

Netherlee and Stamperland Church

Kirk Session at Netherlee

7.30pm on Monday 6th September 2021

1 CONSTITUTION

Meeting constituted by Rev Scott Blythe with Prayer.

2 SEDERUNT & APOLOGIES

There were 46 Elders present with apologies from 17 Elders as per the Sederunt Sheet. Also present for the beginning of the meeting – Dr Gary Macfarlane from Designed to Succeed.

3 CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The draft Agenda was agreed with 5 additional items under AOCB.

4 DISCUSSION TOPIC – *Netherlee roof project*

Scott opened the meeting by highlighting that it was only today that we received the report from Designed To Succeed (D2S) after several meetings with some office bearers and members of the Kirk Session. The report had been circulated to the Kirk Session. Fortunately we have Gary with us this evening to take us through the report and answer any questions we may have.

Please also refer to Appendix A

Gary outlined who works for D2S and the rationale behind what they do. They have completed 60 projects in churches all over Scotland, and currently have 13 live projects. They do not charge a fee for the work, instead asking for a donation which supports a project providing vocational training for street children in Rwanda. To date this has supported 135 children and they have raised £30,000.

Gary stated we need to be clear about our future Gospel intentions, but whatever we choose to do our buildings and finance should always serve our Gospel work. They feel we have two excellent buildings. He reminded us that both Netherlee and Stamperland made the decision at Union to keep both buildings. Keeping them for worship, organisation and community use, and as a source of income.

The financial crisis in our National Church impacts on the output of the General Assembly in May 2021. Presbyteries must review their plans which in Glasgow equates to ministerial posts reducing from 135 to 85. Expenditure on property is only allowed re three emergency categories, of which water ingress is one. December 2022 is when the new Presbytery plan should be published. By then it will have been decided which churches will be kept and which will be disposed of.

Looking at Netherlee, and in particular the roof situation, Gary reports that Roger (retired architect at D2S) suggests we have a design fault which causes water to pool and therefore ingress. He recommends engaging with a roofing expert to investigate this. They would also suggest improving the gutters and downpipes. With a significant spend projected for the Netherlee roof they suggest selling the surplus manse to raise funds, but also to avoid looking at just one problem. The proposal is that while we do further research on the roof at Netherlee we also carry out a feasibility study on our Stamperland buildings.

Looking at Stamperland they believe it could provide significant opportunities to develop new initiatives both for worship and additional funding streams. It is very well positioned and has a sanctuary area that could be developed into a 7 day a week multipurpose space. For example, a new kitchen and/or café servery could facilitate fellowship meal events. Access is a major challenge but is worth looking at to see if solutions can be found.

Gary commented that spending nearly £1million on the roof at Netherlee might make folk worry that there is no money left for the Stamperland building. By doing work in tandem this could be avoided, and income streams could be established. Gary closed by stating that all this is an ongoing project, and that D2S will next be meeting with our Finance Committee to ensure they have robust plans to support our Gospel work.

Scott thanked Gary for his presentation, and opened the floor to comments and questions.

Some were of a technical nature, for example asking why the D2S report recommended further exploration of the gutters and utilising cheaper modern materials, which seemed to differ from the previous report to Session by Tony Ireland. A further look at the reasons for the water ingress seemed sensible to some folk. Gary commented that with architects you will always get a difference of opinion, but stated that Roger had much experience of church buildings. Tony commented that if we did not use the materials recommended by our Conservation Architect there was the possibility that Historic Environment Scotland might deem us unsuitable for grant aid.

There was a concern expressed about the ongoing financial viability of maintaining two buildings. John Montgomery (Finance Convener) stated that while we should wait for the further potential research and/or the definitive cost of the project, he was confident that this cost would be met by Netherlee and Stamperland Church. Whilst it might be desirable to know the outcome of the new Presbytery plan (expected December 2022) others felt that was too long a delay.

