

Bretton Parish Council

Minutes of the Finance Committee Meeting held on the 5th June 2018 at 7.30 p.m. at the Parish Offices, Unit 2, Pyramid Shopping Centre, Bretton

Present: Councillors, M Clements, (presiding) J Hayes, C Lee, and S Warren.

Others: B Champness (Clerk)

Not present:

	Open Forum
	There being no members of the public present no open forum was held and the meeting was formally opened at 19.30
1.	To appoint a Chair
1.1	It was resolved that Cllr Clements be appointed Chair for the forthcoming year being the only nomination.
2.	To Appoint a Vice Chair
2.1	It was resolved that Cllr Warren be appointed Vice Chair for the forthcoming year being the only nomination.
3.	Apologies for absence
3.1	Apologies were received from Cllr Bhatti (work)
3.2	Resolved: that the apologies be accepted.
4.	Declaration of Interest – To receive Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests, as set out in Chapter 7 of the Localism Act 2011 and the nature of those interests relating to any Agenda item
4.1	Cllr Lee and Warren declared an Interest in Item 10 being members of the Pyramid Steering Group. Although the Clerk did not have to declare an interest he stated that he was Chair of the Steering Group.
5.	To Approve Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 1st May 2018 (Fin 17-06)
5.1	Resolved: The minutes of the Meeting held 1 st May 2018 were approved and were signed by the Chair as a correct record
6.	Matters to report – <i>restricted to items not listed elsewhere in the agenda</i>
6.1	There was nothing to report.
7.	Items deferred from previous meeting

	7.1	There were no matters deferred from the Previous Meeting
8.	Items deferred from Full Council	
	8.1	There were no matters deferred from Full Council
9.	To approve and or amend the Terms of Reference of the Finance Committee and to approve and or amend the Financial Regulations.	
	9.1	The Financial Regulations had been amended in November 2014 and it was considered and resolved that they did not need amending, as no changes nationally had been communicated to us nor had there been any difficulty in operation of our present regulations, and that they were formally approved.
10.	To discuss the following matters in relation to the Pyramid Community Centre	
	10.1	<p>To consider the quote from Business Watch: At the last meeting the Clerk was asked to go back to one of the three companies we had asked for quotes to carry out various tests within the centre. The Clerk admitted he had not done this as his reasoning was quite simple. Had he gone back to the company that gave the cheapest quote and they agreed to his request he would be questioned by BusinessWatch as to whether they had the job and he would have to advise that a cheaper quote had been received. As BusinessWatch had a price promise they would either beat or match the quote. The Clerk did not want to get involved with a Dutch auction. He had in fact met BusinessWatch as they had made contact asking when they would be expected to start the servicing. At the meeting several new matters were considered.</p> <p>One was in relation to having an intercom system installed. Currently anyone could walk into the Centre and no one would know that they had entered the building. This it was felt was not very secure especially as we had people using the side rooms and they would not even see people entering the building. The system envisaged was for a visitor having to ring the intercom to be let in and this could only be done by someone in the building. As the quote for this item had not been received the matter is to be left in abeyance.</p> <p>The other matter was to try and make the building more secure. We were still being plagued by young people coming into the grounds, climbing on the roof and trying to enter the building.</p> <p>The new system that BusinessWatch suggested was to have the alarm system remotely monitored. If someone came near to the camera they would be detected, and an alarm would be raised at the control centre and they would then speak to the person/people warning them that they had been recorded and if they did not leave then the police would arrive. The cost of that was £3000 plus VAT to have the remote monitored cctv system installed plus £200 plus VAT per annum per camera. It was not clear from the quote whether the cost was £3000 per camera or an overall sum of £3000, therefore, the Clerk was asked to get this position clarified.</p> <p>The third matter was having a member of their security team to come and close after a party. They would be on site for up to 30 minutes and would ensure the place was emptied and locked up with the alarms being set. The cost of that was £30 plus VAT per visit. If agreed, the cost of this would be added to any booking fee. Resolved: This was agreed.</p>

