

# Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

## MINUTES

*A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held by online conferencing  
on Wednesday 21st February 2024 at 2.00 pm  
and chaired by the Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair)*

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The opening prayer was said by the Revd Preb Terry Bloor (Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent).
- 1.2 Present: The Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair), the Ven Julian Francis, the Ven Dr Sue Weller, the Revd Preb Jo Farnworth (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Mary Thomas (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, the Revd Margaret Brighton, Andy Foster, Chris Gill, Dr John Hunt, Candida Pino, Bryan Martin, Adrian Mathias, Mark Stewart, Peter Woollam.  
In attendance: Nigel de Gaunt-Alcoat (DAC Organ Adviser), Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Rosie Nightingale (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Revd Geoffrey Eze, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Edward Higgins, the Revd Dr David Isiorho, the Revd Andrew Lythall, Dr Andy Wigley.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Adrian Mathias, items 4.1.1, 7.2.1, 7.4.2, 9.3.1; the Revd Andrew Lythall, items 4.1.1, 9.3.1.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

### 2. Matters arising

- 2.1 Coming into effect of the [Faculty Jurisdiction \(Amendment\) Rules 2023 \(Explanatory Note\)](#) on 1st January 2024 – provision for contested heritage
- 2.2 Appointment of Dr John Hunt (Honorary Research Fellow, University of Birmingham) as DAC member appointed after consultation with Historic England (statutory role on the DAC), following standing down of Julie Taylor (HE Inspector), 19th January 2024
- 2.3 Commencement of Christine Rier in 3-year post of Church Buildings Support Officer (CBSO) within the diocesan [Church Buildings Team](#), as part of the national Church of England [Buildings for Mission](#) initiative (parish support), 15th January 2024

**Decision:** The matters were noted; the DAC chair warmly welcomed Dr John Hunt to the meeting

**Action:** None

### 3. New matters

- 3.1 Appointment of the Revd Margaret Brighton (PtO, Rugeley Deanery) as DAC member with an accessibility focus, following standing down of the Revd Zoe Heming (Diocesan Enabling All Adviser), 12th February 2024

**Decision:** The matter was noted; the DAC chair warmly welcomed the Revd Margaret Brighton to the meeting

**Action:** None

## 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*

- 4.1.1 Tamworth, St Editha (heating), 21st November 2023 (Peter Bemrose)  
(Lichfield Archdeaconry)

**Decision:** The report was approved without amendment

**Action:** The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the report to the parish

### 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 Stretton w Claymills, St Mary (organ), 22nd November 2023 (Nigel de Gaunt Allcoat)  
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.2 Criftins-by-Ellesmere, St Matthew (trees), 27th November 2023 (Andy Smith)  
(Salop Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.3 Pheasey, St Chad (heating), 28th November 2023 (Peter Bemrose)  
(Walsall Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.4 Upper Tean, Christ Church (bells), 29th November 2023 (Peter Woollam)  
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.5 Stone, St Michael (organ), 18th December 2023 (Nigel de Gaunt Allcoat)  
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.6 Castle Church, St Mary (trees), 5th January 2024 (Andy Smith)  
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.7 Shawbury, St Mary the Virgin (trees), 6th January 2024 (Andy Smith)  
(Salop 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](#)) (item 7.2.2 below)  
Date and time: To be confirmed

**Action:** The Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with the DAC attendees and PCC representatives on the date and time 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*

<b>6. Walsall Archdeaconry</b>
--------------------------------

**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**

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

*Unlisted*

6.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-086932</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620151	Church Name:	<a href="#">Pheasey: St Chad</a> (Beacon Church)
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	St Chad Pheasey
Applicant Name:	Revd Chris Lane	Quin. Inspector:	Sarah Baldwin [project architect: Alexander Lane]
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	19-Apr-2023
Proposal:	Creation of youth, families and community coffee shop, and installation of double glazing and possible solar PV panels		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£100,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 26th July 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC noted a report (without site visit) on the scheme by a DAC Heating Adviser (item 4.2.3 above). In relation to which, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents.

The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the church building had not yet been fully identified and justified, pending further development and submission of the scheme for formal (statutory) DAC advice next. However, in relation to which, and in accordance with rule 4.4 of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, 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 Archdeacon of Walsall continued to commend the proposal, which is considered to fit well with the parish’s vision for revitalisation of the church and a deeper reach into the community.
2. In support of these comments, a DAC architect member reaffirmed that there are no specific issues with the proposed alterations. However, it was noted that the updated drawings submitted by the project architect are at the ‘concept design’ stage.
3. As such, additional explanatory written information and drawn details, including a specification and working drawings, will be required for consideration at the formal DAC advice stage.

