

Paroisse de Saint Sauveur  
Minutes of the Douzaine Meeting held in the Herm & Jethou Rooms at the  
Community Centre at 7.00pm on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020 (respecting social distancing  
guidelines currently in force)

Present	<p>Messrs D Bertrand (DB), J Brache (JB), Mrs C Connolly (CC), Mr R de Garis (RdG), Mrs K Fooks (KF), Messrs S Gibbs (SG), J Gillson (JG), P Harris (PH), J Liddy (JL), R Murray (RM), J Norman (JN), P Connolly (PC) and N Le Poidevin (NLP) (Constable – presiding).</p> <p>Mr G Chapman (GC), Parish Secretary was present to record the minutes.</p>	
Apologies	Mr K Ball (KB)	
Decisions made at the remote meeting held on 20 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	The note recording the decisions made at the remote meeting held on 20 <sup>th</sup> April 2020 was agreed with no amendments and signed by the Constable.	
Matters Arising	None	
St Saviour's Community Centre LBG (SSCC)	<p><b>Replacement Roof(s) at SSCC.</b></p> <p>NLP reminded the Douzaine that the Constables had received a request from Mr P Duquemin (PD), a Director of SSCC LBG, asking that the Douzaine approve that parish funds (representing the balance received from the sale of the former Douzaine Room at La Grande Rue - approx £90k) should be used to replace some of the roof(s) at the Community Centre. The documents relating to this matter and the quotes for the work had been circulated previously.</p> <p>KF asked RM (who is a Trustee of SSCC) if the Trustees and Directors have met to discuss the proposals.</p> <p>RM confirmed that no such meeting has yet taken place and agreed that perhaps it should have done but because of the Covid 19 restrictions on social movement this had not been possible to arrange.</p> <p>KF asked how much money the SSCC LBG had available as cash, and what fundraising efforts had contributed to the SSCC finances.</p> <p>NLP confirmed that this was about £4k. Because of Covid 19 restrictions the LBG had not been able to realise some £20k of planned income during March, April and May.</p> <p>KF said that it would be good for the Douzaine to meet with all of the Trustees and Directors at the same time.</p> <p>JN suggested that the LBG needs to demonstrate how they intend to fund future maintenance and explain what maintenance has been carried out in recent years.</p> <p>SG agreed with the point made by JN, adding that the Trustees should be commended for the work they have done in getting the Centre up and running but there needs to be a clear understanding of what happens next. There might be funds available (Douzaine Room sale proceeds) for a replacement roof this time, but what provision is being made for the next unexpected maintenance cost, this needs to be explained.</p> <p>KF said that she did not want to see any parish money committed to development of phase 3, suggesting that the Trustees should concentrate their fundraising efforts to ensure that the existing buildings are properly maintained before commencing any new building.</p> <p>JN asked RM to liaise with the Trustees and Directors to establish how funds will be made available for ongoing maintenance of the Centre's</p>	

