



Oldbury on Severn Parish Council

Clerk/RFO: Mrs Victoria Bailey
88 Badger Road
Thornbury
South Gloucestershire
BS35 1AD
Tel. 07922807405
oldburyonsevernpc@gmail.com
www.oldburyonsevern.uk

Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of Oldbury on Severn Parish Council held on 10th August 2022 at The Memorial Hall, Camp Rd, Oldbury-on-Severn, Bristol BS35 1PR at 7.00pm

Present: Chairman Cllr Keith Sullivan, Cllr Laura Day, Cllr Chris Jennings, Cllr Matthew Riddle, Cllr Sheila Bedford and parishioner and vice-chairman of the Memorial Hall Simon Ingram

Clerk: Victoria Bailey

Note the original agenda for this meeting was written by Chairman Cllr Keith Sullivan

1. Apologies

Apologies received from vice chairman Cllr Dylan Griffiths and Cllr John Cornock

2. Declarations of interest and dispensation requests

LD declared an interest as her building firm put forward a tender for the Memorial Hall project. MR also declared an interest as his nephew has also tendered for the Memorial Hall extension. Both MR and LD will leave the room if necessary.

3. Consider whether to hold this meeting in camera

Agreed by all present to not hold this meeting in camera

4. Where are we now? Before we look at what is required in the future it seems pertinent to consider where we are at present

SRB stated that OPC had agreed to apply for the grant but did not agree to anything beyond this. KS concerned that the project appears to cost more than the lottery grant; CJ countered this is normal practice when applying for grant funding. LD felt that OPC agreeing to apply meant that it would be actioned. CJ would like financial help in funding any potential shortfall.

a) At the last meeting (on 05.07.22) it was agreed that the OPC would apply for the lottery grant and pay for the required licences. That is in clear agreement with the minutes and the agenda. There was no agreement to do anything more

SRB, KS and MR voiced agreement with this assertion.

b) Although there have been several short discussions there have been no formal motions to the OPC and no sight of any drawings, specifications or proper discussions on the finance before the

05.07.22 and these were neither complete or conclusive. This project has a value of over £100k and it is deserving of more time than has been given to it by the OPC so far and thus this meeting is necessary, essential and not necessarily the end

At CJ's request VB shared CJ's email on the projector listing times he had mentioned the project over the past year at Full Council meetings. CJ stated the primary objective is to make the hall more accessible. KS would like formal drawings and specifications to go through the council. CJ said detailed drawings and information were not shared with the OPC as they had not asked for it; therefore the Hall Committee assumed OPC were satisfied and confident in the work the Hall Committee were doing on the application. KS reflected there had been failures in communication by both parties and this was an opportunity to set everything straight.

c) Attached as Appendix A are the specifications and the drawings, will the Chairman of the EMC please confirm they are correct and current

KS said he had received many different drawings; CJ confirmed KS's drawing presented in Appendix A was correct.

d) Have the EMC agreed to the details of the project and is that minuted? Have the HC been informed? If not, when will that be done?

CJ confirmed it is discussed in every EMC meeting. CJ will circulate the Hall Minutes from the past 12 months

Action

CJ to circulate EMC's minutes to councillors
--

e) The OPC, as the Sole Trustee have not been informed of the details, until today, and are now invited to discuss and decide whether to vote to support the project. (The decision on 05.07.22 certainly implies that the OPC support the project but a formal vote is required supporting the details and costings, if further actions are required.)

SRB proposed a vote:

Oldbury on Severn Parish Council vote to support the project (without financial commitment at this stage) and its specification

All voted in favour. Motion passed.

f) Attached as Appendix B is a list of Contractors invited to tender and the tender document. While it does not hold us up from proceeding, it must be remembered that no contract can be signed until we have three quotes. With a contract of this size it would be foolish to attempt to avoid this. Every effort should be made to obtain extra quotes.

CJ now has three quotes but will not disclose them as LD and MR are present; also he would like to take the quotes to the EMC for detailed discussion, then recommend the best suited builder to OPC. OPC will then vote on the contractor to undertake the building work.

g) We have been told that the lottery commission will not give a grant to the Hall as it is not the owner and that must be done through the OPC. Appendix C gives details of this

OPC ratified the previous decision that the OPC will apply for the lottery grant as per the discussion in July 2022's Full Council meeting. CJ confirmed that the lottery funders are happy with the legal aspects of ownership of the hall.

SRB proposed: *Oldbury on Severn Parish Council will apply for the lottery grant*

All voted in favour.

5. Does the OPC now approve this project (as owner of the Hall)?

It was agreed this had been covered in discussions minuted above.

6. It may be necessary to defer the following three questions until after the financial question is answered.

7. Does the OPC now wish to take ownership of this project?

KS stated that if the Parish Council own the hall then the Parish Council should take ownership of the project; VB pays the bills with EMC managing the project. KS would prefer CJ to act as the hall's representative in relation to the extension/ building work as he is a councillor.

SRB proposed: *Any problems or issues arising during the build must be reported back from EMC to PC and discussed in Full Council*

All in favour.

