

Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

MINUTES

A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held by online conferencing on Wednesday 10th April 2024 at 2.00 pm

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The opening prayer was said by the Ven Julian Francis.
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair), the Ven Julian Francis, the Revd Preb Jo Farnworth (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, the Revd Margaret Brighton, Andy Foster, Chris Gill, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Edward Higgins, Dr John Hunt, Adrian Mathias.
In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant), Christine Rier (Church Buildings Support Officer (CBSO)).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: The Ven Dr Sue Weller, the Revd Mary Thomas (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Geoffrey Eze, the Revd Dr David Isiorho, Bryan Martin, Candida Pino, Mark Stewart, Dr Andy Wigley, Peter Woollam.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Adrian Mathias, item 6.4.1.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

2. Matters arising

None this meeting

3. New matters

- 3.1 Standing down of the Revd Andrew Lythall (DAC clergy member), 21st March 2024
- 3.2 [Standing down of the Ven Paul Thomas](#) (Archdeacon of Salop, ex-officio DAC member), 23rd March 2024
- 3.3 [Retirement of the Ven Julian Francis](#) (Archdeacon of Walsall, ex-officio DAC member), 8th May 2024

Decision: The matters were noted; the DAC Chair wished the Archdeacon of Walsall well in retirement, which was echoed by the DAC members

Action: The DAC officers to liaise with the Acting Archdeacons of Walsall ongoing

4. Adviser site visit reports

4.1 Reports for approval

The following reports relate to prospective or submitted proposals which accord with the agreed criteria for a 'major' faculty case, which must be considered by the full DAC and to which the [delegated authority](#) faculty procedure is not applicable

None this meeting

4.2 Reports to note

The following reports relate to prospective or submitted proposals which can be or have been

processed under [List B](#) (Archdeacon's permission) or the [delegated authority](#) faculty procedure, which are not required to be considered by the full DAC

- 4.2.1 Checkley, St Mary and All Saints (trees), 30th January 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.2 Whixall, St Mary (trees), 6th February 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Salop Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.3 Slindon, St Chad (bells), 19th February 2024 (Peter Woollam)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.4 Whitgreave, St John the Evangelist (trees), 26th February 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.5 Willenhall (Short Heath), Holy Trinity (trees), 7th March 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Walsall Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.6 Pelsall, St Michael and All Angels (trees), 7th March 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Walsall Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.7 Great Haywood, St Stephen (trees), 16th March 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Lichfield Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.8 Mavesyn Ridware, St Nicholas (trees), 27th March 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Lichfield Archdeaconry)

Decision: The reports were noted

Action: None

5. Forthcoming DAC site visits

- 5.1 Whitmore, St Mary and All Saints (Grade II*) [quin. inspector: Jennifer Chambers]
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
Provision of accessible toilet in new extension (OFS [2024-094384](#)) – as considered at
21st February 2024 DAC meeting
Date and time: Tuesday 14th May 2024 at 10.00 am

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with the DAC attendees and PCC representatives on the details of the DAC site visit

6.–9. Casework for consideration

The following applications relate to submitted proposals which accord with the agreed criteria for a 'major' faculty case, which must be considered by the full DAC and to which the [delegated authority](#) faculty procedure is not applicable

6. Lichfield Archdeaconry

6.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

6.2 Reorderings and new facilities in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

6.3 Extensive alterations (structural or liturgical) which affect the character of a listed church building

None this meeting

6.4 Conservation, alteration or disposal of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest

a) Informal advice (before external formal consultation, if applicable)

Grade I

6.4.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-091168	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620061	Church Name:	Penkridge: St Michael & All Angels
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Penkridge with Stretton
Applicant Name:	Revd Gregory Yerbury	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Oct-2019 [Andrew Capper]
Proposal:	Make safe (dismantle and lay flat) the chest tomb of William and Mary Hodson (part of a group of four Grade-II listed monuments) in churchyard		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£475
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee supported the principle of the proposal to make the memorial safe, but not the proposed interventions to achieve this. It was considered that the impact of the proposed works on the setting of the listed church building, and the fabric of the listed memorial itself, had not been fully identified and justified. The DAC encouraged the parish to reappraise its Statements of Significance and Needs accordingly.

