

Grosmont Futures – Minutes of Meeting 24th November 2021, 6.00pm, via Zoom

Present

Deb Nevill (DN), Lynne Potter (LP), Mark Whitaker (MW Chair), Oliver Huntsman (OH), Peter Willis (PW), Jo Whitaker (JW), Peter Clarke (PC), Witek Mintowt Czyz (WMC).

Apologies

Jan Chatfield (JC), Jane Moggridge (JM), Alex Minford (AM), Andrew Stumpf (AS).

Mark Whitaker (Chair) Welcomed everyone present, including Peter Clarke to the meeting.

Minutes of the Meeting held on 10th November 2021

The minutes were accepted as an accurate record.

Action Points:

From Meeting of 27th October - Review of Web site – DN and LP review of GF website, a few changes to be made when JM back from her holiday. Also DN will be speaking with PC regarding ways of posting information to the website on a regular basis to raise the profile of the project.

2 From minutes of meeting held on 10th November – WMC shared the ‘Good Councillors Guide 2017 code of conduct’ with GF committee members (resent to PW) and is in Dropbox.

DN formally wrote to PC inviting him to be co-opted onto the GF Committee and to join the Steering Group, to which he replied to the positive.

3. DN wrote emails to Andrew Stumpf, Gill & Alan Clark and Jean Price thanking them, on behalf of GF, for providing valuable input to the discussions at the GFCC meeting.

Action: DN a copy of the email to be placed into Dropbox.

Matters Arising not included on the Agenda

None

Correspondence

Andrew Stumpf and Dewi Lloyd sent emails to update us, and if anyone has any ideas where to put furniture, plants or trees to let him know individually. Information about this is on a separate section of the website. **Action LP to check with JM that AS project is on the Grosmont.wales website.** Georgie Davies, from Garway Hall, has sent an email to DN, now on their mailing list, about films coming up, which means the hall is open. Would it be a good time to make an appointment for a visit by the subgroup? **Action DN to arrange a visit.**

Agenda

1. **Finances – OH** – the balance remains at £316.79 with no movement for the last couple of months.

2. **Review of progress against the GCH project timeline – JC** is away but said that everything has been at a standstill for a while, but that with changes taking place e.g. the formation of the steering group, the timeline will need additional information and structuring.

Action JC to discuss with PC.

3. **Formal Co-opting of Peter Clarke on to GF – MW** asked PC if he wanted to be the Project Manager. PC felt from various discussions with GF members and the skills that he could bring then he would like to offer his 30 year experience and skills to GF in that capacity. MW questioned how

his role fitted into the general structure e.g. as the Boss. PC stated that it was the Project Manager's Role to organise – to ensure the team is adequately funded, resourced, given time and space to carry out the tasks they need to do. Also that there is good communication to all and between the stakeholders, to the steering group and the project teams themselves, there being more than one project running, and to create a structure that is simplified bringing more focus to the delivery side of the projects that GF wants to run. Roles and responsibilities need to be clearly defined so that things run more smoothly – as discussed in the Program Structure point 5 on the agenda. He did point out that PW was seen as the expert and that the GFCC would be looking to him to help to get the funding required to repair the Town Hall but that the GFCC needed to understand that they need a 10 year maintenance program for the town hall too.

When questioned by MW, PC compared his role to that of an Operation Manager rather than a Chief Executive when put it in terms of the business structure of a Company.

MW asked a couple more questions to PC regarding his role and relationship with the project which was pointed out would be answered in point 5 of the Agenda.

LP was having some difficulties hearing PC. LP pointed out that PC would be speaking shortly but he needed to be formally co-opted as 'Project Manager' with a show of hands - All present did so unanimously.

4. Town Hall Steering Group – MW noted that, from the last meeting minutes, the first meeting of the Steering Group was to have taken place within 2 weeks of the 8th of November, did that happen?

No

PW – 2 dates required. 1) The first initial meeting to plan the proposal for, 2) second, a full face to face meeting of the full steering committee when the proposal (already shared with the GFCC members of the steering group) can be discussed and agreed.

