

Minutes of Meeting of Dedham PCC on Monday 30 March 2020 4pm

By Zoom

In Attendance: Antony Wilson (Chair) Peter Wilson, Lynn Al Sad, Vee Druitt, Christine Frost, John Reed, Gabbie Watson, Suzanne Woods

1. APCM & Annual Report. ACW reported that the Diocese had announced that APCM meetings would be postponed up to a furthest date of 31st October 2020. It was noted that the Annual Report was only waiting the vicar's contribution to complete it and it would then be emailed to all on the parish electoral roll with hard copies being made available at a later date.
2. P.A System It was reported that DELT had approved a contribution of up to £10,000 to upgrade the Church's p.a. system. LAS therefore proposed that this upgrade should proceed on the basis of the current quotation of £7,400+ VAT. GW seconded the motion and it was passed nem.com.
3. Organ
 - a) CF asked whether the offer of a substantial donation for a digital organ might consider donating towards a pipe organ. The understanding was that this would not be the case. CF said that she saw all the arguments for and against the replacement and agreed with the recommendation of the Organ Working Party (OWP) but was concerned as to the state of the finances following the Covid-19 outbreak.
 - b) GW agreed that there would be some difficulty in raising the necessary funds but preferred the option of the organ coming from Glasgow.
 - c) JR would not wish to follow any alternatives to the Organ Committee's recommendation but would like more clarification on the costs which could arise and a timeline for getting it installed. He would also like to hear of fundraising ideas.
 - d) VD expressed gratitude for the very comprehensive report and asked that the Organ Committee be formally thanked. She sees their recommendation as the ideal solution but cannot see it as realistic either now or in the near future, bearing in mind the latest news from the Church of England/Diocese in respect of each parish fully funding its clergy. She asked whether we could continue with the current organ until it ceases to work altogether and then might it be possible to install a digital organ as a temporary measure. She noted that the style of services is changing and we do not make the same use of the organ nowadays. VD feels that the PCC cannot commit any money to this project at this stage.
 - e) LAS agrees with all previously said. She feels that the proposed recommendation is the best and that, although it seems a great deal of money, the Committee's recommendation would be a long-term investment and we should go with this. LAS also wishes there to be a vote of thanks to those on the OWP who produced the comprehensive report.
 - f) SW expressed concern about committing to the purchase of the organ from Glasgow, or indeed any organ, before knowing that the funds were in place. Presumably the costs of moving the organ, storing it etc would all need to be met even before restoration and installation.
 - g) PW- email sent 25 March 2020
 - 1.WE all agree the latest report gives us a structured basis for discussion
 - 2.WE have to remember a digital organ may have a "benefactor" which means no burden on the church. Why could a digital order not be "fixed" so Vat can be reclaimed? Do we need to hear a good digital organ demonstrated in the church?
 - 3.Do we all agree that a pipe organ is the preferred choice IF the money can be found
 - 4.Which is best Pipe organ option? Nicholson quote £240k wholly new or largely new compared to £192k for rebuilding an old organ?
 - 5.Why will the church be without an organ for 9 months with new option but less with a refurbished organ?

6.If refurbished organ chosen the sound needs to be heard and approved

7.I understand the refurbished option will take 2/3 years to be delivered. What happens in the intervening time

8.If it is decided to go for a pipe organ a fund raising group will need to be formed; the size of the task must not be underestimated. As a minimum from my experience the following will be needed as a minimum.

- A Patron—someone to head the appeal and make a major donation
- Chair person—to manage the day to day fundraising, has contacts and prepared to make a substantial donation
- 6/8 committee members who must each be prepared to bring in 8/10 contributors; this means that these members will need to know well a wide range of contacts and not all be approaching the same people
- Think of fund raising events that can raise meaningful sums and be prepared to organize
- In general terms it is likely that a successful appeal will need one major donation(50K?) two substantial donations(£20/25k?), and five/eight meaningful donations (£5/10k). The remainder would come from fund raising. Since the organ will not be delivered for 3 years donors could pay over this period having made a firm commitment at the outset

Regarding PW question 5, LAS and GW felt that it would take longer to build a new organ than to refurbish a second-hand one, but LAS would seek clarification from the Organ Working Party

ACW questioned what the wider congregation may feel and suggested that a letter be sent to all asking for feedback. It being important to reassure people that the PCC represents the wider body of the church. He also pointed out that we needed to be mindful of wider giving and that any fundraising for the organ should not be at the expense of the general giving to the church. Also that, as a PCC, we should look forward to the future needs of the fabric of the church e.g. work on the windows. It was said that people may well agree to the most expensive option, without recognising how the cost was to be met. Also given the option, others may simply go for the least expensive. It was agreed that the letter would need to be accompanied by the Report.

It was noted that, once Antony Watson had played the organ in Glasgow and approved it for purchase, it could be secured for the sum of £1500.

It was agreed that ACW and PW would jointly draft a letter to the electoral roll.

The meeting concluded at 4.45pm