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Archdeacon of Lichfield (in absentia) had confirmed that they had seen the memorial several times, and that it appears to have further deteriorated over recent months. Previous repairs have made the situation worse. The Harris fencing is unsightly, as it is on the main approach to the south door and main entrance. It was noted that the parish has made efforts to contact the family (as heirs-at-law), as yet to no avail.
2. The DAC also recognised that, from a practical point of view, funding can be an almost insurmountable problem for PCCs when tasked with the repair of so many monuments (Penkridge churchyard possessing a number of listed groups of memorials).
3. However, the Committee did not support the proposal presented. Wherever possible, any safety measures such as fencing or dismantling unstable monuments should be followed by plans to repair and reinstate them. Concern was expressed that if not repaired, but simply dismantled with no plan for reassembly, this monument would be gradually and inexorably lost.
4. Instead, a more extensive photographic record of the chest tomb should be made and submitted, to better understand its structure and how it stands among the group of four

listed memorials. Their significance has been recognised (through statutory listing) as a group, which, as a heritage asset, would be negatively impacted upon by such dismantling, as the very reason for its listing would be negated.

5. This record should best constitute a condition survey, recording the location, dimensions, monument type, inscription, structural condition etc. of the monuments, and which is recommended to be undertaken by the PCC's quinquennial inspector (QI architect).
6. This survey should inform, and provide the basis for evidenced reasoning for, the proposal to be put forward for the treatment of the memorial. Where there is a small difference between the costs proposed for different options, there would be a presupposition for a lasting repair on a like-for-like basis, so as to reinstate and maintain the listed memorial.
7. The Committee affirmed that such a report should provide the justification for any works proposed, and the feasibility of a lasting repair.
8. Lastly, the DAC member nominated by the Local Government Association cautioned that dismantling could only be supported by the Local Planning Authority if specifically required as part of works to repair and reconstitute the memorial, where applicable.

It was determined that, in relation to the current proposal (to dismantle and lay flat), external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), where still applicable.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

6.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

6.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

7. Walsall Archdeaconry

7.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

7.2 Reorderings and new facilities in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

7.3 Extensive alterations (structural or liturgical) which affect the character of a listed church building

None this meeting

7.4 Conservation, alteration or disposal of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest

None this meeting

7.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

7.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

8. Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry

8.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

8.2 Reorderings and new facilities in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

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

Grade II

8.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-083568	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620409	Church Name:	Trent Vale: St John the Evangelist
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Trent Vale
Applicant Name:	Eileen Bithell	Quin. Inspector:	Geoff Hillman
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	07-Nov-2012
Proposal:	Internal restoration and reordering following extensive fire damage at the church (in April 2022)		
No. of Times to DAC:	Fifth	Cost Est:	£1,800,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the internal restoration and reordering proposal (rather than the new east window stained glass alone, as at 21st February 2024 DAC meeting) as an application for informal advice at 22nd November 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. Further to which, the DAC Lighting, Electrics and AV Adviser undertook a site visit on 9th January 2024 (no written report), and a DAC Heating Adviser provided mechanical services design comments, submitted to the parish on 7th March 2024.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the latest Statement of Needs. The Committee continued to support the

principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee confirmed that the matters previously raised by the DAC's informal advice had been considered, and that the current submission includes a wide range of new and updated supporting documents relating to the architectural proposals (plans, elevations and sections), the internal contents, and the mechanical and electrical (M&E) aspects of the reordering scheme. It was noted, also, that the furniture/chairs now form part of the current submission.
2. The DAC expressed the general consensus that the overall design has moved forward. It was reaffirmed that the project was the result of an insurance claim, after fire, within a Grade-II listed interior, and that the current proposal contains fittings which were lost but are sought to be replaced close to like-for-like, such as upholstered chairs and carpet, as well as those which reflect the opportunity for betterment, such as new internal facilities. With these considerations in mind, the following points were highlighted for review.
3. In terms of the architectural elements, a DAC architect member expressed the view that the proposed pod still appears close, visually, to the arcade. The relationship of the pod to the rear of the arch, and the associated relationship of the materials of both, are not fully understood, and should be explained by a series of extra photographs or a drawing showing the elevation looking west.
4. An ambulant stair is shown to the pod first floor (meeting room), which is better than standard, but which will not cater for wheelchair users, limiting amenity of the new space. The DAC member with an accessibility focus expressed the view that the pod should be universally accessible, including by wheelchair and related users. Further to which, the DAC member nominated by the Local Government Association commented that where a feature is new-build, rather than pertaining to historic fabric, particular emphasis should be placed on ensuring that it is wholly accessible by design.
5. The servery hatch is now wider, but a DAC architect member indicated that it still looks too tight for the size of the servery. It was suggested that almost all of the east side should be opened up.
6. The developed drawings for the various screens show joinery that is now better resolved. The view was expressed that it is tidy, rather than inspired.
7. Treske furniture is proposed for the liturgical furnishings. The view was put forward that although of a catalogue design, it appears to match with the proposed welcome desk, as a suite. It is of reasonable quality for a Grade-II church. However, it should be noted that in such a stripped-out interior these pieces will be especially focal.
8. Upholstered chairs are proposed for the congregation, which departs from the Church of England [guidance on seating](#) (2018) in listed churches. However, members acknowledged that similar chairs were present (following a previous grant of faculty) in the pre-fire interior and noted the parish's strong preference for them again in the reordered space. The chairs shown in the latest Statement of Needs may be acceptable in the remodelled interior, although they do not appear to have the cleanest of proportions. Caution was more widely expressed about their suitability or otherwise for stacking, specifically those chairs which are proposed to have arms, so as to maintain the flexibility of the new space.
9. Blue carpet is proposed for the nave and chancel. It was suggested that this may be too domestic in appearance, and will deteriorate over a relatively short period of time, albeit that a similar floor covering was present in the pre-fire interior. It was commented that a