Reflecting back on our decision to move to Union with both buildings it was pointed out that both our buildings were busy during the week. Hopefully as life returns to normal they will become increasingly busy again which is good in terms of community use, youth organisation use, and of course as valuable income streams. In terms of worship only one sanctuary (at a time) is required.

Scott thanked Gary for the report and his time answering questions, and as he left the meeting good luck for the curling match he was heading off to. He then invited Tony to the Lectern.

Please also refer to Appendix B

Tony opened by saying he had two “hesitations” from the report/presentation by D2S –

- (1) D2S seem to feel there will be difficulty in us gaining approval from Presbytery and the General Trustees (P>) for the proposed roof work. We have been submitting forms to both seeking approval in principle to allow us to proceed with seeking grant aid. Clearly nobody knows what will be in the Presbytery Plan (Dec 2022), however, in our conversations with folk at P> we have received nothing but positive encouragement, including recently that it satisfies one of the recent emergency criteria.
- (2) D2S have suggested there is a temporary fix that we could undertake, as a cheaper alternative and/or to match their expectation that P> will not approve the work until after December 2022. The roof problem has been on our radar since 2009. Several attempts have been made to fix this complex problem and that is why we have now spent approximately £8,000 on experts to properly address the issue. Our Conservation Architect and Quantity Surveyor have provided an intensive list of factors concerning the roof, stating it is very similar to work required on Oban Cathedral. D2S made no mention of the buttress separating from the building, something spotted by the Structural Engineer we employed.

Scott thanked Tony for his remarks, and opened the floor to comments and questions.

Tony was asked if works related to the “further research / design fault / gutter solution” issue mentioned by D2S was included in Tony’s report presented at the previous Kirk Session. He said yes it was, and solving the problem was also included in the indicative budget for the project. Tony then repeated his concern that a cheap non-lead fix could possibly put grant aid from Historic Environment Scotland at risk. We have applied for the maximum amount of £200,000.

When it was again suggested we await the Presbytery plan (Dec 2022) Tony repeated the positive encouragement received to date, and asked the question, if there is no Netherlee and Stamperland where is the church to be? It was asked could we spread the cost over a number of years. Tony replied in his experience of such projects this was not something he could envisage happening.

It was highlighted how difficult we have found it to get volunteers to become Office Bearers, so as well as buildings and finance guiding our choices, we need to be mindful that we need folk to step up to support and drive projects and mission forward.

Tony intimated if the Kirk Session was happy to approve in principle the roofing of the Netherlee sanctuary, this would allow the gathering of grant aid to continue so we would know how much we would be getting. Without a yes in principle we cannot progress with grant aiders (or P>).

Next step would be to put the work out to tender. At this point the project costs would crystallise so we would know the actual cost. Then we would return to the Session (possibly November) to get the final go ahead for the project which might start by March 2022. By approving in principle tonight we are not making an irretrievable decision.

In the final round of comments it was noted that (a) we are blessed to have a spare manse that may raise £400,000 – which would be held by the GT and only available for capital spend, e.g. an essential roof repair (b) the number of reductions to ministerial post within Glasgow Presbytery tells us that many small congregations around us will be worried if they have a future or not (c) it has been a lot of information to assimilate and nobody wants to rush into an irretrievable decision.

Tony finished this part of the meeting by seeking approval in principle from the Kirk Session to continue with the roof project for the sanctuary at Netherlee, including –

- **Continuing to gather grant aid**
- **Selling the surplus manse**
- **Starting our own fund raising initiatives – this is a pre-condition of many of the smaller grant aiders considering our request**

Scott acknowledged that there was a lot of information before us and that these were not easy issues to tackle. He praised everyone for having carried out the discussions so peacefully.

Looking forward Scott said taking a decision to now choose one building had implications we need to acknowledge. Although we only started properly worshipping as one congregation yesterday he feels we are so “meshed” together already to make such a decision possible. Our income would be hit twice as we would lose members and the potential for rental income from the other building.

