

# Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

## MINUTES

*In relation to the [Health Protection \(Coronavirus, Restrictions\) \(No. 3\) and \(All Tiers\) \(England\) \(Amendment\) Regulations 2021](#), which came into effect on 6th January 2021, a meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held remotely (by written electronic means and online conferencing) on Wednesday, 10th February 2021 at 2.00 pm*

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Opening prayers were said by the Revd Preb Terry Bloor (Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent).
- 1.2 Present: The Ven. Simon Baker (DAC Chair), the Ven. Julian Francis, the Ven. Sue Weller, the Rt Revd Alistair Magowan (Acting Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent), the Revd Preb Terry Bloor (Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent), Andy Foster, Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat, the Revd Nick Heron, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Claire Hines, David Litchfield, Adrian Mathias, Mark Parsons, Andy Smith, Julie Taylor, Peter Woollam.  
In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Imogen Campbell (Assistant DAC Secretary), Rowan Jones (Diocesan Registry Assistant), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: The Ven. Paul Thomas, Sarah Butler, the Revd Preb Pat Hawkins, Bryan Martin, Brough Skingley, Andy Wigley.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Mark Parsons, item 4.1.8; Adrian Mathias, item 4.1.6; Sarah Butler, items 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.2.1.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

### 2. Matters Arising

#### 2.1 Publication of DAC meeting dates and confirmation of afternoon start times in 2021

The DAC Secretary affirmed that the [DAC meeting dates](#) in 2021 (8 meetings) had been published on the DAC web pages of the diocesan website. It was confirmed that remote DAC meetings, held by online conferencing, would commence at 2.00 pm on those dates, but that in-person meetings, when resumed (following the lifting of national Covid-19 restrictions), would recommence from 1.30 pm (as recorded on the diocesan website).

#### 2.2 Postponement of DAC and adviser site visits (from 6th January 2021)

Following the resumption of DAC and adviser (i.e. group and individual) site visits from 2nd December 2020 (with the reopening of church buildings for public worship and related activities), albeit then subject to individual requirements and local situations, site visits are further postponed from 6th January 2021 due to statutory restrictions on movement and gatherings under the [Health Protection \(Coronavirus, Restrictions\) \(No. 3\) and \(All Tiers\) \(England\) \(Amendment\) Regulations 2021](#); the National Church Institutions have advised against all work-based travel for both staff and volunteers (see item 7 below). Visits are proposed to restart in accordance with [Government guidance](#) (the roadmap out of lockdown, from spring 2021) and advice from the National Church Institutions, and only in relation to the DAC [policy and procedure](#) and associated Covid-19 [risk assessment](#) for site visits.

### **2.3 Expressions of interest sought for DAC Heating, Lighting and Audio-Visual Advisers (by 15th February 2021)**

The DAC Secretary updated the Committee on the withdrawal of the DAC Heating, Lighting and Audio-Visual Adviser, previously reported at the 14th October 2020 DAC meeting (New Matters, item 3.1). In order to uphold the DAC's statutory responsibility to give formal advice on casework in these areas, since that time, the DAC Chair and Secretary have co-ordinated short-term, interim cover through the voluntary secondment of three separate advisers to Leicester DAC. However, it was recognised that this is a stop-gap measure, and that the recruitment of one or more additional, permanent advisers is required. At the present meeting, it was reported that an [advertisement](#) seeking expressions of interest for the roles had been published on the DAC web pages of the diocesan website in January 2021, with a closing date of 15th February 2021.

**Action:** The DAC Chair and Secretary to undertake recruitment of one or more additional, permanent DAC advisers on heating, lighting and audio-visual

### **2.4 Publication of DAC minutes in the public domain (from 24th March 2021)**

The DAC Chair confirmed that, following prior agreement by the Committee at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting (Any Other Business, item 9.1), the minutes of DAC meetings (but not agendas, to avoid duplication) would be published on a dedicated [minutes of DAC meetings](#) web page of the diocesan website from 2021 onwards, with the minutes placed online after parishes had received the outcome of the decisions on applications. It was confirmed that confidential items could be exempt from the minutes or redacted (as is the case with local authority minutes and those of other bodies). It was noted that the DCMS [guidance note](#) (2010) on 'The operation of the Ecclesiastical Exemption and related planning matters for places of worship in England' indicates (para 10) that 'Denominational systems of control need to be open and transparent'. It was further commented that applications, including supporting documents, made under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 (from 1st April 2020) on the Online Faculty System were now in the public domain via a [public notices section](#) within that online portal.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to publish the minutes of DAC meetings in 2021 on a dedicated web page of the diocesan website, commencing with the minutes of the present meeting (following DAC approval of the same at the 24th March 2021 DAC meeting)

## **3. New Matters**

### **3.1 Retirement of the Ven. Simon Baker as DAC Chair (from 30th April 2021)**

The DAC Chair, formerly Archdeacon of Lichfield and DAC Vice-Chair, indicated that he was to retire from the role of DAC Chair from 30th April 2021, alongside the post of Rector of Lichfield, St Michael and Wall, St John the Baptist, in the diocese. The next DAC meeting, on 24th March 2021, would accordingly be the last for the Ven. Simon Baker as DAC Chair, and the Committee anticipated the opportunity to thank him at that meeting for his work as Chair. The DAC Secretary indicated that further to the requirements of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 (Schedule 2), and where a casual vacancy occurs among the Chair, the appointment to fill the vacancy is made by the Diocesan Bishop, without external consultation. The Church Buildings Council had previously confirmed that there is no legislative requirement to advertise the role of DAC Chair.

