



St Michael and All Angels, Ledbury

Minutes of Parochial Church Council - 20 October 2021

Present: Keith Hilton-Turvey (Chair)
Andrew Beech
Cath Beech
Benjamin Hilton-Turvey
William Hopkinson
Tim Keyes
Christabel Panter
Peter Scull
William Simmonds
James Smith
Diana Veasey
Peter Veasey

Apologies: Sue Cooper, David Houghton, Julian l'Anson, Ian James, Lisa-Jayne Lewis, Abby Wake, Will Wake

833. The meeting was held to complete the agenda of the meeting held on 29 September. Keith Hilton-Turvey opening the meeting with Psalm 136 and prayer.

Minutes of meeting on 29 September

834. These were agreed with one abstention, subject to the final sentence of paragraph 812 being deleted.

Fabric

835. Andrew Beech noted that the quinquennial report had yet to be received. Most planning for work on the fabric had been suspended pending this. However he had invited Ian Cramp, who had designed the chancel lighting, to consider how the lighting of the Chapter House might be improved. He hoped that the heating might be improved at the same time, and asked whether anyone knew the size of the void under the Chapter House floor that might potentially be used for underfloor heating. Andrew Beech will contact Bob Hale and Nick Bickham, who it was thought might know.

Action: Andrew Beech

836. Caroe and Partners seemed to be overwhelmed with work at present, and had not yet submitted plans for repair of the broken stonework in the floor of the south aisle. Neither had invoices been received for the now completed work on the tower.

837. Andrew Beech expressed concern at the way the Polidoro Last Supper painting was being presented within the church, with great prominence being given to it being allegedly "Titian's Lost Last Supper". This was not a view shared by the wider art world, and care was needed not to be seen to overclaim. The painting remained insured as a work by Polidoro, which attribution was generally accepted. It was agreed that, should the existing leaflet be reprinted, it should be redrafted to include a caveat about Ronald Moore's attribution of the painting. It was also agreed that David Houghton should write to the stewards pointing out the caveat, and that the church takes no position on whether any of the painting is or is not by the hand of Titian.

Action: David Houghton

Audio-visual

838. Benjamin Hilton-Turvey presented a document (see Annex A) making recommendations in respect of purchasing (a) a drop-down screen to replace the present temporary one, (b) a replacement projector, (c) three live-stream cameras and a control desk, and (d) an internet connection into the church via the room above the north porch where a WiFi router would be situated.

839. Points noted in discussion were:

a) that the internet connection would be wireless line-of-sight from the church office to the top of the ladder across the nave roof, from where it would be routed by wire alongside the existing cabling for the PV array into the room above the north porch. The exact cost wasn't known. Benjamin Hilton-Turvey will ascertain this. In the interim £1,000 was budgeted for the purpose;

Action: Benjamin Hilton-Turvey

b) of the three live-stream cameras, one would be a static camera located on the sill below the west window, one remotely controllable Pan-Tilt-Zoom camera located adjacent to the static camera and the third a mobile camera with a tripod;

c) the proposals did not include alterations to the sound system, but all were compatible with an improved system should this be introduced at a later date;

d) before a faculty can be applied for, details of the proposed mounting of the drop-down screen and the proposed wiring run, including the type and colour of wiring proposed, will be required. Benjamin Hilton-Turvey will obtain these from the contractor;

Action: Benjamin Hilton-Turvey

e) because of the void under the chancel floor it was noted that two scaffolding towers either side of the chancel arch will be needed with a bridge between them. The quotes in Annex A may or may not include the cost of scaffolding. Benjamin Hilton-Turvey will find out whether they are, and if not, what the additional cost would be;

Action: Benjamin Hilton-Turvey

f) VAT was not recoverable on any of the equipment proposed. The Shackleton legacy would be available to part-fund this work for the next six months and there was money available in the building funds (but these were not being replenished and would run out in due course if this continued);

g) it was not known whether other external grants might be available to support this work. Lisa-Jayne Lewis will enquire.

Action: Lisa-Jayne Lewis

840. The recommendations at Annex A were proposed by Benjamin Hilton-Turvey and seconded by Tim Keyes. They were agreed, subject to clarification of details listed in paragraph 839 above and also that a faculty would be sought, with two abstentions.

841. Cath Beech pointed out that some £1,745 remained available towards funding a replacement sound system. William Hopkinson proposed that this be used to fund a professional look at the system to see what improvements were desirable. This was agreed with one vote against and one abstention.

Action: Benjamin Hilton-Turvey/Lisa-Jayne Lewis/Keith Hilton-Turvey

Vestments and altar linen

842. It was agreed that this would be carried over to the November meeting. Ian James would be invited to draft a paper introducing the subject, for discussion by the PCC.

