

Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

MINUTES

A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held hybridly (in person and by online conferencing) in the Reeve Room at St Mary's House, Cathedral Close, Lichfield on Thursday, 26th May 2022 at 2.00 pm

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Opening prayers were said by the Ven Paul Thomas.
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven Julian Francis, the Ven Paul Thomas, the Ven Sue Weller, the Ven Megan Smith, Andy Foster, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Edward Higgins, David Litchfield, Bryan Martin, Adrian Mathias, Andy Wigley, Peter Woollam.
In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Clare Beavon (Diocesan Pastoral Officer).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, the Revd Jo Farnworth, the Revd Zoe Heming, Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat, Mark Parsons, Brough Skingley, Andy Smith, Julie Taylor, Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Adrian Mathias, items 4.1.1, 4.6.1, 7.1.2; the Revd Zoe Heming, item 4.1.2; Edward Higgins, item 7.1.1; Mark Parsons, item 7.2.2.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted with one amendment (see the post-meeting corrigendum recorded in those minutes (Registry Matters, item 6.1.2) and the revised decision of the DAC below (Registry Matters, item 6.1.1).

2. Matters Arising

2.1 Confirmation of members of new Lichfield DAC for 2022–27 (following Bishop's Council meeting on 25th May 2022)

At the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting (Matters Arising, item 2.1), the DAC Chair invited current DAC members to put their names forward, via the DAC Secretary, for consideration as members of the new Lichfield DAC for 2022–27, the constituting of which new Committee was previously raised at the 8th December 2021 DAC meeting (Matters Arising, item 2.1). In accordance with [schedule 2](#) of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018, prospective (and returning) members are required to be appointed by Bishop's Council.

At the present meeting, the DAC Secretary confirmed that the names of all those put forward to Bishop's Council at its meeting on 25th May 2022 had been approved by that body for appointment. This includes 6 new members, being one member appointed from Diocesan Synod (a statutory position on the DAC), three new conservation-accredited architect members (two of whom have experience on other DACs), and two new clergy members. The DAC Secretary indicated that the operational environment of the newly-constituted DAC is distinct from that of the previous DAC of 2015–21, within the context of post-Covid recovery, the Black Lives Matter movement and contested heritage, the national and diocesan goal of net zero carbon by 2030, and the [Shaping for Mission](#) diocesan programme of renewal. Reflecting these matters, the membership of the new DAC is positively more diverse, including ethnic minority and disability representation.

The DAC Secretary also indicated that in accordance with the 2018 Measure (as above) the DAC Chair is appointed by the Diocesan Bishop after consultation with the Bishop's Council, the Diocesan Chancellor and the Church Buildings Council. The latter two consultations have been undertaken, with Bishop's Council consulted at its meeting on 25th May 2022 on the proposed appointment of the Revd Preb Pat Hawkins as Lichfield DAC Chair for the Committee to be constituted for 2022–27; Pat Hawkins is currently Chair of the DAC following a casual vacancy. The DAC Secretary confirmed the favourable consultation response of the Bishop's Council, for the Bishop's appointment.

At the present DAC meeting, the DAC Chair additionally indicated that the role of DAC Vice-Chair had become vacant from 1st November 2020, following the cessation in that role of the then Ven. Matthew Parker, at that time Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent, to become Bishop of Stafford. As a non-statutory appointment, which does not require external consultation, a nomination for DAC Vice-Chair will now be made by the DAC Chair from among the members of the new DAC.

Action: The DAC Secretary to liaise with the Bishop's Office; the DAC Chair to nominate a DAC Vice-Chair at the first meeting of the new DAC as a statutory body on 20th July 2022

2.2 Standing down of David Litchfield, Mark Parsons and Andy Smith as DAC members

In relation to the constituting of the new Lichfield DAC for 2022–27 (item 2.1 above), the DAC Secretary indicated that David Litchfield was to stand down from his role as a member appointed from Diocesan Synod (a statutory position on the DAC) following the current meeting and had not put his name forward to be a member of the new DAC. Members extended a vote of thanks to David Litchfield for his valuable contribution to the work of the Lichfield DAC, having undertaken that role since December 2012.