The DAC Secretary separately indicated that following the prior notification at the 14th October 2020 DAC meeting (New Matters, item 3.2) that the then Ven. Matthew Parker, at that time Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent and also DAC Vice-Chair, was to become Bishop of Stafford, the role of Vice-Chair became vacant from 1st November 2020. As a non-statutory appointment, which does not require external consultation, a nomination for DAC Vice-Chair will be made by the new DAC Chair in due course.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to liaise with the Diocesan Bishop on the matter of the forthcoming vacancy of DAC Chair

### **3.2 Verbal report from the Ven. Julian Francis on roundtable discussion of the CCB draft papers on contested heritage (held 13th January 2021)**

The Archdeacon of Walsall, being a lead on the taskforce looking into racial justice in the diocese, gave a verbal report of his attendance at a recent (online) roundtable discussion of two major draft papers, dated December 2020, on contested heritage by the Church of England's Cathedral and Church Buildings Division. Comments on the papers were submitted by delegates in January 2021, with the revised papers likely being collated nationally before Easter. The Archdeacon commented that renewed consideration is being given by the national Church to memorials connected with historic slavery, following the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement, and specifically in relation to contested narratives and the applicability of heritage legislation. The Church of England is seeking to make a positive and systematic response, rooted in theology and good practice, for the long term.

It was commented that the DAC will need to give advice on memorials to petitioners and potentially wider communities, but that guidance will be offered to dioceses from the national Church, with the possible creation of an advisory panel at national level (with a library of case histories). A recommendation of the roundtable discussion was that dioceses could also have local enablers for local conversations. The Committee expressed the importance of the subject in its broadest terms, and it was suggested that the DAC could facilitate a diocesan discussion session, with other conservation bodies, which should be opened up to a wider (non-white) audience. Black clergy should be specifically invited to attend and participate, co-ordinated by the Archdeacons. The Diocesan Registry could also be involved, to provide advice and comment on historic and current patronage, noting that (grant) money for church buildings may continue to come from such sources. A date for a discussion session would be confirmed in due course.

**Action:** The Ven. Julian Francis to research and co-ordinate a diocesan discussion session, with other conservation bodies and clergy participants

## **4. Casework for Consideration**

### **4.1 Reorderings and New Facilities**

#### **a) Informal Advice** (*before external formal consultation, if applicable*)

*Grade I*

4.1.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-055791</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620563	Church Name:	Shrewsbury: Holy Cross [Shrewsbury Abbey]
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Shrewsbury: Holy Cross
Applicant Name:	Revd Dr Tom Atfield	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	11-Sep-2018
Proposal:	Access project: replacement of internal doors/porches		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third	Cost Est:	£70,500
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC noted again that Shrewsbury Abbey had [received](#) £98,900 in October 2020 from the Government's Culture Recovery Fund (Covid-19 sustainability), for access and visitor experience improvements, including new doors and external pathways, and historical interpretation signage. The QI architect had indicated that works have to be completed by the end of March 2021, but subsequent enquiries by the parish have indicated that the completion deadline might be extended by the grant body to the end of June 2021.
2. The revised submission seeks to retain all elements of historic screens and doors, with the heavy glazed inner lobby screen to the south door being the only section to be removed.
3. However, no visual has been provided of the proposed screens and doors to show the overall visual impact on the interior of the worship space. There are closeup images of the screens, which show that the installation in all cases (within the nave) are to flat stone walls without carved or profiled stonework.
4. The replacement of the internal south porch was welcomed. The documents refer to the removal of a 'lintol forming a trip hazard', but it is not clear where this is and what is to be removed – it is assumed that this is part of the 1979 screen and not earlier stonework.
5. The internal screen to the north porch is to be slightly set back from the internal wall masonry set off an internal arch with lower arched stone opening containing a timber screen and doors – this appears Victorian though there is no information on the screen provided. It was noted that the timber screen and doors are now to be retained.
6. The visual provided suggests that the doors to be kept open have a relatively low head height. The arrangement of the new and old doors is visually poor and results in the new glass doors being almost flush with the internal face of the stone wall. It would be preferable to remove the Victorian timber screen and door (noting it is in poor condition and not of architectural merit). The glass door/screen should then be installed to the line of the removed timber door, i.e. at the internal arch, where it will be far less conspicuous.
7. There are no photographs of the interior (porch) side of the 'medieval' north door that is to be retained. A glass roof is proposed as part of the internal porch, but its connection with the medieval door and screen cannot be determined. It is assumed that there is a flat timber lintol and the connection can be reversible.
8. Details have been provided of the automation system and floor boxes. These are 150mm deep and unlikely to affect below-ground archaeology. The provision of control boxes

with wired links from the floor boxes to switches, fire alarm, and keypad was noted. The drawings suggest these will be surface mounted on the stonework, next to the doors within the nave, but this needs to be reconsidered.

9. The proposal to move internal memorials within the porch is acceptable, and it was noted that no inscribed floor memorials would be affected. Similarly, external path works are shown on the line of existing paths using new paving to the north. It is assumed that these will be stone flags to match the south path that is to be repaired, and as such was also deemed acceptable.
10. The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the setting of the Abbey is designated as a Scheduled Monument and that the path works will require Scheduled Monument Consent. A cross section for the new path to the north porch would assist in understanding the likely depth of ground disturbance and archaeological impact. The parish should consult Historic England on the principle of gaining Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) in relation to the works for the paths. Subject to the advice of Historic England, it is possible that an archaeological watching brief may be necessary as a condition of SMC and faculty. Adequate budgetary provision should be made for this if it required.

