

MARSH FARM COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRUST
THE REGENERATION COMMUNITY TRUST

AGENDA

for joint meeting to be held at

The Community Enterprise & Resource Centre

. at 12.00 noon on Friday 7 May 2004

1. Attendance
 2. Chair of Meeting
 3. MFCDT / Regen Trust :
 1. Review of communication and joint working
 2. Regen Trust Board meetings
 4. Nomination of candidate for appointment as Regen Trust Resident Director
 5. Property Management Contract
 1. Contract Specification
 2. Process for Appointment of Contractor
 6. Review of Policy on Rent-Free Space
 7. Draft House Rules
 8. Training
 9. Date of next meeting
-

- [THE COMMUNITY ENTERPRISE & RESOURCE CENTRE]
- [MARSH FARM, LUTON]
- []
- [MANAGEMENT AND LETTINGS POLICY]

THE COMMUNITY ENTERPRISE & RESOURCE CENTRE

MARSH FARM, LUTON

MANAGEMENT AND LETTINGS POLICY

EXTRACT :

" 2.2 Lettings policy

(a) Arrangements are likely to fall into the following categories:

1. Occasional use on either an irregular or regular basis,
2. Sharing arrangements e.g. regular, but not exclusive use of part of the CERC, or
3. Exclusive use of parts of the CERC.

(b) All arrangements to use (or share) any part of the CERC must be by way of a formal written agreement.

1. All space allocation is subject to formal approval by Regen Trust (acting by the Property Manager where this is within delegated authority);
2. All occupation must be by formal agreement. The type of agreement will be determined by the extent and nature of the occupation not by the nature of the occupier. Standard forms of agreement to suit each category identified in 2.2(a) above have been adopted by Regen Trust for use by PPMF;
3. A licence will only be granted where there is a significant degree of sharing or if the agreement is only to last less than 6 months;
4. A lease will be granted where occupation will be for more than 6 months, or where an extension of occupation will result in occupation being for a total of more than 6 months, or where in the specific instance the Property Manager decides that a lease would be more appropriate than a licence;
5. All leases will be excluded from the protection of Part 2 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954;
6. Subject only to (8) below, all 'lettings' will be at the open market rental value plus a service charge element based on the running costs of the CERC allocated on a pro rata basis;
7. All property agreements are to be processed via the Property Manager in accordance with the Application Process set out in (c) below, and acting within authority delegated for this purpose by Regen Trust.

8) Rent free space : on request from MFCDDT following the Application Process (see 2.3 below), a licence for any unoccupied space at the CERC may be issued by the Property Manager without charge of rent for a period of up to 7 days (continuous) provided that no occupier benefits from this for more than a total of 14 days in any rolling 12 month period. The imposition of a service charge must be considered in each case, particularly where additional costs will be incurred in relation to the letting. (Note : any rent subsidy for a longer period will require a project application to MFCDDT). Any such request from MFCDDT's Executive Committee should be made to the Property Manager at least one week before the start of the proposed licence, and the licence should be signed by the proposed occupier at least two days before occupation commences on this basis.

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses.

2. The second part of the document is a list of names and addresses.

3. The third part of the document is a list of names and addresses.

Patel, Sonal

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 September 2004 19:07
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Organisation Workshop project application writing loop
Attachments: Ivan Version 02.doc

Dear all

Thanks to all of you who have agreed to take part in this exercise - please put all recipients in your address book for future replies.

I'm writing to begin the process of knocking the proposal around to each other in order to develop it. The proposal is being written up as part of an application to the Marsh Farm Community Development Trust, in order to assist the Trust reach it's targets with regard to employment and enterprise -particularly for the most excluded sections of the community.

We also intend to submit the application for ESF money recently awarded to Luton which is specifically targetted at helping excluded/hard to reach groups into employment.

Please find attached a first draft of the proposal (by Ivan using input from other loop members) and feel free to comment, enquire, criticise or simply to observe. All are valuable to the process and I hope we can work together to make a solid case for this exciting technique to be delivered in Luton - because we really believe it can and will help to resolve one of the most difficult problems facing our community.

Looking forward to your input

One Love

[REDACTED]

Too much spam in your inbox? Yahoo! Mail gives you the best spam protection for FREE! [Get Yahoo! Mail](#)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Patel, Sonal

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2004 10:47
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@nps-pl[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@nps-pl[REDACTED]>

Subject: MF Outreach - The Cube

[REDACTED]

This is coming from my home email - I'm not going in to my office today, and Regen Trust's Board asked me to confirm their decision to you as soon as possible. Please continue to use my usual email address, not this one.

Subject to 5 conditions, the Board approved a licence to MF Outreach to occupy The Cube for 4 weeks commencing Monday 9 August 2004 to provide activities for local children and young people. The 5 conditions, which must all be fulfilled by the end of Wednesday 4 August, are as follows :

- A. NPS must be satisfied that risk assessments have been carried out for all proposed activities, and also satisfied that appropriate risk management arrangements are in place.
- B. The grant of £5,000 from MFCDT to MF Outreach must be confirmed.
- C. NPS must ensure compliance with requirements stated in an email of 30 July from Building Control [REDACTED] you whether NPS will fulfil these requirements completely, or whether action is required by MF Outreach).
- D. The Fire Officer's written requirements must be copied by MF Outreach to NPS. (Those requirements must be fully complied with before The Cube is used).
- E. NPS must be satisfied that welfare facilities (including toilet accommodation) are required by the Licence will be in place before The Cube is used.

All terms of the Licence must be strictly complied with.

The Board has agreed to waive the service charge in relation to this Licence, but as you acknowledged, MF Outreach will be responsible for any Business Rates which become payable.

The Board is keen to see the activities go ahead, so hopefully these points can be dealt with in good time before the end of Wednesday 4 August.

I'll be in my office from about 8.30 on Monday [REDACTED]

Regards
[REDACTED]

4.2 Process for accountability of Regen Trust to MFCDT

The Secretary informed the Board that he had received a letter from Em Ekong of MFCDT confirming requirements for monitoring of Regen Trust by MFCDT. He added that he had heard from her that as part of the monitoring process she had met with John Driver of NPS to obtain information, and he understood that no concerns had been identified.

4.3 Appointment of new "Resident Director".

The Secretary reported that a nomination was still awaited from MFCDT.

