

Grosmont Futures – Minutes of Meeting 22 June 2021, 6.00pm, via Zoom

Present

Deb Nevill (**DN**), Witek Mintowt Czyz (**WMC**), Jane Moggridge (**JM**) Lynne Potter (**LP**) (Chair), Jo Whitaker (**JW**), Mark Whitaker (**MW**), Oliver Huntsman (**OH**), Clare Preece (**CP**), Peter Willis (**PW**)

Apologies

Alex Minford (**AM**) and Jan Chatfield (**JC**). **JM** leave meeting at 7.00pm

Minutes of the Meeting held on 1st June 2012

The minutes were accepted as an accurate record.

Action Points:

2.5 From Minutes of meeting held on 4th May 2021 – **The Linolt link** is not working, **WMC** has not had time to do it.

Action: **WMC** suggested it be shelved until further community input is required again.

From minutes 1st June

1 Finances – Bottle of wine for Richard Brown as a thank you gift. **Action:** **PW** still to hear back if giving alcohol is OK. **JC** to send a receipt/copy to **OH**.

3 Bat Survey – **LP** had been in contact with Sue Price who has done a dusk survey. There is slight evidence of bat activity so she may not need to do second, dawn survey. **Action:** **LP** will inform **GF** of progress next meeting.

8 Childrens Competition - DN has include photos of children in a short write up for the Church Link which will be in the centre pages of July edition.

All other **Action Points** were on the main agenda and would be discussed as they arise.

It was suggested, and agreed, that Number 8 on the Agenda should be shelved until the next meeting because there is much to read from both **PW** and **AM**, and it would be of value if **AM** was present to talk through his proposal. It will be given priority.

NB: Some confusion regarding Capital Development Grants – of which there are two. For clarity : Capital Development Grant for Architectural Heritage Fund being applied for by GCC for repairs. Capital Development Grant for Rural Futures, Lottery Heritage Fund that we are applying for, for the GCH project.

Matters Arising not included on the Agenda

None

Correspondence

None

Agenda

1. **Finances** – **OH** – the balance is £341.79. A payments has been made to Frameworks of £35 for the framing of the picture of the Childrens Competition Entries to go up in the Town Hall. The two approvals are from **AM** and **JC**. Also a payment to Phoenix Printers of £60 for the Banner – approvals from **DN** and **AM**.

OH sent updated spreadsheet to **DN**.

2. **Review of progress against the GCH project timeline** – **LP** pointed out that **JC** wanted us to look at lines 8, 16, 17, 18 and 38. **PW** pointed out, everything is not complete and there is lots

going on at the same time. The main things we are waiting for are the results of the various surveys and appointment of the architect and his/her report, and once correlated we will be in a better position to bring all the strands together and use the information to refine changes to the budget which will inform the plan.

So everything is still dependent on getting the above information so that we can get the Project Plan Finalised and the application in before turning things from orange to green. **Action** – Ongoing.

3. Project Plan Development – Architect’s Brief. Planning review and budget sub-group meeting was had on the 16th June and the results shared with the rest of the group. **PW** pointed out that the group looked at the various ways that the project could be funded and that as a group it was decided to aim the project to fit into the £140,000 grant and £5,000 budget from GCC rather than look for other funding strands and that if there isn’t enough money to complete the whole project that the focus would be on the upstairs over the undercroft but an Architect was required to help with the options and costings.

LP pointed out that a discussion had taken place with an architect and that a more realistic budget of £120,000 could be used for the building costs. She wanted to know from the group, and minuted, whether all that were present agreed and were supportive with going forward with sticking with the £140,000 grant – there was no negative response.

PW also mentioned that the group had spoken of establishing a management committee which **AM** was working on and will be discussed with the rest of the committee next GF meeting.

Action – Come back to this next meeting, priority on Agenda.

Preliminary architectural brief – **WMC**

From the 3 architects contacted 1 has given an informal response and Sarah Brown has given a formal response. She has already been down to take a look at the town hall and given some preliminary feedback. So at present we only have 1 engaged of the three and Jan, Lynne and Witek were suitably impressed. She was very practical, feet firmly on the ground particularly with regard to the budgetary constraints and put herself at the practical end of the project.

LP added that Sarah works on her own but assured the group that if we had time strictures she would look into our needs first. She also came up with some great ideas and questions too e.g. 1) Do we get VAT back? 2) Do we have to pay it in the first place? (As some projects can be zero rated). The result of which will affect the funding stream in different ways.

Action - CP to investigate – Clare did say that the Council can reclaim VAT every 3 months. Are we exempt from planning fees? **WMC** asked about that and yes there would be and it would be £200 - £300. There is no listed building consent fee and the listed building application is concurrent with the planning application, so sharing the same information, but the above fees will be to the planning department.