In consideration of the external requirement that works are completed by the end of March 2021, or at the latest by the end of June 2021, to ensure the project fits to the agreed funding programme, the Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, could advance for formal consultation with external statutory bodies, in accordance with the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019, to be advised by the DAC Secretary upon request, prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

#### 4.1.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2019-044302</a>	Case Status:	Proposal in preparation
Church Code:	620274	Church Name:	Eccleshall: Holy Trinity
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Eccleshall
Applicant Name:	Jonathan Jones	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [Simon Smith]
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	19-Oct-2018
Proposal:	Reordering with addition of kitchen and toilets, and to move and make more accessible items of historical significance		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£249,079
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 ( <i>i.e. case is pre-external formal consultation</i> )		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC affirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade I listed – and specifically the visual impact, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
2. It was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not been sufficiently identified and justified, or that enough research has been undertaken with potential users, and that the Statements of Significance and

Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [reorderings](#) and [Statements](#).

3. The submitted plan suggests that three tombs are to be relocated to the south aisle by conservators, but only two are shown re-sited.
4. The south aisle is to be used as a place to deposit elements which are to be disturbed by the works, including two tombs and a historic screen from the west screen to the south aisle. There are no photographs or details of any element to be relocated, and these should be provided.
5. The drawing refers to the remounting of the historic screen but additional detail is required – there is concern that the screen is to be fitted directly in front of a sizeable radiator which may affect the fabric of the screen.
6. There are Saxon carved stones to be removed from the north-west corner, which are also to be relocated, but no photographs are provided and no proposed place identified.
7. Pews are to be removed from the south aisle and replaced in part with chairs, but no details are provided of either the existing pews or proposed chairs. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that the pews are by Street, and form part of a high-quality Victorian restoration of the 13th-century interior. Consideration should also be given to the Church Buildings Council (CBC) [guidance note](#) (2018) on church seating.
8. The floor is to be replaced in part, but no details of the existing or proposed finish are given, and these should be provided.
9. The font is proposed to be relocated, but which is in a designed section of floor, and it was queried whether this is also to be relocated. The Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent commented that the relocation of the font to its proposed position near to the south door fits theologically and practically.
10. The new partitions, screens and furniture appear to all be finished in vertical tongue and groove oak boards with little detail – there is a large amount of this proposed, which will have a significant impact on the west end. It was queried whether this finish is based on anything else in existence at the church.
11. The proposed north-west corner is a mass of partitioning over two levels to maximise storage, toilets and kitchen. This will conceal the original construction and volume, and will leave a corridor space without natural lighting. There appears to be a real over intensity of development in this area, which could be better laid out.
12. There is a particularly long drainage and service run proposed from the north-west corner of the church down to the road to the south. This runs with the slope of the ground, but an assessment on the required depth of excavation would be useful – there is potential for significant archaeological disruption.

The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that informal consultation should also be undertaken with The Victorian Society and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB).

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

*Grade II\**

4.1.3

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-056663</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620469	Church Name:	Bolas Magna: St John the Baptist
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Bolas Magna
Applicant Name:	Gill Hughes	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [Simon Smith]
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	23-Jan-2015
Proposal:	Reordering of Chancel area		
No. of times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	£2,926
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal in a different form (application ref. 2020-046755, under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015, since abandoned) as an application for informal advice at the 12th February 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC affirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade II\* listed – and specifically the visual impact, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
2. It was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not been sufficiently identified and justified, and that the Statements of Significance and Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England [guidance](#) on Statements.
3. The need for an easily adaptable seating area has been demonstrated and the chancel is the only space able to accommodate this. However, what is less clear is why the existing stalls and book rests need to be moved.
4. While the moving of these to the gallery is reversible, their removal will alter the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest. This need to move the stalls and book rests needs further explanation. The age and significance of the stalls and book rests also needs further consideration in the Statement of Significance.
5. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that Bolas Magna has the most complete pre-Victorian interior in north Shropshire (except for the private chapel at Halston). The box pews in the nave, the pulpit, west gallery, altar rail and Royal Arms are all 18th-century work and almost certainly contemporary with the church.
6. The stalls in the chancel are made up from earlier, probably 17th-century, pieces. The revised Pevsner guide to Shropshire refers to the ends, but substantial parts of the seats are clearly older, perhaps of the same date as the chancel. The sequence of the fittings of the chancel is unclear, as the dado behind the stalls is made up of parts of re-used box pews, and so is probably significantly later. However, unless the stalls were brought in, they must have been present in the church since 1726, and indeed well before. The likeliest reason for having these seats in the chancel in the 18th century is that they were used for communicants.
7. The nominated member commented that these stalls are significant historic items and an integral part of an important set of fittings, and as such removing them would have a significant, negative impact on a rare pre-Victorian interior. It is possible to argue that

moving them to the gallery is reversible, but the complete interior would still be significantly harmed by doing so.

8. In relation to the proposed carpeting of the chancel and sanctuary, the application does not include an explanation for the need for the carpeting or an assessment of the impact on the appearance and character of the interior of the church, and these should be provided.
9. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that the church currently has a parquet floor in reasonable condition, which complements the historic fittings, and that carpeting it would harm the traditional appearance of the chancel. A large area of red carpet of the colour proposed would further harm the appearance of the interior. The proposed chairs are upholstered in a colour unsympathetic to the interior, and are wood stained in a colour which has no relation to the interior.
10. Instead, as an alternative to the current proposal, the DAC advised the parish to consider the retention of the existing stalls and book rests in the chancel and supplementing them with chairs to provide flexible seating. It was similarly suggested that the carpeting of the chancel and sanctuary should be removed from the proposal (i.e. leaving the present chancel floor exposed), as this would adversely affect the appearance of these sensitive areas of the church.
11. Further information on the proposed heating should be provided, as whilst the proposed heaters appear to be suitable, further information, including how they will be installed and where the wiring will go, will be needed before these can be recommended.
12. Additional information should also be supplied on the proposed chairs, which should be of a design that is in keeping with the existing furnishings, including confirmation that the un-upholstered version of the proposed chair would be used and that they would be stained to match the existing furnishings. The parish should also provide details of the proposed number of chairs, and how and where these will be stacked and stored when not in use. Consideration should be given to the Church Buildings Council (CBC) [guidance note](#) (2018) on church seating.