Referring to the D2S comment that “Buildings and Finance should always serve your Gospel work” Scott said he felt positive about the potential to change the space at Stamperland to help increase hall rental income. Currently our income is 80% members / 20% hall rentals. To make our future more sustainable we should try and move this towards 60% members / 40% hall rentals.

Scott opened the floor to comments and questions.

There was support for the idea of making changes to the Stamperland building to increase hall rental income. Some worried that Netherlee might be closed by the next Presbytery plan. Scott felt that churches that sit and wait for the Presbytery plan are likelier to face closure than those who try to move forward and utilise their buildings and finances to support their mission work.

Norrie Bolton proposed the following –

- **To complete the Feasibility Study recommended by D2S on the Stamperland building in a matter of a few weeks to understand the options and costs of change that could help increase our hall rental income**
- **To agree in principle to the request regarding the roof of the Netherlee sanctuary as outlined by Tony – see bold text on the previous page**

This was seconded by John Montgomery and John Currer.

Scott commented it was clear that it was too early to commit to a final decision tonight, but by our next Kirk Session (01/11/21) or perhaps earlier, we should have clearer and more concise information to help guide us in our decision making.

He asked if Session were happy with the proposal that had been proposed and seconded. The majority of those present agreed, and when explicitly asked, nobody wish to register an objection.

Finally it was asked if we could start to examine how we implement our mission in tandem with the agreed proposal. Scott concurred with this sentiment, and again thanked everyone for their input.

5 WRITTEN REPORTS

Scott asked the Conveners if they had motions to propose or highlights to mention –

Finance

John Montgomery reported an error in his report spotted by Dennis Burt – warm appreciation all round. The net deficit to 31/07/21 should have read £9,455 an increase of £1,192 since 30/06/21 and not the £7,847 and £962 respectively.

Fabric

Malcolm MacVey informed us that a new battery unit and FDCP control panel for the kitchen fire shutter in the kitchen at Netherlee had been fitted. He also asked that the rear door at Netherlee not be left lodged open with parking cones as this was causing the hinges to drop which would lead the door to not function properly and thus become a security issue.

Correspondence

- (1) From Mrs Irene Rowe in relation to a donation in memory of her sister Fiona Fowler.
- (2) From Alex Johnston resigning as our Independent Examiner. Session Clerk has thanked Alex for his service to both churches and the united church.

Scott asked the Trustees if they had any questions. There were none.

Scott asked the Trustees if they accepted all the reports as presented. The majority of those present agreed.

6 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

Kirk Session minute of 07/06/21 was approved.

7 ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

Worship

- (1) Following a short discussion it was agreed to amend the end of December to have the following services –
 - a. Fri 24 Dec – Christingle – 5pm – Stamperland
 - b. Fri 24 Dec – Watchnight – 11.30/45pm – Netherlee
 - c. Sat 25 Dec – Christmas Day – 10.30am – Stamperland
 - d. Sun 26 Dec – Boxing Day – 10.30am - Stamperland
- (2) Netherlee Primary School services have been agreed for the following dates –
 - a. Tue 21 Dec 2021 – am time tbc – Netherlee
 - b. Thu 31 Mar 2022 – am time tbc – Stamperland
 - c. Fri 24 Jun 2022 – am time tbc – Netherlee
- (3) We have mixed views on Communion invitations, nonetheless a new version titled Netherlee and Stamperland will be made available.
- (4) As we have Readers at the Lectern once again can the Duty Team please place the Bible from the Vestry cupboard on the Lectern with the readings bookmarked.
- (5) As we have a new wider staircase to the pulpit the old bible (once returned to the front pew) can be processed to the pulpit in front of the minister by one of the Duty Team.