timber, tile or stone floor might be expected, and with some articulation of the large space. Similarly, a vinyl imitation-oak flooring is proposed to other spaces, which does not seem to be of appropriate quality.

10. In relation to the M&E aspects of the reordering scheme, extensive comments on the submitted M&E elements and related considerations, from a technical standpoint, would be provided by respective DAC Advisers, including the DAC Heating Adviser. The Committee agreed that these responses be conveyed to the parish as the additional informal advice of those Advisers.

With these comments in mind, the view was widely supported that, now two years since the fire, the church should move to be reordered and reopened in a timely manner. It was recommended that the additional views of external bodies should now be sought on the current proposal accordingly.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is applicable. The Committee indicated that the application should be resubmitted for external informal consultation (pre-application advice) with Historic England, the Victorian Society, and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

8.3 Extensive alterations (structural or liturgical) which affect the character of a listed church building

None this meeting

8.4 Conservation, alteration or disposal of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest

None this meeting

8.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

8.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

9. Salop Archdeaconry

9.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

9.2 Reorderings and new facilities in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

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

Unlisted

9.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2024-096317	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620534	Church Name:	Weston Rhyn: St John
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Weston Rhyn
Applicant Name:	Revd Stuart Jermy	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood [proposed project architect: David Hughes]
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	14-Sep-2022
Proposal:	Insertion of screen in former chancel		
No. of Times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal (in a different form) as an application for informal advice at 2nd September 2020 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. Prior to which, the DAC previously considered the proposal for informal advice, as an application to amend faculty no. 4490 granted in 2017 (including the chancel screen) (OFS 2019-045103, now superseded), at 12th February 2020 DAC meeting.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the church building had been sufficiently identified and justified. In relation to which, and in accordance with rule 4.4 of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023, Statements of Significance and Needs are not required to be submitted as part of a faculty application for a church building that is not listed.

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee noted that the PCC has explored various solutions and settled on a scheme for which they have prepared three options for comment.
2. The first option is shown on the original drawing (no. 1603-A303 Section 3, dated 19th April 2017) by the quinquennial inspector (QI architect), and maximises the glazed area in a timber screen with two simple vertical mullions and arcaded solid panel at first-floor level. This maximises the visual link between spaces and is a relatively light-touch.
3. The other two options, '7a' and '7b', introduce a variety of horizontal frame members which erodes the simplicity of the design and distracts from the glazed elements.
4. If cost is the overriding factor, whereby the sheets of glass in the original design are sought to be smaller, then the Committee expressed a preference for option '7b' from the latter two options.
5. Overall, however, the DAC confirmed that the PCC should work up the original option, and noted that this may now include double glazed units, as suggested by the PCC. Joinery details should be provided to show how this would be constructed.

6. Should the maximum height of the glass sheets be required to be reduced in height, to facilitate production, then the rail of the arcaded solid panel at first-floor level might instead be raised in height to accommodate, which would also sit more satisfactorily against the spring of the arch.
7. The screen element, when resolved, should be considered alongside the proposed upper floor level and associated access, and the whole scheme put forward next as part of the current faculty application.
8. The Diocesan Registry Assistant (present at the meeting) advised that in view of the nature of the proposed changes, and the distance in time from the grant of the original faculty (2017), the current proposal goes beyond an amendment to faculty and as such should proceed, as it is now, under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023.
9. As such, the parish should have 'due regard' to [guidance on net zero carbon](#) issued by the Church of England. Should advice on heating the new space be required by the parish, then the PCC is invited to request a DAC Heating Adviser [site visit](#) to the church, through the DAC Secretary.