4. In relation to which, it was recommended that the project architect and parish should consult the 'Formal advice' section of the [faculty supporting documents](#) web page of the diocesan website for guidance on the level of detail that should next be submitted.
5. With reference to the possible solar PV panels, and associated heating considerations, the DAC Heating Adviser who undertook the recent report (above) has provided further comments on these aspects and related considerations, from a technical standpoint.
6. These will be forwarded to the parish as the additional informal advice of that Adviser, being comments approved by the DAC.

It was determined that external formal consultation under rule 4.5 the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 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 any requirement for planning permission or other secular statutory consent, where applicable. In such cases, the PCC must confirm with the Local Planning Authority whether planning permission or other consent is needed.

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

#### 6.2.2

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-093044</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620190	Church Name:	<a href="#">West Bromwich: Holy Trinity</a>
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Holy Trinity, West Bromwich
Applicant Name:	Revd Neil Robbie	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper (retd) [project architect: Jeremy Bell]
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	02-Apr-2019
Proposal:	Reordering to improve access and heating		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£1,026,330
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The Committee last considered the proposal as a DAC site visit report, and a separate but related site visit report by a DAC Heating Adviser, approved at 20th July 2022 DAC meeting. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents.

The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and setting of the church building had not yet been fully identified and justified, pending further development and submission of the scheme for formal (statutory) DAC advice in due course. However, in relation to which, and in accordance with rule 4.4 of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, 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 Archdeacon of Walsall commended the proposal, in connection with the parish's vision for improvement of community access and stewardship of the environment.
2. The DAC member with an accessibility focus expressed the view that the overall scheme focuses positively on access, with sufficient room in the proposed entrance layout for multiple users to gain equal access to the church building at one time.

3. In support of these comments, the Committee confirmed that the need for the proposed changes can be understood. However, it was considered that the impact of the proposal requires further assessment.
4. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that West Bromwich, Holy Trinity is a significant unlisted heritage asset (designed by Samuel Dawkes of Cheltenham, 1840–41), which has received a notable internal reordering in the 1990s.
5. The DAC member supported the principle of the proposal, but expressed the cautionary view that the design of the proposed extension, and inclusion of internal features such as a curved glazed screen, do not relate to the form or nature of the original church building.
6. A DAC architect member further commented that the scheme, including such details as the curved glazed screen, may not be achievable within the proposed budget.
7. The suitability of glass as an external material also, in terms of security (including possible susceptibility to vandalism), was separately queried.
8. The Committee affirmed that further detailing is needed to resolve some key issues and to make clearer the rationale for the design. Additional written and drawn information should be provided by the project architect on the following (and associated) points:
  - Impact of path works on burials and trees, the tarmac finish, and details of any landscaping to be undertaken
  - Detailing of the new glazed entrance and roof
  - Detailing at junctions of new works and the existing building
  - Arrangement and alterations to tall windows bisected by the roof
  - Thickness of the roof construction appears inadequate – required insulation values
  - Manifestation detailing to internal and external glass
  - The new entrance into the church removes a structural buttress – is this safe? Would it not be better to fit within structural bay? (A structural engineer should confirm)
  - Relationship of internal glazed screen with sloping ceiling
  - Detailing of internal tea/coffee point, toilets and partitions
  - Detailing of lift and balustrade down to adjacent hall
  - Audio-visual systems, electrical installations, drainage etc. require detailing
  - Finalisation of internal alterations (selection of option) to hall
9. With reference to the heating proposals, a DAC Heating Adviser has provided more extensive comments on these aspects and related considerations, from a technical standpoint.
10. These will be forwarded to the parish as the additional informal advice of that Adviser, being comments approved by the DAC.

It was determined that external formal consultation under rule 4.5 the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 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 suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. However, the PCC should note that this does not remove any requirement for planning permission or other secular statutory consent, where applicable. In such cases, the PCC must check with the Local Planning Authority whether planning permission or other consent is needed.

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

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

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**

None this meeting

### **6.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building**

None this meeting

### **6.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry**

#### **6.6.1 Faculty amendment request: Penn, St Bartholomew (Grade II\*)**

Proposed amendment to faculty [2018-026971](#) (original faculty granted on 20th June 2019): to leave the 94 headstones that have not been re-erected flat on the ground

The Committee last considered the original proposal as an application for formal advice at 23rd January 2019 DAC meeting. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the proposed amendment to the faculty granted, and the updated supporting documents.

It was noted that the faculty originally allowed for 'the reinstatement of graveyard memorials', and specifically that '41 memorials will be reinstated, where necessary providing a sound base; 109 will be partially sunk into the ground so that one-third of the memorial is below ground leaving the inscription visible; 32 memorials to be laid flat into the ground flush with ground level; the kerbs to 44 memorials to be tidied and replaced in a symmetrical manner.'

The DAC observed that the proposed amendment relates to the group of 109 memorials (above), and that, of those, 94 are sought to be left laid flat, i.e. they have not been re-erected under the faculty to date. It was noted that the present contractor (memorial mason) has suggested that the re-erection process could harm or damage the memorials. The PCC has resolved to leave these headstones flat on the ground, being of the view that families were likely not now tending them.