Refuse collection

East Renfrewshire Council do not provide exemptions for Brown Bin permits. So £80 later we have one for each building. Trade Waste continues at our Stamperland building. We do not get this service at Netherlee as the bigger vehicles cannot navigate the roads around the building.

Presbytery request re COP26

We have been asked if our halls could be available for Christian Pilgrims coming to Glasgow in late Oct/November. As neither is suitable because we have no showering facilities, and other hall users to consider, we will instead write out to all the folk we have on email directing them to the COP26 website. If they are of a mind to offer accommodation in their own homes they can do so here.

8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING(S)

- Kirk Session at 7:30pm on Monday 1st November 2021 at Stamperland.
- Group and Committee meetings as per schedules issued.

9 CLOSE

The meeting was closed with all present saying the Grace.

APPENDIX A (D2S) and B (Tony)

Scott Blythe
Minister

Stuart Buchanan
Session Clerk

Designed to Succeed

10 Broom Gardens, Lenzie
Glasgow, East Dunbartonshire G66 4EH
Phone: 07515650299
E-Mail: garymacfarlane1@me.com
Web: www.designedtosucceed.weebly.com

Netherlee and Stamperland Parish Church

The following is a short summary of our initial review, having met with key members of your property, finance and vision teams. You have asked us to:

1. Move your Vision Statement to an Implementation Plan
2. Review your Financial Situation
3. Prepare an assessment of your buildings/resources in light of your Vision Statement.

Gospel Vision

In our view, your church needs to be clear about your future Gospel intentions, and specifically what use you aspire to make of each building. **Buildings and Finance should always serve your Gospel work.** At present, you are in the early stages of formulating how you will make use of your 2 church buildings for this Gospel work, and there are key questions about:

- Alternative forms of Worship
- Continuing support for your current partner organisations
- Youth and Family Development, community engagement, support for the elderly, caring for those in need, through:
 - a range of well-organized and attractive activities and
 - a clear structured Plan which incorporates Pathways to Faith for individuals and families
- What present and new activities each building should focus on
- How much income you wish to generate – both capital and revenue

We plan to progress this vision work, towards providing you with an implementation plan.

Buildings

A key issue is the question as to whether you urgently require to re-roof the Netherlee Sanctuary and their attached halls, at a cost close to £1 million. This clearly has significant implications for your finances, questions the future role of the Stamperland buildings and manse, and complicates the work on your longer term vision.

As a result, and because this matter is coming to the Session on Monday 6th September, this short paper summarises our perspective, and which I will enlarge on at your Session meeting.

In our view:

- **you have 2 excellent buildings, both having a clear place in your Church Gospel aspirations**
- **Netherlee and Stamperland Church should fairly progress both church building developments in tandem, so that it secures the Union agreement of the 2 Congregations, and which was fully supported by Presbytery.**

DTS Commentary

1. Netherlee Re-roofing Project

Glasgow Presbytery is currently working on a new Presbytery Mission Plan, which will lead to a reduction in ministerial posts from 133 to 84, and all church buildings being designated into 2 groups – **those to be retained and those to be disposed of**. The Presbytery and the General Trustees presently will only consider emergency and wind/watertight applications – so that no Congregation is seen to ‘being favoured’

In the light of this, we are far from convinced that a major project of re-roofing costing £1 million would be agreed to by Presbytery and the General Trustees at this stage, given that the roofing problems at Netherlee have been present for a number of years, and the new Presbytery Mission Plan is presently being worked on, and likely to take to December 2022.

Such a request to Presbytery and the General Trustees will require full written approval, and this may lead to a major re-roofing of the Sanctuary being delayed for a couple of years.

Crucially, there is in our view an outstanding matter as to what exactly is the cause of the water ingress into the Netherlee Church Sanctuary, which must be addressed whether a full re-roofing is undertaken or a more limited solution can be found.