4.4 Appointment of new "Statutory and other agency Director".

The Secretary reported that following the notice inserted by [REDACTED] in the newsletter of Voluntary Action Luton, [REDACTED] of the Hackney Charitable Trust had expressed interest in joining the Board. The Secretary had sent [REDACTED] details and in the same way as with previous appointments had suggested to Mr Haruna that he might attend a meeting of the Board as an observer. The position was noted.

4.5 Training for Directors

It was agreed that a training event should be held on the morning of the next Board Meeting (10 September 2004) as a joint event with MFCDT to focus on the new property management specification.

4.6 Administrative Support

The Secretary reported that following the last Board Meeting he had as requested by the Board contacted Turning Corners to discuss provision of administrative support, particularly minute taking at Board Meetings. Richard Rochester of Turning Corners had suggested that the person who takes minutes for MFCDT's Board might also be used by Regen Trust. The Board asked the Secretary to pursue this further.

4.7 Policy and Procedure on Conflict of Interest

The Secretary said that this item had been included simply to draw attention of Board Members to the need to declare an interest when under a conflict of interest in relation to any matter to be discussed. He referred to Clause 5.3 of the Memorandum & Articles of Association which requires this. The Board noted this.

5. PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SPECIFICATION

[REDACTED] said that she understood that the Board had agreed to the proposal that property management services should continue to be provided by NPS under their contract with Luton Borough Council, but with a new commission based on an improved specification with a view to developing the quality of the service provided. However, she was conscious that Regen Trust had no personnel capacity to monitor the performance of the services. She said that she had had discussions with Government Office regarding the extent of MFCDT's involvement in running the CERC, and there was awareness that there is now significantly more expertise in property matters in MFCDT's management team.

[REDACTED] said that the Council now propose that MFCDT should act as agent of Regen Trust in monitoring NPS's performance on a day to day basis and in making the Project Application for Regen Trust and PPMF. She added that she understood that MFCDT is proposing to establish a CERC Committee as a sub-Committee of MFCDT with specific terms of reference, and that this would replace the "Client Team".

[REDACTED] welcomed the proposals as the start of an exit strategy for Regen Trust with MFCDT beginning to take responsibility for management of the building but under the ultimate responsibility of Regen Trust. He suggested that a "route map" for this "exit strategy" should be created.

[REDACTED] said that he was concerned at a role for MFCDT in management of NPS if this created a gap in the arrangements involving Regen Trust's Board. [REDACTED] said that under MFCDT's proposed role it should report to Regen Trust's Board regarding its monitoring of NPS's management of the property against performance indicators in the property management specification. The Secretary suggested that the proposal, which should involve raising capacity of MFCDT in property management issues, related to the function of monitoring NPS activity, and did not extend to decision making: MFCDT would act as Regen Trust's agent in monitoring NPS activity, but all decision making would remain with NPS (under delegated authorities) and with the Board of Regen Trust.

[REDACTED] said that this monitoring role is not currently being performed due to a lack of capacity. She suggested that under the proposed arrangement, a representative of MFCDT should report to each Board meeting of Regen Trust in relation to monitoring NPS activity. She added that the role of the CERC Committee would be to make recommendations to NPS and to Regen Trust Board regarding property issues, as well as to assist in the review of policies on management of the CERC.

[REDACTED] said that it was important that the roles of MFCDT and the CERC Committee in relation to property management should be clear and documented, and that the responsibility and authority of Regen Trust should not be eroded except as agreed by the Board.

[REDACTED] suggested that the new property management specification should include the Terms of Reference of the CERC Committee. The Secretary added that any agency role of MFCDT should itself be set out in the specification, and Margaret Birtles' suggested that the agency role should be established under a service level agreement between Regen Trust and MFCDT.

The Board then approved in principle the proposal that MFCDT should act as agent of Regen Trust in monitoring the activity and performance of NPS in management of the CERC and in the Project Application. The Board asked that full details of the agency role should be included in the final draft of the property management specification.

[REDACTED] added that following a meeting held earlier in the day with the senior management team of MFCDT and [REDACTED] it was proposed that a special joint meeting should be held on Thursday 5 August 2004 with a view to finalising the Project Application which should refer to the new arrangement which the Board had just decided.

6. REPORT FROM JOINT MFCDT/REGEN TRUST MEETING

The Secretary reported there had been notification at the joint meeting of two prospective applications for space for one or two day events where the matter was beyond the scope of NPS's authority due to the extent of space involved. Both applications were for licences at full rent. However, the Secretary said that the Board had previously confirmed delegated powers for leases and licences which are beyond NPS's authority [limited to licences of space of up to 1,000 sq ft for periods of up to 6 months], and so no action was required of the Board unless it wished to consider the position. The Board confirmed that this could be dealt with in accordance with the existing authority which the Secretary had referred to. *[Note: where a matter is beyond NPS's authority, the Chair and any two other Directors have authority to authorise the issue of licences to occupy (Minute 6.1 of 18 July 2003), and the Chair and any three other Directors have authority to authorise the grant of standard leases (Minute 6.5 of 24 October 2003)].*

The Secretary said that otherwise discussion at the joint meeting had focused on MF Outreach's application for a licence to use The Cube (which had been considered at item 7.4 above), and various outstanding points as noted under item 4.

7. PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

Minutes of a Meeting of the Board of Directors of
THE REGENERATION COMMUNITY TRUST
held at The Community Enterprise & Resource Centre
Northwell Drive, Luton at 2.30 pm on Friday, 30 July 2004

Present: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (Secretary) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Before commencement of the Meeting the Board heard a presentation by Glenn Jenkins, Chair of Outreach Marsh Farm Limited, regarding the application for use of The Cube, and specifically requesting waiver of the service charge.]

1. APOLOGIES / CHAIR OF MEETING

It was agreed that [REDACTED] should Chair the meeting.

The Secretary said that he had received apologies from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], who were both unable to attend the meeting.

In view of the presentation heard by the Board before the start of the meeting, it was agreed that item 7.4 should be considered next. It was noted that as a Director of Outreach Marsh Farm Limited, [REDACTED] was under a conflict of interest and accordingly she withdrew from the meeting during item 7.4.

7.4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEASES AND LICENCES

All members of the Board were keen that the activities proposed in the application for use of The Cube should go ahead, but it was noted that a number of issues in relation to risk management were still outstanding. It was also noted that "MF Outreach" had applied for a grant to MFCDT, and that MFCDT were carrying out a separate risk assessment on the proposed activities for the purpose of that application.