Action: Andrew Beech/Ian James

Reviews

843. William Simmonds proposed himself as chair of the pastoral care review, seconded by Peter Veasey. This was opposed by Keith Hilton-Turvey who believed that he would be more suitable and that he should chair the review. On being put to the vote William Simmonds was appointed chair of the pastoral care review with six votes in favour, one against and five abstentions.

844. Keith Hilton-Turvey proposed, seconded by James Smith, that he chair the review of youth and children's work. This was agreed with nine in favour and six abstentions. Keith indicated that he would arrange the first meeting of the review group before the next PCC meeting.

Action: Keith Hilton-Turvey

845. There was some discussion as to whether Mary Anne Keyes should be invited to chair the LMDG strategy review. She is not currently a member of the Group, and only the congregation (not the PCC) may invite people to join it. Tim Keyes will sound out Mary Anne as to whether she would be prepared to lead the strategy review. For discussion at the November meeting.

Action: Tim Keyes

Matters Arising

846. Consideration will be given to making large-print orders of service available. The church is also looking to reintroduce pew sheets, but is mindful of the possibility of new Covid restrictions being introduced.

Action: Keith Hilton-Turvey

847. Andrew Beech will seek replacement lower wattage (and smaller) bulbs for use in the sconces behind the pulpit and on the south chancel arch.

Action: Andrew Beech

848. Keith Hilton-Turvey will speak to Mandy McPhee (Diocesan Safeguarding Officer) about how completion of the online safeguarding training is to be recorded.

Action: Keith Hilton-Turvey

Other business

849. It was agreed that the cut glass rose bowl found in the room above the porch should not be disposed of, although no immediate use for it was identified.

850. The baptism scheduled for 7 November will bring some 30-50 family members into the church. Many are Roman Catholics, but the family are content for an Anglican communion to take place. There was some discussion of how to arrange the communion given the additional numbers, and also of seating arrangements. Keith Hilton-Turvey will check whether the family would be content to feature in a live broadcast and recorded broadcast available on line.

Action: Keith Hilton-Turvey

851. Cath Beech pointed out that there is a potential conflict of interest in transferring the Ecumenical Fund to LEAF, as the two charities have at least one trustee in common. Charity law requires the “exporting” charity to consider this and to confirm that any potential conflict can be appropriately managed. The PCC agreed unanimously that it could do so.

852. It was agreed that the church needs to find someone to co-ordinate the various small groups as David Kirkham is ill.

The next meeting will be held on 17 November at 7.30 p.m. in the Chapter House. It was agreed that meetings in 2022 will be held on: 17 January, 16 March, 18 May, 20 July, 21 September, 16 November. Please note that the January date is different from that previously indicated, and will be on a Monday evening.

The meeting closed at 21.32 with prayer and the grace.

ANNEX A

Audio Visual Proposal

Current situation

A.1 In the course of 2020 a need for people to watch a church service without requiring attendance to the building was found. A live-stream was one method developed to address this need. Developed initially in parallel with already-recorded video services, live-streaming the main Sunday service has now replaced the highly resource and time intensive videos.

A.2 Live-streaming was immediately well received by the Church. Even after restrictions have lifted, the live-stream is still watched every week. The initial set-up has been expanded with additional devices to also provide a reliable recording of the service. This recording is also watched weekly.

A.3 The live-stream provides a direct connection into the Church service for people not in the building. The recording provides a valuable resource for later viewing. The accessibility of church services and events to everyone, in the Ledbury community and beyond, is obvious, while also providing additional avenues of communication and engagement.

A.4 The current set-up has grown out of a testing set-up and is not viable long term. There is total reliance on the church borrowing multiple devices from multiple volunteers each week. The current set-up has also proven to be unreliable at times even when all equipment is in use. Expertise on the equipment is also required to provide a quality live-stream and recording, greatly limiting the people able to operate it.

A.5 Related to the live-stream is the screen and projector ("s&p"). The church recently upgraded the projector. The s&p is currently required for every service, providing the liturgy and lyrics clearly without requiring each congregant to use multiple books and booklets. In contrast to the pre-Covid practice, the future is most likely to see the books and booklets supplementing the s&p in many services. Since being introduced regularly years ago, the s&p has been generally well received and appreciated by the church. It has been particularly well received by the wider community, including special events such as the Civic Service.

A.6 The current s&p set-up is reliable but preparing for Sunday requires effort and expertise every Saturday evening which is not always available. Set-down after the service also required effort and expertise every Sunday. A few volunteers assist the central AV team for set-down, when available. However, recent experience (e.g. the 14 October Bells Service) has demonstrated that the current projector cannot project a clear image when at extreme angles like on a pillar.

A.7 Currently the permanent sound system, live-stream set-up and s&p (with additional speakers when required) are all unconnected. This makes controlling the audio-visual of a service difficult and often requires multiple people. This lack of connection has the consequence of a lower quality live-stream and recording. The current sound desk, which houses the sound mixer, provides no room for any live-stream equipment.