The DAC Secretary also indicated that Mark Parsons (in absentia), a DAC architect member, and Andy Smith (in absentia), DAC Tree Adviser and DAC member, had indicated that they were to step back from the role of DAC member, also not seeking to be members of the new DAC. Instead, Mark Parsons will become one of the five new DAC Architect Advisers to the DAC, which role was last discussed by the Committee at the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting (Matters Arising, item 2.2). Andy Smith will continue in the active role of DAC Tree Adviser. Members extended a vote of thanks to Mark Parsons and Andy Smith for their valuable contribution as members of the Lichfield DAC, having undertaken that role since October 2015 and June 2019 respectively.

Action: The DAC Secretary to liaise with the Bishop's Office

2.3 Proposed additions to revised Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy (approved at 6th April 2022 DAC meeting), for subsequent DAC approval

The DAC Chair confirmed that the revised Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy (v.4 April 2022) had been approved by the DAC at its meeting on 6th April 2022. Prior to which, at the 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting, the Diocesan Registry Assistant present had proposed a possible addition to the policy, in relation to private faculty applications for gravestones that fall outside the requirements of the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#) (2013). That proposal was considered more fully by the Archdeacons, and the Committee, at the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting.

At that meeting, it was suggested that such applications might be delegated to the respective Archdeacon, for formal DAC advice. However, it was noted that the Churchyard Regulations (p. 1) recommend that clergy seek the informal advice of the Archdeacon where there is any doubt as to whether the proposed memorial is of a permitted type. Therefore, applications which require formal DAC advice are those which have not been resolved by reference to the Archdeacon, and the Committee determined that a wider DAC view on these cases would be valuable accordingly. Relating to which, the DAC Chair would consult the Chancellor on criteria for the assessment of such applications.

At the present meeting, the DAC Chair indicated that a meeting had been convened with the Archdeacons and Associate Archdeacons on 19th May 2022, to discuss inter alia the processing of private faculty petitions on churchyard matters, at which meeting the formation of a sub-committee of the DAC was proposed. At the current DAC meeting, the DAC Secretary accordingly introduced two proposed technical additions to the current revised policy, for the processing of a) private faculty petitions for non-conforming churchyard memorials, and b) churchyard policies submitted by PCCs for faculty approval. It was confirmed that these would be subject to the same exemptions and provisos of the currently-approved policy.

In relation to which, the Committee confirmed its support for the creation of a sub-committee of the DAC with the sole function of giving DAC advice, under delegated authority, on the above two categories. The sub-committee would constitute the DAC Chair, one or more Archdeacons (and Associate Archdeacons), one or more clergy members, and a statutory lay member of the DAC, to be drawn from among the members of the new Lichfield DAC for 2022–27 (item 2.1 above). The sub-committee would operate as a working group, appraising applications prior to the determination and giving of formal advice by the full Committee at the subsequent DAC meeting.

Decision: The updated revised [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (v.5 May 2022) was approved by the DAC, including the creation of a related sub-committee of the DAC

Action: The DAC Secretary to publish the revised policy on the new public-facing web page, detailing the [delegated authority procedure](#), on the diocesan website; the DAC Chair to consult the Chancellor on criteria for DAC assessment of private faculty applications for gravestones that fall outside the Churchyard Regulations

2.4 Commencement of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 from 1st July 2022

The DAC Secretary updated members that the [Faculty Jurisdiction \(Amendment\) Rules 2022](#), previously discussed at the 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting (New Matters, item 3.1), would come into effect on 1st July 2022. The amended Rules have been made specifically in connection with the Church of England, and diocesan, [target](#) to reach net zero carbon by 2030. Both List A (deemed consent) and List B (Archdeacon's permission) will now encompass environmental matters, with List B including LED light fittings, roof insulation and photovoltaic (solar) panels on unlisted church buildings and halls, and wireless broadband services. Meanwhile, the installation of like-for-like fossil fuel boilers and new oil tanks will now be subject to a full faculty application and options appraisal.

