

Bretton Parish Council

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on the 24th August 2021 at 7.30 p.m. at Unit 3 Pyramid Shopping Centre.

Present: Councillors J Merrill, A Gasparutti, R Strangward C Lee (presiding), M A Stanton, L Aldridge, P Gatward

Others: S Radouani (Clerk), Rev H Del Pino, K Shaw (Better Bretton)

Residents: J Buckle,

Open Forum	
K Shaw was on hand to answer any questions the Parish Councillors had based on the previous overview of the proposal presented by K Shaw. The Parish Councillors had some questions.	
The meeting was formally opened at 7.43pm	
1 Apologies for Absence & Resignations	
1.1	J Bhatti -holiday, A Ellis – Holiday, M Horrell -Holiday, J Hayes – leaving, C Fenner - personal and A Fenner – personal. Resolved: apologies were accepted
2 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.	
2.1	Resolved: No interests logged
3 To discuss the Bretton People's Partnership Proposal	
3.1	If the Parish Council wish to agree in principle to work on the application -Reference to phase 1 of the key milestones timetable for action.
3.2	Discuss who will be the potential lead on the application - Reference to phase 1 of the Key milestones timetable for action

The Councillors raised various questions and concerns on being the lead organisation for the Bretton People's Partnership. This was based on the following:

- The overall budget request for the project was £250,000.00 however, there were no costing / budgetary figures provided for the project or the wage of a full-time coordinator and meeting event.
- It was questioned if the amount requested from the National Lottery of £250,000 was enough for the project and to pay a full-time coordinator's salary which was highlighted as between £28,000 -£35,000. However, there would also be ongoing costs.
- The Cllrs were advised that it would depend on who the lead was and what they could bring to the table. They were also advised that they would need to manage the coordinator and the finances.
- The Cllrs asked about the logistics – where will the coordinator be based, from home, office or within the community. They were informed ideally to share an office somewhere within the community.
- There were concerns of only one person working on the project, as potentially elements could not be taken forward if the coordinator were off sick for a period.
- There was discussion on potential leads, like the Cresset, PCVS, Crosskeys and PCC, all shown an interest in becoming the lead.
- There were discussions on partnership working with the community. Projects and priorities from the communities would be put into an action plan.
- It was suggested critical priorities in the park first, a business forum, and then work on an action plan for the theme.
- The Cllrs were informed that Crosskeys Homes have volunteer's officers to take things forward.
- The Cllrs were advised that the Funding from the National Lottery would be paid in advance every quarter.
- The lead organisation will take the lead and the overall responsibility of the project. They would also have a legal contract and partnership with other partners like Crosskeys etc.
- There would be various projects to work on over the period.
- The Cllrs were advised that the lead organisation would employ the coordinator, and they pointed out that the National Lottery would require an employment process to recruit the coordinator officer.
- The Cllrs highlighted the volunteers would need to be DBS. Based on this, who would do it and pay for it?
- The project will try and find opportunities for people to do things in the community.
- There would already be a structure within the organisation, and they would have adequate legal structure/insurance.
- Developing a plan with what if's
- The Cllrs raised the question of what are you expecting from the Parish Council? – contributing through the lottery. It was suggested influence, money into the pot and working together.
- The Cllrs were informed that one of the aims is to test how people work – it can be uncomfortable at the time.
- A question was raised on what the vision was for the next 5 years. It appears that no plan has been put in place. Also, what is the timescale for the projects – setting up and executing – this was not known.
- The Cllrs advised that we need to think about post-pandemic with all projects as things have dramatically changed across the board.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were also discussions on raising the precept to potentially pay for some of the projects outlined in the proposal. The Cllrs advised that 95% of Bretton residents would not want the precept to be increased. The Cllrs were advised that this may not be an issue as it would be down to the communication issued to the residents on why you had to raise the precept. Doing this would give you an opportunity to push things through. • The Cllrs were advised that you need to educate the community on how things work, and teaching people is the key. • The Cllrs highlighted that based on the proposal, which was submitted to them in the current format, it would not work, as there was nothing to maintain, not enough money being asked for to cover wages etc. and no costings, projections provided. • The Cllrs asked the question on what the lead organisation should bring to the table. They were advised they could get in other businesses into the equation. • The Cllrs advised that the money from the Lottery is your running costs. Is there any matching required? There was no answer to this. • The Cllrs asked how are you going to choose the lead organisation. What are the criteria? The Cllrs were informed that various organisations had different ideas / strengths to bring to the table. Like Cresset – central neutral. Crosskeys Homes – Tenants live locally. PCVS – can provide support to the community and are neutral. • Cllrs asked, do you have a preferred choice? It appears that nothing has been discussed or agreed upon yet. • The Cllrs advised that a business plan would need to be produced to illustrate projected costs over a period. • It was confirmed that no schools had been approached. • Cllrs asked if PCC was the lead organisation how would they manage the funding. They were informed that the money would be ring -fenced for the project. • Cllrs asked how big do you perceive the partnership is going to be? They were informed that it would depend on who comes forward to join the collaboration • The Cllrs asked if the projects could encompass the Good Neighbours scheme. They were informed that it would be outside of the scope. • The Cllrs were informed that the concept of the proposal was to change people’s mindset and identifying the facilities around.
	<p>The Parish Councillors were left to deliberate and evaluate the meeting. Based on the discussions and material provided, the Parish Councils voted unanimously that they would support the proposal but would not take on being the lead organisation.</p> <p>To resolve: The Parish Council asked the Clerk to inform K Shaw of the decision made by the Parish Council.</p>
63	The meeting closed at 21.05

DRAFT