

Meeting of the Parish Church of St Margaret, Rainham
Parochial Church Council

Monday, 17th May 2021
 via MS Teams, 19:30



Present: Revd Christine Allen (CA); Heather Baker (HB); Ann Critchley (AC); Lorna Dyer (LD); Janet Garnons-Williams (JGW) – Chair; Felicity Holton (FH); Revd Jonathan Jennings (JPJ); Davina O’Brien (DOB); David Ormiston (DO); Linda Randall (LR); Owen Smith (OS); Jodie Ward (JW); Terry Whittaker (TW)

PCC MINUTES

Item	Details	Action
1.	Intro:	
	This extra meeting had been called following the PCC meeting on 12 May 2021 to better understand the first quarter 2021 accounts and ensure due diligence. There would also be an item regarding the Parish Administrator role. JGW was held up for the start of the meeting so asked TW to chair in her absence.	
2.	Apologies:	
	These were received from Nigel Barfoot (NB); Nick Grief (NG); Frank Pantony (FP); Kayleigh Ward (KW); Revd Nathan Ward (NW) and Charley Whittaker (CW). CA advised that she needed to leave the meeting for Evening Prayer at 20:00. In response to a question raised, it was noted that a PCC is quorate if one-third of its membership is present, (in this case more than six), with the majority being lay persons, and three-quarters of the members must be present (15) to consent to the transaction of any item or business not specified on the agenda.	
3.	Finance Committee Update:	
	<p>TW thanked DOB and Jane Forsyth for their help in pulling together the figures for the spreadsheet circulated to PCC for this meeting. He stated that there had been some learnings for the Finance Committee relative to the way figures were presented. The budget figure presented for the first quarter was the annual budget divided by 4 however this can give a misleading illustration when there are elements that are either seasonal, comprise few items of large cost or where there is forecast to be a change in circumstances in the year e.g. the salaries budget, as there will be no salary cost for JW in the last quarter following her departure. The Finance Committee had also reallocated some of the categorisation of spend and income to map cost centres into the budget more accurately.</p> <p>Specifics to note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income: £45,417 as against a budget/4 of £51,798 – whilst this suggested that income was below budget, it was actually more than the detailed budget figure because 1) there was an unanticipated reimbursement from the Vicar & Churchwardens Fund for expenses from the last quarter, as well as a Covid grant from the local authority and 2) the true budgeted figure was only £36,800 due to lower expected rental income in Q1 from the MC due to Covid restrictions. • Expenditure: £64,686 as against budget/4 of £65,767. There were a couple of minor anomalies: -£900 for the Independent Examiner’s expenses which are yet to be paid and £1,296 shown as Bazaar and Fundraising which were costs for the Just Say Hello Project. • Cost of Services appear to be above budget – this is due to a share of the cost for additional cameras and lighting. It is not anticipated that these will be replicated. • Salaries – see comment above. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sundries relate to small amounts that cannot be specifically classified. In summary, the Finance Committee were happy that the budget is as expected. In response to a question raised, there are things to look out for in the second quarter accounts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the new contract with Norse for cleaning – there is currently no split between church and MC cleaning costs so it will be prudent to keep an eye on this. some costs are aggregated to the MC admin expenses but these need to be more accurate. the Finance Committee are working hard on cost centres and mapping onto the budget. it would be good to challenge budget holders on spend (authority is currently for 15% of their total budget). <p>PCC members had no further questions and thanks were given to the Finance Committee for pulling together the presentation in such a short space of time.</p>	
4.	Parish Administrator Role:	
	<p>JGW advised that there was a proposal from the Finance Committee and Staff team to recruit a replacement for Kate Canton as Parish Administrator for 10 hours a week. The role is budgeted for and does not involve any extra cost to PCC. DO raised the question about the original study that was carried out which suggested that this role could be made redundant, with Jane Forsyth and/or a volunteer picking up aspects of the work. TW and DOB confirmed that this was the case, but during the consultation period it was agreed that the role was viable at 10 hours a week which had resulted in Kate’s new contract in August 2020. It was suggested that the PCC advertise for an equivalent role rather than a like for like role to enable some recasting if needed.</p> <p>Concern was raised about the knowledge and tuition that would be needed, specifically with regards to the graveyard. JGW and TW confirmed that Kate was aware of this and had offered a longer notice period to assist in the handover.</p> <p>JGW proposed and OS seconded the proposal that ‘the PCC seek replacement for the Parish Administrator role with an equivalent salary’.</p> <p>FOR: 12 AGAINST: 0 ABSTENTION: 0</p>	
5.	Dates of Next Meeting:	
	<p>APCM - Wednesday 19 May, 19:30 via Zoom First meeting of new PCC - Wednesday 9 June, 19:30 via Teams</p>	
	The meeting finished at 20:03	