8. What management structure does the OPC consider appropriate and who will be responsible?

9. Does the OPC now wish to consider what further help/assistance the OPC can provide to the Hall/EMC?

It was decided to cover items 8 and 9 in later on in this meeting and possibly revisit if not covered.

10. What is the cost of the project and can it be "phased"?

a) As three quotes are not yet received presumably no quotes have been opened and any figures are based on estimates

CJ responded that there are now 3 quotes, received via email, which he is reviewing. LD explained the tender process so everyone understood the stages of the application and advised that getting a

surveyor would greatly increase the cost of the project.

b) What are these estimates, how are they established and what is the maximum cost, including any overspend?

CJ said it is impossible to say what the maximum would be although he doesn't foresee any major overspend. LD said that once the foundations are in place the cost ought to be more predictable. CJ has asked all builders to quote to the same specification. Simon Ingram spoke, reporting that the latest communication received from the lottery was that they need three quotes. CJ said that once it is definite that they are getting the lottery money he will then look in detail at the quotes with the hall committee then pass on all three quotes, with reasons for the halls favourite, to the Parish Council.

c) The lottery commission are expected to contribute £99,000

CJ: Yes

d) Are we correct in assuming the EMC have £33,000 available?

CJ: The EMC have £33k available and are happy to dip into reserves if necessary.

e) It has been suggested that this could be split into several phases but this will have to be discussed with the successful contractor which means that the total spend will have to be considered as one for this application

CJ answered they could do phased payments i.e the path, then entrance. CJ thought they could keep a retainer of 20%; LD advised this is usually 5%. KS asked whether the amount asked for from the lottery had been based on one quote; CJ replied yes as it was all he was able to get at the time due to covid restrictions.

f) What is that total spend? And how is that split, i.e. OPC, LF and EMC.

CJ answered the contract is for £126,500 plus VAT. CJ said that there will be a phasing of payments and advised that VB can reclaim VAT quarterly. So it would consist of: invoice sent to PC, invoice sent to the lottery, lottery usually pay within 5 days. Lottery do not pay the VAT. LD advised most payment terms are a month from receiving the invoice. LD advised CJ to check if the builders are VAT registered; CJ will check.

CJ said if £96,000 needed to be paid the lottery would pay £80,000 back so £16,000 would need to be found to cover the shortfall. MR felt that this would be a useful way to use OPC reserve funds.

Action

CJ to check all builders tendering for the project are VAT registered

KS had been advised that we cannot use allocated reserves; this was discussed and it was decided VB should contact ALCA for clarification.

Action VB to ask about the use of reserves from ALCA
--

Simon Ingram left the meeting at 20.32pm

KS advised CJ to avoid an over spend; CJ replied EMC will look to crowd funding if this happens. KS asked for a breakdown of the phases and whether certain aspects of the build can be cut if they were not financially viable; CJ replied he could not answer that without speaking with the contractor. LD responded that it would alter the cost of the build to make changes. CJ would like OPC to gift or lend money if there is an overspend.

Lottery retain 5% until the project is complete.

SRB proposed: *Oldbury Parish Council will award a small grant and/ or a loan after reviewing the council's unallocated reserves then decide upon the figures.*

All in favour.

10. As the OPC have agreed to apply for the lottery grant we need to see the necessary application forms etc. Can these now be supplied?

CJ replied that he has sent these forms to KS.

11. When we have these forms we may ask for more information.

Covered during previous discussions

12. To establish exactly what the Hall want the PC to contribute towards the project. See 5. to 7. above. The basic point is do the OPC manage and control the project or should it hand back to the EMC at this point.

SRB proposed: *The Parish Council's position in that the project is managed by the hall and administered by the Parish Council with CJ managing the whole project.*

All agreed with this statement

13. To consider what it is legal and proper for the PC to do

a) It will be necessary to establish precisely (allowing for any "maybes ifs and buts") what the cashflow will be and how it will affect the balances of the OPC and the EMC.

(b) It has been suggested that any use of existing assets, such as reserves specified in the balance sheet may be illegal, even if only used temporarily while awaiting income from the Lottery Commission.

(c) There are conflicting ideas on the application of VAT that need to be resolved.

(d) Other problems may emerge along the way.

It was agreed 13 a), b), c) and d) were covered during previous discussions (yet not all points were established.)

14. To consider and understand the cost to the PC of supporting the Hall project. This includes the financial cost as well as the management cost. There could be a considerable cost to the Clerk as well as a cost in councillors time and effort. All these this need to be understood.

KS asked VB to keep a regular timesheet of the project. It was agreed CJ would be the main point of contact and do all administration unless it is something only VB is authorised to do.

15. To decide what contribution the PC will make

Covered previously

16. Any other relevant business

Jenny Cowie from the lottery has asked for more technical information which CJ will send. The Memorial Hall will find out if it has been successful the week of 21st August 2022.

SRB would like to thank CJ and recognise the effort and time her put into applying for the grant. SRB extended this thanks from the Parish Council to the hall committee which CJ will pass on to them.

17. Close of meeting 21.15pm