The Church of England has issued a national [press release](#) and [explanatory notes](#) on the changes. The new Rules require parties to have due regard to advice produced by the Church Buildings Council (CBC) on net zero carbon, where proposals for net zero carbon

apply. In compliance with which, the CBC has recently published [specific guidance](#) on the Church of England website, which must be given due regard by both PCCs and the DAC when relevant to the proposal.

Action: The DAC Secretary to update the [DAC web pages](#) of the diocesan website prior to 1st July 2022; the DAC to have due regard to the CBC guidance when giving advice on faculty applications from 1st July 2022

2.5 Arrangements for temporary cover for DAC Lighting/Electrical Adviser (diocese-wide)

The DAC Secretary confirmed that short-term, interim cover on lighting and electrical matters had been sought through the voluntary secondment of the adviser to Leicester DAC, in order to uphold the DAC's statutory responsibility to give formal advice on casework in these areas, as last raised at the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting (Matters Arising, item 2.4). This proposal for cover is as previously arranged during a prior period of vacancy (14th October 2020 DAC meeting, New Matters, item 3.1). However, at the present meeting, the DAC Secretary indicated that such cover could not be secured at the current time, due to the personal circumstances of the Leicester DAC adviser.

Furthermore, advertising for [expressions of interest](#) in this and related building services adviser roles in the diocesan Bulletin, on the diocesan website, and via the diocesan Facebook page, had similarly returned no expressions of interest. The DAC Secretary indicated that the vacancy of DAC Lighting/Electrical Adviser was particularly acute with the commencement of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, incorporating the installation of LED light fittings under List B (which casework requires internal consultation on behalf of the Archdeacons), from 1st July (item 2.4 above).

The DAC Secretary proposed that the expression of interest details would be sent to all parishes in the diocese direct, with a view that a suitably qualified and experienced adviser might be identified from among those congregations.

Action: The DAC Secretary to liaise with the diocesan Director of Communications on the proposed direct mailing of the expressions of interest advert to all parishes

3. New Matters

3.1 Final (post-consultation) version of Routemap to Net Zero Carbon by 2030, including milestones for church buildings, to be discussed at General Synod in July 2022

The DAC Secretary indicated that the Diocesan Bishop and Diocesan Secretary had co-responded, based on the views of the diocesan Net Zero Steering Group, to the Church of England's consultation on the [Routemap to Net Zero Carbon by 2030](#), the final (post-consultation) version of which is to be discussed at General Synod in July 2022. The draft routemap included [milestones](#) for church buildings, which are recommended to be undertaken by parishes and the diocese from 2022 onwards, including participation in the Church of England's [Energy Footprint Tool](#) and A Rocha UK's [Eco Church](#). The final milestones will be published from July 2022.

Action: DAC members and advisers to be mindful of these milestones when considering applications from parishes, alongside the requirement to have due regard to CBC guidance where proposals for net zero carbon apply (item 2.4 above)

4. Casework for Consideration

4.1 Reorderings and New Facilities

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

Grade II

4.1.1

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-072442 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620048 | Church Name: | Bednall: All Saints |
| Archdeaconry: | Lichfield | Parish: | Acton Trussell with Bednall |
| Applicant Name: | Alison Kendall | Quin. Inspector: | Adrian Mathias |
| Listing: | Grade II | Date of Last QI: | 01-Mar-2022 |
| Proposal: | Improving community facilities, to include toilet and refreshment area | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | First | Cost Est: | £50,000 |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

