

## BUXTON TOWN TEAM Scrutiny Group

Minutes of meeting held 12 October 2012

- 1) Present: Charles Jolly; Trevor Gilman; Derek Bodey. Charles acted as chair and Derek offered to produce a note of the meeting.
- 2) Apologies: None

3) Terms of Reference: These were discussed at length and Derek agreed to produce a first draft based upon the discussions. It was agreed that once we had a firm draft they would need to be submitted to the 'setting up group'/ board for approval.	Derek to provide first draft
4) Remit: the notes from the workshop on 19 June 2012 were used to inform the discussion of the terms of reference. It was noted that the current volunteers were too few and that a better size for the scrutiny group would be 5, with a quorum of 3. Ideally the additional members would be able to offer specific expertise in legal and financial matters.	Derek to email Janet to convey this view
5) Setting up group: Trevor had attended one meeting of this group. From the notes of meetings, it was clear that the group was operating in an open, democratic and transparent way. Membership was open to all who wished to be involved at this formative stage. There was a good level of discussion and agreement by consensus.	
6) Ideas and Vision Group: No-one had attended this group but from the notes of meetings, the comments made in 5 above also applied to this group.	
7) Communications Group: No-one had attended this group but from the notes of meetings, the comments made in 5 above also applied to this group. It was decided that we should begin to attend the groups as observers of the process in order to undertake first hand information. Initially Trevor would attend 'Setting up' , Charles 'Ideas and Vision' and Derek 'Communications'. This would start if possible with the next cycle of meetings.	Initially Trevor would attend 'Setting up' , Charles 'Ideas and Vision' and Derek 'Communications'
8) CIC application: Again the process of drawing up the application and the accompanying articles of association was open and transparent. All interested parties had the opportunity to engage in the discussion. It was felt by the group that there should be an opportunity for the scrutiny group to review and approve the articles before they were submitted, as they would form the basis upon which the group would make its judgements about future actions. It was believed that a new, final (?) version was to be circulated soon and we proposed to use this one for the purpose.	Derek to email Janet to convey this view and the update on draft terms of reference.
9) Image: Process for developing options for logo etc and deciding on one is fine. It was noticed that one proposal seemed close to that of the Buxton Group but it was felt that it was up to that group to raise a concern if they wish to.	
10) Web-site: It was agreed that this fell within our remit	
11) AOB: Partner scheme: This would provide £10k of government funding with support form MP. This to allow some aspects of the Portas proposal to be delivered. Method of selecting these was fine.	