Having read your architect’s report, discussed the matter with Property Group, seen your video (2014) and observed your roof design and sight of water ingress, **we are not clear that you have fully identified and found a design solution to this fundamental problem**. To us, because of the position of water ingress, this may well be a design issue related to the parapet wall, and Roger’s comments are:

Clearly the parapet gutters are a problem. The outlets are hopelessly inadequate and can easily block up with roof moss, silt and feathers. In heavy downpours water will back up making the whole of the parapet profile one large gutter along its total length with the result of penetration along its length.

The remedy here is to redesign the gutter and add at least 2 extra down pipes plus overflows at the ends of the gutter. This would mean cutting into the stone to form the outlets.

In terms of the gutter, I suspect that this would involve new stepped lead work on a new ply base and would involve running the lead up and under the slates. It may be possible to run the new lead into the existing raggle in the cope or run it over the top of the cope to complete a total seal. . Quite a lot of work which would require a scaffold.

The internal gutter may not need to be replaced but if it did the slates on each side would need to be stripped back several courses to allow the lead to run up each slope as before.

Same detail for shorter length of parapet on the east side

This raises the issue that a more limited range of works (than the complete replacement of the Sanctuary roof), may allow you to achieve an effective solution to the water ingress, **at much lower cost than full replacement of the Sanctuary roof**, and may be more acceptable to Presbytery and the General Trustees at this time.

We recommend that a respected roofing contractor is carefully briefed, - DTS is happy to work alongside your architect on this matter - to urgently investigate this possibility, and what detailed works and costs may be required. The roofing contractor should also be asked to consider effective options for the Halls roof to address its water ingress issues.

If this proposal does not achieve a suitable solution, then a complete re-roofing may then well be required, for reasons of nail sickness, slates that are deficient and other issues.

Stamperland

The Stamperland buildings, in our view provide significant opportunities to develop new initiatives, and increase funding streams. It is very well positioned, and has an attractive Sanctuary area that could be developed into a 7 day a week multipurpose space, providing opportunities for

- New additional midweek forms of worship
- Youth and Family initiatives
- Café and Fellowship meal events
- Counselling activities

In our view an Architect led Feasibility Study, with Outline Design and Costings should now be commissioned and look at addressing:

- A new kitchen and café servery
- Making the building much more accessible – particularly between the Sanctuary and the robust hall
- New accessible toilet areas
- Opportunities for increasing rental income, and capital income

Recommendations:

To provide confidence for both the Netherlee and Stamperland members, we strongly recommend progressing **the following in tandem**:

1. In the next 4 - 6 weeks, engage an experienced roofing contractor to investigate and bring forward a clear diagnosis, evidence thereof, recommendations and costs on an effective solution to the water ingress. We have found Trademark Property Care – 07876103408 – recently very helpful on 2 separate roofing projects
2. Progress with Presbytery and then the General Trustees, proposals for a full Sanctuary roof replacement, as to whether they are willing to provide written support for this at this particular time.
3. DTS to continue with the vision work, and link this to a robust Architect led Feasibility Report with Outline Design and Costings - in other work we have undertaken with Angus Design architects they have charged approximately £5,000. This should clearly demonstrate to the Church trustees how the Stamperland buildings can be cost effectively adapted to provide additional Gospel initiatives as part of the implementation of your intention for 2 sites Gospel work.
4. Work should commence between DTS and your Finance group on a robust financial plan for the 2 buildings, and which includes at the appropriate time a grant scoping report (£400)

Dr Gary Macfarlane MBE, Roger Fleming RIBA, Iain Cavin – retired QS
Designed to Succeed – www.designedtosucceed.weebly.com

NETHERLEE & STAMPERLAND PARISH
NETHERLEE CAMPUS..... HERITAGE WORKS

This paper is intended

- (a) to underline key points from the paper I prepared for the June Session meeting,
- (b) to narrate such progress as has transpired since that meeting, and
- (c) to seek the authority of the Kirk Session generally to move forward with the roof repairs and the associated grant applications and all necessary consents from Presbytery and General Trustees.