After detailed discussion, the Committee suggested that the Archdeacon of Walsall might undertake an Archdeacon's site visit to the churchyard, as a fact-finding mission, to note the restitution works already completed and those not yet undertaken, in order to contextualise the current request and best appraise the suitability of the proposal, prior to wider DAC consideration of the faculty amendment for formal DAC advice.

Specifically, it was recommended that the Archdeacon might ascertain whether the proposal is for the 94 memorials to be laid flat into the ground, flush with ground level, akin to the group of 32 memorials under the original faculty, rather than being left resting on the ground and thereby causing a potential trip hazard.

**Decision:** Defer

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the Diocesan Registry Assistant; the Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with the Archdeacon's Office to co-ordinate an Archdeacon's site visit

## 7. Stoke-upon-Trent 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

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

*Grade I*

##### 7.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2021-065626</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620435	Church Name:	<a href="#">Burton-on-Trent: St Modwen</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	St Modwen Burton-on-Trent
Applicant Name:	Geoffrey Brown	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	27-Nov-2018
Proposal:	Internal reordering of both East and West ends		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third	Cost Est:	£250,000 [original scheme]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The Committee last considered the proposal as a DAC site visit report approved at 4th October 2023 DAC meeting. In that report, the Committee confirmed the view of Historic England and the Georgian Group, being the informal (pre-application) advice of those bodies, that a suitable compromise appeared to have been reached on all matters within the reordering proposal apart from the glazed screen, proposed to span and enclose the rear of the nave under the west gallery, in terms of the mitigations made to both the original and subsequent versions of the proposal. As such, the resulting public benefit of the scheme, without the screen, could be argued to outweigh the harm proposed to the special character of the listed church building.

However, as with the Committee's prior informal advice concerning the level of visual impact and impact on fabric of the glazed screen, and noting the responses of the external bodies consulted, the DAC was at that time divided in its support for the screen within the scheme. In relation to which, the DAC was not convinced that the resulting public benefit would outweigh the harm of this aspect. In order to inform the final view of the DAC, and thereby to reach a resolution on the remaining matter of the screen, additional steps were suggested to be undertaken by the parish.

The DAC site visit report recorded that these suggested steps were not pre-empting any future decision of the DAC, but were intended to advise the parish on how it may expand on its reasoning for the glazed screen, so as also to inform the final view of the Committee. In addition to which, the DAC confirmed that the parish should next seek the informal advice of the Church Buildings Council (CBC), on the application in its amended and fully-described form (i.e. after addressing the points raised by the DAC). As such, it was advised that the scheme to be consulted on should include the glazed screen under the west gallery.

Consultation is required with the CBC where proposals involve the alteration of a Grade I (or II\*) listed building to such an extent as would be likely to result in *harm* to its character as a building

of special architectural or historic interest. The DAC recommended that such consultation should accordingly be undertaken, in view of the designation by Historic England and the Georgian Group that the incorporation of the glazed screen would be harmful to the listed church building. Following this consultation, the scheme was to be resubmitted for final informal DAC advice.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including a revised drawn plan (no. 36-307-06 Rev C, dated November 2023) and reworked visuals of the proposed screen (drawing nos 36-307-SK10 and 36-307-13 Rev A, dated January–February 2024) by the QI architect, a written response from the parish to the suggested steps in the DAC site visit report, and the informal consultation response of the Church Buildings Council (following a CBC site visit in December 2023, dated January 2024).

The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal for a reordering within the church, and to recognise the pastoral and missional case for this. After extensive discussion, the DAC determined that it could support the latest mitigating (compromise) version of the scheme, as proposed through the QI architect's amended drawn plan (no. 36-307-06 Rev C, as above).

However, the Committee resolved that the matters relating to the glazed screen previously raised by the Committee's informal advice and site visit report, and those by the external statutory consultees, including most recently the CBC, had not been sufficiently and convincingly addressed by the parish and QI architect, such that the DAC could not fully support the inclusion of the glazed screen within the final proposal for reordering.

In reaching this view, the Committee highlighted the following points:

1. None of the submitted examples of glazed screens in other highly-listed church buildings were deemed to be directly comparable: the Sutton Coldfield screen is in a corner under a side gallery, not full-width; the Tamworth screen is steel-framed and in an arch; the Birmingham example is just glazed doors (not at all similar); the Knutsford screen has prominent timber-framing; the Small Heath screen is a mix of framed and structural glass, and is in a tall arch.
2. However, the visualisations of the proposed screen for Burton, St Modwen are fairly photorealistic, and were deemed to be more helpful in the process. A DAC architect member expressed the view that the visuals appear to show that the design is probably as ethereal as it could be.
3. The Committee noted that the justification provided for the scheme includes the parish explanation that the new west-end space is required to be discrete, secure, and to be independently heated and lit. However, the parish's rationale does not include sufficient detail of the activities that the parish envisages with respect to the above qualities.
4. The parish has not sought advice from a DAC Heating Adviser or DAC Lighting Adviser (as suggested in the DAC site visit report), but where M&E services are highly relevant to the parish's stated needs for the new west-end space.
5. Separately, and additionally, the DAC Organ Adviser confirmed their previously-expressed concern, now further based on the latest visualisations, regarding the close proximity of the glazed screen in relation to the highly significant Wyatt organ case, in the same vertical plane.