<p>10.2</p>	<p>To consider the quote from Ace Fire and Security: Notwithstanding the comments above the Clerk had been in touch with the one other company to see what they would charge for these services.</p> <p>The basic entry system complete with code lock and emergency release and maintenance would be £790.00 with the maintenance costing £96 per annum. In view of what was said above this matter has been held in abeyance.</p> <p>The cost of annual service visits for the intruder alarm and maintenance agreement would be £136 per service visit. They also supplied quotes for various tests to be carried out but as Business watch was cheaper it was resolved that we would offer them the contract.</p> <p>Cllr Clements wanted the Clerk to compile a list of the various systems in place at the centre, so we would have knowledge of what we had in place.</p> <p>Resolved: that the contract for the various tests be given to BusinessWatch.</p>
<p>10.3</p>	<p>To receive an update on the Conference attended by the Clerk in relation to Village Halls and Community Buildings:</p> <p>The Clerk reported that he attended the conference organised by Cambridgeshire ACRE in relation to Village Halls and Community Buildings. This was well attended but there were not many Parish Councils in attendance.</p> <p>The first matter of interest to the Parish Council was having the correct valuation of the premises in the event of a claim being made should there be a fire. An example was given that a hall was valued at £100,000 but when the loss adjuster called he thought that the proper value was £200,000. The audience was asked what they thought the sum received from the insurance company would be. The popular answer was £100,000 whereas the correct sum was £25,000. The other recommendation was that this valuation should be updated every five years. With regard to the Pyramid Centre we have the place insured for £713,599.00 and on the 5th June, someone attended from the insurance company we instructed to give a rebuild valuation and the full details will be sent on in due course.</p> <p>The other matter of interest was in relation to forming a CIO. There was a talk by a partner from a firm of Solicitors in Cambridge, Birketts, in the morning and a workshop in the afternoon which the Clerk attended. The Solicitors offered a three-tier service of Bronze, Silver and Gold. Bronze was giving help and advice but with you doing most of the work at a cost of £2500. Silver was giving more detailed help and assistance at a cost of £5,500 with Gold being the service whereby they did almost everything that was needed at a cost of £9500. The reason for their costs being high was not only the service they gave but, on the assumption, that we would convey the property to the newly formed charity. The CIO would then run the centre and be responsible for everything. With that in mind if we wanted to run the Parish Council from the Centre it would not be our building and it would be anticipated that we would have to pay rent.</p>

10.4	<p>To decide if any payments/accounts for the Pyramid Community Centre could be borne by Bretton Parish Council: The Clerk explained that this was on the agenda as he was not sure what accounts should be paid for from the income received from bookings or by funds from Bretton Parish Council. The building now belonged to the Parish Council and it was an overhead that they must be responsible for it. He explained that he had spoken to the internal auditor about this matter. According to the auditor some parish councils agree that a charity or a group of volunteers should run the community centre. This would mean that they would be responsible for paying all of the outgoing and receiving the income from bookings. Other parish councils agreed to run the community centre themselves and if they did this all of the expenses in relation to running that centre should be paid for by them. They would have a separate item in their accounts to show income received and outgoings, so they had a good idea of what it cost to run the centre. This meant that if like the Insurance premium part was in relation to the office and the other was the community centre then the total cost should be divided between both centres. The Clerk said that a decision was needed as to whether we were going to let the centre be run by a charity or by ourselves. It was agreed that at this moment in time we did not have the volunteers to set up a charity, but this may change in the future. As a result, it was agreed we would run the centre ourselves. Because of this agreement all invoices and expenses that can be attributed to the centre should be included in the running cost of the centre and apportioned between the cost of the centre and the office.</p>
10.5	<p>To consider the possible use of funds to allow work to be undertaken on the centre.</p> <p>The Clerk explained that, having made inquiries for obtaining a grant for Capital work to be done, it was almost impossible. If existing users were able to apply for a grant from Awards for All then the lottery would expect users to have a minimum 5 year lease or agreement with the parish council. If we were not able to give them this could not apply for a grant but there might be other sources for them to apply to. As a result, he was wondering if we could reach some agreement over funding. We had over £60,000.00 in General Reserves and had, had a similar sum for the last 11 years but had never had to use it. As a result, if for arguments sake we asked for £20,000 for works to be carried out at the Centre, this could be paid back from any excess funds at the end of each financial year. There was no need to make up the reserve in one go and we would not have to call on the residents to pay for an increase in the precept. At the moment the centre was being used at about 40% of its capacity and if and when the premises were smartened up we could then market the centre and hopefully attract more business. He agreed that he did not have a set figure of what was needed and what work required to be undertaken all he wanted was an assurance that if he carried work in getting quotes and estimates for works to be done if an approach was made at a later stage then this request was a possibility. It was agreed that in principle the suggestion was something that could be looked at but if a decision was made then they would expect accounts to be available and a breakdown of what work was being done and a business plan showing the anticipated usage and income to be received.</p>
10.6	<p>To consider whether we employ someone to work 16 hours a week to help out in relation to bookings, banking, opening and closing and any other necessary work:</p> <p>It was agreed that further information was needed before a decision could be made. A Job Description should be prepared and an estimate of the time that the person would be expected to work although the hours worked could be flexible. Cllr Lee said that she would come to the office to work with the Clerk to prepare this information.</p>

