that Partners were not covered for Personal Injury. However, if they were injured whilst carrying out their role in the Partnership, and the Partnership was thought to be at fault, the Partner could take legal action against the Partnership and, if proved, the claim could be settled under the Public Liability cover that the Partnership does have. NH asked BL to check if Partners would be covered for Personal Injury under Qube’s insurance. <p>There were 5 actions to carry forward (listed at the end of this document)</p>

4	<p>Chairperson's report</p> <p>a. Update from Project Planning meeting NH gave an overview of the Project Planning meeting that had taken place on 10th November and drew attention to the work plans for BL and PP that had been distributed with the minutes of the 10th November meeting. NH advised that, in order to support this revised work plan, the project planning group would no longer exist and that 'task and finish' groups would be formed to look at each individual project when needed.</p> <p>b. Chair's meeting NH reported that he was attending the Chair's meeting on 10th December.</p>
5	<p>Co-ordinator report</p> <p>BL had circulated a written report in advance of the meeting. She gave the following additional information at the meeting:</p> <p>a. Grants BL advised that she is currently working with 5 groups to develop grant applications of varying values – Three Parishes Community Wildlife group, Sunday Social Club, Extend Classes, All Saints Church Hall and the Hillfort group.</p> <p>b. Training BL advised that there is a Local Trust training event on 19th January looking at Community land Trusts. Any partners that are interested in attending are asked to contact BL for more information.</p> <p>CB noted that spending to date was behind profile and suggested a 'push' on grant schemes to get spending back on track. CB advised that we may, in future, have to look more closely at spending to target as Local Trust may start to come under pressure from the Big Lottery to ensure that spending is aligned with budget profile.</p>
6	<p>Communications and Community Project Officer Report</p> <p>PP had circulated a written report in advance of the meeting. She gave the following additional information at the meeting:</p> <p>a. School savings club PP reported that over £200 had been saved at Gobowen school on Friday 18th November. Partners commented on how successful the savings club was and PP was asked to find out if it would be possible for adults to use the school savings club as a way to pay in to their accounts.</p>

7	<p>Evaluations Process – feedback from Partners</p> <p>Community Chest applications from Year 1 and their completed evaluations had been distributed to 6 Partners at the last Partnership meeting. Partners had been asked to review the applications and evaluations and to give feedback at this meeting.</p> <p>SH made the following observations in relation to the evaluation she had reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the information in the evaluation it was difficult to assess whether or not the application represented good value for money. • At the time that the evaluation form was completed only half of the money had been spent and there had been no follow up regarding the remaining expenditure. <p>NH commented that situations like this needed to be followed up as there should be certainty regarding the value of grant spent. Partners agreed, however it was also agreed that, as this grant was awarded and the evaluation form completed over 12 months, it was inappropriate to follow up this particular one.</p> <p><i>AB left the meeting at this point.</i></p> <p>PS had no observations in relation to the application she had reviewed. The project had achieved what it set out to achieve and the forms had been fully completed.</p> <p>GP gave a summary of the evaluation that he had reviewed and made the suggestion that the evaluation should stipulate a minimum of 6 photos to be included.</p> <p>NH asked for volunteers to form a task and finish group to look at the whole grant process from evaluation to application. NH, GP, PM, MR and PS agreed to be part of the group. BL was asked to arrange a date in early January for the first meeting.</p>
8	<p>Big Grants Scheme</p> <p>a. Response from Selattyn & Gobowen Parish Council.</p> <p>As agreed at the meeting on 19th October, BL had obtained responses to the 3 questions raised by Partners in relation to this Big Grant Scheme application and these had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Details of the discussion relating to each question:</p> <p>Question 1 concerned the powers of Parish Councils to receive income from grant funding. Partners accepted the response.</p> <p>Question 2 concerned the Parish Council reserves. CB pointed out to Partners that the Parish Council was, in effect, deciding not to fund this themselves as they could access funding for this project. This could be viewed as the Parish Council using Big Local money to cover services that they should provide themselves. Partners discussed whether or not funding playgrounds constituted a ‘statutory obligation’ and agreed that it did not. BL advised that the programme of playground equipment renewal had been carried out using grant funding for many years. NH commented that the application could have come from the Playing fields committee which would have negated many of the issues that Partners were discussing.</p> <p>Question 3 concerned income from housing developments. RM explained the different regulations that governed whether or not a Parish Council receives income from new housing developments and advised that the developments in Gobowen</p>

did not qualify. Partners expressed concern about the phrase “the opportunity was not followed through” that had been used in the Parish council’s response to this question. NH expressed concern that Parish Councils were not receiving money they were entitled to.

NH asked BL and CB to meet with the Parish Clerk to more fully understand their response to Questions 2.

RM raised a question about the grants process for Big Grants and whether or not the Partnership should consider asking application to present / discuss their application with Partners which could reduce the likelihood of questions and responses and the time lag that this entails. CB advised that this should not be considered as it was bad practice for a funder.

b. Six monthly report from Gobowen Central.

The report had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Partners commented that the report lacked information about who had provided it and that future reports should include the name of the author and their role in the project. BL advised that the report had been prepared by Corrie Davies with the backing of the Gobowen Central Development Group.

Concern was raised that the report did not clearly identify income streams or provide an income forecast, there was too much superfluous information and reference was made to projects / initiatives (such as Resilient Communities) with no explanation of the initiative or its relevance in this case.

NH asked CB and all Partners to feed back any comments or requests for clarification to BL to send to Corrie.

