



## **Minutes of the Board Meeting**

**Held at the Hall for Gwinear**

**On Wednesday 22nd Feb 2017 at 7pm**

Present :

Directors

Mr Richard Rogers (Chair)	RR
Mrs Cathy Woolcock	CW
Mr Nicolas Herian	NH
Mrs Rosemarie Norman	RN
Mrs Jenny Tovey	JT
Mr Giles Eustice	GE

Minute Taker

Beckie Pascoe (Bluesky)	BP
-------------------------	----

### 1. Apologies

Mrs Diana Hall - Diana had emailed her thoughts on the projects prior to the meeting.

### 2. Minutes of previous Board Meeting (13<sup>th</sup> July 2016) and Matters Arising

RR read through the minutes, RR updated board on his email to the advisory panel and their responses. The minutes of the board meeting dated 13<sup>th</sup> July 2016 were agreed by all attending and signed by RR. BP to upload to the website.

### 3. Update on banking

BP gave the board a breakdown of the accounts to date. There is £67,311 with the Hope Farm funds due of £7,754, since moving funds in to a savings account £159.72 had been earned in interest.

### 4. Approval of invoices

Invoices for hire of hall for tonight's meeting and Bluesky administration services for the next 6 months were approved and a cheque to withdraw £20 for petty cash was agreed to purchase stamps, stationary etc. BP will keep a petty cash record.

Insurance will be due at the beginning of May and the board agreed to renew the current insurance policy if the policy cost is still reasonably the same.

5. Letter from Gwinear and Gwithian Parish Council dated 3<sup>rd</sup> Nov 2016

BP read the letter from the Parish Council:

RR invited comments from the board - GE said he could see where the Parish Council were coming from with the loss of Brian, GE was at the initial meeting when this was discussed. He added that the fund was set up by two avid parish campaigners and this fund would not be here without them. He added that in his opinion there was no gain for it to be removed from the articles. RR said that this was done at the time because no one had come forward and it was seen as restrictive for the fund, discussions followed around taking the article out.

CW said that originally the fund had to be separate from the Parish Council with one representative from Gwithian and one from Gwinear. With the removal of article 2.8 RN and JT are not on the board as a representative of the Parish Council now. JT added that Mike Smith would be an asset to the board however there is no vacancy at present as the maximum number of board members is 7. RN said that at the time of the AGM she didn't understand the implications of the removal of article 2.8, JT agreed, CW said that the 'non Parish Council' directors were interviewed for the position and there is a good cross section of people on the board. RR said that if a vacancy comes up then anyone from the Parish Council can apply.

NH suggested increasing the set maximum number of directors. Discussion followed around issues experience with conflict of interest with the applications as found during the current round of applications. It was agreed that increasing the number of directors would not help this issue.

BP to write a letter back to Parish Council explaining that the board have the interests of the whole community and there they are not losing this with the removal of the article, it is taking away the potential of being compromised. There are still two parish councillors on committee that has the best interests of the whole parish. Also to advise that Mike Smith is welcome to apply as a candidate at the next AGM when there is re-election and retirement due of some of the directors.

All of the board in attendance agreed.

6. Update of previous grants awarded

Board members gave their updates and BP read the emails she had received on each project from the representatives:

Wall Village Hall Toilets – Wall Hall is part of the area known as Wall Methodist Chapel (which is a listed building) permission is required to create the new toilet cubicle. This



permission has now been granted. Work will commence as soon as the builder is able to start.

IT Resources - Connor Downs School - Part of the money has been spent and the iPads are on order due for delivery later this month.

Refurb of Gwithian Church Hall - currently waiting on the builders to do the insulation work and have been told that they will not be able to start until Easter at the earliest, these builders have experience in working with older buildings. The heating and lighting work can not be done until the insulation is finished.

