

# 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 Wednesday 31st May 2023 at 2.00 pm*

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The opening prayer was said by the Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair).
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair), the Ven Julian Francis, the Ven Paul Thomas, the Ven Dr Sue Weller, the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, the Revd Jo Farnworth, the Revd Geoffrey Eze, Andy Foster, Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat, the Revd Dr David Isiorho, Bryan Martin, Candida Pino, Brough Skingley, Mark Stewart, Julie Taylor, Peter Woollam.  
In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: Chris Gill, the Revd Zoe Heming, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Edward Higgins, the Revd Andrew Lythall, Adrian Mathias, Steven Matthews, Dr Andy Wigley.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Bryan Martin, item 5.2.1; Adrian Mathias, items 5.1.2–5.1.4, 5.3.2–5.3.3.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

### 2. Matters arising

#### 2.1 Publication of Church of England web page and guidance on reducing embodied carbon of church building projects, May 2023

The DAC Secretary informed the Committee that the Church of England has published a new [web page](#) and [guidance](#) (2023) on reducing embodied carbon of church building projects, which can be read alongside the preceding joint Church Buildings Council (CBC) and Ecclesiastical Architects and Surveyors Association (EASA) sustainability and net zero carbon [best practice note](#) (2021) on church projects, which also includes embodied carbon. However, in accordance with the new guidance, the DAC Secretary indicated that this matter is not in scope for the national Church and diocesan target for net zero carbon until after 2030.

### 3. New matters

#### 3.1 Anonymised summary of responses to Lichfield DAC Member Feedback Questionnaire, April–May 2023

The DAC Chair confirmed that 20 DAC members (out of 24, not including the Chair), had completed the [Lichfield DAC Member Feedback Questionnaire 2023](#) (via Google Forms), which bespoke feedback form had been created by the DAC officers. The intention of the questionnaire was to capture structured and constructively critical feedback on the role of DAC member and the operation of DAC meetings, further to the constituting of the new Lichfield DAC for 2022–27 through Bishop's Council at its meeting on 25th May 2022, i.e. a year ago. The DAC Chair thanked the DAC officers for providing members with the opportunity to give comment on their experience to date, with a view to making changes to process, where required.

The DAC Secretary presented three key charts generated from quantitative responses to questions relating to a) the length of DAC meetings, b) the move to hybrid DAC meetings (in person and via Zoom), and c) the recent presentation of cases by architects, including guest speakers. In relation to the latter, it was recognised that presentations by architects need to be time limited and without the opportunity for questions from members. The DAC Chair separately indicated that qualitative responses to the questionnaire included reference to the 'culture' of the DAC, highlighting its role as a diocesan (as well as a statutory) committee, and the need to carefully consider and give sufficient weight to the missional arguments put forward by parishes (the 'parish voice'), when addressing conservation and heritage matters. The DAC Chair reiterated that the role of the Archdeacons in this discursive and contextual aspect remains key.

#### **4. Site visits and reports**

##### **4.1 Adviser site visit reports for approval**

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

None this meeting

##### **4.2 Adviser site visit reports to note** (not circulated)

*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 Cockshutt, St Simon and St Jude (audio-visual), 28th March 2023 (Brough Skingley)
- 4.2.2 Whitgreave, St John the Evangelist (trees), 10th May 2023 (Andy Smith)
- 4.2.3 Holmcroft, St Bertelin (trees), 10th May 2023 (Andy Smith)
- 4.2.4 Great Haywood, St Stephen (trees), 11th May 2023 (Andy Smith)

**Decision:** The reports were noted

**Action:** None

##### **4.3 DAC site visit reports for approval**

None this meeting

##### **4.4 Forthcoming DAC site visits**

- 4.4.1 Cheswardine, St Swithun (Grade II\*) [quin. inspector: Candida Pino]  
Provision of external access ramp system (OFS [2023-083734](#))  
Date and time: Thursday 15th June 2023 at 2.00 pm
- 4.4.2 Trent Vale, St John the Evangelist (Grade II) [quin. inspector: Geoff Hillman]  
Internal restoration and reordering following extensive fire damage at the church (in April 2022) (OFS [2023-083568](#))  
Date and time: Tuesday 11th July 2023 at 10.00 am
- 4.4.3 Burton-on-Trent, St Modwen (Grade I) [quin. inspector: Adrian Mathias]  
Internal reordering of both East and West ends (OFS [2021-065626](#))

