

Benefice of Milborne Port with Milborne Wick, Goathill, and Charlton Horethorne with Stowell
Section 11 meeting held on Tuesday 25th January 2022 at Church House, Bathwell Lane, Milborne
Port

Tuesday 25 January 2022, 7.00 pm at Church House, Bathwell Lane, Milborne Port

Those present: Charlie Beney (CB) [CHAIR], Ann Bennett, Harold Clarke, Bill Closs, Roger Cowley, Nicki Edwards (NE), Pat Elliott, Ben Grundy, Jacquie Hall, Robert Hall (RH), Amanda Hughes (AH), Jane Jeanes, Trevor John, Linda Mumford (LM), Richard Redman, Rev. Kevin Rogers (KR) [AREA DEAN], Anne Salkeld, Graham Sharpless (GS), Paul Springett, Barbara Tindale, Susan Wales, Trudy West^[SEP]

Apologies for absence: Bridget Buckland, Elaine Ennis-Bunt, Nick Bunt, Mary Clothier (MC), Lyn Harrison, Amanda Mackintosh, Mel Oura, Lizzie Snell

Welcome, introductions and prayer – CB welcomed everyone to this specially convened Section 11 meeting, which will begin the formal process to appoint a new incumbent for the Benefice, by approving the Parish Profile, and by appointing the PCCs' representatives to drive the process forward. He then introduced the Area Dean, Reverend Kevin Rogers, and invited him to open the meeting with prayer.

KR then emphasised that the Benefice was viewed by the Diocese and Deanery as a strong one, and "one to watch". He described the national and local context within the Church of England as one full of uncertainty but also as one that presents many opportunities. The Diocese is presently going through a period of financial instability with the number of regular worshippers down, and that this Deanery is faced with the prospect of losing stipendiary posts. KR asserted the need in the future to align resources, and any future incumbent which we appoint here for our Benefice will be vital in supporting the Deanery, and assist with addressing the issues associated with these challenges. He reiterated that there is no intention to split the Benefice, but that the new leader must have the vision to help share the load. NE stressed the need to attract a person who will be working in our Benefice, for our Benefice, and that those are big enough tasks in themselves. CB agreed, and stressed that the joint PCCs do not intend to be derailed in their vision for our future.

Approve the Parish Profile – a final version had been sent electronically to all members prior to the meeting. LM confirmed that the Archdeacon, on behalf of the Diocese, had approved it. CB thanked LM, on behalf of all PCC members, for her unstinting work in producing a contemporary document, which looked both visually appealing and read very well. Those present showed their appreciation by applauding LM for all she had done on everyone's behalf. GS queried if the document would benefit from a table of contents, and asked that the document be re-checked for typographical errors. MC had asked prior to the meeting that the repertoire tackled by the choir of St John's be acknowledged in some way. LM thanked everyone for their comments, confirming that checks would indeed be made, however as it was already a long document, further changes were unnecessary.

CB then asked that the members present formerly vote to adopt this document as the Benefice Parish Profile. All were in favour, with none against.

Appointment of representatives in the selection of the new incumbent – CB reminded those present that these are central roles, as each PCC is delegating its responsibilities for the appointment of a new incumbent to these lay representatives, and that it is important that the persons selected

represent the breadth of the congregation, and have the confidence of all. A maximum of two representatives per PCC should be appointed, and the following were duly selected as their PCC's representatives:

Charles Beney and William Closs (Charlton Horethorne with Stowell);
Harold Clarke and Judith [Trudy] West (Goathill);
Nicola Edwards and Jacqueline Hall (Milborne Port with Milborne Wick)

Placing the advertisement – A discussion followed about how the advertisement should be worded to attract the best possible candidates, and two examples from other parishes were briefly considered. The conclusion was that it will be up to the appointed representatives to agree on wording, and whether to advertise it on the Diocesan website, as well as in The Church Times which, whilst being costly, will be seen by a wider audience. It was agreed that the advertisement should be specific and relate directly to the Parish Profile, and that the advertisement be placed as soon as possible. The question of who will meet the bill for this advertisement (benefice or patrons) will be addressed by the representatives in due course.

Section 12 Meeting (only if necessary) – As everyone was in agreement with the process thus far, as described above, CB concluded that this would not be necessary. RH voiced concerns about the future, but, as it is the Diocese's firm intention to purchase a new Vicarage, the immediate future here is secure. CB added that the Benefice is central, and that it is a success because of all the hard work undertaken by so many within the Benefice. Although the new incumbent will be working as part of the team within the Deanery, the central focus for us should be on our Benefice.

Statements from the Deanery and the Diocese – the current and future needs of the Deanery, and the Diocese, have been described by KR to this meeting, and are also contained within the statements provided for the Parish Profile.

With the formal business being concluded, CB asked if there were any further questions or comments. AH questioned timescales: CB envisaged advertising by mid-February at the latest, with the intention to move as fast as possible.

After thanking everyone for their support, and a final prayer from KR, the meeting closed at 7:48 pm.