7. Representatives of the following associations have been invited to the meeting to answer any questions:

### **7.30pm Gwithian Residents Association - Speed Monitoring Signs**

*(RR left the room at this point as he declared an interest).*

Ruth Greenaway (RG) joined the meeting as representative, the board asked questions:

JT - does it need to be authorised by the Highway?

RG - The Highways Agency are happy to have it there but they are not going to pay for the sign or installation. The running costs will then be in perpetuity by the county council.

NH asked whether there were any accidents recorded caused by speed?

RG said there were a number of incidents that she is personally aware of. There is no pavements at the village, in the summer thousands of visitors come in to the village

NH asked about changing the speed limit?

RG - This will not be changing, there was a proposal to change from 60 from the Porthreath direction, just before the bends coming from the Towans. The costings to make an application to change the limit would be between 6 and 7k. There was a consideration to change it to 40 but it is not enforced. RG said that these road signs are effective and motorists do slow down.

CW asked why the application is for 2 signs although a feasibility study has not been done for both?

RG - they (Cornwall Highways) can judge the effectiveness of a sign it by comparing it to other areas. The application is for two although the feasibility study is done for one.

Discussions followed around the road and how dangerous the road is.

CW asked about the cost of buying one?

RG said that the quote from last year was £5800 for one – there has been a reduction now in the cost to about £5000, an up to date quote can be sought.

RG said she knows that the one site is suitable for the signs, but unsure about the 2nd site.

NH - asked about insurance?

GE said that in his experience the council should cover any damage to the signs once installed on the highway.

CW thanked RG for her attendance.

*(RR returned to the meeting).*



*\*\* Note – discussions and voting on the applications happened after all the application representatives had been heard \*\**

RN proposed in favour, an additional 5 members were in favour, 1 not in favour to the following:

GGSCF to fund the one sign that has the feasibility study and then the GRA can reapply for the second. A grant of £5000 with a 10% leeway given on provision of a accurate quote. The board would request that 'Funded by GGSCF' be visible on the sign.

*\*\* Post meeting note – A grant of £6000 has been awarded – up dated quote of £5853.53 with extra for additional notice of 'Funded by GGSCF'. \*\**

#### **7.45pm Gwithian Chapel Limited - Gwithian Visitor Centre**

Sarah Kind has been in hospital therefore Ruth Greenaway (RG) stayed to represent this project, if the project goes ahead then Ruth will become a trustee. RR said that the current trustees live in Dorset, he had had a conversation with Martin Thomas who owns the Chapel on the phone this week.

CW asked how are the on-going costs going to be met?

RG - difficulty that exists with the chapel is its need to find a way to keep going, if there is no income coming in then it is not happening. Martin is happy to keep funding it to a degree.

RG went through the background of the chapel, there are no ceremony or religious purposes now, it is still open for people to visit.

RG said that the board of trustees were looking at ways to make it useful, a community interest to the village, they had a consultation last year with the community to get ideas.

The idea of a visitor centre offering space to community groups too, was suggested.

English Heritage have assisted as it is a listed building to re-thatch and helped with structural costs.

CW asked is Martin expecting to get his loan back that is documented in the accounts, as he and the other trustees have been funding the chapel for some time.?

RG said she did not believe so.

GE asked if anybody has looked in to other projects like this in other communities?

RG said Martin came along to the residents association meeting to ask what people wanted him to do with the property, there were a few suggestions but there are not a huge amount of options - the visitor centre appealed to the large majority. The scope of the Feasibility Study would be: we have this building what can we do with it – this would be addressed first towards the planning department. Then look at what there is in the vicinity and what would complement what already exists.

GE - First question he would look at is if anyone else is making this type of project a success. How was the figure for the grant application obtained?

RG - this figure was an initial amount - costed by funding a graduate type person for a number of days a week over a number of months, on reflection, this figure would more likely be £6k, not the £15k applied for in the application.

Who will employ them?

It would be a consultant appointed by the trustees.



If project goes ahead than the trustees will have to change, RG will be a trustee if this happens.