Taking these points together, the DAC recommended that the parish should give consideration to the CBC's suggestion that the screen might be omitted from the present proposal. This aspect



might perhaps be sought by way of a separate and subsequent faculty application, when further information in support of the case, or otherwise, can be gathered by the parish, in relation to the use of the church building when all other aspects of the reordering are in operation.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. The Committee indicated that the application should be resubmitted for external formal consultation with the Church Buildings Council, Historic England, the Georgian Group, 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

*Grade II\**

### 7.2.2

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2024-094384</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620427	Church Name:	<a href="#">Whitmore: St Mary &amp; All Saints</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Whitmore
Applicant Name:	John Inchley	Quin. Inspector:	Jennifer Chambers
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jun-2021
Proposal:	Provision of accessible toilet in new extension		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

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, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and setting of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified. The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance and Needs, and suggested that the parish might consult the Church of England [guidance on Statements](#).

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

1. The Committee affirmed that the need for the proposed accessible toilet and refreshment facilities at the church is clear.
2. The application includes an options appraisal, which considers the potential position for the facilities. However, one alternative option appears to be missing: an internal unit of toilet and refreshment point at the nave west end. This could be Part M-compliant and would give level access, as well as being less expensive to construct. This option would, however, cause the loss of internal seating space.
3. The Committee noted, from the options put forward by the QI architect, that the solution preferred by the PCC is an externally-accessed toilet in the north-east corner of the church.
4. The DAC considered this option to be potentially feasible, but cautioned that the detailing is of some concern. The new extension encroaches on to both adjoining buttresses. These are key elements of the historic fabric and should be kept exposed and unencumbered by the extension.

5. These buttresses appear to be absorbed into the extension due to the size of the Part M-compliant toilet facility. The DAC queried whether the timber framing/walling could be reduced, or consideration given to a smaller toilet facility in this location.
6. The Committee indicated that it would be useful to receive an existing plan marked up with any existing drainage, electric intake, or water supply information. A wider context plan would also aid understanding of key views etc.
7. The DAC recommended that the parish make contact with the Local Planning Authority on the separate matter of planning permission for any external development works (where applicable).

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee suggested that a DAC site visit should be undertaken, to meet with parish representatives and the quinquennial inspector (QI architect) at the church. The revised scheme, when further developed following the DAC site visit, should then be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant; the Assistant DAC Secretary to co-ordinate a DAC site visit (item 5.1 above)

### *Grade II*

#### 7.2.3

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-083568</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620409	Church Name:	<a href="#">Trent Vale: St John the Evangelist</a>
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) – new east window stained glass only for this DAC meeting		
No. of Times to DAC:	Fourth [first for glass]	Cost Est:	£1,800,000 [whole reordering]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the internal restoration and reordering proposal as an application for informal advice at 22nd November 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. However, at the current meeting, the DAC gave consideration to an additional matter within the wider scheme, being the proposal for a new (replacement) stained glass window in the chancel east window.

The east window stained glass was last referred to, but not considered, in informal advice at 5th April 2023 DAC meeting, when the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies recommended that the significant original stained glass by Gordon Forsyth, lost in the fire (apart from one fragment, to be retained), should be replaced with a newly-commissioned stained glass window of similarly national quality, perhaps by way of a limited competition by invitation.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the proposed glass design, the parish's design brief and designer's rationale, and details of the process through which the parish had procured the current designer and glass design.

The Committee also gave consideration to the informal advice received from the Church Buildings Council (CBC) in accordance with rule 4.6(3) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, which consultation ‘must be undertaken in any case where the Diocesan Advisory Committee considers that its advice would be of particular assistance’. Such consultation was undertaken in part as the Lichfield DAC does not have a DAC Stained Glass Adviser. The DAC has taken account of the informal advice of the CBC in the giving of its own informal advice on the parish’s proposal.

After extensive discussion, the Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, for a new stained glass commission to replace the window lost by fire at the church. Furthermore, the DAC recognised that the parish, and the local community surveyed in the process, have expressed positive support for the new window design, and that the parish considers the new work to reflect the heritage of both the church and its locality.