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

1. The Archdeacon of Lichfield commended the parish on its approach to date, including consulting with the QI architect and conducting surveys with the local community and CofE primary school, and its consideration of the church building within the deanery framework as part of the diocesan [Shaping for Mission](#) process.
2. In support of these comments, the DAC affirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade II listed – and specifically the visual impact, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
3. In relation to which, the principle of the proposal was supported, but it was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not yet been fully identified and justified, and that the Statements of Significance and Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [reorderings](#) and [Statements](#).
4. In relation to the drawn options appraisal submitted, the DAC noted that the PCC had expressed a preference for Option 1, constituting an adjoining external extension at the south-west of the church building. The Committee noted that there would be loss and adjustment of pews in all options, and various other internal adjustments, including relocation of the organ and font, and perhaps work to flooring.
5. With regard to Option 1, the DAC considered that a modest extension could be acceptably contained in this location. However, as currently shown, it appears too tight a fit. It was suggested that the extension needs to be at least 350 mm or so inset from the diagonal buttress, and the abutment with the nave wall needs to be lower and clear of the nave eaves. The modern form could be in keeping, but the gothic arching in the gable may not be consistent. The glazed screen to the arcade will be complex to achieve and arguably transformative. It might be better to form a separate freestanding screen away from the arcade, within the south aisle.

6. In terms of Option 2, the DAC noted that this was a broadly similar concept to Option 1, but that the extension is narrower, which makes the fit more comfortable. There is no door proposed in the gable end, which is less busy and arguably happier, but again the abutment with the nave needs to be lower. The overall gothic approach is likely to be less controversial, and possibly easier to achieve here. The glazed arcade screen that opens up is welcome, allowing the original form to read, but may be preferred to be positioned inside the arcade (as above).
7. In relation to Option 3, the DAC commented that if the required elements of the scheme can be fulfilled internally, albeit with a smaller servery, then this should be given serious consideration. It would again be preferable to set the screen well inside the arcade, particularly if some of it is to be solid adjacent to the toilet and servery. It was queried whether the external porch was required, as this did not form part of the other two options.
8. Separately, the DAC Archaeology Adviser noted that the current Victorian church had replaced an earlier church within an ancient churchyard. All three options therefore have the potential to impact earlier burials and possibly any surviving below-ground remains of the earlier church building. Of the three options, Option 3 would likely have the least impact in this respect, given the more limited size of the new porch compared to the south-west extensions in Options 1 and 2.
9. To provide further information about the extent of these impacts, and the likely options for mitigating them, it was recommended that the QI architect commissions an archaeological desk-based assessment in the first instance. Subject to the results, it may also be necessary to undertake an archaeological evaluation, comprising a trial trench. Both pieces of work will then inform whether further mitigation is required as a proviso of any faculty consent.
10. Depending on the exact route, the excavation of a foul drainage connection may also impact on burials and human remains within the churchyard, which could be mitigated through an archaeological watching brief.
11. All three options (external elements) will also require planning permission from the local planning authority, so it is recommended that the PCC seeks pre-application advice from [South Staffordshire Council](#) (and also from the County Archaeologist at Staffordshire County Council).

It was determined that the proposal would affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, and the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that a DAC site visit should be undertaken, to meet with parish representatives and the QI architect at the church. The revised scheme, when further developed, 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 7.1.2 below)

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

Grade II

4.1.2

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2021-057775 | Case Status: | Application in formal consultation |
| Church Code: | 620471 | Church Name: | Church Aston: St Andrew |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|
| Archdeaconry: | Salop | Parish: | Church Aston |
| Applicant Name: | Revd Zoe Heming | Quin. Inspector: | Anne Netherwood |
| Listing: | Grade II | Date of Last QI: | 01-Mar-2017 |
| Proposal: | Reordering nave north aisle to introduce toilet and cupboard tea point | | |
| No. of times to DAC: | Fifth [in this form] | Cost Est: | £30,000 |
| Formal Consultations: | Historic England; Victorian Society | | |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 27th October 2021 DAC meeting. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, and the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable. In relation to which, the DAC Secretary indicated that following receipt of formal advice from the Victorian Society, a 'material change' had been made to the proposal as previously considered for informal DAC advice at the 21st July 2021 DAC meeting. The Committee determined to recommend the proposal, with the proviso that the design of the servery ironmongery should be submitted for approval by a DAC architect member, but to defer the issuing of the Notification of Advice until the re-consultation response of the Victorian Society had been received.