After discussion, subject to 5 conditions, the Board approved a licence to MF Outreach to occupy The Cube for 4 weeks commencing Monday 9 August 2004 to provide activities for local children and young people. The 5 conditions, which the Board required should all be fulfilled by the end of Wednesday 4 August, were as follows:

- A. NPS must be satisfied that risk assessments have been carried out for all proposed activities, and also satisfied that appropriate risk management arrangements are in place.
- B. The grant of £5,000 from MFCDT to MF Outreach must be confirmed.
- C. NPS must ensure compliance with requirements stated in an email of 30 July from Luton Borough Council's Building Control Department (Samantha Philpot) to James Daniel of NPS. ([REDACTED] was asked to consider whether NPS would fulfil those requirements completely, or whether action was required by MF Outreach).
- D. The Fire Officer's written requirements must be copied by MF Outreach to NPS, and those requirements must be fully complied with before The Cube is used.
- E. NPS must be satisfied that welfare facilities (including toilet accommodation) as required by the Licence will be in place before The Cube is used.

The Board added that all terms of the Licence must be strictly complied with. The Board agreed to waive the service charge in relation to this Licence, having noted first that almost all costs of PPMF regarding The Cube would be incurred whether or not it was occupied, and second that Glenn Jenkins had acknowledged that MF Outreach would be responsible for any Business Rates which become payable.

[REDACTED] returned to the meeting at this point]

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2004

The Minutes were approved by those present as a true record, and were signed by Sid Rutstein who had chaired that meeting.

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 11 JUNE 2004 (not otherwise on the Agenda)

The Secretary said that the Agenda of the present meeting covered all matters which might arise from the Minutes of the previous meeting.

4. THE BOARD

4.1 Representative of MFCDT at Regen Trust Board Meetings

The Secretary said that at the joint meeting with MFCDT held immediately before the present meeting, representatives of MFCDT had confirmed that MFCDT's Board had not yet considered the matter.

Dear All,

Please find attached Agenda for Friday, 3 December 2004 Board Meeting commencing at 2.00pm, together with documents as shown on the attached list.

Please note that a joint meeting with MFCDT representatives will take place in the morning commencing at 11.00am. The Agenda will be circulated separately.

Kind Regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

The information in this email and any attachments is confidential and may also be legally privileged. It is intended for the addressee only.

Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately, destroy any copies and delete it from your computer system. It is not to be relied upon by any person other than the addressee except with our prior written approval. If no such approval is given, we will not accept any liability (in negligence or otherwise) arising from any third party acting or refraining from acting, on such information. Copyright in this email and any document created by us will be and remain vested in us and will not be transferred to you or any other party.

A list of the names of the Partners of this firm is open to inspection at the above address.

Griffith Smith is regulated by the Law Society.

Message: The Regeneration Community Trust

Case Information:

Message Type: Exchange
Message Direction: External, Inbound
Case: FOI-739071_2013_MFO
Capture Date: 01/10/2013 16:27:10
Item ID: 105457
Policy Action: Not Specified

Mark History:

No reviewing has been done

Policies:

No Policies attached

The Regeneration Community Trust

From

Date 29
November 2004
15:42

To

Cc

Agenda03-12-04.doc (42 Kb HTML) Regen-Directors 30-07-04.doc (52 Kb HTML) FW Short profile of Michael Haruna..doc (22 Kb HTML) Future Management.doc (24 Kb HTML) CERC Committee Draft 4 ToR November 2004.doc (60 Kb HTML) Exit Strategy.doc (29 Kb HTML) 14 November 04 Site Management Report.doc (44 Kb HTML) 13 Budget v expenditure Nov 2004-5 Budget.xls (68 Kb HTML) HOUSE RULES March 04.doc (23 Kb HTML) DATES FOR MEETING.doc (22 Kb HTML) BILL2004.doc (54 Kb HTML)

<<Agenda03-12-04.doc>> <<Regen-Directors 30-07-04.doc>> <<FW Short
profile of Michael
Committee Draft 4 ToR November 2004.doc>> <<Exit Strategy.doc>> <<14
November 04 Site Management Report.doc>> <<13 Budget v expenditure Nov
2004-5 Budget.xls>> <<HOUSE RULES March 04.doc>> <<DATES FOR
MEETING.doc>> <<BILL2004.doc>>

From:

To:

- 6.6. It is recommended that MDCDT officers increase their level of participation in OW related activities, and that the MFCDT also identifies opportunities for developing and enhancing its staffing, services and programmes afforded by the OW.
- 6.7. The consultants recommend that currently planned activities like the Economic Area Survey, the Plugging the Leaks workshop, the feasibility testing for the OW potential enterprises, as well as the partners and participants engagement events be considered as OW preparation activities, and therefore, part and parcel of the OW process.
- 6.8. The results of these activities should be fed into the OW proposal as soon as they come in.

7. Summary

The consultants consider that the feasibility of the OW has been sufficiently established, and therefore, think that there is no need to carry out further studies before going into the OW process. Therefore, the next step should be the putting together a fully fledged OW proposal and business plan, concurrently with the activities mentioned under 6.7, and get it through the MFCDT appraisal system as soon results from preparation activities come in. The consultants recommend that the MFCDT gives adequate support to the FE for it to be able to develop this project proposal and budget.

There is a sharp difference between the feasibility of the Organisation Workshop as a capacitation event and the feasibility of potential enterprises coming out of the OW. The OW would have accomplished its objectives whenever the participants have achieved an organisational level of consciousness expressed in collective, organised action.

Once this is there, *the development programme that is using the OW within its tool kit* can have -feasible enterprises- as another outcome, for which the OW has to be complemented by other necessary tools.

The organisational consciousness of the members of any given enterprise is a condition without which the enterprise will certainly be unable to succeed as proper, independent business. In this regard, the contribution of the Organisation Workshop to the viability of an enterprise resides precisely in its capacity to facilitate the development of the said organisational level of consciousness. Nevertheless, success in business depends not only on this factor, but it depends also heavily on the market conditions and the businesses operating environment as a whole. Therefore, the support that MFCDT and partners are able to provide to the emerging enterprises during a follow up period after the workshop will be as important to their take off as the recently acquired organisational proficiency of the enterprise.

