**Ide Parish Meeting**

**8 September 2016, 6pm, Ide Memorial Hall.**

**1. Purpose of meeting:** To hear preliminary proposals on the plans for development of Pynes Farm Yard by the Church Commissioners.

2. Apologies received: Rose Saunders, Sarah Tiley, Kevin Lake, Alan Connett, Ian Campbell, Charles Rawson, Louise Watson.

3. Meeting chaired by Ide Parish Council Chair Nick Bradley (NB), minutes taken by Pete Bishop (vice-chair).

4. NB opened the meeting, stated the purpose and format of the meeting, then introduced Matthew Naylor (MN) and Jonathan Hoban (JH) from the Church Commissioners and from their agents, Deloittes, respectively. Before giving an overview of the preliminary proposals NB stated the importance of the opinions of Ide residents, and that the forthcoming Ide Neighbourhood Plan would be an important factor in determining whether or not planning permission for development would be granted, given that site is currently outside the parish’s agreed development envelope. NB thanked Peter Pattison and Chris Bishop for their work on the Ide Neighbourhood Plan.

NB stated that a parish poll on the issue will be held as part of the statutory arrangements in finalising a Neighbourhood Plan.

MN outlined the remit of the Church Commissioners – to make best use of the assets of the Church. He pointed out that the Pynes Farm Development plans were only indicative, and that for them the meeting was for primarily for ‘fact finding’.

JH reiterated that Deloittes were present to obtain villagers’ thoughts and views, with eventual intention of getting a scheme for the site included in the Neighbourhood Plan.

JH outlined the nature of the existing site, and the proposed plan – 13 dwellings of mixed size and tenure, with some retention of existing buildings and walls most notably at site entrance. Intention is to have a scheme with a ‘farm courtyard feel’, with adequate parking spaces included in the site footprint. He stated that in his opinion the site would have minimum impact as it is not overlooked from elsewhere in village, nor would it be overlooking other properties external to the site. Highways have accepted the entrance setup.

The floor was then opened to villagers.

Colin Chapman asked “What is long term plan for the site if this proposed development did not occur?”

Matthew Naylor & Jonathan Hoban: no alternative plan, their remit was for this plan only.

Karen Robson (current tenant: keeps horses at Pynes Farm) said she was upset that current tenants received no notification of any proposed planning development.

Liz Bishop queried car parking. JH said all included on site plan.

Peter Hayes questioned the intention of the proposal – was it for realising cash or helping the community? He also said that proposed development could initiate spread of further development most notably in the orchard across the road. He also queried whether extra traffic had been taken into full consideration.

Matthew Naylor responded to this by saying that yes they aim to maximise income from assets but that they try to work with communities for mutual benefit. Regarding traffic, this had been through the necessary hoops with Highways. Regarding the orchard – future development could not categorically be ruled out. JH reiterated that the plan is only indicative, and would have to take into account local, regional and national housing planning policies.

NB stated that the intention is for the orchard to be included in the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan as a protected area.

Nick Irving questioned the number of dwellings proposed; and asked “How will this development benefit the village?” Jonathan Hoban responded saying that some dwellings will be ‘affordable’, and that it would provide housing for people.

Kevin Taborn expressed the opinion that, as proposed the site is outside of current permitted development window, would proposed development open up the possibility of an (undesirable) spread of further developments. JH stated again that the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan would be instrumental in whether or not the development would proceed. They also stressed the natural physical limits to the site in question.

Jo Jeffries asked if there was a particular proportion of ‘social housing’ to be included. Jonathan Hoban replied that this would depend on number of dwellings that were actually built.

Chris Parkinson asked about nature of ‘mixed tenures’, what does this mean in effect?

JH said any agreed and permitted scheme would be sold to a developer, and that it would be the developer’s decision regarding tenure types.

Mark Thomas expressed the opinion that housing was much in need in village, and that he could see how much the church would have to gain from realising assets from the proposed development. He went on to impress upon Deloittes that the power of the church was very present in the village, but asked what actually had the church done thus far for the good of the village? He pointed out that the village desperately needed certain community amenities such as sports, gardening and recreational areas but that historically talking to the church regarding such things had been unrewarding – there had been zero engagement from the church, and he asked how things would be different. His opinions were greeted with applause from fellow villagers.

