

The Parish Church of St Margaret, Rainham
Parochial Church Council

Full meeting of the PCC on Thursday 27th February 2025
19:30 in Church



Present: Heather Baker (HB); Lorna Dyer (LD); Janet Garnons-Williams (JGW); Philip Holdcroft (PH); Emi Inetianbor (EI); David Ormiston (DO); Jean Penney (JP); Linda Randall (LR); Revd Nathan Ward (NW); Terry Whittaker (TW)

In Attendance: Jo Whittaker (JW) – Secretary; Alex Brewer (AB)

PCC MINUTES

Item	Details	Action
1.	Welcome and Opening Act of Worship:	
	NW welcomed Alex Brewer to the meeting who was attending to both observe the meeting and deliver a report as part of his training for the Bishop's Certificate. The meeting then opened with the first part of Evening Prayer.	
2.	Apologies:	
	These were received from Nick Grief (NG); Simon Hall (SH); Charley Holden (CH); Felicity Holton (FH); Revd Jonathan Jennings (JPJ); Davina O'Brien (DOB) – Treasurer	
3.	Minutes of the Meeting on 23rd January 2025:	
a.	<u>Approval</u> – TW proposed and JGW seconded that the minutes be accepted as a true and accurate record of the meeting. All in favour.	
b.	<u>Matters Arising</u> (not included elsewhere) – The Surveyor's report was still to be circulated to the PCC; this would be addressed by NW later on in the meeting.	NW
4.	Alex Brewer, ministry and mission feedback from his Bishop's Certificate course:	
	<p>AB provided a brief background as to what had led to his current position and advised that one of the modules of his course was to present to the PCC on mission and ministry. The five dimensions of mission, as defined at the 1988 Lambeth conference, were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tell – proclaim the good news • Teach – baptise and nurture believers • Tend – respond to human need (e.g. groups, coffee morning, services) • Transform – unjust structures (e.g. JSH community larder) • Treasure – sustain creation (e.g. Eco Church) <p>and a 3 year plan was proposed to meet these dimensions. However, the challenge was not just whether St Margaret's was achieving these but the need to find the pray-ers and focus on prayer which would lead to an inevitable change. AB asked the question as to where prayer was prayer happening as it was not obvious to him, and queried whether the congregation would know how to get involved in prayer.</p> <p>There was some discussion about this and the PCC indicated the times and locations where prayer was taking place. Thanks were given to AB for his insight, particularly in a year where it had been agreed that prayer was a focus. AB advised he had a formation group to support him and they would spend time together to reflect on what next and feedback to the PCC.</p>	
5.	Safeguarding:	
	JP had circulated a level 2 Safeguarding Action Plan (SAP), in line with the Church of England's recommendation that each church have a plan in place to set out how policy was being put into action, and then reviewed regularly. The circulated plan was a top level summary of actions with a lot of work that had been carried out underneath. Thanks were given for the work done inputting all the information into the national system and it was agreed that the structure was good and made everything more visible.	

	<p>There was some organisational lessons to learn from the last five years, particularly with the various role descriptions that had changed and were still to be agreed for various reasons. After some discussion it was proposed that the safeguarding committee send role profile pro formas and other amended forms to the Diocese to gain their comments and/or concerns regarding the forms being used.</p> <p>The Action Plan itself was very positive with lots of 'green' completed areas due to the hard work of the committee. There was discussion as to some groups/activities that may be missing from this plan, and it was requested that the choir be included as a group on this plan due to their capacity for children to be involved. It was further agreed that this would form part of a staged action plan and the committee were asked to consider if there were any other groups or activities missing and bring these to the next PCC.</p> <p>NW proposed and TW seconded the proposal that: 'the PCC accept the documents as the Level 2 Safeguarding Action Plan for St Margaret's Church and ask the safeguarding committee to come to the next PCC with any other activity they believe should be added onto the Action Plan'.</p> <p>FOR: 10 / AGAINST: / ABSTENTION: 0 Proposal agreed unanimously</p> <p>There was a question as to how we would see progress and at this stage it was proposed by NW and seconded by JP that the safeguarding committee bring the level 2 Action Plan to each monthly PCC meeting (acknowledging that this should be an annual action). All in favour.</p>	<p>JP</p> <p>JP</p> <p>S/guarding cttee</p> <p>JP</p>
b.	Policies:	
	<p>There were two policies to be agreed, 'Taking Photos and Filming' and the 'Archive policy'. Both drafts had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p><u>Photographs</u> - JP advised that the photo policy had been taken from the Diocesan guidance but there were three amendments that the committee had suggested. Some questions were raised over live streaming and whether this constituted filming given that the Diocese had a different policy for live streaming. After some discussion it was proposed by NW and seconded by JGW that: 'the PCC take independent legal advice from Anthony Collins solicitors on the policy for live streaming, photographs and filming' and ask them to write for us.'</p> <p>FOR: 10 / AGAINST: 0 / ABSTENTION: 0 Proposal agreed unanimously</p> <p>In the interim it was agreed to use the suggested draft policy in relation to photographs only and take out mention of filming, and follow the current diocesan guidance for filming and streaming.</p> <p><u>Archive</u> – this had been drafted in conjunction with the Chancellor who had experience with historic archives and GDPR.</p> <p>JP proposed and NW seconded the proposal that: 'the archive policy be adopted by the PCC'.</p> <p>FOR: 10 / AGAINST: 0 / ABSTENTION: 0 Proposal agreed unanimously.</p>	<p>JP</p>
6.	Church Overview:	
	Given the time constraints, it was agreed this would be carried over to the next meeting.	
7.	Mission Strategy:	
i.	<p>Review Objective 10:30 Service – 6: Continue to develop All Age format of services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NW had met with JW and TW and been in contact with the diocesan Children's Advisor who had suggested a couple of projects nationally to look at. There was no proposal to change the current format of the all age services at the moment but this would continue to be reviewed. 	
ii.	<p>Review Objective 10:30 Service – 7: Review the relationship between 252Kids and the weekly service and when children are in the service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was part of the wider plan of working with young people, children and families and would be worked on in conjunction with i) above. 	