The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that informal consultation should also be undertaken with Historic England, the Georgian Group, and the Church Buildings Council. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies indicated that they would be pleased to revisit the church, to see the chancel fittings, upon the recommencement of DAC [site visits](#) (currently postponed due to Covid-19 restrictions).

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

*Grade II*

#### 4.1.4

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2019-034232</a>	Case Status:	Proposal in preparation
Church Code:	620504	Church Name:	Hales: St Mary
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Hales
Applicant Name:	Dr Marcus Griffiths	Quin. Inspector:	Geoff Hillman
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Apr-2015
Proposal:	Install toilet, refreshment area and improve access		

No. of Times to DAC:	Third as informal	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 ( <i>i.e. case is pre-external formal consultation</i> )		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 6th May 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme, following a site visit report approved at 7th August 2019 DAC meeting. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The report of the DAC site visit conducted in July 2019, in connection with the creation of an accessible entrance from the rear of the site around the west end to the south entrance, advised the parish to consider adding to the main stair flight (i.e. not to create a pathway between the landing platform and the steps).
2. It was noted at the 6th May 2020 meeting that the parish had subsequently pursued their initial idea, with separate steps to the porch, with flanking ramps, with retaining walls and railings, and a path between this and the main flight. It was suggested at that time that this arrangement should be reconsidered, preferably keeping one flight, and obviating the walls and railings as far as practicable with gentle ramps and vegetation guarding. Another interesting possibility had been suggested by The Victorian Society, through informal consultation, which was to have a ramp at one side only, thereby reducing the installation by half.
3. The new drawing, no. 5100/004 rev. A (dated 8th December 2020) was considered at the present meeting, but it was noted that this still has railings. The Committee restated that it would be preferable if the land could be raised on the bank, also with new planting, and obviate the need for railings. A scheme of graded ground rather than ramps, without railings, should be developed, to avoid a hard barrier. It was recommended that this external scheme should be submitted for pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority (planning permission).
4. In relation to the facilities proposed under the west tower, the new drawing confirms the previous DAC advice that the screen should be set behind (west of) the tower arch, on the line of the new inner partition. It was restated that when further developed, drawings in addition to a plan will be required, including an elevation and screen details (the new sketch is not sufficiently clear), and details of extract outlets, drainage, flooring, etc.
5. In connection with the proposed tea bar, it was previously recognised that the proposed location in the north-west corner of the nave had resulted from DAC advice in July 2019, taking pressure off development at the tower base. However, it was queried at the 6th May 2020 meeting whether the proposal needs to have a full and sizeable enclosure, but whether it could not just be a counter, with a concealed sink and taps.
6. The new drawing, considered at the present meeting, shows the proposed installation unchanged. The Committee restated that a counter would be less intrusive, and furthermore that the installation should not be visually related to the tower screen, as in the new sketch, as this extends the impact across much of the west end. It was restated that elevational details, and full joinery details, will be required, and well as photographs of the immediate context. Lastly, the use of vinyl as a floor surface was cautioned.

The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that informal consultation should also be undertaken with the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer) and The Victorian Society.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

#### 4.1.5

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-057775</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620471	Church Name:	Church Aston: St Andrew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Church Aston
Applicant Name:	Revd Zoe Heming	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2017
Proposal:	Reordering nave north aisle to introduce toilet and cupboard tea point		
No. of times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	£24,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal in a different form (application ref. 2019-035523, under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015, since abandoned) as an application for informal advice at the 11th December 2019 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC continued to support the principle of the proposal, to site the proposed toilet and tea point at the west end of the nave north aisle, and considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had been sufficiently identified and justified.
2. The revised scheme had addressed the matters previously raised by the DAC informal advice. However, further construction information should be provided regarding the toilet and tea point.
3. Details of the proposed materials and design of the external panelling, door, and hot drinks servery should be provided.
4. Details of the necessary external repairs should also be submitted, which relate to the wet wall caused by a leaking gutter (that does not have a stop end and appears to be in poor condition). It was queried whether there are any planned repairs to the enclosed north aisle west window.
5. Further information should be provided on the treatment of internal wall surfaces within the accessible toilet.
6. Details of how the extract vent is being installed (diamond cut hole through masonry), and the nature and appearance of the external vent (normally a recessed black painted cast iron grill cover over the ventilation hole), should be submitted. It was queried whether it would be possible to rely on natural ventilation via an opening light in the north aisle west window.
7. A specification of the electrical services should also be provided.
8. The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the current church building is an 1867 rebuild on an older site. Excavation of services across the churchyard therefore has the potential to disturb both articulated and disarticulated human remains dating from the medieval period onwards. As previously advised, an archaeological watching brief will be necessary in relation to the groundworks to lay the new foul drains. The amount allowed for this in the QS estimate (£5,000) should be adequate for this work.
9. It might assist the external formal consultation stage in due course if the parish were now to commission a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) from an archaeological contractor of its choice.

The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that informal consultation should also be undertaken with the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer) and The Victorian Society.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

**b) Formal Advice** (after external formal consultation, if applicable)

*Grade I*

4.1.6

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-055575</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620104	Church Name:	Tamworth: St Editha
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Tamworth
Applicant Name:	Gwen Wilkinson	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Jul-2015
Proposal:	Reordering: office, cafe, shop, toilet and screening to aisles		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third (in this form)	Cost Est:	£220,000
Consulted:	Historic England; The Victorian Society; [SPAB also responded]		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by preceding DAC informal advice. At that meeting, the Committee determined that the application should advance for formal consultation with external statutory bodies, in accordance with the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019, prior to receipt of formal DAC advice. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the consultation responses received from Historic England, The Victorian Society, and the SPAB (the latter not requested), but did not recognise these as formal objections for consideration in the DAC's own formal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

**Decision:** Recommend (external formal consultation undertaken)

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

*Grade II*

4.1.7

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-057545</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620471	Church Name:	Church Aston: St Andrew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Church Aston
Applicant Name:	Revd Zoe Heming	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2017
Proposal:	Removal/reordering of pews in the side aisle		
No. of times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	£21.98
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal in a different form (application ref. 2019-035523, under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015, since abandoned) as an application for informal advice at the 2nd October 2019 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and noted that no pews are to be permanently disposed of (being placed in safe storage). The Committee determined to recommend the proposal, to make permanent the Archdeacon's Licence for temporary minor reordering ([2019-044987](#)) granted on 13th November 2019 (expiring on 13th February 2021).

