

# Minutes of the Boothby Pagnell Parish Meeting

## Annual General Meeting

### 16<sup>th</sup> May 2014

---

**In attendance** – Peter Williams, James Cox, Rachel Williams, Deidre Collins, Gill Cowdell, Linda Hutchinson, Trevor Hutchinson, Tom Blake, Jo Blake, Andrew Osborne, Keith Smith, Pauline Haw, Ian Rutherford, Lynne Rutherford, Dena Baker, Mark Baker, Jenny Hunt, Percy Hunt, Andy Crawford Russ Hart & Richard Pallier

The meeting opened at 20:03 at the Boothby Pagnell Social Club Room

Due to a point raised at the previous year's meeting regarding the meeting being held in premises serving alcohol, the Chairman asked if the meeting should be moved elsewhere – All in attendance were in favour of remaining in the BPSC Room as there are no other suitable premises available.

- 1) **Apologies** – Paul Dyson, Hazel Dyson, Liz Cox, Neville Cox, Gill Taylor, Pam Collier, Mike Collier, Dawn Crawford, Audrey Roberts, & Ernie Roberts
- 2) **Minutes of the AGM held 2 August 2013** – The minutes of the meeting were read and agreed by all to be a true record. Proposed – T Blake, Seconded – D Collins

Objection raised by I Rutherford who stated certain items had been omitted from the minutes; it was pointed out that he was reading the wrong document.

- 3) **Matters Arising** – There were no matters arising.
- 4) **Finance Report** - The finance report had previously been circulated and copies were available at the meeting. Peter Williams explained each item of the income and expenditure account.
  - The repairs to the bench have been carried out by J Twilley at a cost of £45.
  - There is no cost for insurance as it was agreed at the last meeting that the Parish Meeting had no insurable risks.
  - There is no cost for the audit as Grant Thornton carry it out free of charge due to the size of the parish.
  - The contribution to the PCC was £116 against receipts for churchyard maintenance.
  - There was a contribution of up to £200 towards the cost of the construction of the boules court but this was not spent by the year end.

P Williams reported that the Annual Return for the year to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 had been completed. This includes the internal audit carried out by D. Crawford for which thanks were expressed. Also it includes the Annual Governance statement which was read out.

Questions about the Finance Report.

Q) A Usborne - Are the parish bank accounts the best choice available in terms of interest etc.?

A) P Williams - in his opinion they are. Although private individuals can obtain better interest rates this is because banks like to sell other things to individuals. The Parish Meeting is not a good customer and so cannot get as good interest.

Q) I Rutherford - Who are the signatories for the cheque books?

A) P Williams – The Chairman & the Clerk are the signatories which means at present P Williams & J Cox.

No further questions

The Finance Report and Annual Return were approved. Proposed – A Usborne, Seconded – T Blake

- 5) **Model Publication Scheme** – P Williams explained that the Information Commissioner requires all local authorities to have a Publication Scheme to give information about how to obtain information pertaining to the Parish. The scheme needs to be in a format the Commissioner approves and so it is helpful to use a template provided by his office. P Williams has tailored this template for relevance to the Parish Meeting and copies were available at the meeting.

I Rutherford had previously circulated his own proposed version of the Scheme to all properties in the village. This had caused some confusion as he had not made it clear when he did so that it was merely his own version and was not actually the version being proposed at the meeting.

P Williams went through all sections of the scheme explaining their relevance and how he proposed they would apply for Boothby Pagnell Parish Meeting. After some discussion the Model Publication Scheme was adopted. Proposed – T Blake, Seconded – R Pallier

- 6) **Procedural Standing Orders** – P Williams explained that despite the Parish Meeting being a very small organisation it was sensible to have a documented schedule of procedures that could be updated from time to time if required. He had therefore prepared and circulated at the meeting a copy of his proposals. They were based on a version provided by I Rutherford and P Williams thanked I Rutherford for the template.

