

Report of the PCC's deliberations & activities in 2021 for APCM 25th May 2022

The PCC met 4 times in the year to fulfil its obligations to set a budget for the following year, to scrutinise and approve accounts, to pledge money to the diocese for 2022 and to oversee the stewardship of and development to the land and property it controls on behalf of the diocese.

In addition, it approved governors to the church school in its parish, it sent delegates to the Deanery Synod and it considered changes to render more efficient the administration of the Parish Office and the fulfilling of its duties as trustees of the parish as a charity registered with the Charity Commission.

Readers should also know that 2 members of the PCC also serve on the Diocesan Synod. A report from them is submitted to the Annual Parishioners' Meeting, as is a report on Deanery Synod.

Exceptionally in 2021 the audit that began in the spring of 2021 was not concluded until the autumn, owing to new auditors seeking information that had never been collated for inspection before and requiring a demonstration of viability in a number of possible future scenarios. To drive this through Neal Harvey of the PCC shouldered the work normally undertaken by the Parish Treasurer (after the role-holder resigned in July) to steer the Parish through to sign-off to the accounts in October 2021 and the timely filing of accounts with the Charity Commission.

In its oversight role the PCC approved spending to maintain and improve existing clergy housing and plans to build new parsonages next to St Mary's church. It also oversaw repair work in the properties near St Mark's church known as the Galustian Flats and exercised responsibilities as landlord over a parish-controlled house in Thornton Road near St John's church.

The PCC also oversaw work on the Parsonages Project, a piece of work that is planned to lead to the building of two buildings designed to house clergy of the Parish within the Parish. (At present two members of the Parish clergy are housed in buildings made available through the diocese on a temporary basis, and one member is housed in the by now sub-standard building known as 3 Arthur Road, the former Verger's house.) Two meetings open to all were held in 2021 to share plans for the buildings, the most recent being an in-person meeting. Notes of this form an annexe to this report.

In addition to the above, the PCC received summaries of Safeguarding matters from the Safeguarding Leads in the 4 Team churches brought together by Neal Harvey as Safeguarding Coordinator. Details remain confidential other than in summary form. A verbal update if found to be needed can be given at the Annual Meeting of Parishioners.

Finally, the PCC examined the proposed governance proposals which its sub-group worked on through the year and which the 4 Team churches have examined in their committees led by representatives from each of the churches. The outcome of this will be submitted to the Annual Parishioners' Meeting with the recommendation that the proposed model be adopted. The work is set out in 3 documents known as A, B and C which will be published before the Annual Meeting.

C Esdale

PCC Secretary

11th May 2022

Wimbledon Parish Housing – notes of open meeting 24th November 2021, held in St Mary's Church Garden Hall

Aim: this meeting was called to enable parishioners and local residents to hear the latest thinking and plans for the development of two extra parsonages for the Wimbledon Parish Team Ministry.

Leading the sharing of information: Rev A Hodgson (AH) and Marcus Beale (MB) with David Ainsworth (DA), Vanessa Forster, Jane Austin and John Bush in support.

1. Background

This meeting followed an earlier one in Spring 2021 when draft plans had been shown to a similar audience. MH reminded attendees that the aim was to provide suitable accommodation within the Wimbledon Parish for two priests serving in the Parish and their families. Currently the Team Vicar for St John the Baptist SW19 is housed outside the Parish through the Diocese and the other in a sub-standard house significantly beyond its service life.

Standards of accommodation for vicars are set out by the Church of England.

2. Architect's account

The brief received at high level was to replace the existing dwelling of 3 Arthur Rd with two dwellings in keeping with the surroundings, preserving the character and with pedestrian and vehicular access that would meet the standards required by the client. The conservation area in which the site sits requires preservation of character of any new building and of the churchyard wall.

Outline suggestions had been made to the client in February 2021. Further input had been taken at the Spring 2021 open meeting; and in July 2021 a submission made of the proposal to Merton Council Planning. Many suggestions had been received. Examples pertaining to the outside appearance were not to reduce the hedge height seen from the road, to have a cycle store, to reduce hard-standing in favour of greenery, to move one house further back, to have more trees, to have photovoltaic cells and to have a brick base to the buildings.

MB showed a map from 1836 showing the site then which illustrated aspects off the topography.

MB showed an aerial view with trees and their types, explained the proposed cladding (that meets all regulations), stated roofs would be pitched and zinc-covered for durability and underneath would be sound-insulated. He then showed various views of the buildings and how they might look from the churchyard.

AH aimed to display some of these illustrations after the Parochial Church Council had seen them at its next meeting 7th December 2021 on the Parish website.

3. Questions asked in the meeting and answers given

- Question: the images suggested hardness: how might this be softened? *Answer:* the images were still to be worked on. When finished, these would show how the hardness was softer in fact.
- Question: where would recycling bins be? *Answer:* pointed out on plan.
- Question: supposing one house was no longer needed, might one be suitable to rent? *Answer:* the detailed brief and architect's design would enable this. A drive would though be shared, as is commonplace. The design specifically made which front door was for which house very clear and ensured that both vicars' visitors' reception room was close to that door and had good light.
- Question: the 2 garden areas are dissimilar – why? *Answer:* although of similar size and constricted by boundaries the aim was to ensure both dwellings had adequate and private garden areas.
- Comment: communication of the inception and progress had not reached all persons present in a timely way. *Reply:* the plans to be displayed will hopefully allay fears over the proposals.
- Question: how would the project be funded to avoid financial trouble? *Answer:* although exact details of financing could not be shared outside the PCC, the brief was to use existing assets to pay for the development and building. Contributions from churches are not envisaged as being needed. MH added that the value of the property portfolio would be expected to be enhanced with the new houses. MH added that the PCC has only so far authorised going to planning and no contracts to build would be issued until funding was assured.
- Question: what disturbance to near neighbours was envisaged? *Answer:* DA: the plan expects site preparation to completing to be just over a year. MB assured that no very deep pile driving was expected to be needed owing to the terrain.
- Question: what is the construction management plan? *Answer:* DA: the next phase of development would include such a plan. The estimated time for construction at this present point is about a year.

Notes: C Esdale, Secretary to Wimbledon PCC

26th November 2021