



Port Isaac • Trelights • Port Gaverne

**MINUTES of the FINANCE & CAR PARK COMMITTEE
HELD in PORT ISAAC SCHOOL ON
21st OCTOBER 2015 following the WC Committee Meeting**

Present:	Cllr. Coles (Committee Chair) Cllr. Collings Cllr. Penny (CC/PC) Cllr. Raynor	
Also present:	Cllr. Manders Cllr. Williams	
Minute	AGENDA ITEMS	Action
	<p><u>Chairman's Welcome and Public Forum</u> – the Chairman welcomed those present, advising them of exits, local hazards, location of WCs, etc.</p> <p>In the absence of the Clerk, Cllr. Williams took the Minutes.</p> <p>Mrs Barbara Bell spoke regarding Port Isaac Playing Field Association (PIPFA) and detailed a proposed meeting on 27th / 28th October, late afternoon at The Bells abode. The meeting is with the commissioned Landscape Architect reference the plans for new play equipment. She will confirm date/time to the Clerk so Members can attend if they wish.</p> <p>Mrs Bell clarified the funding application. PIPFA applied to join the 'First Steps' (FS) programme, applying as a community group including both PIPFA and The Church Rooms Restoration Group (CRRG). They applied together for information and training. The CRRG are not an incorporated organisation. Mrs Bell read sections of an email from their FS advisor, Ms Debby Crouch, addressing the confusion reference the FS grant allocation. Ms Crouch is very confident about their planning budget consultation, but she understands that she may need to clarify this at a meeting with the PC. Members would welcome more clarity. Mrs Bell will have another meeting with her in advance of writing her next report.</p> <p>Cllr. Raynor explained that as funding is channelled through the PC to add the benefit of VAT reclamations how the funds are disposed of, especially with reference to the PC and the CRRG project should be discussed by the PC first. Mrs Bell responded, saying because there will be no joint grant aid funding applications – apart from First Steps – by the Playing Field and Church Rooms committees there should be no confusion over who is holding funds on whose behalf. The Church Rooms team had already formed their own funding network and had appointed their own consultants and the major part of FS funding will be spent on appointing a consultant for the Playing Fields.</p> <p>PIPFA's 'Awards for All' application was then discussed. Cllr. Penny stated that the funds will be allocated when our precept is set. He commented that if we get the CRF award for the New Road toilets, what is set aside for them could be released to match fund any PIPFA award.</p> <p>Cllr. Coles said the issue is one of transparency, citing for instance that Mrs Bell had thought the PC still had £11.5k available, when in fact PC funds for the Playing Fields are only £6,534. Had the PC been updated with the</p>	

	<p>detail of the process that PIPFA was involved in, all would have a better understanding of the position. Mrs Bell said because the Clerk had processed the funding application and accepted the funds on their behalf they assumed that individual council members had access to the First Steps process if they asked for it. Debbie Croucher – FS Relationship Manager – had also offered to come and explain the process to the Parish Council. Mrs Bell said part of her draft community action plan (which she is now compiling) would include dealing with the PC (not issues with the PC) as there was no guidance in any of the FS literature about this.</p> <p>Cllr. Coles said that PIPFA was set up so it could apply for funding that the PC were not able to apply for. However as we make the payments as a matter of goodwill reference VAT, if the PC hold funds on their behalf it may look to an outsider that the PC is in support of financing restoration of the Church Rooms. He commented that the PC may or may not be in support of the CRRG, but as we did not know the details of the consultation we had not had the opportunity to discuss the option. Mrs Bell responded that as FS were involved she assumed that they were keeping us in touch. She said it was a lesson learned.</p> <p>Cllr. Coles also explained that as no permission had been sought for the combined Friends of the School/FS consultation event on our Playing Field effectively the event had not been covered by our insurance. Mrs Bell had thought the Friends of the School/or the School would have requested permission. She said that hopefully in the New Year we should have a nice new playing field and we should be able to move on.</p> <p>Cllr. Coles added that there might be a possible conflict if PC members vote on both committees. Cllr. Penny stated they were advisory not voting members, however he commented the PC needs to establish who the voting members on PIPFA are.</p> <p>Mrs Bell finished by saying: "Lessons had been learned on both sides."</p>	
F&CP72/15	<u>Apologies for Absence</u> – Cllr. Dawe (work commitment) and the Clerk (clash of meetings).	
F&CP73/15	<p><u>Members' Declarations</u> –</p> <p>a. <i>Registerable Declarations of Interests</i> – none.</p> <p>b. <i>Non-registerable interest</i> – none.</p> <p>c. <i>Declaration of Gifts</i> – Members were reminded they must declare any gift or hospitality with a value in excess of fifty pounds.</p>	
F&CP74/15	<p><u>Financial Matters</u> –</p> <p>a. <i>VAT Return</i> – Members noted the VAT return had been submitted.</p>	
F&CP75/15	<p><u>Car Park Matters</u> –</p> <p>a. <i>Overflow Car Park</i> – Cllr. Raynor had been in touch with Mr Andrew White from Knevitts, who is off sick, but will respond when he returns to work regarding the amendment to the planning application for shrubs in place of trees.</p>	
F&CP76/15	<u>Information Only/Future Agenda Items</u> – none.	
F&CP77/15	<u>Closed Session</u> – in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, namely quotations, it was RESOLVED that it is advisable in the public interest that the press and public be excluded and they were instructed to withdraw.	

F&CP78/15	<p><u>Enforcement</u> – a quotation had been received from Premier Parking who had approached the PC without invitation. The PC still don't have an update reference the Government's investigation about unfair parking charge practices.</p> <p>AS Parking's opinion regarding enforcement is that it is achieved either under the Road Traffic Act or Protection of Freedoms Act 2012. Premier Parking would require the PC's parking order to be removed. Cllr. Coles said it affects the collection of fines for enforcement companies. AS Parking had finally got approval for payment by telephone and had installed the signs and information, using a system called WHOOSH.</p> <p>Premier Park would use Ringo a comparable service. These systems support the purchase of season tickets and Cllr. Raynor said we should institute a weekly season ticket. Premier Parking proposed payment by 10% revenue on monies banked up to 100K gross. Cllr. Coles proposed a net <i>not</i> gross percentage in prior negotiation with ASP. Now AS Parking had installed the system Mr Kevin McManus, AS Parking, will draft a new contract reference 10% net revenue.</p> <p>Cllr. Coles assessed both contractors are not far removed from one another in terms of competition. Premier Parking suggested enforcement via two possible models, one done by automatic number recognition. Cllr. Penny said the issue with number recognition system is if you put the number in incorrectly. Cllr. Coles said returning holiday makers would have a shock receiving PCNs by post. NPR system will not have patrols. Cllr. Coles stated that if they are attending to empty the meters they may as well enforce on foot. We require a direct figure comparison.</p> <p>Members RESOLVED to await a direct comparison of pay and display patrols contracts as set out by Premier Park and AS Parking.</p>	
F&CP79/15	<u>Meeting Closed</u> – 7.45pm.	

Signature: (Cllr. Raynor)
Chairman

Date: 9th November 2015