(a) First, I want to underline these key points from the June paper: -

1. Our architects and quantity surveyors have prepared a careful statement of the costs likely to arise for the repairs to the **sanctuary** roof and in their calculations they have built in a level of contingency. The figure supplied covers the slated roof covering but comprehends associated works to masonry, gutters, downpipes and lead works all to a high conservation standard since our building is “B” listed. The global figure is **£557875**. These works are listed by our architects as “immediate”. The condition of the sanctuary is such that the architects are clear that the works should be done in the immediate short term.
2. Because the Netherlee sanctuary is listed we qualify for a grant from Historic Environment Scotland and the maximum grant they can approve is £200,000.
3. The sanctuary repairs are essential works of some complexity and of significant cost. The responsibility of addressing the repairs falls squarely on our shoulders in 2021 as direct successors to those whose vision and commitment laid the foundation stone in 1933 and to those others, generation by generation, who have loved and cared for these buildings, handing them on to our present care. We cannot foresee what the next ninety years may hold but neither could those who first raised a place of worship in Netherlee and so we should match their faith and commitment as we manage the complexities and costs of these essential works.
4. The repairs to the sanctuary are categorised by our architects as “immediate” while the repairs to the halls are listed as “necessary”. The age and condition of the sanctuary and halls are almost identical. They both need major works. It is because of the water ingress and related structural questions that the label “immediate” has been applied to the sanctuary in order to signal priority action but the “necessary” label means that we should give equal consideration now to the recommended works affecting the halls, particularly in light of the significant investment in the internal refurbishment applied to the halls in recent years.
5. The figure for **the halls**, once again the best estimate with contingencies built in but an estimate calculated around a certain level of saving flowing from a single contract for both the sanctuary and the halls, stands at **£386,500**

6. Finally, in this summary of the detail from the first paper, the global figure for sanctuary and hall works together stands at £944,375

(b) Moving on I can report to Session on the developments which have taken place since June. These developments are uniformly encouraging and are as follows :-

1. On the practical front I was personally concerned to obtain some reassurance on the likely level of rot in the south aisle and arranged for exposure of some of the roof timbers in that area. There was rot present in the area exposed but to a lesser degree than I felt was threatened by regular water ingress over the years and the advice I have received from our architect is that the allowance for rot built into the calculations by our QS should be adequate and our costs in that area should remain within budget
2. I have been in direct contact with General Trustees now on two occasions over possible grant aid and on both occasions received their direct support and encouragement sufficient to underpin our grant applications
3. With the minister and Session Clerk I have met with the Presbytery Buildings Officer and I have met and corresponded with the Presbytery Property Convener with a view to securing consent in principle for our roof works. These officers of Presbytery while they cannot speak for Presbytery are approving of the works and have confirmed that our proposed works fall within the category of those essential works which should proceed while an update of the Presbytery Plan is prepared next year.
4. Session confirmed in June that I had authority to pursue grant aid and I have applied to nine grant aiders as follows:

GRANTER	POTENTIAL GRANT	GRANT CONFIRMED	DECISION ??
Historic Scotland	£200,000 max		September
Garfield Weston	£60,000		Sept/Oct
All Churches Trust	£5000 ?	£15,000	August
Scotland's Churches Trust	£5,000		after 12 Sept
Baird Trust	£10,000 ?		November
The Ferguson Bequest	£10000 ?		September
The Bellahouston Trust	£5,000		September
East Renfresshire Renewables	£20,000 ?		November
National Churches Trust	£60,000		Nov/Dec
TOTAL	£375,000		

5. Remarkably, All Churches Trust who had sight of our accounts, showing reserves of over half a million pounds, sent us a cheque for £15,000 on the understanding that if our works did not proceed we would return those funds. Be advised that I have seen from the outset that our level of reserves was likely to be a significant restraint on grant aid so this is such good news, but be advised also this is not a guarantee that the other applications will also go well.