- 5.4. Even though the above mentioned policy framework is clear enough, regulations can be taken out of context, construed as constraints and used to stop, rather than to improve the performance of activities that benefit the community. In so doing, regulations can be put to work against the very policy framework that they are supposed to forward, perpetuating rather than minimising social exclusion in favour of private interests. *"Nowhere does the money leaks out faster than in the efforts to "regenerate" poor communities"*⁴
- 5.5. The Theory of Organisation, a main educational tool within the capacitation process, lends itself perfectly well to receive all the richness of the history of organisation of labour in the UK. Events of major importance, like the Industrial Revolution for example, can be illustrated in the UK as nowhere else in the world.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1. The consultants recommend looking into the formation of a Community Interest Company⁵ as soon as the bill comes into force on 1st July 2005. For the purposes of the Organisation Workshop and beyond, a CIC could be a means to give a common thrust to all small enterprises and community efforts that will come to the workshop. Organisational learning and organisational development is in direct proportion to the complexity of the organisation that the individual belongs to. Learning coming from the participation in a small or micro enterprise is limited to its reach and scope, which does not pose a major challenge to the capacities of the individuals and consequently does not get the most out of them. On the contrary, the complexity of a CIC-type of enterprise does challenge the capacity of the individuals to apprehend whole systems, large scale organisation, and the capabilities gained in this way will be later easily applied to smaller concerns.
- 6.2. Beyond the OW, the CIC may be a good way for residents to take up ownership and responsibility for the delivery of and implementation of the NDC,
- 6.3. The golden rule of the OW "Freedom of organisation within the law" should read "Freedom of organisation within the law *and relevant regulations*".
- 6.4. Therefore, the FE with the support of MFCDT and partners should research existing regulations to carry out the OW as a whole, as well as to perform OW intended activities in particular. The OW as a learning set up should fall under training regulations, but offering "jobs", contracts and payment for work may fall under employers' regulations as well as regulations pertaining to welfare programme support.
- 6.5. Respect for and allegiance to regulations should also mean to develop the capacity of partners and participants to critically look at them in the light of their efficiency and effectiveness to bring NDC intended benefits to the target population. Regulations and or procedures that do not perform accordingly should be identified and a process to modify or change them should be set in motion.

⁴ The Money Trail. The Countryside Agency and New Economics Foundation. ISBN : 1 899407 60 X

⁵ Marek Lubelski kindly informed the consultants about the Community Interest Companies Bill and gave them the necessary reference documents.

- Once people become aware of the fact that they are the potential legitimate recipients of support and therefore have a legitimate stake in the ownership of resources, they want to exercise their legitimate right to decide how they should be used, and benefit directly and effectively from them.
- 4.7. The UK has an old and complex institutional framework, in which detailed regulations preside over most, if not all activities of public interest. All services that make up the state organisation have their own sets of regulations. Some of them have wide scopes, at national level, and services at local levels add their own set of regulations to the national ones. Therefore, citizens intending to relate to state or council services, or to pursue a social undertaking or enterprise, have to be conversant with relevant regulations at all levels. Facilitating community development through such a complex regulatory framework will be one of the key tasks of the FE, MFCDT and all partners.
 - 4.8. In some places, regulations put limits to the ability of the citizens to participate. For example, elsewhere in the UK, regulation prevents people attending computer technology activities from downloading attachments, and in so doing, the regulation defeats the very purpose of the Internet. In another example, replacing a bulb, in the interest of safety, has to be done by maintenance services.
 - 4.9. Such a complex and heavy regulatory framework poses a challenge to the Organisation Workshop technique, even though it does not challenge the methodology or the approach. Whilst the consultants think that the OW methodology is valid in the UK context, the OW technique has to take in the “regulations” feature of the operating environment. This will only require a more thorough preparation phase, including the regulations affecting the intended activities in the analysis of activities of the OW Technical Plan.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1. Based on the findings above, the consultants conclude that the OW approach is relevant and timely to the situation of the NDC at Marsh Farm and eventually to other NDC schemes in the country. The change of activity for a large number of people could be of significance to improve the quality of their lives.
- 5.2. Along the same lines, the preparation, running and follow up of an Organisation Workshop at MF is perfectly feasible, since MF presents all the necessary conditions for the OW to take place: The people, the means of production, the possibility to hand over the means of production to the people and the possibility to enjoy full freedom of organisation within the law and relevant regulations.
- 5.3. The OW approach, that is to say its aims, principles and methods find strong support in the UK policy framework at national level as well as council level. Examples of this can be found in the following policies:
 - National Strategy for Neighbourhood renewal
 - ODPM policy on sustainable communities
 - Countering Social Exclusion
 - Reaching the Hard to Reach
 - Employment Generation
 - LBC community development principles
 - LBC Social Inclusion Policy.

attitudinal components. They can certainly benefit from their participation in the OW. The consultants consider that the successful engagement of the MF NDC target group could be more a question of attitude and local understanding than a question of professional “skill”. In that regard, the Outreach team can provide clear leadership based upon the fact that they are a genuine expression of, *and in this sense are able to partly represent* the population on the estate.

- 4.2. There is a team in place that is sufficiently prepared to efficiently perform the relevant tasks. The Facilitators Enterprise and the MFCDT as a whole went through externally induced periods of inactivity that stopped progress in their efforts to bring the OW to MF. Nevertheless, the team has managed to register and operate as an independent company with the ability to bid for jobs and generate income. It has sound office facilities and continues to go ahead with renewed enthusiasm, commitment and hard work. From May 2002, when the OW seminar took place, the group has gained remarkable understanding of the OW approach as well as clerical, management and computer skills. These have been enhanced by the recent capacity building programme undertaken with the support of MFCDT, LBC and Strategic Urban Futures. The group showed resilience, unity and discipline when administrative decisions affected them, as well as ownership and sense of direction towards their OW goals. These constitute a strong basis for their effort to succeed.
- 4.3. There are high quality physical spaces on the estate where the OW can take place. There are also plenty of unused assets and resources belonging to the wider community that the OW could potentially make available to community usage for their benefit. Perhaps no other country can claim the same level of resource availability.
- 4.4. MF existing community enterprises differ sharply in all characteristics. Some of them have assets and are operating without paid staff, others have assets and are dormant, and others do not go much farther than being ideas whose proponents do not know how to go about getting resources to make them proper enterprises. In all cases, business procedures seem not to be in place.
- 4.5. There are many potential partner organisations that are prepared to join in the OW effort, and in so doing, augment the reach of their services. MF Outreach’s potential partners endorsed the Organisation Workshop Approach and expressed keen interest in joining the Facilitators Enterprise. In general terms all of them seem to have excellent installations, quality educational materials and publications, competent staff. Nevertheless, all of them seem to share the same difficulties to mobilise residents to use available services to engage in activities of interest to them, their families and the community.
- 4.6. OW activities so far seem to be restricted to Outreach, community enterprises and partners, with less involvement from MFCDT officers. This does not go along with the fact that the results of the OW, good or bad, will affect the MFCDT in the first place. Experience so far demonstrates that once the OW releases the organisational potential of the target group, unprepared sponsoring agencies become overwhelmed with the requests for services from the people they always wanted to serve, and unfortunately, their delivery capacity tended to fall way short of what is expected from them. This is a clear risk of the OW.