Site visit to include representatives from Historic England and the Georgian Group  
Date and time: Thursday 27th July 2023 at 10.00 am

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

## 5. 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*

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

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

*Grade I*

##### 5.1.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2021-063282</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620548	Church Name:	<a href="#">Tong: St Bartholomew</a>
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Tong
Applicant Name:	Revd Pippa Thorneycroft	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	22-Aug-2018 [Sarah Butler]
Proposal:	Provision of toilet facilities and a tea point		
No. of Times to DAC:	Fifth	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 23rd February 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. Following which, the Archdeacon of Salop undertook an Archdeacon's site visit on 27th April 2023, at the request of the parish, to meet with PCC representatives and the quinquennial inspector (QI architect) at the church.

At the present meeting, the Archdeacon of Salop gave a verbal site visit report, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been considered. Further to which, Tim Ratcliffe, QI architect, introduced the updated proposal, by invitation of the DAC Chair. Following Tim Ratcliffe's departure from this meeting item, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and specifically the 'Accompanying Notes' (May 2023) file by the QI architect, which includes an appraisal of toilet facilities on either the north side or west end of the nave.

The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal for the introduction of toilet facilities and a tea point at the church, and to recognise the pastoral and missional case for this. However, it 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 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 continued to recognise the needs of the parish, as well as the particular significance of this major Grade I listed church building as a singular composition.
2. It was recognised that the west end of the church is potentially less visible than previously considered by the Committee, as it is generally viewed set back from the A41 road and relatively screened by trees within the churchyard (including along the western boundary). In contrast, the north side of the nave is potentially more visible, when viewed from Newport Road, which lies closer to the church, across the open (unplanted) northern churchyard.
3. Conversely, the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies indicated that, in relation to the architectural logic of the church, the symmetrical west end is a major elevation and a set-piece of the building, whilst the undulating north side is a back-front (rear facade), with no visible entrance – the church effectively being back to front to the street (Newport Road). As such, although visible, the north elevation is not the most important of the church, these being the other three, including the west.
4. The DAC member nominated by Historic England confirmed this view, and further commented that a key issue is not just where the extension could be seen from, but also the importance of the building, its architectural composition, and how it sits on the site.
5. The same member observed that the Statement of Significance focuses particularly on the church interior, and its fixtures and fittings, but it does not sufficiently consider the architectural composition of the building, how that has been put together, and why that is special. This thinking should then be shown to have determined the positioning of the proposed new extension.
6. The Committee affirmed that the change of proposed finish to stone, from timber and glass, of the updated west-front extension is an improvement, as well as its reduced scale (footprint), but its prominence and massing in elevation against the formal west front of this historic church remain a concern.
7. It was noted that the west extension would not require any new openings, by using the existing west door, whilst the north side would require the opening of an historic blocked entrance door. However, equally, the Committee reaffirmed its previous view that it did not consider that the issues raised regarding the north side, expanded upon by the QI architect in their latest notes, are insurmountable.
8. Overall, the majority of the DAC remained unconvinced about the west-end scheme, due to the architectural coherence of the location. However, the Committee determined that both options, for the north and west sides, should be developed, to a certain extent, in parallel at this feasibility stage, to explore the merits and demerits in each case.
9. In relation to the internal scheme, for the tea point in the north-west corner of the nave, the DAC confirmed its support for the principle of the proposal, including its location, but that further detailing is required.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. The Committee concurred with the view of the QI architect, as per their 'Accompanying Notes' (May 2023), that the updated options of the north side and west end of the nave, when further developed, should be resubmitted for external informal consultation (pre-application advice) with Historic England, the Victorian Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), and the Church Buildings Council.

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

## Grade II\*

### 5.1.2

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-081612</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620135	Church Name:	<a href="#">Trysull: All Saints</a>
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Trysull
Applicant Name:	John Tooms	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	19-Jul-2019
Proposal:	New accessible toilet in ground floor Tower Room		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£40,000 [original scheme]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 23rd February 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been addressed.