	<p>buildings and to suggest that phase 3 development should be reconsidered.</p> <p>RM agreed to do this, adding that he believes that phase 3 development will be delayed if not cancelled because in the current economic climate he doubts that fundraising efforts will be successful.</p> <p>NLP wished to place on record that the Douzaine has always supported the concept of the Community Centre and has demonstrated this by supporting every request for financial assistance (from the Trustees and Directors) up until phase 2 was completed. Since phase 3 has been spoken about by the Trustees, with no indication how funds will be made available, the Douzaine has been reluctant to commit parish funds until there is certainty that the project has the finances to ensure completion. NLP also reminded the Douzaine that if all of the £90k available is committed to replacement roofs, there will be no parish funds available to demolish the pool building.</p> <p>RM said that his understanding is that the Trustees' now accept that the proceeds from the sale of the former Douzaine Room can be used for refurbishment of SSCC and that replacement roof(s) is an example of what the funds intended use. He accepts that the funds were not specifically intended for development of phase 3 as some had previously suggested. RM also suggested that it might be the case that in future years the Trustees would have to focus their fundraising efforts on specific maintenance projects, in the same way as (in the UK) some churches have to fundraise for replacement roofs or windows.</p> <p>JN said that the Douzaine has a responsibility to ensure that parish money is used in a cost-efficient way and that this is why there has been a reluctance to commit funds to phase 3.</p> <p>KF asked if there was a way to save on project management costs, and asked why it was necessary to have a building company involved with a project to replace roof(s), when it would be a third party actually carrying out the work with the building company supervising the project for a fee that amounted to 10% of the total cost.</p> <p>DB said that he did not believe there was enough information currently available for the Douzaine to make firm decisions. Although he believes it likely that there will be no alternative other than to agree to fund replacement roof(s) he would like the opportunity to ask questions of the Trustees and Directors before committing parish funds.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Trustees and Directors should be invited to attend the Douzaine meeting on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2020 to discuss the matter further.</p> <p>RM agreed to liaise with the Trustees and Directors to confirm the arrangements.</p> <p>NLP asked Douzeniers to ensure that they made the Constables aware of any questions they have concerning the proposal before Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> June.</p> <p>RM agreed to collate all questions, liaise with the Trustees and Directors and circulate the answers before the meeting planned for 22<sup>nd</sup> June.</p>	<p>NLP/PC</p> <p>RM</p> <p>All</p> <p>RM</p>
<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>The Constables had previously circulated documents concerning the Planning Department's refusal for a development at Rus des Massies. The owners had written to the Constables asking for Douzaine support for the development. The main reason given (for refusal) by the Department appears to be that the existing building on the site had been 'abandoned' and NLP reminded the Douzaine that when the application was first submitted, the plans were reviewed by Douzeniers and no objection was raised.</p>	

	<p>JN said that in his opinion the Department are selective when they apply the planning rules, because (in his opinion) there are at least 2 properties in the parish which had previously been abandoned but have been granted planning permission to develop dwellings on the site. He would rather see the Rue des Massies site granted planning permission than continue to be an 'eyesore' as it is now.</p> <p>SG disagreed with the view expressed by JN, suggesting that the Department had made their decision based on current legislation. It is his understanding that under the rules that applied to previous planning guidelines, permission had been granted for development on the site, but did not take place. Those rules have now been replaced and the Department's decision in in line with current legislation. The examples (of development approval) given by JN were not in an agricultural priority area whereas Rue des Massies is.</p> <p>RdG reminded the Douzaine that there was previously a habitable dwelling on the site and this had been occupied by an elderly couple. He asked why, if other 'abandoned' properties have been granted permission why this site should not be similarly treated.</p> <p>RM suggested that it was not for the Douzaine to 'takes sides' in the matter, - if the applicants did not accept the Department's decision there was an appeal process available and suggested that the applicants should investigate this course of action.</p> <p>JN agreed that it would not be appropriate for the Douzaine to support an applicant in a dispute with the Planning Department but remains of the opinion that the Department makes inconsistent decisions.</p> <p>DB suggested that it would be wrong for the Douzaine to comment on the reasons why the Department makes any particular decision without a full understanding of why that particular decision was made.</p> <p>The Douzaine agreed that commenting on decisions made by the Planning Department is not part of the Douzaine's remit and that the Constables should reply accordingly.</p>	NLP/PC
Parish Rates	<p><b>Overcharge on 2020 Rates.</b></p> <p>GC explained to that there had been a 'bug' in the computer programme that was used to produce the rates. This has resulted in approximately 260 accounts being overcharged by £2.57 each. As soon as the error became known, those responsible for the maintenance of the computerised records rectified it and arranged for letters to be sent to those parishioners concerned. The suggested remedy is to apply a credit to the 2021 rates account for those that have already paid the 2020 account or to reduce the amount due for 2020 if the account is yet to be paid.</p> <p>To date, no-one has made any adverse comment about the proposal.</p> <p><b>2020 Rates Income.</b></p> <p>GC reported that there have been quite a few requests to delay payment of the 2020 parish rates and, although there was no way to be sure until later in the year, it was possible that there might be a shortfall in the income to be raised this year.</p> <p>SG suggested that the Constables should write to the Policy and Resources (P&amp;R) Committee to determine if there might be any facility for States' assistance in the event that there should be a significant shortfall.</p> <p><i>The Constables subsequently decided to wait until the end of July, when the financial position will be more certain, before they entered into correspondence with P&amp;R.</i></p>	NLP/PC