This final presentation also explained the national policy context, the LBC community development and social exclusion policies.

MF local businesses provided food, drinks and entertainment. About 50 participants attended the seminar. Amongst them MF residents, representatives of Barnfield College, Luton Borough Council, Luton Chamber of Commerce, Learning Skills Council, New Economics Foundation, Voluntary Action Luton, Family Matters and members of community enterprises. During the presentations and their corresponding Q&A periods the participants showed manifestations of endorsement of the OW approach and interest to join the Facilitators Enterprise. Later, the FE developed a follow up questionnaire sent by e-mail to all participants. Interviews and formalisation of the partners' participation in the FE are still in progress.

3.7. Perusal of documents. The consultants looked at a consultancy report prepared by ECOTEC, as well as the Community Interest Companies Bill and related documents made available by Marek Lubelski. The MF history book prepared by Jacki Jenkins also contributed to place the current situation at MF into perspective. NEF booklets "The Money Trail" and "Plugging the Leaks" provided invaluable information on the efforts to make regeneration money to remain within the targeted NDC communities.

3.8. Conference. Under the theme "It is time to swim against the tide", the consultants participated in a conference held at Friends House, London on the 26th March 04. Several officers and residents of NDC schemes took part. The consultants made a presentation on the OW, together with Dr Raff Carmen and Gavin Andersson. Other presenters were Bernie Ward from New Economics Foundation and Mr Ben Merric, from the Social Exclusion Unit. At the end of the conference, a group of Lewisham NDC scheme gathered to discuss what they had listened to and its potential. Later one of them wrote to the consultants expressing interest in carrying out an OW at their own NDC scheme, and asking them for the availability of English speaking facilitators on the approach.

3.9. Meetings. The consultants briefed James McGinlay CEO of MFCDT. Apart from that, they did not benefit from any exchange with MFCDT Programme Managers. They also held several working meetings with Drs Raff Carmen and Gavin Andersson to prepare for their respective presentations. Friday 18th March 05 they held a wrap-up meeting with Marek Lubelski to brief him on the developments of the week and map out the way forward.

4. Findings.

4.1. There are hundreds of potential participants that can engage in the OW. The target group of the intended OW would be the "hard to reach". They are largely out of employment, living either on benefits or without them ("workless"), sometimes performing activities characterised as dysfunctional towards mainstream society, likely to have frustration, cynicism and depression as a basic

The data collection process was still in progress when the consultants ended their mission.

3.6. Partners Seminar. The seminar took place at MF Community Enterprises Resource Centre on the 16th March 05 under the theme “Minding Our Own Business”. James McGinley, CEO of MFCDT briefly opened the seminar. The consultants made a presentation on the OW approach, emphasising the following points:

- In history, division of labour led to highly developed human organisations even in the absence of reading and writing.
- High level of organisation led to the development of reading and writing, and not the other way round.
- Consequently, literacy is not a pre-condition for learning.
- The OW approach creates conditions for the division of labour to emerge in a social group, and with this, it triggers the capacity of the individuals to create their own organisations and make the most out of learning opportunities.

The seminar also enjoyed presentations from Dr Raff Carmen on Autonomous Education, Bernie Ward, Head of Local Money Flows at New Economics Foundation and co-author of ‘Plugging the Leaks: making the most of every pound that enters your community’ and Marek Lubelski, Neighbourhood Renewal Co-ordinator, Luton Borough Council Community Development.

Dr Raff Carmen made the following points:

- Current education and training approaches are based upon the “transmission” of knowledge, from an “active” agent to a “passive” recipient.
- Even “participation” has the element of the “active” agent “inviting” somebody to be “part” of something and becomes “*participation*”
- The OW approach emphasises autonomous human agency in learning, and at the same time recognises the capacitation role of tools and equipment in a learning activity. In the final analysis it is the car itself what “tells” people how to drive.

Bernie Ward pointed out the following:

- The problem is not necessarily that too little money flows into a community.
- The problem is rather what the people do with the money.
- Often money gets spent on services provided by outsiders.
- Consequently, the money leaves the area as soon as it comes into it.

Marek Lubelski highlighted the key points of the feasibility process:

- Confirm that OW aims, principles and methods are relevant and timely
- Identify the opportunity that the OW offers to innovate and develop solutions to intractable problems
- Share the policy context for all partners – how can the OW meet your objectives?
- What are the practical barriers that the OW method presents for partners in terms of offering services and allocating resources?

3.4.5. Roles and responsibilities of the FE and each one of its members.

3.4.6. The need to analyse data on existing community enterprises. This led to the preparation of a questionnaire with basic information on the enterprises, subsequently applied by the FE members.

3.5. Enterprises' data collection. The division of labour between the different members of the FE allowed for a quick data gathering of the present position of the enterprises being fostered by CERC. Data requested from the enterprises included the following:

- names and number of participants,
- description of the activity,
- existing means of production,
- value of the assets,
- average work-time of the people,
- product definition,
- estimated cost per unit,
- estimated selling price per unit,
- estimated market possibilities,
- present income,
- potential for new members
- problems.

The activities included were:

- Farmers café,
- Radio station,
- Transport,
- Café 2000 Food for Thought,
- Car Boot Sales,
- Community Launderette,
- Multimedia,
- Marquees –
- Bouncy Castle,
- People's Market,
- Little Bears Crèche,
- Printing and Publishing project, Co-ordinet,
- Performance Arts groups,
- Club Adventure,
- Music Editing and Recording,
- Community Building,
- Community Farm,
- Project Engineers,
- Bookkeeping Services,
- Youth Forum,
- Wauluds Bank Trust Heritage Museum.