RN suggested that contact should be made with the local Heritage officer regarding planning and what could be done – this should not cost anything. Also talk to English Heritage to ask their thoughts. For visitor info Visit Cornwall could advise, there are many things that could be done initially that would require no monetary cost.

RR thanked RG for her time.

**\*\* Note – discussions and voting on the applications happened after all the application representatives had been heard \*\***

GE commented that he understand what they are trying to achieve but some degree of work that can be undertaken themselves initially - study other villages in other areas and what has/hasn't been successful. We then would be supportive with more information and research as suggested.

RR said he had already spoken to English Heritage and Cornwall Council's Heritage officer - this is a listed grade 2\* building which means doing much could be very limited. Cornwall Council said that they need to fill in a form to say what they want to do first. No one in the village seemed to want to take on the responsibility following the villagers meeting. Discussions followed whether another organisation could take over the project.

CW proposed a rejection of the application, 6 additional directors agreed.

DH suggested in favour for offering £5000 instead of £15k for the study in her comments via email.

### **8.00pm Gwinear and District Villages Association - Reawla Park - phase 2 & 3**

NH is the treasurer of the Gwinear villagers association, JT is the chairman. GE is the son in law of JT, RN is a parish councillor. All four declared an interest in the application. Discussions about whether the presentation can go ahead, decision that it would go ahead but RR informed the presenters the issue with the expression of interest and that DH was not in attendance in person although she has made her thoughts known on the application only via email.

The representatives are Shirley Negus (SN) GVA, Michael Roberts (MR) GGPC - working group for Reawla Park, Vida Perrin (VP) Clerk to GGPC, Sue Benham (SB) - Pen Tye Residents, Jenny Tovey (JT) GVA

The group gave a presentation starting with MR informing the board about the current project vision.

SB gave an overview of how the project has evolved and told the board that the up coming April fun day would enable the representatives to give feedback to the community.

JT explained the format of the GVA and explained the phases including 2 & 3 of the project plan.



The board was shown a video of children from Reawla being interviewed about their favourite parts of the park, what they think of the park at present and their thoughts once the park is refurbished. They were also asked what their favourite part would be after the park is finished.

The board then asked the following questions:

RR – there is confusion about who is requesting the money?

VP replied that it is all the community groups working together including the Parish Council, Penwith Community Development and Cornwall Council - all form the working party to move the project forward.

RR – why is the application not for the whole amount of the project?

VP replied that it is better to phase the project and there are parts that they felt that GGSCF could and could not fund, this was also showing the community that the project is on-going rather than getting all the money together to do the whole lot in one go. There is already money for the interactive path from Cornwall Council and the refurbishment of the existing equipment.

VP explained the sketch of the plan and the areas which they were requesting GGSCF fund. There is an application ready to go in to 'Awards for All' Lottery fund to complete the phase.

GE asked is the GGSCF funding pivotal to getting the lottery funding?

Yes it is – they need both to finish the phase, turn around for the lottery application is approx. 6 weeks.

RR - who would look after the grant?

GVA would rather the Parish Council hold the funds, the working group will be facilitating the project overseen by the Parish Council and the Parish Council can claim back the VAT. Discussions followed about VAT reclaim, the amount applied for is ex VAT, MR said that the Parish Council have the cash flow to fund the VAT element prior to reclaim. MR added that this is an integrated project within the community - making a garden for the community rather than a playing field, making a much more valuable place and central attraction for the community.

CW - who will police the area?

Discussions followed around the anti-social behaviour issues historically, JT said that if there are areas with in the park that appeal to many people/generations - it will be self-policed. GE added that he had discussed issues with the youth community and he believes that an older element of the youth will look after this too. The Pen Tye Association have been very proactive with events and the generation that was causing issues seems to have moved away. MR said that there is a better feeling about Reawla being a nice village.

NH asked what was the time frame for the completion of whole project?