Specifically, the DAC noted that the quinquennial inspector (QI architect) has carefully considered various options for the location of the proposed toilet facilities, by way of an options appraisal, which the PCC had considered. The preferred option is to insert the facility into the base of the tower. Detailed designs have been prepared, which are modest and acceptable. In relation to which, the parish should now develop its Statements of Significance and Needs accordingly.

However, it was noted that there will be some underground services, which would require archaeological considerations. The QI architect has confirmed that they will make arrangements for an archaeologist to undertake a watching brief during the excavation of the proposed foul drainage connection. Further to which, the DAC Archaeology Adviser indicated that the parish should provide a copy of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the watching brief with their application for formal DAC advice, for approval by that Adviser.

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 Historic England and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

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

## Grade II

### 5.1.3

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2022-072442</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620048	Church Name:	<a href="#">Bednall: All Saints</a>
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:	Second	Cost Est:	£50,000 [original scheme]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The Committee last considered the proposal as a DAC site visit report approved at 20th July 2022 DAC meeting, and subsequently as a verbal site visit report by the DAC Organ Adviser accepted at 28th September 2022 DAC meeting. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee’s informal advice had been addressed.

Specifically, the DAC Organ Adviser confirmed their previous view that the proposed moving of the organ is supported, and that its repositioning will in fact make a greater musical impact in the nave. The Adviser noted that the organ should be dismantled to provide restoration of the original parts (under List B, i.e. Archdeacon’s permission), before re-erecting at the north-west corner of the nave.

The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that, in archaeological terms, the scheme is likely to have the lowest impact of the three options the PCC have considered. However, there is still some potential for human remains to be encountered during the excavation for the new foul drain and, to a lesser extent, the new pathway. Related to which, the Adviser indicated that the parish should provide a copy of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for an archaeological watching brief with their application for formal DAC advice, for approval by the DAC Archaeology Adviser.

The Committee supported the positioning and detailing of the proposed kitchenette and toilet, but suggested that consideration should be given to the possibility of a top rail on the storage cupboards at the end of the aisle. The development of the entrance porch was also supported, but the manifestation on the new inner glass door was considered to need much work. It was considered positive that the gates are to be retained, but members queried whether they could be reused somewhere rather than fixing them to the porch wall.

However, the Committee cautioned that in relation to the updated proposed south aisle screen (drawing no. 36-339-20, dated April 2023), the recommendation in the DAC site visit report (p. 2) and preceding informal DAC advice, that ‘it might be better to form a separate freestanding screen away from the arcade, within the south aisle’, had not been adopted. The view was expressed at the present meeting that, as currently shown, the arcade screen design is not resolved yet, noting that the junctions with the piers and capitals appear to have caused issues in the design process.

It was observed that, as a result, the screen design has a mixture of timber framing, timber infill panels, and direct glass-to-masonry junctions, which was considered to be overcomplicated in combination. It was instead suggested that either a timber frame should be formed all around (but which could get a little heavy), or preferably the whole screen should be set inside the arcade, as the DAC previously recommended. The Committee suggested that the quinquennial inspector (QI architect) prepare drawings of the latter, for consideration under [delegated authority](#) by a DAC architect member and the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies. If not so resolved, the application will return for full Committee consideration at the next DAC meeting.

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 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 2022 Rules), could be processed by delegated authority, in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (Amended April 2023). 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

#### 5.1.4

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2022-072989</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620370	Church Name:	<a href="#">Marston: St Leonard</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Marston St Leonard
Applicant Name:	Revd Preb Richard Grigson	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	02-Feb-2022
Proposal:	Installation of toilet and kitchen facilities		
No. of Times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	£100,000 [financed under an assurance by HS2 Ltd]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The Committee last considered the proposal, in a previous form, as a DAC site visit report approved at 14th March 2018 DAC meeting, and subsequently at 6th June 2018 DAC meeting (under Any Other Business, rather than as a submitted casework item). At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and setting 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 commented that the proposed internal tea point is compact and neat, with fairly traditional panelling, and as such was supported.
2. The general concept of the external extensions is acceptable, and the set-backs from the porch face and the church flank walls were considered to be adequate. In relation to which, the available height appears to have caused issues in the design process.
3. The proposed flat-roofed approach is probably the preferred solution, as any pitched-roof approach is likely to make more impact.