3.2. Installation of procedures in the Facilitators Enterprise.

- **Work plan.** The organisation of work for the week began on Monday 13th March 05. All tasks at hand went into a simple Gantt chart, containing the list of tasks, the dates and the name of the person in charge.
- **Weekly co-ordinator.** One of the members of the FE would perform as co-ordinator for the week, on a rotational basis. Her/his tasks included the supervision of the accomplishment of all the tasks included in the work plan, plus gathering the information generated during the process. The FE elected Caroline McBride as co-ordinator for the week.
- **Critical Analysis.** All information collected whilst monitoring the advance of the work plan would go into a written report called "Critical Analysis". This is put together by the weekly co-ordinator, photocopied and distributed to all FE members shortly before the next meeting.
- **Meeting procedures.**
The weekly co-ordinator would chair the meeting according to the following agenda:
 1. Time allocation. The meeting would allocate the total time to be used for the meeting.
 2. Reading the Critical Analysis
 3. Discussion: one or 2 minutes for each member to suggest suppressions, additions or changes to the Critical Analysis.
 4. Conclusions. The remaining time, usually about 10 minutes, will be used to read the proposed conclusions of the meeting, containing the new task distribution, time and responsible person in the form of a new work plan for the coming period. The FE decided to have weekly work plans, to be reviewed within a weekly meeting. Therefore, before the weekly meeting the co-ordination of the FE must prepare the Critical Analysis and the proposed work plan based upon the tasks that could not be performed as planned and upcoming tasks

3.3. The consultants visited the Community Enterprises and Resource Centre, looking at the availability of space, used and unused areas and their conditions. Other visits to spaces that could be potentially used during the OW also took place.

3.4. The consultants held extensive discussions with Outreach team on the following: /A

- 3.4.1. Existing and potential community enterprises, their apparent feasibility and characteristics.
- 3.4.2. OW intended participants, their profile. How to design the social composition of the group and technicalities of the pre-registration process.
- 3.4.3. OW Logistics, food for participants for the first days. The participation of community enterprises as service providers.
- 3.4.4. The problem of personal versus community ownership. Role of the feeling of personal ownership on conflicts of common occurrence.

Preparations for holding an OW began in earnest after a May 2002 seminar, coming to a halt and regaining momentum later. MFCDT, LBC Community Development and MF Outreach Ltd agreed a programme to take this forward in October 2004. This effort entailed capacity building and learning events to a point that would enable the group to undertake further actions, and included an intensive period of development to support the initiation of the OW and its Facilitator's Enterprise. This report focuses on the activities that took place within this study.

Following a steady nourished e-mail correspondence, MFCDT and partners arranged for the consultants to travel to the UK to conduct learning sessions with the Facilitators Enterprise, a group tasked to prepare for the OW and approach potential partners and get them engaged into the OW process.

LBC Community Development has been instrumental in introducing the idea of testing the transferability of the OW to a UK environment and in arranging the first seminars.

2. Terms of Reference

The consultancy worked to the following objectives:

- To contribute to the prospective partners' acceptance of the OW concept as a valid approach to tackling the problems facing the implementation of the New Deal for Communities at Marsh Farm, in particular in reaching the "hard to reach" residents.
- To contribute to prospective partners' engagement in the OW process through expressions of interest in participating in the Facilitators Enterprise.
- To appraise the operating conditions for an eventual OW held in the UK.
- To identify the challenges posed by the said operating environment, as well as the opportunities within the UK institutional framework open to the OW as well as to the enterprises that may emerge from the OW.
- To assess the viability of holding an OW at Marsh Farm and figure out what needs to be done to contextualise the OW techniques to the UK conditions.

3. Activities performed

3.1. Briefings The consultants arrived to the UK on the 12th March 05. They attended 2 briefing meetings. The first of them in the morning of the Sunday the 13th March 05 with Glenn Jenkins, Jacki Jenkins and John Sheppard and the second one in the evening of the same day, where Dr. Raff Carmen, Glenn Lawson Ricky Bell and Caroline McBride joined in. In these meetings Raff, Isabel and Ivan received information on developments on MF after May 02, when the last seminar on the OW had taken place.

- Tools to adjust individual behaviour to the needs of social participation and bottom-up, transparent, democratic decision-making
- Types of meeting and meeting procedures.
- Planning techniques and co-ordination procedures.
- The General Assembly Meeting.

Practical work, complementary to theoretical lessons, comprises the following techniques:

- Exercises on job analysis, identifying jobs, tasks and operations.
- Exercises on distribution of labour, allocation of time and resources.
- Presenting the above in the form of a work plan (Gantt chart.)
- Exercises on decision-making at working committee level. Discussion of the work plan.
- Exercises on the combination of work plans on a single Gantt chart that is representative of the thrust of the enterprise for a certain period.
- Exercises on decision-making at level of co-ordination committee.
- Exercises on decision-making at General Assembly meeting.
- Exercises on performance evaluation of the work of each working committee, compiling it into a progress report (Critical Analysis).

Towards the end of the workshop, the participants would have completed 30 to 40% of the physical work they have embarked upon, and achieved the organisational awareness needed to carry on. Vocational skills, literacy courses, numeracy development and accounting and many other specific learning activities would have commenced around the second week of the workshop and will continue during the follow up process.

The characteristics described above are unique to the Organisation Workshop. There is no other adult learning approach that is able to work with hundreds of people in one go, combining all necessary work and learning activities within a framework of own-power development and autonomous learning. The fact that it is in principle socially, racially and ideologically inclusive makes it into a “Social Exclusion” antidote par excellence.

The OW at Marsh Farm

The efforts to bring the OW approach to the UK began soon after the inception of the Marsh Farm Community Development Trust, year 2000. Some of the founder members of the Trust knew about the OW approach through available literature and actively sought and established contacts with OW practitioners in Southern Africa. Some of these practitioners travelled to the UK, and delivered seminars on the methodology, with the attendance of residents, members of community working groups and members of partner organisations. All of them endorsed the approach as a valid tool to counter some of the problems facing Marsh Farm community.

leaders, politicians or bosses. Therefore, such a commencement of the workshop provokes some initial confusion that can last for days or more than a week. Since the facilitators only provide food for the first four days, the sustenance of the group thereafter depends upon the work they do, which translates into money as soon as their fledgling enterprise submits proper labour records, with charges that follow prevailing market rates. During the process, the facilitators deliver lectures on Theory of Organisation, where the participants can find the necessary orientation to solve their organisational problems.

Throughout the workshop, the participants may face supply shortages, quarrel about money and many other problems, including lack of technical knowledge to carry out their activities. Learning becomes a felt need, which drives the group to forward many technical co-operation requests to the facilitators. On the organisational side, the need to perform in several fronts at the same time will lead them to split their available labour force into different committees, which in turn will lead to co-ordination and genuinely democratic decision-making procedures.