This view was reflected by some DAC members (clergy and lay), who considered the design to be a light, clear, accessible arrangement, and that the principal theme, Christ blessing the children, is well executed and properly multicultural. The Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent commended the visual variety within the design, noting that the window’s primary aim is to tell a story of faith within a local context, and which might appeal especially to young visitors to the church. The DAC member with an accessibility focus suggested that consideration could further be given to one of the children being depicted as a wheelchair user, or perhaps a child with Down’s syndrome, in order to be even more representative and welcoming.

However, other DAC members (similarly clergy and lay) cautioned that the current design does not sufficiently reflect, or resonate with, the specific context in which it is to be situated, and that it does not fulfil the Committee’s previous advice that that new window should be of similarly national quality as the Forsyth design which has been lost. The standard of the new design was also not deemed to be equivalent to other examples of work submitted by the proposed designer. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies drew comparison with the submitted example of the Transfiguration window in the Catholic church of Manchester, St Chad (Cheetham Hill) (Grade II [listed](#)), with its unified composition, dramatic glazing and vibrant colour.

Overall, in relation to these comments, the Committee was relatively split on the current proposed design for the Trent Vale window, including its subject matter and execution. As a way forward, the DAC recommended that the parish might revisit its design brief, with a view to simplifying or omitting some of the visual references within the scene, in order to create a bolder, more iconographic vision (such as the Transfiguration window referred to above), but which still reflected its local setting.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is applicable. However, formal consultation will not be required with the Church Buildings Council (CBC) under rule 4.6(2)(b), for the introduction of new art work in a Grade I or II\* listed building (i.e. Trent Vale, St John the Evangelist is Grade II). The Committee suggested that the scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

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

#### 7.2.4

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2021-064657</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620234	Church Name:	<a href="#">Calton: St Mary the Virgin</a>

Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	St Mary, Calton
Applicant Name:	Maxene Middleton	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Parsons
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Oct-2020
Proposal:	Creation of rear extension for toilet and kitchenette, and accessible ramp to south porch		
No. of Times to DAC:	Fourth	Cost Est:	£65,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 4th October 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, and confirmed that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and setting of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

The DAC also confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had substantially been addressed. However, in relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following final advice:

1. The Committee confirmed that a structural engineer's report now formed part of the application paperwork, as requested by the DAC, which appears to indicate that in principle the extension can be built without compromising the existing building. It was noted that the report also advises that detailed engineer's proposals will be needed in due course.
2. Details of the proposed lantern to the overthrow have also now been provided by the QI architect. However, the Committee did caution that the height of the overthrow appears to follow a domestic door head height (2.11 m), which may cause issues of access in relation to head-height and coffin-bearers. It was recommended that the arch should be lifted on 200–300 mm of verticals on either side.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. Notwithstanding that external informal consultation responses have been received, the Committee indicated that following approval by a DAC architect member of an amended drawing of the overthrow, to be supplied by the QI architect, the final revised application should be resubmitted for external formal consultation with the Victorian Society and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

The Committee resolved that the giving of formal DAC advice following external consultation, where no formal objections are raised by external consultees and where no 'material changes' are made to the proposal (rules 4.7–4.8 of the 2019 Rules), could be processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#). Where these criteria cannot be met, the application will return for full Committee consideration at the next DAC meeting following receipt of the external formal consultation responses.

In relation to the current submission, the Committee would recommend the proposal with provisos.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant, and to process the giving of formal DAC advice by delegated authority through consultation with a DAC architect member

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

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**

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

Grade II\*

7.4.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-091038</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620427	Church Name:	<a href="#">Whitmore: St Mary &amp; All Saints</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Whitmore
Applicant Name:	John Inchley	Quin. Inspector:	Jennifer Chambers
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jun-2021
Proposal:	Repair and refurbishment of the tiled reredos		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£7,000
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, 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. It was noted that the Lichfield DAC does not include a professional conservator among its members. As such, the Committee resolved to seek the advice of such a professional, in relation to such important conservation work, encompassing the repair and refurbishment of the tiled reredos.
2. As such, informal consultation with the Church Buildings Council (CBC) had been undertaken prior to the present meeting, in accordance with rule 4.6(3) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, which consultation 'must be undertaken in any case where the Diocesan Advisory Committee considers that its advice would be of particular assistance'.
3. The Committee accordingly confirmed the informal advice from the CBC, received from a Church Buildings Officer (Conservation) under delegated authority, in the giving of its own informal advice on the parish's proposal.
4. In relation to which, the DAC supported the view of the CBC that the proposals from the QI architect, as Chambers Conservation, are well documented and appropriate.

5. However, more detail may be required around the causes of the deterioration, such as whether the cracking is due to some structural movement, which may or may not be active, and whether there are any issues with moisture infiltration that would lead to salt efflorescence, and whether this has been addressed.
6. It was observed that the contractor is not an accredited conservator, which is acceptable in this case where the conservation-accredited QI architect is involved and knows the quality of their work.
7. Some concern was expressed with the grout (BAL) suggested, as it is cement-based, and additional clarification was being sought from the CBC advisers on this matter. Furthermore, it is important that water-based treatments are not used on the alabaster.
8. With regard to the proposed grout and adhesive, a DAC architect member additionally queried whether the QI architect had considered using Ty-Mawr products (i.e. Adhere Cal, suitable for tiling, and entirely lime-based).