(c) The last section of this paper is intended to help the Kirk Session move forward to approve the roof works to the sanctuary and the halls **in principle** on the understanding that there will follow over the next few months a rolling programme of detailed approvals as we engage in a tender process for the works and as our grant aid support becomes clear. That will give a flexibility to our final decision making so that in light of tender prices and grant release we can either do all the works for economies of scale in a single contract or we can opt to address the sanctuary on its own and hold over the halls. My hope is that as news of our grant applications reach us we can on Session approval move to seeking tenders towards the end of this year with a view to a contractor being appointed and works commencing, say, March 2022 and being completed by the end of 2022. I should also mention as a practicality that our architect hopes to allow worship in the sanctuary to continue uninterrupted throughout unless there is an essential need to work internally which at the moment seems unlikely.

I need Kirk Session approval of the roof works because of three related pressure points. First I have submitted all necessary forms in draft to Presbytery and General Trustees but all the forms need to be signed off by Session. Second if you cast your eye back to the list of potential grant aiders you will see that several are due to decide in September so in fairness we should be clear on our decision this month and third some of these grant aiders will want to see formally that Presbytery and General Trustees have granted approval and these Church approvals rely on a decision of Session that the works should proceed.

This is not my first heritage project. I assisted a Glasgow priority area charge, Govan and Linthouse Church, with three grant aided projects at a cost of £1,500,000. Unlike Netherlee and Stamperland they had modest reserves (how blessed we are!) but the feature shared with Govan is that they had, like us, a surplus manse. It is the manse and its sale which delivers the financial capacity to complete the roof works and I recommend that Session move to approve its sale at our September meeting

It is worth underlining the Church rules on a manse sale. All free proceeds after legal expenses and a 10% levy (which goes to the Central Fabric Fund or by arrangement to a Priority Area charge) accrue to Netherlee and Stamperland Church but for fabric purposes only. I think a reasonable net figure for the manse sale after these charges is £400,000. The global figure for what are, remember, “conservation standard” works to both the sanctuary and the halls is an initially eye watering figure of £944,375 but with the sale of the surplus manse the figure reduces to £544,375 and subject to successful grant aid from Historic Environment Scotland of £200,000 reduces to £344,375 which could *in theory* be met

entirely from our reserves which are reported in the September Session finance report at £524,409.

I want to look at other possible variations on how we might manage our money but this is as good a place as any to say that grant aiders are reassured in their decision making if they see self-help operating locally within a congregation. I would strongly recommend, following upon any decision to proceed with the works, that over the coming months we engage in an effort to raise funds dedicated to supporting the roof works which will secure the building's integrity hopefully for another 90 years. I do see us in 2021 standing shoulder to shoulder with the founding fathers and sharing their energy and vision.

Next can I move to bring in the potential impact of grant aid working again with the global costs of £944,375 and applying again the figure of £400,000 from the sale of the surplus manse and £200,000 from Historic Scotland so that we are left to find £344,375. We have grant applications with eight grant aiders after Historic Scotland who may support us to a maximum of £175,000 and if they do then we would need just under £170,000 from our reserves and we would still have over £350,000 left in our reserves. These figures clearly are variable until the grants are confirmed and take no account of a roof appeal or local fund raising but they do confirm that we should view the global figure of £944,375 with less trepidation. I am confident that we are likely to be the only congregation in Glasgow which could so readily be in touching distance of financing a project of this size while retaining substantial reserves. How blessed we are!