**Decision:** Recommend (external formal consultation not applicable)

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

*Unlisted*

#### 4.1.8

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-056566</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620335	Church Name:	Westlands: St Andrew
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	St Andrew, the Westlands
Applicant Name:	Revd Andrew Dawswell	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Parsons
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	01-Aug-2019
Proposal:	Construction of replacement hall as extension to main church building		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£605,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, and confirmed that the revised scheme had addressed the matters previously raised by the DAC informal advice, including that the tower is to be retained; the south sanctuary windows are now all to be retained, with none blocked; and the glazed link has been subdued, with zinc cladding and grey window frames. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal with provisos.

**Decision:** Recommend with the following proviso (external formal consultation not applicable):

- The execution of the new construction should reflect throughout the quality of materials in the existing church building, which are of a high standard.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

#### 4.1.9

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-057160</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620339	Church Name:	Birches Head: St Matthew
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	The Holy Evangelists, Hanley
Applicant Name:	Revd Phillip Jones	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [Simon Smith]
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	18-Aug-2016
Proposal:	Introduction of nave altar and re-arrangement of chairs		

No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£965
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, and determined to recommend the proposal. Specifically, the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that the chairs and their existing arrangement are not of any historic or artistic interest. The Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent confirmed that the celebration of the Eucharist in this focused manner would be consonant with the tradition of this church, and removed the need for continually moving furniture from the side chapel. The design and colour of the proposed altar was also deemed to be sufficiently in-keeping with the existing fixtures and fittings.

**Decision:** Recommend (external formal consultation not applicable)

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

## 4.2 Fabric Repairs and Alterations

### a) Informal Advice (*before external formal consultation, if applicable*)

*Grade II\**

#### 4.2.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-057717</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620525	Church Name:	Oswestry: St Oswald, King & Martyr
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	St Oswald, King and Martyr, Oswestry
Applicant Name:	Paul Crosby	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Nov-2016
Proposal:	Conservation of the C17th Yale Memorial using a fully funded grant from the Historic England Covid-19 Emergency Heritage at Risk Response Fund [work to be completed by Sept 2021]		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£10,915
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and supported the proposal. It was determined that the application should advance to formal consultation with external statutory bodies, prior to receipt of formal DAC advice. As such, formal consultation should be undertaken with the Church Buildings Council, in accordance with rule 4.6(2)(a) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019, in relation to the conservation of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

*Grade II*

#### 4.2.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-057120</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620576	Church Name:	Donnington Wood: St Matthew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	St Matthew, Donnington Wood
Applicant Name:	Revd Paula Smith	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [Simon Smith]
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	03-Aug-2018
Proposal:	Repairs to ceilings in nave, crossing and transepts		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£33,710
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered a related proposal, for repairs to the (1970s) polychrome painted chancel ceiling (application ref. 2017-016743, under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015, since abandoned, now [2021-057996](#) under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019, not yet resubmitted), which was last considered for formal advice but deferred at 2nd May 2018 DAC meeting. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the current proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not been sufficiently identified and justified, and that further investigation (as below) is required. The Statements of Significance and Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England [guidance](#) on Statements.
2. The submission shows that a sizeable chunk of internal plaster has fallen from the ceiling, but there is only one photo of the damage, shown together with a section of plaster at ground level. There are no photos or record of other sections that are loose, and these should be provided.
3. The transept is noted to be the area of concern and has been closed off on the advice of the architect. The nave ceiling is proposed to be overboarded as a precautionary measure. The intention is to overboard the entire ceiling using a build up of 25 mm battens and 18 mm painted plywood. The application states that one pitch of the south transept has already been treated this way, but no photos are included, and these should be provided.
4. The architect states that ideally the building needs reroofing to prevent further issues, suggesting that water is ingressing through defects in the roof finish and destabilising the internal finish.
5. The area of the fall is at a weak point in the ceiling, directly underneath the valley gutter and junction of ridges and hips where the north (or south) transept roof meets the nave roof and beneath the valley gutter/lead saddle. The disturbance is most likely due to localised defect in the roof covering or maintenance loadings in the valley. The concerns with regard to further falling plaster are understood, but it is unclear how widespread this issue is. No high level inspection has been undertaken to test the plaster – could a spider lift access the interior?
6. A 3D view of the interior is available online (via the [Telford 50 Buildings Project](#) website), where further issues are shown to the north pitch of the nave at the west end. This is again most likely as a result of localised issues with the roof covering.
7. The build up of the roof and ceiling needs investigation. This could be gauged with external opening up off the spider lift/cherry picker. The architect's sketch implies that the ceiling plaster is fixed directly to the underside of the tiling battens, with tiles torched

into place. However, this is not how it appears in the photo of the damaged area – no battens are visible.