Power and Organisation are not "taught" or "transferred" (empowerment) to the group. Grassroots organisations develop or achieve them as a consequence of the Organisation Workshop set-up. The OW approach, therefore, can be said to be an autonomy-enhancing approach.

The Lectures on Theory of Organisation follow the programme below:

- History of Organisation of labour, from the Primitive Communal System to the Market Economy and Globalisation. This provides the framework for future enterprises and social organisations.
- Concepts of Political Economy: Commodities, value of commodities.
- Classification of social groups according to their agendas.
- Social strata emerging as a result of the market economy.
- Social psychology of the large group: Individual workers, industrial workers, mixed types and lumpen³.
- Psychological profiles of the social strata. Matches and mismatches of the psychological profiles with the requirements of social participation and membership to social organisations and enterprises.

³ Gavin Andersson has offered us the following description of this character acting in one particular social environment: "He's the one who goes on the picnic with everyone but neglects to bring along any food or drink, doesn't help collect wood for the fire, watches others making it, stands nearby telling jokes and chatting and graciously accepts to have a beer (and then another), while others are tending to the work of 'braaing' the meat, then eats heartily, and goes for a stroll next to the river just as everyone is doing the work of packing up and cleaning the campsite. He depends on the work of others, and usually on the good will of others..." The same social character can be found throughout the social spectrum

On the feasibility of the Organisation Workshop Approach At Marsh Farm, Luton Borough Council, UK.

Consultancy Report

11/05/05

*Consultants in Community Participation
OW specialists*

1. Background and Context.

Introductory note on the OW

The OW is a holistic organisation training approach developed in Latin America more than 30 years ago and adapted to the Southern African context about 16 years ago.

The approach is activity-oriented and based upon locally identified problems beyond the reach of an individual working on his/her own. When any particular community is prepared to contribute labour to the solution of some of their most urgent problems, the OW provides a framework to achieve a comprehensive package of skills learning, education, self-management experience and at the same time some infrastructure or productive activities. Learning takes place around work activities. It includes basic organisational skills, literacy, vocational skills, numeric development, basic childcare and cultural activities.

The workshop goes on for 4 to 6 weeks, with the facilitators' team staying on the spot. Community participation is the widest possible, for the workshop allows for as many people as labour is required by the productive activities. Therefore, the number of participants is limited only by the amount of resources the development agency can make available in the form of hand tools, raw materials, very basic board and lodging facilities, a cash start up grant and a development fund¹ and eventually a limited provision of food².

Once the people and the means of production are in place, the Director of the workshop gives a short introductory speech setting the rules of the course. The participants have to organise themselves, for which they enjoy full freedom of organisation within the law and relevant regulations. Once (somehow) organised, they receive the means of production that enable them to carry out the different activities. Communities are not used to exercise freedom of organisation, but to receive commands from authoritarian

¹ The start-up grant is a lump sum of about US \$ 1 to US \$ 2 per participant in countries like Mozambique and up to US \$ 10 per participant in Brazil. The development fund is about half the estimated cost of the labour that the community will put into project activities. They are paid to the participant's enterprise, not to individuals. The use of money as learning tool brings the element of *reality* into the learning process.

² Food for participants for the first 4 or 5 days of the workshop may be included in the package. In countries where farmers do not receive subsidies and the poor and the unemployed do not have access to benefits, food has been a further incentive to participate and a condition that facilitates group formation. In cases of extremely poor population, food allows the minimum strength to attend lessons and work activities without collapsing or falling asleep. In the UK context, food may not have a motivating impact.

10/10/10

Dear 

Thank you for your reply to our letter. I have attached a copy of our response, a hard copy of which will arrive in the post. I too have sent copies to those I cc'd the letter to originally.

Thank you

Glenn Jenkins

ALL-NEW Yahoo! Messenger - *sooooo many all-new ways to express yourself*

Joe Montgomery Director TDG

Dave Crean Chair MFCDDT

We will be in touch in the near future to discuss Kelvin's approach to Jeff Rooker as previously discussed at our meeting.

Thanks for your help.

One Love

Glenn

Note: forwarded message attached.

ALL-NEW Yahoo! Messenger - *sooooo many all-new ways to express yourself*

excluded communities.

I now need to ask that you give this matter your personal attention, because there is a serious danger of this approach being frustrated by local and regional government.

If you could agree to receive a delegation from Outreach we will provide full details of our concerns and of the many crucial projects facing closure. Please do not delegate this to somebody else Claire – this is very much an exclusion issue and deserves to be looked into at the very top.

Thank You

Yours Sincerely

Glenn Jenkins

Chair – Outreach MF

[REDACTED]

eviction, the Marsh Farm history book praised in all of the newspapers, TV, Radio etc – these are all community led projects which arose via the Outreach team.

We feel strongly that our project has suffered from a deliberate policy of lack of co-operation/support at regional/local government level, culminating in the commissioning by GO East/LBC of an 'audit' report by Ecotec - which was highly inaccurate, misleading and caused massive damage to our project and those which are dependent on our support. (see enclosed MFCDT board response to this report).

At a previous meeting with [REDACTED] we requested that the issue of this policy of non co-operation/support would be looked into and resolved - but the Ecotec report very conveniently for GO/LBC overtook the process agreed by [REDACTED] and led to the removal of our previous delivery team Renaissi (who were also formally complaining about this policy).

Before New Deal for Communities existed [REDACTED] from the Social Exclusion Unit visited Marsh Farm, and I had the pleasure of spending the day touring Luton to show her some examples of genuine community led regeneration in action. She was very inspired and told us that support for these kinds of activities were to be provided by Government. The NDC, with its emphasis on community led partnership, smaller areas, larger amounts of funding and a longer period in which to effect change, showed that she was being truthful and that the Social Exclusion Unit were listening to the marginalised groups and those who work and live in

Kelvin/Pat

This is a copy of our letter to [REDACTED] Director of the Social Exclusion Unit, and her reply which is self explanatory.

[REDACTED]
Social Exclusion Unit.

06 May 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing to you on behalf of the Outreach team on Marsh Farm Estate, Luton's NDC area. We have recently had our funding agreement terminated resulting in 13 local people being thrown back onto the dole and the end of funding for the largest volunteer base in Marsh Farm. Outreach are the single most effective (if not the only) link between the Trust and many of the most excluded residents of Marsh Farm. We are working on the implementation of several projects which are **essential** to the engagement of 'hard to reach' members of our community.