Lastly, continuing with an examination of potential finance, let us look at a "worst case scenario" where every grant application is rejected, barring of course the one we hold, then we would be left to find £944,375 less £400,000 so £544,375, less £15,000 so net £544,360 a figure which would wipe out reserves and so would be unthinkable. The answer then is clear that we would be forced to put off the hall works to another day, going ahead with only the sanctuary works at £557,875 less £400,000 from the manse less the £15,000 grant received and the remainder £157,860 from reserves. We can pay for the sanctuary no matter what, but I do not think we will be left without grant aid and just as Govan folk surprised me, not with their generosity but with the level of their generosity, I do think Netherlee and Stamperland folk and the local community, seeing the scope of plans which will future proof our buildings, will look to be part of something which can be exciting rather than a burden.

I am aware that this is a lengthy paper. I hope that the roof project is all the clearer for it and that the Kirk Session will sanction both the works and the sale of the surplus manse and will share the confidence I feel that we *can* do this.

My closing words take me away from a direct focus on fabric and finance to ask whether in recent times we have suffered a crisis of confidence.

I wonder, you see, whether folk saw a million-pound bill and thought that it simply could not be possible that we could afford such a figure. I wonder whether folk saw us holding two separate suites of buildings at Stamperland and at Netherlee with our reserves severely depleted. I wonder whether in these still early days of our Union and during the huge

disruption which is Covid folk saw only a threat of declining numbers and an aged congregation. In the midst of these thoughts my mind turned to Paul's letter to the church in Corinth where he told them Love was the greatest thing but only after Faith and Hope. Today we do not know of a certainty what the next five years will bring but then neither did the first Kirk Session in 1934 and like them we have to be confident in Faith and Hope that we have done our best on our watch to secure what we hold in trust.

The core fabric issue where confidence is short is the issue of our ability to hold two buildings. I remember the concern of some who questioned the spend on the electrics at Stamperland. My view at the time was crystal clear that our Trustee duty in face of dangerous electrics was that the work had to proceed and that led on (in Faith and Hope?) to a small team of amateur painters transforming the space ready for the return of worship and community use. Now as we face the management of the roof project at the Netherlee campus questions are again being asked as to whether the united congregation can afford to operate and maintain two separate suites of buildings. This arrangement of holding two buildings at our local discretion was our choice I am told! So, taking account of that concern over our ability still to hold two buildings I personally wanted to be clear as to the core operating costs at our Stamperland campus and the Appendix at the end of this paper is the result. After the electrical works the Fabric Team are familiar now with both the Stamperland buildings and the Netherlee buildings and recognise that they are each as capable as any large scale building of throwing up unexpected repairs, but if the Netherlee roof project goes ahead then in the short term we will be left managing two buildings which are in the best possible heart

And we should see that as exciting since it will leave us free to focus on, and opens us up to, the real challenge, which is Mission.

Tony Ireland

29th August 2021

Stamperland Fabric Costs 2016 to 2019

	2016	2017	2018	2019
INCOME FROM PREMISES	£13,208	£13,074	£13,481	£12,163
BUILDINGS COSTS				
Gross Fabric	£14,518	£10,889	£13,297	£38,986
a <i>Adjusted fabric SEE NOTES</i>	£1,518 See note 1	£9,389 See note 2	£2,841 See note 3	£3,486 See note 4
b heat & light	£5,815	£5,346	£4,634	£4,394
c insurance	£2,898	£2,901	£2,932	£3,102
d cleaning	£4,145	£3,740	£4,512	£4,450
Add Working Costs a-d	<u>£14,376</u>	<u>£21,376</u>	<u>£14,919</u>	<u>£15,432</u>
Average other costs per note 5	£4,841	£4,841	£4,841	£4,841

Note :1 disallowed £13000 in "fabric" spent on digital organ

Note : 2 disallowed £1500 re manse

Note : 3 disallowed £10456 for screen & projector

Note : 4 major works to large hall roof £13800, double glaze hall windows £15750, entrance steps £4000 and hall ceiling £2000 so total £35550 to add to £3486 making £38986

Note: 5 No account taken of average of general expenses @ £2676pa, ground maintenance @ £186pa, and telephone, posts and printing @ £1979pa making a total of £4841