8. Overboarding with ply sheets will not only merely mask the issue, but it will destabilise the plaster finish and could lead to rot in the roofing battens as an impervious material is introduced.
9. The proposed works would also have a visible impact, potentially affecting the character of the listed church building – the build-up of 43 mm appears similar to the downstand of the rafters (which appear to be approximately 50 mm with a chamfered edge). Again, it would be useful to survey this area and show the affect.
10. Lastly, it was cautioned that £34,000 is not an inconsiderable sum, and more investigation is needed before agreeing to overboard the entire ceiling. It may prove cheaper in the long run to access and check the ceiling before undertaking localised repairs to the lime plaster ceiling and roof above.

The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

**b) Formal Advice** *(after external formal consultation, if applicable)*

*Grade II\**

4.2.3

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-052133</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620124	Church Name:	Penn: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Penn, St Bartholomew
Applicant Name:	Richard Pithers	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Arrol
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Oct-2013
Proposal:	Restoration of window and addition of memorial glass in choir vestry		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£1,680
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 11th November 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the DAC informal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal with provisos.

**Decision:** Recommend with the following proviso (external formal consultation not applicable):

- In relation to the proposed memorial glass design, by Off the Wall stained glass contractor (January 2021), the parish should liaise with the DAC Organ Adviser (via the DAC Secretary) on the proposed musical notation depicted, as this was still not deemed to be suitable.
- The parish should address this matter prior to advancing to the Public Notice stage on the Online Faculty System.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

### 4.3 Services and M&E

#### a) Informal Advice

None this meeting

#### b) Formal Advice (after external formal consultation, if applicable)

*Grade I*

##### 4.3.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-054586</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620318	Church Name:	Betley: St Margaret
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Betley
Applicant Name:	Jennifer Walton	Quin. Inspector:	Graham Holland
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Jun-2019
Proposal:	To illuminate the East Window and War Memorial Window, internally from external installations, and to install an external light over the chancel door		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second (in this form)	Cost Est:	£2,486
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 11th November 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the DAC informal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

**Decision:** Recommend (external formal consultation not applicable)

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

*Grade II*

##### 4.3.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-055859</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620223	Church Name:	Wolverhampton: St Jude
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	St Jude, Wolverhampton
Applicant Name:	James Sturgeon	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Arrol
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Sep-2016
Proposal:	Installation of new internal lighting with associated wiring and controls		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£118,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme,

following site visit reports by the DAC Lighting Adviser, approved at the 30th November 2016 and 5th July 2017 DAC meetings, in relation to electrics and lighting respectively.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the DAC informal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal. The potential visual impact of the spotlights was raised, as to whether images of the proposed spotlights were included in the application, and this was subsequently confirmed to be the case.

However, it was reiterated that in relation to the electrical condition report dated 25th August 2016, classification code C1 (danger present) indicates that the safety of those using the installation is at risk, and immediate action should have been taken, as indicated in the 2016 site visit report. Similarly, classification code C2 (potentially dangerous) indicates that whilst those using the installation may not be at immediate risk, urgent remedial action should have been taken to remove potential danger. The interim DAC Lighting Adviser commented that the C1 and C2 repair work should be included within this contract, and this was subsequently confirmed to be the case. Separately, the Committee cautioned that the current situation would have bearing on the church's insurance and liability.

It was therefore again recommended that the parish should apply for an interim faculty for the required urgent works to the electrical system, but for the interim faculty application to cover both the electrical and lighting works, as the same contractor is to carry out the remedial electrical work and installation of new lighting.

**Decision:** Recommend (external formal consultation not applicable)

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

#### **4.4 Furniture and Fittings**

##### **a) Informal Advice**

None this meeting

##### **b) Formal Advice**

None this meeting

#### **4.5 Memorials, ABCRs and Churchyards**

##### **a) Informal Advice** (*before external formal consultation, if applicable*)

*Grade II\**

##### 4.5.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-055941</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620560	Church Name:	Shrawardine: St Mary
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Montford with Shrawardine

Applicant Name:	Esther Oates	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jan-2016
Proposal:	Conservation and subsequent display of 18th century maiden's garland		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£920
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and supported the proposal. The Committee confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the DAC informal advice, but offered the following additional advice:

- The parish should give consideration to the proposed security arrangements for the subsequent display of the restored item (i.e. against theft).

The Committee determined that the application should advance to formal consultation with external statutory bodies, prior to receipt of formal DAC advice. As such, formal consultation should be undertaken with the Church Buildings Council, in accordance with rule 4.6(2)(a) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019, in relation to the conservation of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

**b) Formal Advice**

None this meeting

**4.6 Landscaping**

**a) Informal Advice**

None this meeting

**b) Formal Advice** *(after external formal consultation, if applicable)*

*Grade I*

4.6.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-054726</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620274	Church Name:	Eccleshall: Holy Trinity
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Eccleshall
Applicant Name:	Jonathan Jones	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [Simon Smith]
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	19-Oct-2018
Proposal:	Pave the Bishop's Path and add three new memorial stones in the area for the burial of cremated remains (ABCR)		

No. of Times to DAC:	Third	Cost Est:	Not stated [previously £9,120]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 14th October 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the DAC informal advice.

However, the DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that whilst the line of the proposed path has been subject to previous disturbance/deposition, and the depth of excavation will be limited (c. 220 mm), there is some limited potential for disarticulated human remains to be revealed during the initial turf stripping, regrading and preparatory works to enable the sub-base to be laid. As a precautionary measure, it was therefore recommended that an archaeological watching brief is maintained during the initial turf stripping and any other preparatory groundworks to ensure that any such material is appropriately recorded and treated. The PCC should ensure that adequate budgetary provision is made for this work. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal with provisos.