At the present meeting, the DAC Secretary indicated that following receipt of the re-consultation response of the Victorian Society, a second 'material change' has been made to the proposal as last considered for informal DAC advice at the 27th October 2021 DAC meeting. In relation to which, [rule 4.8](#) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 requires external statutory consultees, in addition to the DAC, to be re-consulted again on the revised proposal (to respond within 21 days). As such, the DAC was unable to give its final, formal advice at the present meeting, as per the 2019 Rules.

However, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the parish had addressed, though not fully resolved, the matters previously raised by the Committee's deferral advice and the Victorian Society's re-consultation advice. As such, the Committee upheld to recommend the proposal with provisos, but again to defer the issuing of the Notification of Advice until the final re-consultation response of the Victorian Society had been received.

Decision: Recommend with the following proviso:

- The design of the servery ironmongery, and joinery details through the wall panelling and the kitchen units (of a scale no less than 1:10), should be submitted via the DAC Secretary for approval by a DAC architect member (who will liaise with the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies on the same).

Action: The DAC Secretary to defer the issuing of the Notification of Advice until the final re-consultation response of the Victorian Society has been received

4.2 Alterations and Fabric Repairs

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

Grade II*

4.2.1

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-069283 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620122 | Church Name: | Pattingham: St Chad |
| Archdeaconry: | Walsall | Parish: | Pattingham & Patshull |
| Applicant Name: | Philip Sims | Quin. Inspector: | Simon Smith |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Date of Last QI: | 17-Nov-2016 [Andrew Capper] |
| Proposal: | Remove the current wooden screen and curtain across the west door and tower entrance; draught exclude and renovate the historic oak door at the west end | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Second [revised scheme] | Cost Est: | £35,000 [original scheme] |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC last considered the proposal in a different form (with a glazed screen) as an application for informal advice at the 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that as the proposal would affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC reaffirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade II* listed – and specifically the visual impact, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
2. It was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had been sufficiently identified in the Statement of Significance, but not justified, whereby more detail is required on the provenance, date of construction and any dedication of the Victorian screen.
3. The DAC noted that the revised application is now for the removal of the Victorian open screen and curtains, and for the draught stripping of the earlier west door, which is to be brought into regular use. The principle of the proposal was supported, and the Committee concurred that the works would remove clutter and expose the higher-quality joinery of the west door.
4. Confirmation is required, though, of the effect the screen removal will have on the existing fabric – are any elements embedded in the stonework; what repairs will be needed to the floor and walls?
5. In relation to the intention to draught strip the west doors, the proposal for self-adhesive draught strip tape and a simple brush strip at the bottom of the doors is likely to be ineffective.
6. There is no detail of the edge of the door and its relationship to the stone surround or any detail of the meeting stiles of the doors – these should be provided with correctly detailed draught stripping shown. The self-adhesive tape will fail prematurely particularly in the twist of the arched head. Consideration should be given to taking down the doors and machining in a suitable draught seal to the perimeter and meeting stiles.

7. The photographs provided are very useful. However, they show a number of areas of daylight both under the door (above the floor tiles) and within cracks in the timber panelling of the doors themselves. In order to suitably reduce the draught, it is clear that some works will be required at the door threshold and filling with timber fillets/timber repairs undertaken to the doors, which should be detailed in the current application.
8. The DAC advised the QI architect to take a closer look at the potential to improve the draught stripping to these doors, in part to mitigate the possibility that the PCC will seek to refit a draught lobby in a few years' time. Suitable detailing is required for approval due to the age and significance of the doors.

