



## Meeting of Three Fields Community Trust – Church Hall Meeting Room – 12/07/16

**Attendees :** Andrew David (SEWEA), Paul Turner (MAGOR), Rob Ollerton (Magor Churchmen), Sally Raggett (Magor Players). Karin Henderson (ARC)

**Apologies :** Andrew Rodley (Magor Brownies)

The following is a set of action notes of the meeting but is not intended as verbatim minutes.

	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision / Action</b>	<b>Who</b>
1.	<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	PT informed the group that the aims of the meeting were to update the people who had expressed an interest in possibly becoming directors of the recently established “Three Fields Community Trust” on progress and ideas to date and to confirm if they wished to become directors	
2.	<b>Draft proposals for the 3 Fields Site, the building and the financing</b>	<p>AD explained that a stage 1 Expression of Interest form (for a Community Asset Transfer of the site) had been submitted to Monmouthshire County Council via GAVO. The form, which is now published on the Three Fields Community Trust website – <a href="https://threefieldstrust.org/">https://threefieldstrust.org/</a>, shows that a company has now been established, lays out the aims of the company and how the project is intended to be financed and delivered. AD and PT showed the attendees the drawings of the <u>draft</u> ideas on what might go on the site and included a suggested floor plan of the community building. The final size, layout and content of the building would depend on finances, further consultations and planning constraints but the group were supportive of the draft ideas and agreed that they were suitable to go forward as the initial proposals as required by GAVO/MCC (i.e. basic design plan with estimated costings of what is proposed, how it is to be run and financed in terms of capital and revenue costs).</p> <p>The multi-purpose building was just one part of the project – other ideas were discussed, e.g. how the site may be used for young people, for health and fitness, for a safe meeting place etc. All of these ideas would be developed and consulted on as part of the project but being able to extend and/or modify the building and continually develop the site both in terms of use and the running of it were key to eventual success.</p> <p>It was agreed that AD would submit the basic design plan to MCC</p>	<b>AD</b>

	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision / Action</b>	<b>Who</b>
		The draft site plans and building ideas would be uploaded on to the website	<b>PT</b>
3.	<b>Confirmation of who would be directors of the Trust</b>	<p>AD and PT thanked the attendees and AR for expressing interest in joining the team of directors (which currently only consisted of AD and PT – needed to initiate and register the company). It was important to strengthen the team with individuals who were prepared to be actively involved in the project delivery and take ownership for certain areas that needed to be developed and maintained in the future.</p> <p>SR was happy to take ownership of building facilities, development, organising and booking. RO offered help with publicity and communication (e.g. Video of the project) and event organisation (and linkage with the Churchmen). KH was willing to act as an advisor on matters that involved public safety, disability and other people considerations. Both RO and SR were willing to become directors. KH was willing to become a member/advisor and to keep the director option under consideration. AD re-affirmed that he would act as the company secretary and PT would take on a project management role.</p> <p>AD would register SR and RO as directors.</p> <p>PT would explore with AR, who was unable to make the meeting, how she might like to be involved.</p> <p>It was agreed that the decisions made above would strengthen the Trust but there was still a need to bring others in, as either members or possibly directors, who could bring ‘something to the party’ and be active in the delivery. All would need to use their networks to identify and introduce such people to the Trust</p>	<p><b>AD</b></p> <p><b>PT</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p>
4.	<b>Project Plan and Governance</b>	<p>PT suggested that, in his opinion, one of the reasons that MUSLA had failed to deliver was the fact that although there was a reasonable business plan and some recognition of the need for a project plan, there was little evidence of on-going project management – particularly around risk and issue management and the transparency thereof.</p> <p>PT explained that project management need not be over-egged or turned into an ‘art form’ to be effective but could be scaled accordingly, using some recognised industry standard frameworks and methodologies. Two such were ‘The Business Excellence Model’ and ‘PRINCE’ (Projects IN Controlled Environments). The concepts of these were explained to the attendees who agreed that the approaches were logical and supported the idea of using them. PT would upload the concepts onto the website (<a href="#">Plans Section</a>) along with the outline target milestone diagrams</p>	<b>PT</b>
5.	<b>Communications</b>	A communication plan would be developed as part of the overall project plan. All publicity methods would be used, including; Website, Twitter, Facebook, The Press and Publicity	

	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision / Action</b>	<b>Who</b>
		Events. Some of these, i.e. Website and Facebook were in development. PT thanked RO for offering help with this area. PT reported that Cllr. Taylor would be mentioning the Trust in her article in the next edition of the Villager and publicising our website.	
6.	<b>AoB and Date of Next Meeting</b>	<p>It was agreed that participants would flag up areas that they believed could be risks to the project so that they could be recorded in the 'risk and issue log'</p> <p>There was no other business other than to agree a date for the next meeting. It was provisionally agreed as Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> August, Church Hall meeting room, 6.15pm (to be confirmed). This meeting would be open to all interested parties</p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>RO</b></p>

PT/14-07-16