A.8 The PCC has previously recognised the need for a permanent, reliable solution for both live- stream and s&p. Investment is required to improve the s&p to streamline preparation. Improvements will also make it easier to use, expanding the body of people with the skills to direct the projection in- service.

A.9 Serious investment is also required to maintain and improve the online services. Improvement also provides versatility, augmenting the features of the building for concerts and other events. There is a requirement to install an internet connection in the building, without which live-streaming would be wholly unviable. Since no single camera-mounting position provides coverage of all areas services can reasonably cover (table, lectern, pulpit, baptism font) multiple cameras are required. The work also needs to connect, or enable the future connection of, the s&p, sound system and live-stream. This will enable one or two people to control the audio-visual delivery reliably without requiring great skill and expertise.

A.10 I have previously approached Openreach about installing an underground WiFi cable to the building, resulting in estimates starting at about £3,000, not including getting the cable inside the building. A cheaper alternative would be preferable.

Below are multiple quotes for replacing and installing a suitable live-stream set-up and a quote for s&p set-up.

Requirements

A.11 The Church requires:

- A permanent internet connection into the building,
- Multiple cameras and mixing cabinet¹,
- Integration into the current sound system,
- The s&p set up integrated into the live-stream.

It would be advantageous to have

- Capacity to expand the number of cameras if required in the future,
- Ability to control the cameras during a service without leaving AV desk,
- Upgrade of current sound system.

Quotes (all prices include VAT)

Wild Edric Media: about £12,000

Integrates and upgrades current sound system and sound desk, £1,950

One fixed and three portable cameras for streaming, 8 channel mixer, £9,900

The 8-channel mixer enables cheaper addition of more cameras later, portable cameras provide most flexibility for recording (baptisms, weddings, funerals, concerts, etc.). Cameras cannot be adjusted remotely, adjustment of camera mid-service difficult. Storage of cameras also needs to be considered. Setting up the mobile cameras before each service required.

Litenet: about £7,000

Three fixed cameras, 4 channel mixer, internet installation (from Rectory), £7,083.15, recurring monthly £50.40 for internet service.

No breakdown of the one-off costs was provided. Minimal stream setup, cameras only to provide fixed views. Installing new phone/internet-line from Rectory viable but normally expensive, plus additional monthly cost. This would provide a router in the church building.

¹ Note the distinction between a mixer and a mixing desk. A mixer is the single piece of equipment that selects which camera feed to “send” to the live-stream. Any time more than 1 camera is used, a mixer is required. A mixing cabinet or desk is furniture that houses that equipment.

Distributed Sound & Video (DSAV): about £9,000

One fixed camera, one portable camera and one PTZ (remote operated) camera, 4 channel mixer, £6,153.90

Good balance of low set-up and flexibility, additional microphone so minimal integration with current sound system. The static and PTZ cameras would be mounted on the window ledge above the West Door while the portable camera requires secure storage. Additional £2,722.80 for new, securable, mixing desk cabinet replacing current sound desk also available.

Audio Visual Direct (AVD): about £11,000

Screen (3m, 16:10 aspect ratio) and projector using current projector, £6,954 One PTZ camera, point-to-point internet from church office installation, £4,183.20

Double-drop screen behind arch so to be completely hidden when not in use. Electrically operated, remote controlled winch for screen. Additional £1,574 for new projector rather than using current.

One camera severely limits flexibility, no mixer so unable to expand with additional cameras without additional cost of mixer. Using existing office internet connection avoids additional monthly cost. Point-to-point equipment varies in cost. After a brief internet search, costs normally between £300 to £500 for equipment. I would guess 2 days 'work to install. This solution would provide an internet router in the church building, providing a wired connection for the live-stream and wifi in the building (the strength of the wifi signal will depend on the router).

Recommendation

Screen and projector:

Audio Visual Direct, using new projector, £8,528

Live-stream, including securable mixing cabinet:

DSAV, three cameras total (1 static, 1 PTZ, 1 mobile), £8,876.20

Internet:

Audio Visual Direct, unclear on installation cost.

Total: £17,404.20 plus point-to-point internet.

Distributed Sound And Video provided the best combination of simple and functional streaming functionality with capability to add one additional camera later if required.

Audio Visual Direct for internet access in the building utilising the internet service from the office avoids additional monthly costs.

This combination would provide a greatly improved s&p arrangement, easy set-up which can be done shortly before each service without no heavy lifting. Both the image quality and screen itself will be higher, making it easier to see. This height will also avoid the projection catching the tops of heads for shadow-puppets.

This will also allow the s&p to be fully integrated into the live-stream, also requiring minimal preparation and lifting only when the mobile camera is required.

A new mixing cabinet would be required due to the value of the mixer and other equipment contained nearby.

A permanent set-up inherently makes it easier to train other people on the operation.

This recommendation does not incorporate an upgrade to the sound system but will integrate when the sound system is upgraded. The new cabinet also provides room for an improved sound mixer.