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 formal consultation with the Church Buildings Council, in accordance with rule 4.6(2)(a) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, in relation to the conservation of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

The Committee resolved that the giving of formal DAC advice following external consultation, where no formal objections are raised by external consultees and where no 'material changes' are made to the proposal (rules 4.7–4.8 of the 2022 Rules), could be processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#). Where these criteria cannot be met, the application will return for full Committee consideration at the next DAC meeting following receipt of the external formal consultation responses.

In relation to the current submission, the Committee would recommend the proposal with provisos.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant, and to process the giving of formal DAC advice by delegated authority through consultation with a DAC architect member

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

*Grade I*

7.4.2

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-083428</a>	Case Status:	Application in formal consultation
Church Code:	620377	Church Name:	<a href="#">Sandon: All Saints</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Sandon with Burston
Applicant Name:	Kenneth Pemberton	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Dec-2020
Proposal:	Fabric conservation works (project in NLHF Development Stage)		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second (first as formal)	Cost Est:	£263,000
Formal Consultations:	Church Buildings Council (CBC); Historic England (both no objections)		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 26th July 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee’s informal advice had been addressed.

The DAC carefully appraised the external formal consultation responses, and noted that no objections had been raised for consideration in the DAC’s own formal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal with provisos.

**Decision:** Recommend with the following proviso:

- The programme of archaeological work must be carried out in complete accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for an archaeological watching brief by Henshaw & Associates dated January 2024.

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

### 7.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

### 7.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

<b>8. Salop Archdeaconry</b>
------------------------------

#### 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

None this meeting

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

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

*Grade I*

##### 8.3.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2024-093687</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620563	Church Name:	<a href="#">Shrewsbury: Holy Cross</a> [Shrewsbury Abbey]
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Holy Cross Shrewsbury
Applicant Name:	Hugh Peate	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall



Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Jun-2022
Proposal:	Suspended floor in choir vestry, and two screens with lockable doors		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£25,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

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

However, the DAC concurred with the view of the DAC Organ Adviser that it is not advisable to have carpet near the organ, and specifically, in this context, its workings, especially as the organ has been recently rebuilt. The Adviser cautioned that even a very small amount of fluff/dust can have an adverse effect on the instrument. Carpet is also sound-absorbent, which is similarly detrimental for musical instruments. As such, the DAC determined that the proposed suspended floor should not be carpeted, and the Committee's support for the proposal is based on this amendment being made within the parish's proposal. Instead, a solid timber floor (at best), or a finish which is dust-free (at least), should be put forward for consideration.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee indicated that following approval by a DAC architect member of an amended drawing of the floor, to be supplied by the QI architect, the final revised application should be resubmitted for external formal consultation with Historic England and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

The Committee resolved that the giving of formal DAC advice following external consultation, where no formal objections are raised by external consultees and where no 'material changes' are made to the proposal (rules 4.7–4.8 of the 2023 Rules), could be processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#). Where these criteria cannot be met, the application will return for full Committee consideration at the next DAC meeting following receipt of the external formal consultation responses.

In relation to the current submission, the Committee would recommend the proposal with provisos.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant, and to process the giving of formal DAC advice by delegated authority through consultation with a DAC architect member

*Grade II\**

### 8.3.2

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-087735</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620546	Church Name:	<a href="#">Stockton: St Chad</a>
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Stockton
Applicant Name:	Gavin Hamilton	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jun-2018



Proposal:	Roofing works: interim measure to repair the nave roof and to replace the felt on the north transept and the inadequate lead covering on the south transept and the gutters behind the parapets with fibreglass		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£46,560
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. It was noted that Stockton, St Chad is on Historic England [Heritage at Risk Register](#), and that there is active water ingress at the church. The Committee supported 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.

However, the Committee asserted that this view is dependent on revision of the proposal, to omit reference to the possibility of removing the roof parapets and changing the gutter and roof edge detailing to the nave and transepts (based on the precedent set in the 1960s, where the parapets to the chancel were removed). The remaining parapets are highly characteristic, and their removal is no basis for making decisions on repairs at this time.

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

1. The like-for-like localised repair of the nave roof tiling is uncontroversial.
2. The QI architect indicates that the felt to the north transept is still operational, so it does not seem sensible to replace it at this time with another 'temporary' covering.
3. However, the proposed GRP (fibreglass) system would not be breathable, so there are concerns about condensation and moisture build-up beneath. Related to which, a DAC architect expressed the view that GRP is a long-term, rather than temporary, solution, which would be accordingly detrimental.
4. It is not clear that the QI architect has considered other more affordable options, such as stainless steel or possibly aluminium – or even the use of more roofing felt (rather than GRP), if finance is the overriding factor – noting that neither the gutters nor the low-pitched transept roofs are prominent from ground level.

