

**Charney Bassett Parish Council
Charney Hall and Field Trust
Joint Meeting**

**Wednesday 27th April 2022 (in the Village Hall)
Minutes**

Present: (For CBPC) David Roberts; David Nellist; Kay Adamson; Trevor Brown (Clerk).
(For CHAFT) Neil Dobson; David Sibbert; Lucy Gildersleeves; Christine Trotman;
David Jones, Annabel Brown.
(For both) Mary Castle.

Apologies: Evelyn Campbell (CBPC Councillor and CHAFT Trustee).

ND confirmed that the meeting had been arranged following discussion at the CHAFT Meeting of 6th April 2022 (minute 10c). There had been prior liaison on an agenda and it was agreed as follows:

- 1 Outcome of CHAFT Special Meeting held at 4.30 pm on 27th April 2022.
- 2 Proposed changes to CHAFT Governing Document.
- 3 Charney Wick Ditch – discussion on timeline for action.
- 4 AOB

It was agreed that ND should chair and TB would take minutes.

1 CHAFT Special Meeting

Two matters had been discussed:

- Land Registry entries for Village Hall and Charney Field.
CHAFT had sought quotes from two solicitors to change the Registry entries. At £280 (+ VAT) one quote was considerably less than the other (£1k) and it had been decided to appoint the cheaper. No contribution was sought from the PC, but it would be asked to sign a consent form. Full details of the form were not yet known but it would include the changes that were to be made to the Land Registry entries (DS had alerted TB to these before the meeting). The PC asked CHAFT if it would seek clarification on why a consent form was required (the property transaction having already taken place via the Charity Scheme). CHAFT members felt this may well be a standard requirement of the Land Registry and that it best to await the form which may provide adequate explanation. Parish Councillors could be asked to agree sign off at its next meeting (11th May – **TB to include an item on the agenda**). MC asked that the PC consider holding a special meeting if this were not possible.
- Length of term for elected trustees (see 2 below).

2 CHAFT Governing Document

It was proposed to increase the number of elected trustees to eight, with the ability to co-opt two additional trustees. The number of representative trustees would reduce to three (two from the PC; one from the PCC). These changes were consistent with the views of the groups who could currently nominate a representative and would now be put to the Charity Commission for agreement. Consideration had been given to extending to two years the

term of elected trustees, but it had been decided this should remain at a year (see 1 above). Other changes were to be made to the Document, but these did not need Charity Commission agreement.

ND confirmed that CHAFT wished for the PC to remain as Custodian Trustee, and assumed the PC was agreeable to this.

There was then discussion of what was expected of representative trustees in terms of responsibilities. ND had raised this in recent correspondence, but advised this was still under discussion and had not been voted on yet. It was pointed out that CHAFT has operated a system of portfolio responsibilities for 2/3 years and adopts a flexible approach to its implementation. The PC explained that its representatives were likely to be less able to take on a portfolio responsibility as they already had duties allocated to them by the Parish Council. CHAFT would consider producing a generic document for all prospective trustees to explain the general expectations of a charity trustee and the way in which CHAFT operates.

3 Charney Wick Ditch

ND explained that trustees were exposed to the possibility of being sued if properties were flooded as a result of inadequate maintenance of the watercourse. CHAFT therefore wished to develop a considered maintenance plan but there was uncertainty as to how to go about this: in particular, who should do it, who pays for work (given there are other riparian owners involved), what should be done and when.

CHAFT representatives had referred the PC to various guidance documents on its role in helping to avoid flooding. TB had reported on this to the PC as it was clear there were differences of opinion as to how extensive this role should be. Since the last PC meeting DR and TB had met with OCC Highways on road safety and an additional officer had been asked to attend to discuss the CWD culvert under Main Street. His view was that some silt could, with benefit, be removed but only if part of a wider operation. This should be for the Environment Agency to advise. A specific EA contact was to be provided, but subsequently only a general EA phone and email had been received (TB to forward to AB).

DS referred to the PC having previously offered to host an informal meeting of the riparian owners along CHAFT's section of CWD. DR advised that the meeting with OCC Highways established that this would now be premature. Others also agreed that a better way forward, at least initially, would be through informal discussion with the various parties. It would still be helpful for the PC to notify all owners adjoining the Charney Field land parcel of the change in ownership (TB to draft for agreement).

4 AOB

A minute of this meeting would be published on the Village website under JLG (content to be agreed by JLG representatives – TB to draft).

The next meeting of the JLG would discuss finalising the MoU. ND felt this should be in the form of a few brief bullet points.

There was then discussion on whether the meeting had 'cleared the air' as had been intended. MC's perception was that relationships between the two organisations were becoming increasingly difficult. She had discussed this with others and this was why she had proposed this meeting be convened. It was agreed the meeting had been useful and that all might now move forward in a spirit of cooperation. Consideration might be given to these meetings becoming an annual event.