The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. Following which, external formal consultation should be undertaken with Historic England and the Victorian Society.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

4.3 Services and M&E

None this meeting

4.4 Furniture and Fittings

None this meeting

4.5 Memorials, ABCRs and Churchyards

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

None this meeting

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

Grade II*

4.5.1

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-070924 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620388 | Church Name: | Weston-upon-Trent: St Andrew |
| Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent | Parish: | Weston-upon-Trent |
| Applicant Name: | Pat Hopkin | Quin. Inspector: | Andrew Capper [retd] |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Date of Last QI: | 19-Sep-2006 |
| Proposal: | New area for the burial of cremated remains (ABCR) | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Second | Cost Est: | Not stated |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC noted that the Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent had conducted an Archdeacon’s site visit on 24th February 2022 to discuss possible options for the location of a new area for the burial of cremated remains (ABCR), prior to the parish submitting its initial application. The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is not applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the Committee’s informal advice. Specifically, the parish had identified a new hybrid configuration, effectively an Option 4, with individual memorial markers to be sited within a self-contained rectangular ABCR (as per Option 3), which is to be created adjacent to but at the eastern end of, rather than distributed along, the southern path in the new part of the graveyard (Option 2). This path had been declared as the DAC’s preferred location, from the three original options, in its informal advice.

Taken together, the Committee considered that a case had been made for exceptionality in relation to the proposed adoption of individual memorials at the points of interment and the requirements of the Chancellor’s [Churchyard Regulations](#). As such, the Committee determined that the application should advance to the giving of DAC formal advice, but to defer the issuing of the Notification of Advice until a formal PCC resolution in support of the chosen location and memorial design, signed by the Chair of the PCC (the minister), had been received by the DAC Secretary, for confirmation by the Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent. A clearly annotated plan, showing the exact location, and extent, of the PCC’s approved location for the ABCR, should be submitted alongside.

Decision: Recommend with the following proviso:

- The new ABCR should only include flat memorial markers, to match the configuration of those in the existing ABCRs within the wider churchyard.

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant upon confirmation from the Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent

4.6 Landscaping

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

None this meeting

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

Grade I

4.6.1

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-070928 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620104 | Church Name: | Tamworth: St Editha |
| Archdeaconry: | Lichfield | Parish: | Tamworth |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|---|
| Applicant Name: | Gwen Wilkinson | Quin. Inspector: | Adrian Mathias |
| Listing: | Grade I | | |
| Proposal: | Existing footpaths through the churchyard to be resurfaced, relit and realigned to enhance the routes linking the proposed public realm to Church Lane, Little Church Lane, St Editha's Close and Church Street | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Second [in this form] | Cost Est: | £252,000 [to be paid for by Staffordshire County Council] |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the response by Staffordshire County Council to the DAC advice, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been addressed.

It was determined that the proposal may be likely to affect archaeological remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. However, the Committee resolved that this requirement had been met by virtue of the direct involvement of the Staffordshire County Archaeologist, who would have been consulted under the Rules, and that the application should advance to the giving of DAC formal advice accordingly.

Decision: Recommend with the following proviso:

- The DAC Archaeology Adviser noted that the submitted Method Statement confirms that all ground works will be subject to an archaeological watching brief that will be monitored by the County Archaeologist. However, a related Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) should be submitted for approval by the DAC Archaeological Adviser.

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

4.7 Bells, Clocks and Organs

None this meeting

5. Casework by Delegated Authority

The following faculty applications, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018 and in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy \(2022\)](#), on behalf of the DAC

5.1

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2021-066891 | Church Name: | Biddulph: St Lawrence |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent |
| Proposal: | Addition of two Pan/Tilt/Zoom (PTZ) cameras to the existing AV system | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Simon Parr† | Date NoA Issued: | 6th May 2022 |

5.2

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2021-068233 | Church Name: | Audley: St James the Great |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|------------------|--------------|
| Proposal: | Introduction of two internal fixed Pan/Tilt/Zoom (PTZ) cameras, within the nave and tower base respectively | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Simon Parrr† | Date NoA Issued: | 6th May 2022 |