11.	To decide if we increase the hours for one of the litter pickers and to increase his salary
11.1	The Clerk explained that this was on the agenda as the litter picker was anxious to know if a decision had been made. It was explained that Rachel Dance at Amey had been contacted who thought she had a barrow but was checking whether it was fit for purpose. The manager at the Cresset had also been contacted to see if the barrow could be stored there. Unfortunately, he was on holiday, but an email has been sent to him and we await his response. Until we knew the position of both these matters it was agreed that the decision would be deferred.
12.	To agree if we employ someone to act as a Locum whilst the Clerk is away and what salary they should be paid.
12.1	The clerk explained that the reason why this was on the agenda was because whilst he was away from the office someone was working in the office answering the telephone and emails received. It was felt that this person should be paid a salary for working. At the moment this person was doing the work on a voluntary basis and spending many hours helping and also looking after the litter pickers. It was agreed in principle that payment should be made but before a decision could be made the Clerk should ascertain from the documents that were used when his salary was calculated what the appropriate hourly rate should be.
13.	Matters of Finance -
13.1	To note current state of finances and agree the Bank Reconciliation.
13.2	To Approve expenditure – [£251.20 – Litter Picker (wages)] [£371.99 – Litter Picker (wages)] £6.63 – The Peoples Pension (pension contributions) [£44.00 – The Cresset (refreshments)] [£242.93 – RBS PLC Mentor Services (Managing Health & Safety Conference)] £43.20 – B M Champness (travel expenses to The Fulbourn Centre) [£2300.00 – ComEquip Ltd (2 laptops and projector and pull up screen)] [£881.52 – Enterprise managed Services Ltd (bulky waste collection in South Bretton)]
13.3	13.3 Payments for Pyramid Community Centre – [£418.00 – Peterborough City Council Rates for June] {£102.36 – Direct365(Trade waste & Feminine disposal) [£11.05 – B M Champness (padlock for waste storage bin cupboard)] []denotes those payments paid between meetings, which have been approved by the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Parish Council or at a previous meeting but not listed

13.4	<p>Resolved: that the above payment be made. The Clerk explained that the payment for £2300 was from the grant that we received for the Seniors Lunch Club. He explained that this grant was awarded to us as a Parish Council, but Can-Do Communities was running it. The first session was last Friday 1st June. This was successful in that 16 people attended. Unfortunately, there was a problem in that the lady who ran the Tuesday Friendship Club thought whilst a good idea the name was very similar to the one they used and was wondering if the name could be changed. After consulting with her it was agreed the name should be Senior Chips and Chat. Marvin had agreed to this and new flyers/posters were being printed and which would be distributed. As the venture seemed to be successful it might be that the funding could run out before the intended 26 weeks it was going to run. As a result, they would be looking for £1 donation to help fund these sessions after the funding was used. People did not have to pay if they did not want to. It was suggested that if people from outside Bretton attended then a charge of £5 should be made.</p>
<p>14. Correspondence.</p>	
14.1	<p>A letter has been received from PPL Regarding a music licence. Last year we paid £35 and this year they wanted £450. The Clerk had written back asking them to explain how they calculated this sum as they clearly had no idea as to how many people that use the centre were playing music. A reply was awaited</p>
14.2	<p>The Clerk was asked if there was any response from the consultant regarding the rent review. It was explained that we were still waiting to hear further whether an agreement could be reached.</p>
<p>15. Any Other Business – <u>Reminder by Law – information exchange only no decisions can be made</u></p>	
15.1	<p>The Clerk said that we were still be plagued by some youths, but the Police had been round to see and explain what action could be taken to stop this happening. They could start criminal proceedings, but they thought the outcome could not be guaranteed even if we were successful and, they were ordered to pay back the money we had spent to repair the damage caused by them, it was unlikely we would ever get the money as they had little or no funds available. The alternative to criminal proceedings was for a community resolution to be put in place. This would mean they would not have a criminal record, but they would be expected not to return to the centre, enter the premises or grounds unless invited but if they were in breach then criminal proceedings could be started against them. The Clerk had agreed to that course of action.</p>
15.2	<p>There being no further business the meeting was formally closed at 21.00 hours,</p>
<p>16. The date of the next meeting – to be held on Tuesday 3rd July 2018 at 7.30 p.m. at the Parish Offices, Unit 2, Pyramid Shopping Centre, Bretton</p>	