NH pointed out that the Partnership could potentially be funding two community building related projects in Gobowen with significant risks of failure and suggested that the Partnership should look at ways of encouraging Gobowen Central and Gobowen Station to work together. RM advised that, in the early stages of Gobowen Central, stakeholders considered alternative accommodation within the village and agreed that the best possible solution was to retain the current building. CB gave an overview of the work that would be involved in getting the two groups to work together and advised that this would be an ambitious project that would likely still be in development beyond the 10 year Big Local programme.

c. St John’s Church Application

St John’s Church had applied for funding for £780.80 (£500 hardware & £280.80 broadband fees). Partners discussed whether or not this use of funding constituted a religious activity and BL confirmed the wording in Local Trust’s grant offer letter relating to the use of funds for religious activity. Partners agreed that there is significant community use of the building for secular activity and that a condition should be put in the grant offer letter advising that the equipment / service should be mainly for secular activities. CB advised Partners that a fund that she was involved in didn’t fund broadband or any other regular fees due to the potential for applicants to apply for repeat funding. NH proposed that Partners approve the full amount of the application (£780.80) but stipulate that this can only be spent on hardware rather than broadband fees and that receipts for all expenses must be provided. Partners agreed with the proposal.

9	<p>Community Chest Applications</p> <p>a. St Martins Parish Church Chapter House (£470) This application was for £470 towards the cost of replacing the Vertical blinds in the chapter house. Partners discussed the usage of the building and commented that future maintenance items should be planned for out of room hire charges. Application Approved</p> <p>b. Heather Bank Residents, Gobowen (£220) This application was for £220 towards a 'Secret Santa' to further develop relations amongst this small community in Gobowen that had recently started doing things together and getting to know each other. Partners recommended that the residents formally create a neighbourhood scheme / residents association. Application Approved</p> <p>c. City Lane and area residents (£500) This application was for £500 towards 2 community events over the next 12 months. Partners recommended that the area develop a formal residents association / membership scheme and fundraise for future events. Partners also suggested that the funding should be spent on re-usable equipment rather than disposable to help ensure sustainability for future events. Application Approved</p>
10	<p>Evaluations received</p> <p>a. TNS Community Foundation. This was passed to PM to review and report back at the next meeting.</p> <p>b. St Martins WI. This was passed to GP to review and report back at the next meeting.</p> <p>c. Weston Rhyn Singers. This was passed to NH to review and report back at the next meeting.</p>
11	<p>Any other business</p> <p>a. Bid writing workshop BL reported on an action that she had taken at the Project Planning meeting on 10th November to investigate the costs of providing a bid writing workshop. She had received a quote for a one day training course for up to 20 people at a total cost of £955. BL also reported that Laurel Roberts had advised that Qube could cover half the cost of the course if half the places could be allocated to Qube staff. DB suggested an alternative training provider and agreed to provide contact details to BL. Partners approved the cost of £477.50 for up to 10 places and asked BL to investigate the alternative training provider before making any firm arrangements.</p> <p>b. Partnership organisations NH suggested that the Partnership invite local organisations with aims that align with the Community Aspirations to become members of the Partnership and he gave the example of Shropshire RCC as one to consider. GP proposed that details of the pros and cons of this approach be compiled and circulated to Partners in advance of the next meeting. BL and NH to prepare document and circulate.</p>

Meeting dates:

Weds 25th Jan 2017 7:30pm

Partnership meeting

Weston Rhyn (TBC)

Actions agreed at this meeting 23rd November 2016

Item	Action	Who	Deadline
3	Check if Qube's insurance covers Partners for personal injury	BL	25/1/17
5	Contact BL for more information on Community land trust training event or to book a place	ALL	16/12/16
6	Find out if adults could pay into their Fairshare accounts at the School Savings Club	PP	25/1/17
7	Arrange date in early January for first meeting of task and finish group	BL	30/11/16
8a	Meet with Parish Clerk to discuss responses to clarification questions.	BL & CB	25/1/17
8b	Feed back any comments or requests for clarification from Gobowen Cental six monthly report to BL.	CB & Partners	7/12/16
8b	Liaise with Corrie Davies in relation to the above action.	BL	25/1/17
8c	Write to St John's Church with the outcome of the discussion	BL	25/1/17
9	Write to applicants advising them of the outcome of their Community Chest applications	BL	30/11/16
10a	Review TNS Community Foundation documents and report back at next meeting	PM	25/1/17
10b	Review St Martins WI documents and report back at next meeting	GP	25/1/17
10c	Review Weston Rhyn Singers documents are report back at next meeting	NH	25/1/17
11a	Provide contact details for bid writing workshop to BL	DB	30/11/16
11b	Prepare document on the pros and cons of Partner organisations and circulate	BL / NH	16/12/16

Actions carried forward – Partnership meeting 19/10/16

Item	Action	Who	Deadline
4d	Try assessment process, complete documentation and report back at next Partnership meeting	RM, AB, NG	25/1/17
6	Oswestry Men's Shed video – send to Men's Shed committee for approval	PP	23/11/16
6	Big Chat video – review and seek retrospective permissions from all involved as needed.	BL/PP	23/11/16

Actions carried forward – Partnership meeting 31/8/16

Agenda Item	Action	Who	Deadline
3	Add minutes of 27/7/16 meeting to website	BL	9/9/16

Actions carried forward – Partnership meeting 28/9/16

Agenda Item	Agreed Actions – Partnership meeting 28/9/16	Who	Deadline
6	Arrange for all Partners to sign new letter of commitment	BL	31/10/16