It was determined that external formal consultation under rule 4.5 the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is not applicable, as the church building is not listed. As such, the proposal will receive the formal (statutory) advice of the DAC only. The Committee indicated that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice. However, the PCC should note that this does not remove the requirement for any other secular statutory regulations, where applicable.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

9.3 Extensive alterations (structural or liturgical) which affect the character of a listed church building

None this meeting

9.4 Conservation, alteration or disposal of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest

None this meeting

9.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

9.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

10. Casework by delegated authority to note

10.1 Faculty applications

The following 'minor' faculty cases, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018 and the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy \(Amended October 2023\)](#), on behalf of the full DAC

10.1.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-084016	Church Name:	Stoke-on-Trent: St Peter ad Vincula [Stoke Minster]
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Replacement of wooden inner lobby doors at west end with new glazed doors [confirmation of external formal consultation under delegated authority]		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	8th March 2024

10.1.2

OFS Application Ref:	2023-087359	Church Name:	Whitgreave: St John the Evangelist
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Replace defective drains in churchyard (granted under interim faculty no. 5142)		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	11th March 2024

10.1.3

OFS Application Ref:	2023-088388	Church Name:	Knutton: St Mary
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	To replace the old gas boilers with a new gas boiler		
DAC Consultee:	Malcolm Price	Date NoA Issued:	15th March 2024

10.1.4

OFS Application Ref:	2023-093126	Church Name:	Eccleshall: Holy Trinity
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Disposal of two surplus freestanding pews (one 18ft pew, one small children's pew) currently located at rear of nave north aisle behind a screen		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Foster	Date NoA Issued:	28th March 2024

10.1.5

OFS Application Ref:	2023-092694	Church Name:	Tamworth: St Editha
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Repair of organ chamber stained glass window and surrounding stonework		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	28th March 2024

10.1.6

OFS Application Ref:	N/A – private faculty no. 5163	Church Name:	Norton Canes: St James
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Introduction of non-conforming memorial (two proposed designs) in churchyard		
DAC Consultee:	Ven Dr Sue Weller (lead) (Archdeacons corporately)	Date NoA Issued:	28th March 2024

10.1.7

OFS Application Ref:	2023-092687	Church Name:	Sandon: All Saints
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Introduction of a metal maintenance shed in churchyard		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	28th March 2024

10.1.8

OFS Application Ref:	2023-089538	Church Name:	Whitgreave: St John the Evangelist
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Felling an ash tree in the churchyard following drains survey		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	28th March 2024

10.1.9

OFS Application Ref:	2024-094951	Church Name:	Leaton: Holy Trinity
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Like-for-like replacement of boiler and associated equipment (under insurance), due to flooding of boiler room		
DAC Consultee:	Malcolm Price	Date NoA Issued:	28th March 2024

10.1.10

OFS Application Ref:	2023-091602	Church Name:	Wellington: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Repair of vault access to cast iron tomb of Samuel Corbett (1885) (referred to in church list description but not separately listed) within churchyard		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	29th March 2024

10.1.11

OFS Application Ref:	2024-093933	Church Name:	Penkridge: St Michael & All Angels
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Clean, repair and renovate the church organ		
DAC Consultee:	Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat	Date NoA Issued:	29th March 2024

10.1.12

OFS Application Ref:	2023-087252	Church Name:	Stafford: St Mary
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	To display the freedom of the borough scroll of the Stafford branch of the Royal British Legion in the north transept (set aside for war memorials)		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Foster	Date NoA Issued:	29th March 2024

Decision: The faculty applications processed by delegated authority were noted

Action: None

10.2 Quinquennial inspector applications

The following applications from PCCs, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield Diocesan Scheme for the Inspection of Churches](#) (Amended June 2022) and the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (Amended October 2023), on behalf of the full DAC

10.2.1 Kingsley, St Werburgh (Grade II), Simon Smith proposed inspector

Decision: The quinquennial inspector application processed by delegated authority was noted

Action: None

11. Any other business

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 5th June 2024 at 2.00 pm**
to be held ***in person (not by online conferencing)*** in the
Reeve Room at St Mary's House, Lichfield

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary
giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 221152

Helen Cook, Assistant DAC Secretary
helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 221155