**Decision:** Recommend with the following provisos (external formal consultation not applicable):

- A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the watching brief should be provided by the parish (via the DAC Secretary), for the approval of the DAC Archaeology Adviser.
- The parish should address this matter prior to advancing to the Public Notice stage on the Online Faculty System.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

## 4.7 Bells, Clocks and Organs

### a) Informal Advice (*before external formal consultation, if applicable*)

*Grade II*

#### 4.7.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-055283</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620157	Church Name:	Walsall: St Gabriel, Fullbrook
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	St Gabriel, Fullbrook, Walsall
Applicant Name:	Revd Preb Mark McIntyre	Quin. Inspector:	Graeme Renton
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	22-Mar-2018
Proposal:	Replacement of failing pipe organ with digital hybrid organ		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£31,500
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 11th November 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme, following a site visit report by the DAC Organ Adviser, approved by the DAC at its meeting on 14th October 2020. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the parish response to

the DAC informal advice, noting that the proposal had not been revised, and offered the following additional advice:

1. The DAC concurred with the informal consultation advice of the Church Buildings Council (CBC), received in accordance with rule 4.6(3) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 and provided by delegated authority under section 12(2) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018. That advice, dated 28th January 2021, includes consideration of the parish response to the prior DAC informal advice.
2. Specifically, the DAC restated its previous view, as also expressed by the CBC, that an investigation should be made into the quality and significance of the pipework of the present instrument, to discern what remains from the organ built by William Hill in 1894.
3. The DAC also reaffirmed that the specification from Cotswold Hybrid Organs (September 2020) is too extensive for the church and acoustic, and recognised that the CBC also considers that the stop list of the proposed new organ is out of proportion to the scale of the building, in the number of stops and their scale.
4. The DAC did not agree with the parish's assertion, in its response to the prior DAC informal advice, that the specification is a matter for the parish itself. The DAC is required to give formal (statutory) advice on the proposal to the Diocesan Chancellor (as well as informal advice to the parish), and the final specification for the work forms a significant part of this advice. As such, the DAC recommended that the parish gives greater consideration to the specification, and the points previously raised by the DAC, in relation to this central aspect of both the scheme and application.

The Committee suggested that the parish should address the above points, and that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

**b) Formal Advice** *(after external formal consultation, if applicable)*

*Grade II*

4.7.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-053160</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620541	Church Name:	Kemberton: St Andrew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Kemberton
Applicant Name:	Keith Hodson	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Sep-2017
Proposal:	Addition to and improvement of bells and frame in the church tower		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£55,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 2nd September 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee determined to defer the giving of informal advice in view of a comprehensive written appraisal of the application by the DAC Bell Adviser, which would be sent to the parish prior to wider DAC consideration of the proposal. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for informal

DAC advice. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the written appraisal. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

**Decision:** Recommend (external formal consultation not applicable)

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

## 5. Casework by Delegated Authority

*The following faculty applications, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018 and in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#), on behalf of the DAC*

### 5.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-050880</a>	Church Name:	Basford: St Mark
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Replacement choir and altar floodlights		
DAC Consultee:	Michael Deacon†	Date NoA Issued:	20th December 2020

### 5.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-056362</a>	Church Name:	Woore: St Leonard
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Workshop cleaning and refurbishing of tower clock		
DAC Consultee:	Robin Hutchinson	Date NoA Issued:	23rd December 2020

### 5.3

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-056789</a>	Church Name:	Pelsall: St Michael and All Angels
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Removal of trees		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	19th January 2021

### 5.4

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2019-033176</a>	Church Name:	Lower Penn: St Anne
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Remove existing lighting and wiring, and install new LED downlights and additional light fittings		
DAC Consultee:	Michael Deacon†	Date NoA Issued:	26th January 2021

† Interim DAC Lighting Adviser

**Decision:** The faculty applications processed by delegated authority were noted

**Action:** None

## 6. Registry Matters

## 6.1 Amendment to Faculty

### 6.1.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2018-027907</a>	Case Status:	Awaiting DAC recommendation
Church Code:	620548	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Tong
Applicant Name:	Revd Pippa Thorneycroft	Quin. Inspector:	Sarah Butler
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Aug-2012
Proposal:	Repositioning the alabaster top of the tomb of Sir Humphrey Vernon		
No. of times to DAC:	Second (in this form)	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015		

The DAC previously considered the proposal as originally specified under faculty 2018-027907, granted on 23rd December 2019, following the Chancellor's [judgment](#). A first amendment to that faculty, for the tomb relocation, was granted (but not used by the parish) on 4th August 2020. The DAC last considered the proposal for a second amendment to the faculty as an application for formal advice at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee did not recommend the proposal (reference is made to that DAC-approved minute, and resultant DAC Notification of Advice, for further context). The Chancellor has directed that the DAC (and CBC) must submit additional formal advice by 5th March 2021.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and determined to not object to the proposal with provisos.

**Decision:** Not object for the following principal reason:

- The Statement of Significance and Needs (dated 8th January 2021), now provided, states that the Humphrey Vernon tomb slab will be laid directly over the existing tile floor surface and on a membrane to protect it. There will therefore be no physical intervention into the floor surface of the church and no archaeological impact as a result.

With the following proviso:

- Consideration should be given to lowering the height of the proposed oak rail (currently specified as 500 mm above floor level) which is to surround the relocated tomb, to remove the potential that it may overwhelm to tomb slab itself.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the Diocesan Registry Assistant

### 6.1.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2019-031526</a>	Case Status:	Awaiting DAC recommendation
Church Code:	620548	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Tong
Applicant Name:	Revd Pippa Thorneycroft	Quin. Inspector:	Sarah Butler
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Aug-2012
Proposal:	Changes to the design of the south porch glazed entrance doors		
No. of times to DAC:	Second (in this form)	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015		

The DAC previously considered the proposal as originally specified under faculty 2019-031526, granted on 3rd December 2019. The DAC last considered the proposal for an amendment to that faculty as an application for formal advice at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee did not recommend the proposal (reference is made to that DAC-approved minute, and resultant DAC Notification of Advice, for further context).