Stuart Brooking pointed out the lack of an area for (especially) children to play football and other ball games.

Janet Woodrose said she was new to the village, stated what a nice village it is, and that we should all work to keep it thus.

Ben Clarke asked what ‘affordable’ meant in this context – would it just be put on market for all comers or were there plans allowing for local purchase only?

As both Matthew Naylor and Jonathan Hoban were unsure how to respond regarding this, John Goodey provided information about the ‘affordable’ tag (a misnomer in his view), and that the current planning drive was for ‘starter homes’, which would be 20% cheaper than market price. John Goodey then went on to tell of CIL, ‘Community Infrastructure Levy’, which would, if above a certain number of houses were built within a development, incur a tax that would go to village funds, but that this was dependant on the floor area of dwellings (CIL only incurred on larger properties).

Roger Luscombe asked what could be done to provide genuinely affordable housing? He also requested that the Church Commissioners ask the current tenant of the orchard opposite to tidy it up as it was ‘in a terrible state’.

Pete Bishop impressed upon Matthew Naylor that what the village wants to see from the church is not income from CIL to fund e.g. sports equipment, but space – the church owns virtually all the land around Ide and the village is crying out for space for amenities but has nowhere for them.

Matthew Naylor and Jonathan Hoban agreed that the gifting or selling of Weir Meadow was ‘a possibility’.

Nick Irving stressed the importance of something forthcoming from church regarding Weir Meadow.

NB provided brief info on history of (non) provision of allotments on Weir Meadow site.

Richard Cloke asked that the village’s cricket and rugby organisations be included in the process of acquisition of Weir Meadow as community amenity.

Matthew Naylor reiterated intention of making enquiries regarding gifting of Weir Meadow as part of mutually-beneficial moves between village and church.

Roger Luscombe queried exact nature of ‘Farm Courtyard Appearance’ of proposed development. Jonathan Hoban said that exact design would come later as part of planning process and that nature of any eventual development would depend upon forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan.

Ann Boyce said that she had doubts about adequacy of parking provision on proposed development, and stressed how important it was for village that it was adequate.

Jonathan Hoban said details would be in final design.

Liz Bishop said that in her opinion the site had 100% too many dwellings.

Nigel Walsh said that in his opinion the car parking provision for proposed site was adequate but asked that as part of two-way process between church and village that existing car park was made larger.

Andy Swain expressed how welcome he and his family had been made to feel upon coming to the village, and that we should welcome newcomers, and that the development was a positive for the village.

Ann Boyce asked Jonathan Hoban to confirm that if fewer than 10 dwellings were to be built then there would be no stipulation that a proportion be ‘starter homes’. JH reiterated that this was the case, yes.

Stuart Brooking asked, should the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan not give provision for the proposed development then what would the Church Commissioners then do? Matthew Naylor said that whilst it would be very difficult to then proceed that it would not necessarily mean that they’d abandon their intentions to realise the asset that is Pynes Farm.

NB informed all that the Neighbourhood Plan had a 20 year lifespan between revisions.

Mark Thomas asked what obligations the church had towards current tenants at Pynes Farm. Matthew Naylor said that if development were to go head they would be served the standard notice for tenants, but that no live-in tenants would be affected as plans would only affect those using farm buildings for livestock-keeping purposes.

NB thanked all comers for their presence and input, and asked that as many as possible completed feedback forms on the development proposal.

65 people attended in all [village population total =450], including David Williams, Mr & Mrs Peter Pattison, Richard Cloke, Ben & Philly Clarke, John & Janet Ffoulkes, Karen Blundell, Clive Edmonds-Brown, Jo Jeffries, Colin Chapman, Peter Cloke, Chris & Lorraine Crook, Barry Hookins, Stuart Brooking, Anna Armitage, Peter Hayes, Janet Woodrose, Nigel Walsh, Karen Robson, Roger Luscombe, Andy Swain, Ann Boyce, Nick Irving, Sue Lawson, Chris Parkinson, Brenda Spivey, Pam Bastone, John Goodey, Jack Frost, Mark Thomas, Dee Howe, Mark Robson, Pete Bishop, Nick Irving, Jane Houghton & many more.

The meeting ended at 7pm.