Through much discussion it was also felt that the Terms of Reference of the Town Hall Community Hall sub committee that was sent to GF Committee lacked clarity. It was agreed that a letter should be written to the Chair of the GFCC thanking them for supplying the Terms of Reference which we believe is applicable to the sub committee but we would like to propose alternative wider Terms of Reference for the steering group.

Action MW to send the draft letter to the GF steering group who will agree the final letter to be sent to GFCC.

PC to do draft reference for the steering group which will be shared with the members of GF for feedback before being presented to the face to face meeting with the GFCC sub committee.

PC – The GF steering group will meet at 10am on Tuesday 30th November for the first time with the aim of producing a complete structure, organisation, terms of reference etc within 4 weeks. Then this will be presented to the GFCC steering group members and the GFCC.

5. Programme Structure – Peter Clarke

Referring throughout to the 3 layer model document in Dropbox.

1) GFCC – The Board.

Explained what the responsibilities of the Council are.

Claire's role needs to be made clear as she is not on the board.

2) Steering Group (GF and "sub-committee")

Consist of representatives of all stakeholders.

Reviews all projects on a regular basis, to report periodically, to listen to and steer the projects.

For clarity - PW role is mentor not part of the steering group.

3) Project Group(s)

There will be at least 4 projects and each group will carry out the activities of their particular project and report back to the Steering Group.

Once gone through the structure PC asked if there were any questions.

WMC had to leave at this point but did say he had just sent an email to all the group regarding terms of reference he was proposing for the GFCC sub committee.

DN questioned where the rest of the GF fitted in as it appeared the Steering Group had a vast amount of work to do. Also, should the GF committee get the same periodical reports from the steering committee as the GFCC do.

PW said that once settled down most of the work will be done by the projects.

If the group is set up correctly, the Board would make decisions but not do the work, the Steering Group will be comfortable because they understand where everything is and there is no confusion or threat to their authority, and they can let the projects get on with it, where the project groups are GF led.

OH suggested that PC do a schematic of what he is proposing to help those people not familiar with the chains of commands and responsibilities can see how things are related to each other.

6) Funding Strategies

PW - We originally were working with a budget of £140,000 but GF recently decided to employ staff at £40,000 and repairs needed to the town hall of £60 - £90,000 were revealed. Potentially, now, the budget required is just under max £300,000 so we need to look at it, prioritise and make definite plans. GF have had conversations regarding funding and have always come back to continuing with the application for the RF £140,000.

Options.

During his research PW found that there are various pots of money, a small number of large pots and lots of small pots of money. He advised that the best strategy would be to go with as small a number of grants as possible. There will be a need for funding on top of the rural futures £140,000 and whatever we do there will be uncertainty of funding avenues. PW has had words with the GF funding officer who in turn has referred it to her superior to find out what our best and easiest options are with the changes that have now occurred and is awaiting response.

Action PW to give feedback to GF when outcome known.

We could consider People and places which is a single funding application of up to £500,000 but will lose the ringfenced £140,000.

Welsh Government Community Facilities Fund do like match funding but community councils are not eligible, but if GF had a 10yr lease they would consider it. It is up to £250,000 and is only capital and we would not have the VAT status and would mean being a bit over budget. Rural future funding can sort the revenue side. But this depends on GF view of taking on the 10 year lease and GFCC agreeing to the lease.

MW checked for clarification what our next actions are:

We need a proper formal agreement with GFCC but in turn that is affected by the type of funding we decide to go for thus the importance of the GF steering group and the GFCC sub group meeting to join up what GF need to do and what the GFCC need to do so that there is clarification of repair costs with no overlapping or duplication. We will then have a better idea of how and what applications we can go for.

We need CIO status confirmed.

Capital Development Grant sub group need to continue to prepare the application.

Points 7 and 8 on the agenda will be put on the next agenda as several people needed to leave.

AOB: None

Date of next GF meeting TBA after the GF steering planning meeting, hopefully before christmas.
GF steering planning meeting – 10am Tuesday 30th November.

Meeting ended 8.10pm