

Date:	17 th April 2019	Venue:	SBL HUB 6:30pm
Present:	Pat (PL), Kevin (KP), Richard(RM), Jim (JB), Emma B (EB) Emma C (EC) Netti (NL), Mel (MS),		
Apologies	Leon(LRL), Trisha(TRL), Barbara (BL),	Actions	
Approval of minutes	Minutes from 20 th of March Proposed 1 st RM 2 nd PL Agreed 5 Disagreed 0		
Actions from last minutes	<p><u>Quotes for Rear Door</u> Two quotes obtained Pavilion Glass (PG) and Lancing Glass Works.(LGW) This is for a reinforced PVC back door. PG= £814+VAT (total of £976.80) LGC = £597.12 inclusive of VAT 3rd Quote was received for £750 Proposed by RM to keep it local and used LGW to replace back door. 2nd by PL Agreed 5 Disagreed 0</p> <p><u>Delegated Responsibility</u></p> <p><u>Beyond the school gates</u> Further communication from Beyond the school gates to say they are working on finding match funding, and whilst the relationship with another community organisation they would like to extend the period of time in which they respond to SBL offer. This was agreed by partnership.</p> <p><u>Window Update</u> Quote and graphics have been received for SBL display window, with the graphic costing £97.54+VAT+ £8p&p. It was agreed to order this asap</p>		<p>EC to contact LGW and arrange</p> <p>EC to re-send contact details to EB</p> <p>EC to respond to Beyond the School Gates.</p> <p>EC to order.</p>

<p>Recap on code of conduct from last meeting.</p>	<p>JB recapped on the key points as identified by the partnership at the last meeting, this included Keeping on topic, 1 conversation at a time and declaring an interest. It was also discussed that this was to update policies so everyone can be familiar with them and also make it easier to manage expectations of new members.</p> <p>A further discussion was had with HC stepping down, there is a need to actively recruit new partnership members, and now the LTO issue is resolved the group can consider the two applications it has. The partnership felt that this is a good time to renew and refresh policies, procedures and ensure a shared understanding of conduct, so new partnership members can be inducted into a partnership which runs smoothly, have a clear understanding of the role and expectations.". JB advised that another area has a policy that a prospective member is invited to attend 3 meetings before they are accepted as a partnership member. This was agreed as a good way for them to be introduced to the group and workings of SBL. It was also suggested that any prospective member is met with SBL to go through policies again to manage any expectations.</p> <p>JB also mentioned a section in the Terms of reference-“Members of the Partnership cannot receive any money or financial benefit from their involvement in the Partnership, except to refund reasonable out of pocket expenses” This was discussed as how this was interpreted, by the partnership.</p> <p>There are currently 2 outstanding applications for partnership it was agreed that they would be met to go through the policies and invited to 3 partnership meetings after the AGM.</p>	<p>EC to continue to update new handbook.</p> <p>JB, EB and RM to arrange to meet with new applicants.</p>
<p>Finance and LTO Update</p>	<p><u>Finance</u> Partnership were given upto date spend report from Community Works, the spend totalling £19521.20 since 1st January.</p> <p><u>AVA</u> LTO working group and JB have been working hard to tie up final spend report with AVA. A final management amount of £8100 owed to AVA minus expenses SBL occurred which was felt to be management costs, therefore the new management fee is £7575, with Local Trust contributing £3984 leaving a total of £3591 for SBL to pay. A figure of £5589 will be returned to Local Trust from AVA. This money to go back in to Sompting Pot.</p> <p><u>Financial Procedure</u> The new financial procedure had been circulated to partnership Proposal: to adopt new financial procedures</p>	<p>EC to close Nationwide Account, with any money in the account being transferred to CW</p>

	<p>Proposed RM 2nd KP Agreed 5 Disagree 0</p>	
Parks and Open Spaces	<p><u>Croshaw Rec</u> 2 proposals have been submitted from Kompan and Russel Play, and in line with both LPC and SBL financial procedures, a 3rd has been requested. Currently proposal where shown, with Kompan being preferred. Once 3rd proposal received, young people will be asked to vote on their preferred park.</p> <p><u>Millfield</u></p> <p>MS (speaking as ADC) advised the partnership that the Millfield is a multi agency project, and that the groundworks would need to be done for entire site first. She has been advised on a potential funding source for this, however ADC can not apply so would look at a partners agency/group to apply for the benefit of Millfield. The next meeting with stakeholders and residents would be 10th May.</p>	
Hub	<p>A reminder was given that the Hub can not be seen to promote religion and politics, as set out in the local trust guidelines and posters should not be displayed.</p>	
AGM	<p>EC advised that SRWA was booked and confirmed for Thursday 16th May, with the room booked between 5pm-9pm.</p> <p>JB advised that the terms of reference needed updating to reflect the shared leadership model. The current terms of reference included the leadership team. It was suggested that this is retained but renamed to the delivery group. This would replace the current LTO working subgroup. This group would look at the day to day running of SBL, with any recommendations given at a full partnership meeting to be discussed and agreed.</p> <p>It was also suggested to replace bi-monthly public meetings with regular public meetings.</p>	<p>JB to send out updated terms of reference for voting on at AGM</p>
Grants	<p><u>1st Sompting Scouts and Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme.</u></p> <p>RM pointed out that the two grants are extremely similar and whether the 2 groups could work together and maybe share resources, and submit a joint grant rather than two separate ones, this may be that either more equipment could be bought, or better quality.</p> <p><u>We too</u></p>	<p>EC to speak to both and arrange for them to discuss.</p>

	<p>The project is an intergenerational arts project. They are looking to work with SBL to develop the project in Sompting and make sustainable. The project is holding sessions in the summer and SBL have been invited to view these. A discussion was had regarding how it would be made sustainable. JB stated that there was no budget for this project and as such should SBL wish to proceed with this, we would have to seek approval for Local Trust to add to our budget. It was agreed that this proposal would be deferred till SBL had seen further evidence of sustainability and also visited the project.</p> <p><u>The Barn Project</u> EB left as she manages Jess Estcourt who runs Tide of Light in her spare time. EB left the room to give Jess and SBL the privacy to discuss the application - as she is not a voting member anyway.</p> <p>Discussion was had regarding the sustainability of this project long term and whether the project was value for money.</p> <p>Proposal: the grant is rejected for the following reasons. -partnership feel that the sustainability of the project has not been sufficiently evidenced. -The project does not represent value for money.</p> <p>Proposed RM 2nd KP Agreed 5 Disagreed 0</p> <p><u>Age UK community club</u></p> <p>For several year SBL has been supporting the AGE UK community club at the Gardners on a Friday. The cost to fund the club is £2600p.a. PL and EC have met with Peter Hornsby and discussed number will now 25 registered with 15 regular attending</p> <p>Proposal:To fund the club for another year. Proposal:PL 2nd NL Agreed 5 disagree 0</p> <p><u>SCC Community week</u> This is deferred till a new grant for is submitted due to change in way changes in the</p>	<p>EC to contact project to advise.</p> <p>EC to advise applicant</p> <p>EC to advise Age UK</p>
--	---	--

	way the week will be run.	
AOB	MS asked JB to clarify what is a statutory duty is. JB advised that it something that a council/organisation has a duty to carryout. An example is the councils have a duty to maintain play equipment so Big Locals can not pay for the maintenance of a play park	

Next Meeting: 16th May @ SRWA

Chair: PL