4. However, the view was expressed that there is an awkward relationship between the old and new copings, leaving small sections of the original porch eaves between the two. These will discharge water down the walls, and it would be difficult to fit gutters and downpipes.
5. It was queried whether there is sufficient upstand to the flat roof copings.
6. The slightly splayed new buttresses also appear unresolved – it was suggested that these need a stronger line or should be just upright. It was noted that any splay will be difficult to execute well without special angled bricks, or bricks laid at an angle on bed, which will need a very competent bricklayer.
7. It was also observed that the cappings to the new buttresses are flat, which will hold water against the wall. The view was expressed that they need to be angled, like the cappings to the existing buttresses.
8. Overall, the Committee resolved that the quinquennial inspector (QI architect) should explore a single lean-to against the nave west wall, covering both extensions, taller than the porch ridge, and running over the porch roof, which would be mitred onto the new roof. It was deemed that this would be a less complicated solution, on the same footprint.
9. It was suggested that the proposed extensions adjacent to the porch will require planning permission from the Local Planning Authority (LPA).
10. Separately, the DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the current late-18th-century nave is understood to have been built on the site of an earlier chapel. As such, it is possible that below-ground remains of this earlier building may exist on the site of the two proposed extensions. There is also potential for human remains to be encountered in these locations, as well as during the excavation for the proposed foul drain and package treatment plant.
11. It was recommended that the PCC should commission an archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) from an archaeological contractor of their choice, to inform further discussions with both the DAC and the LPA and their archaeological planning advisors (it is likely that, as a minimum, a DBA will be validation requirement for the LPA).
12. This should include recommendations for archaeological mitigation measures, including whether an archaeological evaluation is necessary on the site of the proposed extensions. Once the DBA is available it will be possible to advise further.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 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 the Georgian Group and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer).

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

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

None this meeting

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

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



## Grade II

### 5.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-084284</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620196	Church Name:	<a href="#">West Bromwich: St Philip</a>
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	West Bromwich All Saints with St Mary Magdalene and St Philip
Applicant Name:	Revd Dr David Jarratt	Quin. Inspector:	Bryan Martin
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-May-2022
Proposal:	Removal of north and south pinnacles on main east gable, and substitution with simple pyramidal lead cappings at low level		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£40,000
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, in relation to the urgent requirement to make safe the terracotta pinnacles on the main east gable, which are situated above a pavement and adjacent to a primary school. The DAC acknowledged that the cost of the like-for-like replacement of the terracotta pinnacles is beyond the current means of the church and PCC, which view was confirmed by the Archdeacon of Walsall.

However, the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that West Bromwich, St Philip is probably the best survival of the Birmingham terracotta school, and that the pinnacles are the major feature of the gabled front. The Committee raised considerable concerns that the proposed solution to this structural problem, through removal and lead capping, will negatively impact the aesthetics and the proportion of the listed church.

It was also noted that the proposal, and outcome, have the potential of becoming a precedent when considering other churches in similar circumstances.

With these considerations in mind, the DAC suggested that it might be possible to treat the capping as a temporary solution, therefore supporting the proposal to take down and retain the pinnacles, but with the proviso that they should be reinstated within a defined period of time – perhaps five years. It was noted that such a requirement would create the risk of potentially doubling some of the expenditures, i.e. scaffolding costs. However, the Committee resolved that it could not give its full support to the permanent replacement of these decorative elements with just a simple capping.

As part of the wider discussion, the Committee suggested that a separate meeting might be convened, including representatives of the DAC and Historic England, to discuss with the Diocesan Chancellor the issue of policy regarding urgent proposals for the temporary or permanent removal of structural elements of church buildings on public safety, rather than heritage, grounds.