LP also made the point that if appointed Sarah Brown said that she would not be doing it for profit. Also, at a later date, she suggested asking for voluntary help from those that have said they have skills to offer as we need for example quantity surveyor skills, building skills, ecology and structural engineers the fees of which will bite through the budget if not done inhouse.

PW said that he had an hours conversation with her and that we would have to think about how we want the build to take place e.g. just one person overseeing the whole thing or individuals, do we go inhouse (which can take longer) or out source? Keep in mind as there are pro’s and cons to all. He also felt that if Sarah Brown was going to do it at cost then her fees should be well within the 10% of the 125,000 Capital Development Grant.

Action – Wait a little longer to give time for the other 2 to respond and at next meeting formerly appoint one of them.

4. Meeting with the Surveyor – CP began by pointing out that the documents she sent out before the last meeting from Alcocks, Nicholls and Steward Chartered Surveyors in Hereford as well as carrying out the structural survey they made a note that they were also pleased to provide additional services that may be required such as provision of a valuation, a schedule of repair, submission of listed building consent, tendering and project management. They have carried out projects of a similar nature on listed buildings. We were mentioning getting local people to put tenders in, well he probably has a lot of contacts in the area which may be useful to us.

With regards to the Survey, Mark Nicholls has made a visit and commenced the report but needs to go back with extra long ladders to look into the roof space later this week. Basically the building is structurally sound, there are issues with lead work flashing, rain water gutters, and external joinery. Water damage caused by a combination of gutters and flashing problems. Main roof is reasonable but long term would benefit from renewal. General repair and maintenance issues mainly. Full report will be issued by Friday the 2nd of July and will include the lifespan and cost of roof repair. Overall looking promising.

MW pointed out that the damage to the back wall was lower than the lead flashing and thought it may have nothing to do with the roof.

CP suggested to ask any questions once the report has been received.

Action – CP to send out report to GCC and GF committee when received.

5. Meeting with the Heritage Officer (Jonathon Morgan) – LP and WMC – Re. Solar Panels – we could apply but would struggle to get anything but Photovoltaic slates. Sarah Brown said something about taking down the ceiling and insulating the roof and exposing the beams, but he said potentially NO.

WMC - pointed out that the Heritage Officer said that there is nothing that is an absolute red line but if interfering with the structure, fabric or the building, then the more you have to justify that change in terms of essential function of the building.

MW – So putting in an acoustic ceiling that could be removed would be acceptable as it is adding to the structure not interfering with it.

LP/WMC– Regarding the undercroft, we can insulate the floor. Walls, we would lose depth with insulation boards (6-8 inches all the way round and is not breathable) and could cause problems with the stone walls – but he hadn't actually seen them for a long time. You can get a thinner product e.g. aerogel (10mm) breathable membrane which a lime render can be applied over. So it wouldn't affect the fabric of the building but you wouldn't be able to see the stone and is also VERY expensive. Both the Heritage Officer and Architect agreed that we could make the undercroft better and a more comfortable space but not a secure room where all the elements are shut out. Regarding the internal stairs, we would need justification to remove them. They could most easily be covered so defunked rather than be removed. The newer outside stairs are wider, straight and of an easier angle to climb than the internal stairs. He did say there would be significant H&S issues if the outside stairs became the only stairs used then building standards might impose full modern standards which is a risk you'd have to think carefully about.

To conclude he did suggest getting together with the appointed architect and building control to look at it together.

PW pointed out that by getting rid of the internal stairs, would allow for full insulation from underneath which is needed for an Air Source Heat Pump to work efficiently. **WMC** - commented, this may be adequate justification for removal of the stairs.

6. Meeting with Digital Officer (Adam Greenwood) – **LP** started from the end of the meeting. The GF members present at the meeting, decided that although it would be something we would definitely be interested in we had too much to do at the moment. Also, as there has been an unpleasant experience with a digital company in the village before, GF needs our first project to be a positive experience. If someone should come forward to Champion this then GF would of course support them but we are too thin on the ground to take it on now.

Action – to put on the back burner until this project is complete.

7. Community Green Energy Fund – Alex sent a first draft of the application round to members but is not present at the meeting.

WMC – It needs fleshing out. Witek has got a couple of quotes already from potential suppliers but on the basis of no particular advice and four from potential suppliers who are in the process of formulating specific quotations against our perceived needs. He has sent them the relevant photographs and floor plans and has got one company coming to visit next Wednesday to do a site survey to see exactly what we might need.

Action – **WMC** to send out to members a list of the names of the four potential suppliers.

