

Meeting Cenotaph Group – Structural – Meeting

**Date:** Wed 6.1.21      **Time:** 10am - Zoom

**Location:** Zoom.

**In attendance:** M.Smith, J.Carter, D.McGifford, Cllr.R.Douglas, M.Spender, G.Williams, Cllr.J.Smith, S.Dutton, & Ruth Burgess.

Item	Agenda Item / discussion	Comments	Action
	<b>Apologies</b>	J.Lilley and J.MacArthur	
1.	<b>Minutes from previous meeting / matters arising.</b>	The minutes of the last meeting 25 <sup>th</sup> November 2020 had been circulated.	
2.	<b>Completion Date/Documents.</b>	Contractual issues agreed, bottom line accepted, underspend approx. £5000. Awaiting final invoice from Midland Masonry. 5% held back for defects / maintenance with final inspection 24 <sup>th</sup> November 2021.	
3.	<b>Snagging List.</b>	Nothing outstanding at present. Small amount of grouting of paving to be completed.  JKC agreed to look at the white substance leeching from the blue bricks and removed when he visits the site, also to remove the gaffa tape that has appeared on the lights.  Names & Defects. Nick Roberson ( Stone Mason) to visit the site early spring to assess amendments to names and	<b>JKC</b>

		<p>generally look at issues that may arise ( Saxon cross and small chips on odd plinths)</p> <p>MS to organise a name check as some queries have arisen from residents/ relatives and report back prior to the next meeting. Spreadsheet issued at the meeting with MS findings. RD and JS to cross check with work also done by RD and come up with suggestions as to what corrections ought to be made. We will need a follow up meeting to discuss this prior to Nick Roberson's visit so that he can advise what can and can't be done, and what will not affect the overall appearance of the Cenotaph. This meeting to be called mid Feb as workload permits.</p>	<p><b>MS meeting mid Feb.</b></p>
	<p><b>Historical Information.</b></p> <p><b>Not included in meeting discussion 6.1.21</b></p>	<p>Names. <b>Minutes 12.3.19</b> Names / Decorations / Regiments</p> <p>All 14 plaques were checked for accuracy before final confirmation was sent to Stones of Weymouth.</p> <p>Type size was agreed, some positions altered for aesthetic reasons. Where there was a duplication of names regiment information was added to distinguish one person from another.</p> <p>MS to put together a brief explaining the criteria for names being on the cenotaph, how they were collected and a disclaimer for error or liability. MS circulate to the group for comments before making public.</p> <p><b>Criteria for names. 2.4.19 (as requested)</b></p> <p>All of the names from the original cenotaph plaques have been added to the new plaques (there were no set rules as to their inclusion in the first place).</p> <p>The new names added conform to The Commonwealth War Graves Standard.</p> <p>The names are drawn from Congleton town and all of the local parishes that border Congleton</p>	

town.

Our researcher contacted all parishes, visited church yard memorials, church boards etc.

She contacted regimental museums, search various websites and made numerous public appeals through The Congleton Chronicle since 2011.

Regiment names have been added where names are identical, decorations have also been recorded.

***Every effort was made to record all details as accurately as possible. The Cenotaph Group cannot be held responsible for errors made during the recording of the information for which no offence was intended. Please note that this has been carried out totally by a group of volunteers over a number of years, no single entity is responsible.***

**Minutes 28.5.19**

Criteria for names.

MS has now written up the criteria for names appearing on the cenotaph plaques and circulated to the group. This is stored in the Cenotaph file in the office so that it is available to councillors on request.

**JKC Email 11.1.21 (section from)**

At an early stage (after relocation to the Park had been discounted), the Project Group's overall preference was that the replacement Memorial on the current site would largely emulate established CWGC national patterns in terms

		<p>of primary materials, inscriptions/names but subject to retention of the original granite Celtic Cross and Plinth.</p> <p>I had a meeting with a CWGC mason operative and phone discussions with their Advisory Service in relation to stone sources, font type, incised letter sizing etc., and recall that their general advice was to adhere as far as possible to their formal records, which now constitute the National Database, for inscriptions since further enquiries from subsequent generations would be more easily and accurately accessed - Service Numbers/Names etc.</p> <p>The original believed locally derived name plaques dating from Circa 1920, were known to be deficient not only in the extent of names but also affixes/awards and to contain spelling ambiguities, anomalies and colloquial aspects. My recollection is that as a general principle the Group (which included the late John Pullen) preferred not to transfer the original panel details verbatim to the new, but follow CWGC guidelines. The original panels to be relocated for safekeeping to the Town Museum or a Church as local contemporary historical artefacts and referred to in the forthcoming site information panel.</p> <p>You will also recall that Cllr Dennis Murphy sat in on several of the Group's meetings when the inscriptions were being reviewed and gave the benefit of his Military knowledge for source and format.</p> <p>As Mike S. infers and as I suggested at last week's meeting once <u>essential</u> changes have been agreed, a site meeting with Nick Roberson can be arranged, probably around April to review what can reasonably be achieved, but as a guiding principle intervention should be kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p><b><i>Copy of the advert used to collect names will be sent out with this set of minutes.</i></b></p>	
4.	<p><b>Dedication Event.</b> <b>19.9.21</b></p>	<p>MS has issued a document showing who has been contacted re dates in their diaries.</p> <p>MS to contact Gary Dolman for confirmation of the people he has invited then send out the amended document.</p> <p>Cannot progress much further without information from the RAF display team as their attendance would set up a time line. Also we need a much better view on the Covid 19 rules / criteria and overall situation regarding the Pandemic .</p>	<p><b>MS contact</b> <b>GD</b></p>

7.	<b>A.O.B</b>	There was no further business.	
8.	<b>Next Meeting</b>	<b>Mid Feb TBC.</b>	