As such, the DAC determined that the proposed roofing works should not incorporate fibreglass, and the Committee's support for the proposal is based on this amendment being made within the parish's proposal. Instead, alternative options, as referred to above, should be put forward for consideration.

On which basis, it was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable. The Committee indicated that following approval by a DAC architect member of amended details of the proposal, to be supplied by the QI architect, the final revised application should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice. The Committee resolved that the giving of formal DAC advice could be processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#).

In relation to the current submission (i.e. fibreglass), the Committee would not recommend the proposal.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant, and to process the giving of formal DAC advice by delegated authority through consultation with a DAC architect member

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

None this meeting

**8.4 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 II\*

8.4.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-090253</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620608	Church Name:	<a href="#">Prees: St Chad</a>
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Prees
Applicant Name:	Phil Hodges	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	25-Mar-2022
Proposal:	Conservation repairs to the 'Battlefield' stained glass window		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£70,000
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, 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 supported the proposal for isothermal protective glazing.
2. However, in relation to the Holy Well Glass condition report (2023), a DAC architect member questioned whether the proposed 7 mm-wide slit is sufficient to maintain good air velocity in the interspace, to lessen the tendency for condensation to form on the inner face of the protective glazing.
3. The vertical bars in the plan and section are not described in the body of the report. It was queried what they will be made of and what the proposed fixings are going to be like.
4. It was also queried whether the possibility of carrying out mortar repairs to some of the less-deteriorated stones had been considered. Responses to these enquiries should be made prior to the advancement of the application.

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 formal consultation with the Church Buildings Council (CBC), in accordance with rule 4.6(2)(a) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, in relation to the conservation of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, 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

**8.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building**

None this meeting

**8.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry**

None this meeting

<b>9. Lichfield Archdeaconry</b>
----------------------------------

**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**

None this meeting

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

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

*Grade I*

9.3.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2024-093961</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620104	Church Name:	<a href="#">Tamworth: St Editha</a>
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Tamworth
Applicant Name:	John Mulvey	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Dec-2020
Proposal:	Installation of statues at nave clerestory level (principle of proposal)		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£60,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee did not unanimously support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified. The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance and Needs, and recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England [guidance on Statements](#).

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

1. The Committee affirmed that Tamworth, St Editha (Grade I listed) is a major medieval church with Anglo-Saxon remains and extensive work of the late 14th century and 15th century in Perpendicular style.
2. It was noted that the nave has a clerestory with three-light windows, and that between each window is a niche, with an ogee arch and a small stool, for a sculpted figure. The niches, five on each side, would have contained sculptures when the nave was built in the 15th century, but were probably removed at the Reformation. The current proposal seeks to fill these niches with newly-commissioned statues.
3. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies emphasised that this is a very fine building, and the statues will need to be of high quality to fit appropriately into it.
4. The member further commented that the nature of the niches, being vertical, quite narrow, and with small stools, almost enforces the choice of vertical standing figures. It will be difficult to accommodate two figures (Ruffin and Wulfhad, as proposed) in one niche.
5. The DAC affirmed that the programme needs to be carefully considered. The medieval statues were almost certainly of saints thought appropriate to Tamworth. Tamworth had a very important early history as a town and the small amount of Anglo-Saxon work in the church is the only remaining pre-Conquest work in the town above ground.
6. Some of the proposed statues are highly appropriate: Wulfhere who founded the church, Ruffin and Wulfhad, and Offa who was known for his faith and made a pilgrimage to Rome. Some of the others are purely historical without any immediate connection to the building, and as such their choice was queried. The later medieval period is also very important at Tamworth, to which consideration should also be given.
7. An alternative view was offered by a DAC architect member, as to the suitability of seeking to introduce statuary produced in modernity (replicas), into a purely medieval space, but which reflect pre-Reformation history. It was queried whether this represents conservation best practice, and cautioned that this alters the historical record of the removal of the original statuary in the past.
8. The DAC member nominated by Historic England queried why the parish's proposal did not seek to install statuary which would more closely reflect the likely subject (saints) of the original statues installed within the 15th-century clerestory, rather than Anglo-Saxon (Mercian) antecedents, which pre-date the architecture upon which they would be situated.
9. The member cautioned that the introduction of new statuary, presumably painted to reflect medieval practice, would cause a considerable alteration to the visual appearance of the church in that location, and that an impact assessment should accordingly be undertaken in this regard.
10. It was suggested that a possible alternative option might be to utilise a digital projection system, whereby suitable statuary might be projected at different times, including in their original medieval painted decoration, without harm to the fabric or detriment to the historical significance of the space.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 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 Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB).