LP – Wanted to see costings for the fixing and repairing of the equipment and also the call out charges as they can be very expensive. Also, she wanted to know if the companies were coming out to have a look as space is an issue. **WMC** tried to reassure by saying that modern Sound Systems rarely have problems and the Visual system consisted of a screen and a Laser Projector, that doesn't have conventional light bulbs that might go wrong, but do have a 20,000hrs life span.

Action – **GF Committee** to read the first draft of the application and fill in sections/comment.

Action – **WMC** to give feedback on suppliers next meeting.

8. Proposal for discussion surrounding Management of Town Hall deferred until next meeting.

Action – GF committee to read the paperwork
Top of next GF meeting Agenda.

9. Visits to other Community Hubs – Garway Village Hall.

PW – One of the key things that came out of the report JC had written was that it was run very differently from Peterchurch. It is charity run, and is incorporated whilst GF is unincorporated as it doesn't own any assets. Garway was similar to Grosmont in doing things smaller but unlike Peterchurch did not employ anyone. Peter felt that there was some disparity in the group about having paid staff or not and felt that it was something that needed to be discussed, looking at the Pros and Cons and then a final decision made.

Action – To be included in Management of Town Hall discussion at next GF meeting.

OH stated we need to get the structure in place first then determine how you operate it later.

MW - Question about Community Council and Parish Council being same or different. **CP** more or less the same. Changed due to historical events.

10. GF Policies – **LP**: GF needs policies for the Green Energy Fund so JC put together a few from the Garway Village Hall policies. We need to look at them and send her any comments by email.

PW pointed out that GF, GCC and the GCH Management Committee will need to tweak policies depending on what activities etc they are doing but there will be a core that can be used at the moment. Clare was asked what policies GCC had.

Action CP to send a list of GCC policies.

PW – pointed out that the AV equipment will be part of the town hall and so we could use the GCC policy for the Green Energy Fund.

As the building belongs to GCC then a discussion needs to be had with them and decision made regarding which policies are relevant to GCH, GF and the policies changed accordingly to include them.

Action ????????????????

11. Summer Picnic and Draw.

Date changed to 31st July, 12.30 – 3pm.

Tables out the front of the house next door to the pub to the old Greyhound.

Jim and Chloe have dedicated the tables out the front of the pub for the event – they will be supplying chips, sausage dogs and drinks.

Rest of the tables for picnics.

Hope for a band to play – Rob and Ben – so will need to apply to GCC for permission to use the Hall for electricity.

Need to send to GF and GCC a copy of Risk Assessments.

Ask GCC for someone to do the draw.

Have the display included with the tables and have members of GF present to talk.

LP wanted it minuted that she was concerned that if music was being played it might make the event unmanageable.

Lots of discussion about Covid rules and what happens if lock down continues.

Action – DN to talk to Chloe.

Action – Apply to GCC for access to electric supply from town hall for band.

12. Display – LP and JC haven't got around to updating the display. LP asked JW if she would have a go. Printing off is a problem and so LP said that her Mark will do any printing. It was decided that the display would be ready a few days before the Summer Picnic and Draw and would be outside next to where the Prize Draw will be. We need someone to do the draw.

Showed the poster that Jo had put together to the GF Committee – Thank you Jo.

Action - JW to ask Andy Potter to print off and laminate some copies and put them up.

Action - DN to send poster to JM to put on Grosmont website and FB page and to Miriam to put on mums FB page.

Action – CP to put on the GCC agenda to ask for someone on the committee to do the prize draw.

13. Banner – Needs to be up before NHS day, 4th July, On the town hall over the undercroft.
LP – request for help to put it up.

Action MW and Lee Nevill to do.

14. NHS day 4&5th July – Alex had requested a GF presence via a display and also a £10 -£15 contribution to the raffle prizes. LP and MW had not seen the emails so DN to send it to them. It was decided that the emphasis should be on the NHS and that the presence of GF display would detract from that and also it wouldn't be updated by then.

Action DN to forward the emails to **LP**.

AOB None

For Clarity **CP** asked – Does the repair work have to be done before in order for the grant application to proceed or will the repair to the town hall be part of that final grant application? Does the grant hinge on the repair work being done first?

PW and WMC had just left the meeting and so she was advised to contact them.

Action - CP to investigate and get clarity from PW and/or WMC on the relationship between the repair work and the Grant for GCH development.

Date of Next Meeting

GF – Tues 6th July at 6pm. (GCC Mon 12th July)

Project Planning Subcommittee to be arranged.

Meeting finished 7:40pm.

Tues 6th July from 6pm

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84812214534?pwd=Ymhab283bDBnSWhpOXpFNWg0ZU5UQT09>

Meeting ID: 848 1221 4534

Passcode: 145772