At the present meeting, it was understood that the door frame and fixings had already been installed, but incorporating (unapproved) changes recommended by the manufacturer, and DAC advice was additionally being sought on the door handles and manifestation, these not yet installed. In this way, the application was, in fact, in part both a confirmatory faculty and an amendment request.

The DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, but again resolved to not recommend the proposal.

**Decision:** Not recommend for the following principal reasons:

- The Committee did not support the confirmation of the door frame that had already been installed as this was deemed to be too dominant visually and to cause a higher degree of aesthetic impact on the immediate setting. It may be preferable to trim it down, or to paint it out with the masonry, but these mitigations were not unanimously supported. Similarly, the Committee did not support the proposed amendment for a change of door handle material, from oak to stainless steel. The Committee did not consider that consistent information had been provided on the manifestation motifs, where different instances are shown in drawing no. SK1000G-F-0 by Donald Insall Associates and drawing no. 703-E01-A by Structural Glass Solutions, and where the written report by Donald Insall Associates (dated 26th January 2021) refers to the manifestation in printed film in lieu of etched glass, whilst the latter is still referred to in the accompanying quotation by Treasure and Son Ltd (dated 2nd October 2020).

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the Diocesan Registry Assistant

## 6.2 Confirmatory Faculty

### 6.2.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-058360</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620548	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Tong
Applicant Name:	Revd Pippa Thorneycroft	Quin. Inspector:	Sarah Butler
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Aug-2012
Proposal:	Confirmatory faculty for pew alterations in south aisle (re faculty 2019-031526)		
No. of times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC previously considered the proposal, as originally specified under faculty 2019-031526, granted on 3rd December 2019, for formal advice at 30th October 2019 DAC meeting, when the Committee recommended the proposal, following prior consideration for informal advice at 2nd October 2019 DAC meeting.

At the 2nd October 2019 meeting, the Committee supported the then revised scheme for the proposed arrangement of the pews in the south aisle, notably the movement of two medieval pews to the southern end of that aisle and two Victorian pews to the immediate location of the proposed glass entrance doors. It was recognised that the impact of the wider proposal on the localised significance of the medieval pews would be reduced through this revision. Whilst it was noted that the reordering of the various pews in this way would change the 'rhythm' of the current arrangement, the logic of the proposed rearrangement, in terms of mitigating possible impact on significance, was recognised. A newly-presented aspect of the scheme, being a more detailed drawing of the proposed display units either side of the entrance doors, was also supported, pending some minor amendments recommended by the DAC Lighting Adviser.

At the 30th October 2019 meeting, the Committee confirmed the aspects considered at the previous meeting under informal advice. The members were similarly in support of the proposed scheme for the rearrangement of the pews, and, further to the view of the DAC Lighting Adviser, members concurred with the final scheme for the proposed display units.

At the present meeting, the Committee carefully considered the submitted paperwork for the confirmatory faculty, noting that works associated with the south aisle display area had not been executed in accordance with the approved documents under faculty 2019-031526. It was understood from the written report by Donald Insall Associates (dated 26th January 2021) that the incorrect pews had been adapted into the display units, one of these having surviving medieval elements, including a decorative pew end.

The question that needed to be addressed was what the recommendation of the DAC would have been if these proposals had been part of the original faculty petition. The Committee reiterated that it had given lengthy and detailed prior consideration to the arrangement of the pews and adjacent display units, as originally specified, and specifically the medieval pews. The Committee indicated that the unauthorised works, had they not already been carried out, would not have been supported given the harm to the medieval pew. The works as approved (as opposed to those carried out) had been carefully designed to avoid harm to the medieval pews. However, the Committee accepted that the unauthorised works were carried out in error, and also that it is not possible to rectify these unauthorised works, as the damage to the medieval pew cannot be undone entirely.

As such, the Committee determined to not object to the proposal, but on the understanding that this would mean 'not objecting to' the retention of these works, as carried out, rather than condoning the unauthorised works or the resultant damage itself.

**Decision:** Not object for the following principal reasons:

- The DAC accepted that the unauthorised works were carried out in error, and also that it is not possible to rectify these unauthorised works, as the damage to the medieval pew cannot be undone entirely.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the Diocesan Registry Assistant

## **7. Site Visits & Reports** (see item 2.2 above)

*DAC and adviser site visits are postponed from 6th January 2021 due to statutory restrictions on movement and gatherings under the [Health Protection \(Coronavirus, Restrictions\) \(No. 3\) and \(All Tiers\) \(England\) \(Amendment\) Regulations 2021](#); the National Church Institutions are advising against all work-based travel for both staff and volunteers*

### 7.1 **Forthcoming DAC Site Visits**

None this meeting

### 7.2 **DAC Site Visit Reports for Approval**

None this meeting

### 7.3 **DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports for Approval**

None this meeting

### 7.4 **DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports to Note**

7.4.1 Norton in Hales, St Chad (organ), 28th August 2020 (Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat)

**Decision:** The report was noted

**Action:** None

## 8. **Quinquennial Inspector Applications**

*The following applications from PCCs, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, are to be processed in accordance with [section 7](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2020 and the [Lichfield Diocesan Scheme for the Inspection of Churches \(2020\)](#)*

8.1 Market Drayton, St Mary (Grade II\*; CHR ref. [620501](#))

8.2 Seighford, St Chad (Grade II\*; CHR ref. [620378](#))

**Decision:** To process the applications by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to liaise with a DAC architect member and to inform the applicants of the resultant advice, being that of the DAC

## 9. **Any Other Business**

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday, 24th March 2021 at 2.00 pm**

to be held remotely (by written electronic means and online conferencing)

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary

[giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org](mailto:giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org) 01543 622540

Imogen Campbell, Assistant DAC Secretary

[imogen.campbell@lichfield.anglican.org](mailto:imogen.campbell@lichfield.anglican.org) 01543 622569