All of the 'bottom up' projects which so inspired Barbara Roche on her visit to Marsh Farm were Outreach initiatives – the anti drugs music video publicly praised by John Prescott, the music recording studio which is now closed and facing

One Love

Glenn

Note: forwarded message attached.

ALL-NEW Yahoo! Messenger - *sooooo many all-new ways to express yourself*

Message: FW: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm**Case Information:**

Message Type: Exchange
Message Direction: Not Specified
Case: FOI-739071_2013_MFO
Capture Date: 01/10/2013 16:27:05
Item ID: 104789
Policy Action: Not Specified

Mark History:

No reviewing has been done

Policies:

No Policies attached

FW: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm

From: [REDACTED] Date: 16 June 2004 18:41
To: [REDACTED]
Cc:

☒ Fwd: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm  Polly reply to C Tyler.doc (23 Kb HTML)

-----Original Message-----

From: glenn jenkins [mailto:glennjenkins2000@yahoo.co.uk]
Sent: 15 June 2004 08:56
To: tony jules
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm

[REDACTED]

Hope you are all well - please read the attached correspondence between ourselves (Outreach) and [REDACTED] Director of the Social Exclusion Unit - plus her reply.

I've also attached a copy of a letter sent to her following her response by Spectacle Productions - self explanatory. It seems that this exposure is going right to the very top!

Also, the film makers need to book an interview with all three of you guys coz we want to record your experiences here for the film.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Patel, Sonal

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 June 2004 17:41
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm
Attachments: Fwd: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm; Polly reply to C Tyler.doc

-----Original Message-----

From: glenn jenkins [mailto:glenn.jenkins@yahoo.co.uk]
Sent: 15 June 2004 08:56
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Hope you are all well - please read the attached correspondence between ourselves (Outreach) and [REDACTED] plus her reply.

I've also attached a copy of a letter sent to her following her response by Spectacle Productions - self explanatory. It seems that this exposure is going right to the very top!

Also, the film makers need to book an interview with all three of you guys coz we want to record your experiences here for the film.

One Love

Glenn

Note: forwarded message attached.

ALL-NEW Yahoo! Messenger - sooooo many all-new ways to express yourself

Patel, Sonal

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 June 2004 09:02
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm
Attachments: Fwd: Your reply - Outreach Marsh Farm

To all O.W. lovin brothers and sisters...

Note: forwarded message attached.

I've attached copies of this stuff sent out to others in order to keep u all in the picture a bit - hope this helps.

The O.W. can and will continue as a seperate ongoing project whilst we are fighting this rubbish - I am meeting next week with Em Ekong who will be getting involved, she is the new Capacity Building Manager at Marsh Farm and *seems* to be up for pushin the OW...

One Love

[REDACTED]

Too much spam in your inbox? Yahoo! Mail gives you the best spam protection for FREE! [Get Yahoo! Mail](#)

> > <<Agenda-7 May 04.doc>> > > <<Regen-Directors 02-04-04.doc>> >
> <<AgendaMFCDT.doc>> > > <<Extract M&L Policy.doc>> > > <<HOUSE RULES March
04.doc>>

>

> Tel: [REDACTED] 324041

> Fax: [REDACTED] 684000

>

>

> The information in this email and any attachments is confidential and may also be legally privileged. It is intended for the addressee only. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately, destroy any copies and delete it from your computer system. It is not to be relied upon by any person other than the addressee except with our prior written approval. If no such approval is given, we will not accept any liability (in negligence or otherwise) arising from any third party acting or refraining from acting, on such information. Copyright in this email and any document created by us will be and remain vested in us and will not be transferred to you or any other party.

>

> A list of the names of the Partners of this firm is open to inspection at the above address.

>

> Griffith Smith is regulated by the Law Society.

>

>

- [Heading 1]
 - []

THE REGENERATION COMMUNITY TRUST

AGENDA

for the Meeting of the Board of Directors to be held at the

CERC, Northwell Drive, Luton at 2.00pm on Friday 7 May 2004

(preceded by a Joint Meeting with representatives of MFCDT at 12.00 noon - See separate Agenda attached)

*** * ***

1. Attendance / Apologies / Chair of Meeting
2. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting held on 2 April 2004 **
3. Matters arising from Minutes not otherwise on this Agenda
4. The Board :
 1. Appointment of new Resident Director
 2. Appointment of new 'Statutory and other Agency Director'
 3. Training for Directors
5. Contract for Legal & Company Secretary Services
6. Property Management:
 - 6.1 Specification
 - 6.2 Contract
7. Report from joint MFCDT/Regen Trust Meeting.
8. Property Management
 - 8.1 Review of Policy on Rent-Free Space **
 - 8.2 Matters arising from Meeting held on 2 April 2004
 - 8.3 Report from NPS **
 - 8.4 Draft House Rules **
 - 8.5 Leases
 - 8.6 The Cube
9. Finance Report **

> From: Tim Smith, Company Secretary

>

>

>

>

>

> Also By Post to :

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> Subject: The Regeneration Community Trust

>

> Dear All,

>

> Attached, please find herewith Agenda for the next meeting of the Board on Friday, 7 May to commence at 2.00pm : together with documents listed in the attachment.

>

> The Reports of NPS are awaited and will be circulated as soon as they are to hand.

>

> Regards,

>

>

>

May 2004
onwards**Message: FW: Regeneration Community Trust - Meeting : 7 May 2004 at 2pm****Case Information:**

Message Type: Exchange
Message Direction: Not Specified
Case: FOI-739071_2013_MFO
Capture Date: 01/10/2013 16:27:05
Item ID: 104777
Policy Action: Not Specified

Mark History:

No reviewing has been done

Policies:

No Policies attached

FW: Regeneration Community Trust - Meeting : 7 May 2004 at 2pm

From [REDACTED] **Date** 30 April 2004 16:26

To [REDACTED]

Cc

[REDACTED] Agenda-7 May 04.doc (41 Kb HTML) [REDACTED] Regen-Directors 02-04-04.doc (67 Kb HTML)
[REDACTED] AgendaMFCDDT.doc (21 Kb HTML) [REDACTED] Extract M&L Policy.doc (23 Kb HTML) [REDACTED] HOUSE
RULES March 04.doc (23 Kb HTML)

I am forwarding because the first attempt bounced back to me.

Hope all receive well.

> -----Original Message-----

> [REDACTED]

>

> Subject: Regeneration Community Trust - Meeting : 7 May 2004 at 2pm

>