5.3

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-069734 | Church Name: | Fradley: St Stephen |
| Listing: | Unlisted | Archdeaconry: | Lichfield |
| Proposal: | Upgrading of outdated storage heaters in church and meeting room | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Peter Bemrose | Date NoA Issued: | 8th May 2022 |

5.4

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|------------------|---------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-070523 | Church Name: | Butterton: St Bartholomew |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent |
| Proposal: | Restoration of historic sundial, with a replacement gnomon, in churchyard | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Bryan Martin | Date NoA Issued: | 8th May 2022 |

5.5

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-069340 | Church Name: | Bolas Magna: St John the Baptist |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Archdeaconry: | Salop |
| Proposal: | Removal of an urn from the south-west corner of the tower and relocation to the porch (granted under interim faculty no. 4926) | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Bryan Martin | Date NoA Issued: | 12th May 2022 |

5.6

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|------------------|--------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-070303 | Church Name: | Ash: Christ Church |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Salop |
| Proposal: | Repairs to roof, masonry, drains, guttering and repointing tower | | |
| DAC Consultees: | Adrian Mathias; Andy Wigley | Date NoA Issued: | 12th May 2022 |

5.7

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2021-066440 | Church Name: | Himley: St Michael & All Angels |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Walsall |
| Proposal: | Redecoration of Grade-II boundary railings fronting Dudley Road | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Mark Parsons | Date NoA Issued: | 13th May 2022 |

5.8

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | 2022-070650 | Church Name: | Rochester: St Michael |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent |
| Proposal: | Installation of automatic winding and automatic regulation of the church tower clock | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Jonathan Ansell | Date NoA Issued: | 18th May 2022 |

† Interim DAC Audio-Visual Adviser

Decision: The faculty applications processed by delegated authority were noted

Action: None

6. Registry Matters

6.1 Private Faculties

Formal Advice

6.1.1

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Case Reference No.: | N/A – see papers by email | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620150 | Church Name: | Pelsall: St Michael and All Angels |
| Archdeaconry: | Walsall | Parish: | Pelsall |
| Applicant Name: | ██████████ | Quin. Inspector: | Andrew Hayward |
| Listing: | Unlisted | Date of Last QI: | 01-Sep-2017 |
| Proposal: | Introduction of churchyard memorial that does not conform with Chancellor's Churchyard Regulations | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Second | Cost Est: | Not stated |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for formal advice at the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting, which resultant minutes recorded that the Committee recommended the proposal with a proviso. However, at the present meeting, in accordance with item 1.5 above, the Committee indicated that the previous decision recorded as DAC formal advice should be corrected on an error of fact (see the post-meeting corrigendum in the minutes of the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting (Registry Matters, item 6.1.2)).

Subsequent discussion of the proposal, based on additional information from the Diocesan Registry, was undertaken by the Committee at the current meeting. Specifically, the DAC considered written confirmation that the PCC had made prior reference, in communication with the Registry on 28th March 2022, to an existing heart-shaped memorial within the churchyard. The DAC also considered photographs provided through the Registry by the petitioners since the previous DAC meeting that illustrate an existing heart-shaped memorial in the churchyard, and the photographs from the PCC previously considered, which show an irregularly-shaped heart memorial directly adjacent to the burial plot under petition as well as the same memorial illustrated by the petitioners, situated within the same part of the churchyard three rows back from the plot.

With this information taken together, the Committee concurred that there was a reasonable case for precedent within the churchyard, including the immediate proximity of the irregularly-shaped heart memorial directly adjacent to the plot. In this way, the DAC resolved that the petitioners had provided evidence of precedent for such a memorial in the context of this particular churchyard, by way of a case for exceptionality in relation to the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#). The Committee determined, after detailed discussion, to revise its prior decision, and to re-issue its formal advice.