Additionally, informal consultation should be undertaken with the Church Buildings Council (CBC), in accordance with rule 4.6(2)(b) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023, in

relation to the introduction of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest (including new work), in a Grade I (or II\*) listed building.

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

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

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:	<a href="#">2023-083818</a>	Church Name:	Tixall: St John the Baptist
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	To remove condemned boiler from vestry and radiators from church, update electrical fuse board and electrics, and install heaters under each pew		
DAC Consultee:	Malcolm Price	Date NoA Issued:	14th November 2023

10.1.2

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-090948</a>	Church Name:	Ashmore Park: St Alban
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Replace vandalised stage curtains in front of the altar with two movable screens		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	17th November 2023

10.1.3

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-089641</a>	Church Name:	Cannock: St Luke
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield

Proposal:	Urgent works to north-west tower pinnacle, to be taken down then reconstructed immediately, not stored elsewhere (granted under interim faculty no. 5164)		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	17th November 2023

#### 10.1.4

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-091240</a>	Church Name:	Rugeley: St Augustine
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Update and replace small memorial window pane on north side of church by donor family		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	29th November 2023

#### 10.1.5

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-088668</a>	Church Name:	Lee Brockhurst: St Peter
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Rehanging and related works to the two bells, dated c. 1400 and 1721, situated in the bellcote		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Woollam	Date NoA Issued:	29th November 2023

#### 10.1.6

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-089326</a>	Church Name:	Kidsgrove: St Thomas
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Felling of a dangerous (rotten and fallen) Cherry tree by Newcastle Borough Council in the closed graveyard (confirmatory faculty)		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	29th November 2023

#### 10.1.7

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-082209</a>	Church Name:	Alstonfield: St Peter
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Replacement of existing oil-fired boiler with a hydro-treated vegetable oil (HVO)/ bio-oil compatible boiler		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Bemrose	Date NoA Issued:	29th November 2023

#### 10.1.8

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-091917</a>	Church Name:	Streetly: All Saints
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Replacement of existing tandem central heating boilers with a single Vaillant Ecotec Plus 80Kw commercial condensing boiler, including a plate heat exchanger (if required) (granted under interim faculty no. 5184)		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Bemrose	Date NoA Issued:	22nd December 2023

#### 10.1.9

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-089687</a>	Church Name:	Wolverhampton: St Matthew
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Remove church name plastic lettering and existing banner from church exterior		

	and replace both with a new mesh banner, with an additional mesh banner between the two entrances		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	22nd December 2023

#### 10.1.10

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-091592</a>	Church Name:	Wellington: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Repair of tree-root damaged sections of concrete slab paving on the churchyard path with Flexipave to mitigate future damage		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	22nd December 2023

#### 10.1.11

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-091989</a>	Church Name:	Chadsmoor: St Chad
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Installation of steel brackets at the junction of timber roof purlins and gable walls		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	22nd December 2023

#### 10.1.12

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2024-093707</a>	Church Name:	Stafford: St Chad
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Re-roofing works to nave roof (both pitches) and north aisle roof		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	10th February 2024

#### 10.1.13

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2024-093778</a>	Church Name:	Longdon: St James
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Dismantling of the organ to eradicate discovered woodworm and repairing associated damage (confirmatory faculty)		
DAC Consultee:	Nigel de Gaunt Allcoat	Date NoA Issued:	10th February 2024

#### 10.1.14

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2024-094013</a>	Church Name:	Denstone: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Repairs to damaged wall of lychgate following car accident (granted under interim faculty no. 5167)		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	10th February 2024

#### 10.1.15

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2024-093665</a>	Church Name:	Bloxwich: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Permanent removal of three pews (currently securely stored in church hall under TMRO 2023-084078) and disposal by sale; installation of aumbry curtain rail and curtains in opened space		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Foster	Date NoA Issued:	10th February 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 Rolleston, St Mary (Grade I), Joanna Lawton proposed inspector
- 10.2.2 Forton, All Saints (Grade II\*), Adrian Mathias proposed inspector
- 10.2.3 Petton, St Raphael and St Isidore (Grade II\*), Candida Pino proposed inspector
- 10.2.4 Sheriffhales, St Mary (Grade II\*), Candida Pino proposed inspector
- 10.2.5 Welshampton, St Michael and All Angels (Grade II), Candida Pino proposed inspector
- 10.2.6 Cockshutt, St Simon and St Jude (Grade II), Candida Pino proposed inspector
- 10.2.7 Foxt, St Mark the Evangelist (Grade II), Simon Smith proposed inspector

**Decision:** The quinquennial inspector applications processed by delegated authority were noted

**Action:** None

## **11. Any other business**

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 10th April 2024 at 2.00 pm**  
to be held by online conferencing

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary  
[giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org](mailto:giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org) 01543 221152

Helen Cook, Assistant DAC Secretary  
[helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org](mailto:helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org) 01543 221155