This is difficult to say because of the bigger elements, this phase could definitely get done in a year. Discussions around phase costs. MR said that the skate park in particular will need to show local involvement and fund raising.



GE asked if they will come back to GGSCF for more funding?

VP said yes they would because of the nature of the project.

CW – said that on the application it earmarked 55k- from GGSCF and this phase has applied for £21,700 – when would we expect application for rest of the balance?

VP replied that when this phase is completed they would reapply. Money from Council has been allocated.

RR asked what happens about on-going costs?

MR said that the Parish Council know how to run a park and they have a community pride officer to maintain and inspect equipment. Parish Council will know how much to put aside for on-going costs – VP stated that this will come from the Parish Council, MR added it has already been approved and is in the future budget.

RN - asked for more detail on the improved flooring material.

VP said that the bark costs for the whole project would be £9250 , the new material would be £22k . GE calculated approx. 3.5k increase on this phase.

VP said that the costed bark amount could be taken off the amount applied for or kept in and will go towards the cost of the new material and the additional amount required will be applied for via the 'awards for all' grant.

Discussions followed around the cost of the foliage and plants.

CW asked about a contingency plan if goes over budget and what if there is no other funding forthcoming?

VP advised that the landscape architect has put this in their plans, and will continue to apply to other funding pots until successful.

RR - who is in charge of development of the park?

The Parish Council own the ground and therefore have the liability, the working group can not make a financial decision without the Parish Council agreeing, this will be done at public meetings. The Reawla Park working group meet monthly and submit notes to the Parish Council.

GE clarified that the GGSCF would give the funds to the GVA but can the GVA move the funds to the Parish Council to facilitate the VAT return? He asked for an example that this had been successfully done previously.

VP gave example of lottery funding.

GE suggested this was a question for GGSCF to pose to the accountants and Charities Commission.

RR gave a summary of what he had heard from the representatives:

The pathway is funded and is ready to go.

Phase 2 and 3 - these can go ahead on their own and it will be finished with funds from GGSCF and 'Awards for All'. It can stand alone on its own.

£25k from Cornwall Council in the reserves for this project, they will only fund the path and maintenance of current equipment.

RN asked what % is contingency?

VP replied that the consultants put in 10%, she asked there is a lot in for shrubs etc. - will you look at local providers? Yes but need a cost in there initially.

NH asked what are they proposing regarding publicity?

MR said there will be a display board with benefactors

GE - thanked the representatives on their attendance and he commented on a great presentation and properly thought out.

**\*\* Note – discussions and voting on the applications happened after all the application representatives had been heard \*\***

RR read out comments from DH via email.

RR proposes we fund this application and any other application needs to be match funded by the Parish Council.

CW proposes that the offer of funding is tied in to getting the other funding from Lottery 'Awards for All' and the money be released when this is awarded. Also to note is that this award is not an indication that further applications will be successful. Any future applications will be awarded on individual application and judged on merit. The funds will be ring fenced for 12 months.

CW proposed to award £21,700, RR seconds and DH in favour by proxy email vote. As stated NH, GE, JT and RN abstained.

**Gwinear Church Signage** – no representatives necessary as application below £10k

CW - can we fund it as the application is from the church? Discussion around if possible.

Comments about who will benefit in the application. JT commented that no connection has been made with the local school.

RR – advised that in comparison the Wall Hall application came from the Wall Village Hall Committee and the funds go in to the Wall Hall accounts.

CW said that sadly we can not fund it on the grounds of the religious element. All board members present agreed that this was the case.

GE suggested that we make recommendation that they contact the school and show that it is looking at including the wider community to benefit and then approaching the Parish Council. Explain the reasoning behind it. Another alternative would be for a community group to apply to the fund.


8. AOB

BP highlighted two tentative enquiries via email which did not result in a formal application. BP to forward to RR.

9. Date of next meeting: Wed 12<sup>th</sup> July 2017 - Hall for Gwinear



Meeting closed at 22:45pm

 12/7/17.