I Rutherford had previously circulated his own proposed version of the Procedural Standing Orders to all properties in the village. Once again he had not made it clear when he did so

that his document was merely his own version and was not actually being proposed at the meeting.

P Williams went through all sections of the proposed Procedural Standing Orders explaining their relevance and how he proposed they would apply for Boothby Pagnell Parish Meeting. The document explains how the Parish Meeting functions as well as its obligations regarding the Local Government Act. It also explains how meetings may be convened with a Quorum and how often regular meetings are to be held. Copies are available on request from either the Clerk or Chairman.

Questions about the Procedural Standing Orders :

Q) A Osborne – Why were six people required to call a meeting? Is this an arbitrary number?

A) P Williams – No, the number is set as a legal requirement by the Local Government Act.

An objection was raised by I Rutherford regarding holding the AGM and a separate meeting on the same night. He said this was contrary to guidance from the NALC.

P Williams pointed out that the NALC is an independent advisory body not a law setting organisation. BPPM is not affiliated to it and is not bound by its guidance. The legislation only requires a Parish Meeting to hold two meetings each year. It does not say they cannot be on the same night. Given how little business there was for the Parish meeting to transact it seemed somewhat wasteful to seek to hold meetings on two different nights of the year. P Williams did confirm however that the chairman should always be willing to call a meeting if there was an issue or issues that could not reasonably wait for the meeting the following Spring. In any event, as set out in the proposed Procedural Standing Orders, it was open to any resident with five other signatories to call for a meeting at any time. Under the circumstances the current arrangements seemed reasonable.

The meeting considered the proposed Procedural Standing Orders and adopted them.

Proposed – G Cowdell, seconded – P Hunt

7) **Optional Parish Meeting Publications** – P Williams asked I Rutherford if he would like to present three further documents for consideration by the meeting:

i) **Financial Regulations** –

I Rutherford had circulated a paper of suggested financial regulations. A Crawford felt the estimated costs of complying with these proposed regulations would be disproportionate to the benefits achieved. After some further discussion P Williams asked for a proposer for adoption of the regulations. I Rutherford proposed and K Smith seconded. The proposal was put to the vote and rejected by 15 votes to 2.

ii) **Functions & powers of a Parish Meeting**

I Rutherford had circulated a paper about the functions and powers of a Parish Meeting. He explained the document had been produced by the NALC. P Williams asked if there was a

resolution being proposed in connection with the document or if it was being circulated for information only. I Rutherford confirmed it was for information only.

### **iii) Risk Management Policy**

I Rutherford had circulated a paper with a draft Risk Management Policy.

The consensus view was that the issues of risk and insurance are discussed every year and the meeting felt that it was reasonably well aware of the risks faced. Adopting the draft policy would be over burdensome. P Williams pointed out that the draft policy put an unacceptable burden on the Chairman personally. He felt any sensible Chairman would insist on insurance being in place if the Chairman was expected to accept personal liability for everything in a formal Risk Management Policy and the meeting was already aware that the annual insurance premium was likely to exceed the annual precept.

The meeting discussed the issue further and confirmed its view that an annual discussion of risks was appropriate and that a formal Risk Management Policy was not appropriate. P Williams asked I Rutherford whether he wished to propose the Policy but I Rutherford decided to withdraw the proposal.

### **Appointment of Officers**

The Chairman and the Clerk reported that they had received no nominations for either post. Nominations were invited from the floor but none were received.

P Williams expressed his willingness to continue as Chairman. Proposed - T Blake, Seconded – D Collins. Carried unanimously.

James Cox informed the meeting that due to future commitments he could no longer continue as Clerk and stood down. There were expressions of interest in the post from both Russ Hart and Jo Blake. After a brief discussion between them Jo Blake was nominated. Proposed – R Hart, Seconded – G Cowdell. Carried unanimously.

Thanks were expressed by the meeting for the work of Peter Williams and James Cox over the past year for the Parish.

The meeting closed at 20:43.