iii.	<p>Review Objective Communication – 1: Ensure that the newsletter is produced accurately each week and contains all the key information that people need to know ‘what is going on’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Newsletter was a work in progress and JP was doing a sterling job at driving this. 	
iv.	<p>Review Objective Communication – 2: Ensure the regular and timely publication of the Day by Day booklets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ This was being produced regularly and it was hoped to have it ready a week before the first Sunday of the month, however noting that delays were partly due to resource and timings of what is happening in the run up. a. Appoint an editor who can produce the contents of the booklet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Thanks were given to JW and TW who were currently doing this. b. Ensure that all events within the church are published in the booklet and that all published events take place. No ‘To Be Confirmed’ events to be published. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ This was being done and was driving the long term planning, reducing any last minute ideas. 	
8.	Finance:	
a.	<p><u>Position against budget, including unusual or unexpected expenditure</u> – there were no January figures to report as the month had not yet closed; TW confirmed that there was no extraordinary or unusual expenditure expected. The year-end accounts were being finalised and would be completed in the next couple of weeks; the position was currently looking like a small deficit of £2.5k.</p> <p><u>Parish Share</u> – it had been previously agreed that if there was any additional money by year end a payment would be made to the diocese to add additional funds towards our Parish Share. We were not in a position to be able to do this and it was Finance Committee recommendation that this was not made.</p> <p><u>Gas Bill</u> – this had finally arrived and was for £21k. A large proportion was more than 12 months old and would therefore not need to be paid, which had been accepted by SSE. NW had referred the matter to the Ombudsman. It was noted that provision had been set aside to pay the bill but we awaited to hear from the Ombudsman before doing this.</p>	
b.	<p><u>PRF stage financing</u> – a date had been confirmed by the DAC for an on-site consultation on Thursday 20 March at 10am along with national key stakeholders, e.g. Heritage England and the Victorian Society. NW had met with the Heritage Lottery regional director for London and the South East who was very positive about the project and was keen to be involved. Consultation was ongoing with Medway Council as to whether this was a project they would adopt or whether it needed to go through a standard process which would result in a phased project. Going forwards the plan was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive verbal feedback from DAC after their meeting • Consult with PCC • Consult with the congregation, two weeks prior to the APCM with published plans and consult re. unanswered questions • Pull together results of the consultations and write an Expression of Interest to the National Lottery, who would provide a consultant to help with this • Development phase application was to be submitted by 6 August. Work was required to be done with the architects, consultants etc. for this (approx. £500k cost) • December – hear if the application was successful • If yes, funding would be available from February 2026 • The delivery phase and building phase would then start and take about 3.5 years <p>NW reported that the Quantity Surveyor’s report had recently been received quoting an estimated build cost of £7.9m which, with the delivery phase, would make £8m-£8.5m a more accurate total estimate. A ‘war chest’ was needed to</p>	

	<p>fund these works, which had been started by the sale of Station Road. This was then invested in Childscroft but the time had come to utilise these funds (approx. £35k). There were two options that the Finance Committee had considered to make this happen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Take out a loan from the Methodist organisation (MCA) which would need to be repaid over the potential period when the building work would be ongoing, meaning we would likely have a limited income at the time 2. Seek to ask the Church Estate Charity to match fund half the cost, noting that the PCC had a £10k legacy, the £6k loan due back from Acts Six plus an amount in Reserves that could be used. Some of the Acts Six loan money would also be used to pay off the Gas bill. <p>It was Finance Committee's recommendation that the second option be pursued. After some discussion, TW proposed and DO seconded the proposal that: 'the PCC pursue option 2 above.'</p> <p>FOR: 10 / AGAINST: 0 / ABSTENTION: 0 Proposal agreed unanimously</p>	Finance Cttee
9.	Health and Safety:	
	JP had met with Martin Helmore (MH) and gone through the various documents set up by the previous Health & Safety consultant. There was more work to be done and this would be brought to the next PCC for implementation.	JP
10.	Maintenance:	
	NW was due to meet with Gary Williams and Mick Penney in March. He would circulate the Surveyor's report today and, given that no immediate action was required, the report had been forwarded to the Quantity Surveyor to include works into PRF. It was noted we were in a 'Heritage at risk' situation.	NW NW
11.	Correspondence (if any):	
	None to report.	
12.	AOB (to be notified to the Chair prior to the meeting):	
	None to report.	
13.	Dates of Next Meeting:	
	<p>Thursdays at 19:30 in Church:</p> <p>24th April</p> <p>APCM – Tuesday 29th April, 19:00 in church</p> <p>22nd May</p> <p>26th June</p> <p>24th July</p>	
14.	Closing Act of Worship:	
	The meeting closed at 21:41 with the final part of Evening Prayer.	