Separately, the Archdeacon of Walsall suggested that the PCC should give consideration to the development of a churchyard policy, to be approved under separate faculty, in accordance with the Churchyard Regulations, to formalise and harmonise the number of non-conforming or irregular headstones within this specific churchyard.

Decision: Not object for the following principal reason:

- In the opinion of the Committee, there is a reasonable case for precedent within the churchyard, including the immediate proximity of the irregularly-shaped heart memorial directly adjacent to the burial plot under petition.

With the following proviso:

- In the opinion of the Committee, the central memorial would not adversely affect the specific churchyard setting, and the wording of the headstone (deferring the legal question of the use of the maiden name) meets the standard for inclusion. However, the two smaller, detached inscribed hearts either side should not be included with the central heart-shaped memorial, as these were considered to be duplicative in relation to the headstone, and would hinder churchyard maintenance at that location.

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

7. Site Visits & Reports

7.1 Forthcoming DAC Site Visits

7.1.1 Rangemore, All Saints (Grade II*) [quin. inspector: Andrew Capper (retd); project architect: Simon Smith]

Development of nave aisle to meet the needs of parish community (OFS [2021-067216](#))

Date and time: Thursday, 30th June 2022 at 10.00 am [subject to parish confirmation]

Attendees: The Ven Megan Smith (site visit chair), Adrian Mathias, Andy Foster, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Malcolm Price or Peter Bemrose (DAC Heating Advisers) [to include the Victorian Society]

7.1.2 Bednall, All Saints (Grade II) [quin. inspector: Adrian Mathias]

Improving community facilities, to include toilet and refreshment area ([2022-072442](#)) (item 4.1.1 above)

Date and time: Tuesday, 28th June 2022 at 2.00 pm [subject to parish confirmation]

Attendees: The Ven Sue Weller (site visit chair), Bryan Martin, Andy Foster, Edward Higgins, Andy Wigley

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with the DAC attendees and PCC representatives on the dates and times of the DAC site visits

7.2 DAC Site Visit Reports for Approval

7.2.1 Baschurch, All Saints (Grade II*) [quin. inspector: Tim Ratcliffe; project architect: Michael Randall]

New accessible toilet under the west tower (Scheme B) (OFS [2021-067433](#)), 13th April 2022 (Giles Standing, from site notes by Helen Cook)

7.2.2 Ilam, Holy Cross (Grade I) [quin. inspector: Mark Parsons]

Creation of a community hub within the church building (OFS [2022-069621](#), under development), 28th April 2022 (Giles Standing)

Decision: The reports were approved without amendment

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the reports to the parishes

7.3 DAC Adviser Desk-Based Report for Approval

7.3.1 Kings Bromley, All Saints (Grade I) (solar panels), 17th May 2022 (Peter Bemrose)

Decision: The report was approved without amendment

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

7.4 DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports to Note

7.4.1 Berkswich, Holy Trinity (trees), 24th January 2022 (Andy Smith)

7.4.2 Wigginton, St Leonard (trees), 4th March 2022 (Andy Smith)

7.4.3 Ingestre, St Mary (trees), 23rd March 2022 (Andy Smith)

7.4.4 Newtown, King Charles the Martyr (trees), 23rd March 2022 (Andy Smith)

7.4.5 Stanton-upon-Hine Heath, St Andrew (trees), 8th April 2022 (Andy Smith)

7.4.6 Penkridge, St Michael (organ), 12th April 2022 (Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat)

Decision: The reports were noted

Action: None

8. 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 \(2020\)](#) and the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy \(2022\)](#), on behalf of the DAC

None this meeting

9. Any Other Business

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday, 20th July 2022 at 2.00 pm**

Inaugural meeting of new Lichfield DAC for 2022–27

to be held hybridly (in person and by online conferencing) in the Reeve Room at St Mary's House, Lichfield

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary

giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 622540

Helen Cook, Assistant DAC Secretary

helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 622569