In relation to the current case, 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 Historic England, the Victorian Society and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

In view of the urgency of the proposed works, 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](#) (Amended April 2023). 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; the DAC Secretary to separately convene a meeting on policy with representatives of the DAC and Historic England and the Diocesan Chancellor

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

None this meeting

**5.3 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\*

5.3.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-081778</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620448	Church Name:	<a href="#">Stretton with Claymills: St Mary</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	St Mary Stretton-with-Claymills
Applicant Name:	Charles Pidsley	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Parsons
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jul-2019
Proposal:	Decommission existing font and hood but leave in place for display purposes; use alternative portable font for Christenings		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£2,000 [original scheme]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The Committee noted that an Archdeacon's Licence for Temporary Minor Reordering, for the introduction of a portable font, had been granted on 25th May 2023, which expires on 25th May 2025 (OFS [2023-083527](#)). The DAC last considered the wider proposal as an application for informal advice at 23rd February 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was commented that in view of the application of the Lifting Operations and Lifting Equipment Regulations 1998 (LOLER) to the font cover, including the requirement for 12-monthly inspections, the proposal to take the font and cover out of use was supportable but deeply regrettable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee’s informal advice had been addressed. Specifically, the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies indicated that the parish now proposes to lower the cover on to the font but use a pressure-sensitive alarm to prevent any attempt to lift it. This was deemed to be a supportable proposal, as long as the sensor pad is, as the parish indicates, ‘folded discreetly under the hood out of sight’.

The Committee confirmed that the parish’s approach to this problem, and their visiting Morton, St Paul (Grade II\* listed, Diocese of Lincoln), which has a similar font by the same architect, JT Micklethwaite, had been very constructive.

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 Historic England and the Victorian Society, prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

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

### 5.3.2

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2022-080251</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620429	Church Name:	<a href="#">Barton-under-Needwood: St James</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Barton-under-Needwood
Applicant Name:	Revd Andy Simpson	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jan-2022
Proposal:	Augment the ring of eight bells to ten bells, replacing the 18th-century wooden and wrought iron bell frame with a steel bell frame with modern bell fittings		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second (in this form)	Cost Est:	£144,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 5th April 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee’s informal advice had been addressed.

Specifically, the DAC Bell Adviser indicated that the parish has had further consultations with its preferred bell-hanging contractor, Taylor’s of Loughborough, which has provided a drawing of the layout of the proposed new ten-bell steel bell frame. Taylor’s has asserted that no bell ropes will fall in close proximity to the guard rail at the exposed side of the open ringing gallery in the west arch of the nave. As such, this allays previous concerns about ringers’ safety, and the parish has now withdrawn its previous proposal to extend the gallery into the nave area.

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 Historic England, 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](#) (Amended April 2023). 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.

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

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

*Grade II*

5.3.3

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-084412</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620375	Church Name:	<a href="#">Salt: St James the Great</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	St James, Salt
Applicant Name:	Janet Stubbs	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	13-Jan-2021
Proposal:	Permanent disposal of two pews and reintroduction of a third pew at the nave west end, following temporary removal of the three pews under Archdeacon's Licence (OFS 2022-079258)		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Nil
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The Committee noted that an Archdeacon's Licence for Temporary Minor Reordering had been granted on 1st November 2022, which expires on 1st May 2024. The DAC carefully considered the current 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.

Specifically, the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies noted that the pews to be removed are very ordinary pitch-pine pews of 1892 and not original fittings of 1842.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable, and that the application should advance to the giving of formal DAC advice accordingly. As such, the Committee resolved to recommend the proposal.

**Decision:** Recommend

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

**5.4 Landscaping and areas for the burial of cremated remains (ABCRs) in relation to a listed or unlisted church building**

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

None this meeting

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

Grade II\*

5.4.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-084243</a>	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620312	Church Name:	<a href="#">Rushton Spencer: St Lawrence</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Rushton Spencer
Applicant Name:	Josie Hambleton	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [ret'd]
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	23-Oct-2017
Proposal:	New Area for the Burial of Cremated Remains (ABCR) within current graveyard, alongside the east-facing hedge		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee supported the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the setting of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

Specifically, the DAC considered that it is a well thought out scheme, and 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](#). The location visually forms part of an area where full burials take place, and it was noted that two upright markers have already been erected with the Chancellor's authority.

The DAC Archaeology Adviser observed that the proposed ABCR is located adjacent to a boundary hedgerow at the edge of the churchyard and within an area that appears to represent a modern extension of the churchyard. It is unlikely that any human remains will be disturbed, and the archaeological impact of the proposal would therefore be negligible.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable, and that the application should advance to the giving of formal DAC advice accordingly. As such, the Committee resolved to recommend the proposal with provisos.

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

- The DAC noted that the parish is hoping to open a larger ABCR in the future. Should permission be granted for upright memorials in the current proposal, it is recommended that the parish is made aware that no precedent has been set.

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

## 6. Casework from Diocesan Registry

## 6.1 Private faculties

### Formal advice

Grade I

#### 6.1.1

OFS Application Ref:	N/A (private faculty no. 5104)	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620450	Church Name:	<a href="#">Tutbury: St Mary the Virgin</a>
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Tutbury
Applicant Name:	██████████	Quin. Inspector:	Robert Kilgour
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	04-Mar-2019
Proposal:	Churchyard memorial which does not conform to the Chancellor's Churchyard Regulations (2013), as proposed to include two symbols (Staffordshire knot and Scottish thistle). Also to include an inscription to the petitioner's late husband, with room for a future inscription (as double grave)		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

In accordance with section 12 of the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (2023), private petitions for churchyard memorials that fall outside the requirements of the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#) (2013) can be processed by a sub-committee of the Lichfield DAC. The sub-committee operates as a working group, with the sole function of appraising applications prior to the determination and giving of formal advice by the full Committee at the subsequent DAC meeting.

At the present meeting, the Committee carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, as well as the written view of the DAC sub-committee. It was deemed that the physical attributes of the proposed memorial are clearly understandable through the submitted description and dimensioned drawings, and that the petitioner's rationale for both included symbols is well articulated. However, it was resolved that the inclusion of two symbols does not conform to the Churchyard Regulations, whereas with either of the two symbols alone the proposal would be permissible.

The DAC noted that the incumbent's declining of the memorial application is supported by the PCC, and that there is no precedent within the churchyard for a memorial having two symbols. It was concluded that the fact that this grave space is to be a double grave (presumably amongst many) offers no mitigation for the proposal.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable, and that the application should advance to the giving of formal DAC advice accordingly. As such, the Committee resolved to not recommend the proposal.

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

- There is no precedent within the churchyard for a memorial having two symbols.
- The fact that this grave space is to be a double grave (presumably amongst many) offers no mitigation for the proposal.

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

## 7. Casework by delegated authority to note

### 7.1 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 April 2023), on behalf of the full DAC

#### 7.1.1

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2022-080895</a>	Church Name:	Trent Vale: St John the Evangelist
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Confirmatory faculty for securing the building after the emergency response following fire at the church (in April 2022)		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	31st March 2023

#### 7.1.2

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-083606</a>	Church Name:	Trent Vale: St John the Evangelist
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Upholding 4 interim faculties (nos 5016, 5051, 5077, 5091) granted following fire at the church (in April 2022)		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	31st March 2023

#### 7.1.3

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2021-058625</a>	Church Name:	Whittington: St Giles
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	External extension and internal reordering [confirmation of external formal consultation under delegated authority]		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	28th April 2023

#### 7.1.4

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2022-079755</a>	Church Name:	Brewood: St Mary and St Chad
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Repairs to nave south aisle roof arising from 2022 QI report, with improvements to weather protection		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	9th May 2023

#### 7.1.5

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-084060</a>	Church Name:	Acton Trussell: St James
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Replacement of current interior electric lights with modern programmable LED system		
DAC Consultee:	Brough Skingley	Date NoA Issued:	9th May 2023

## 7.1.6

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-084210</a>	Church Name:	Darlaston: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Reinforcement of grassed area in front of church hall using car park mesh and laying two gravelled areas to improve drainage		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	9th May 2023

## 7.1.7

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2022-080333</a>	Church Name:	Eccleshall: Holy Trinity
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	To upgrade the AV system with 3 additional screens and 2 fixed cameras		
DAC Consultee:	Brough Skingley	Date NoA Issued:	9th May 2023

## 7.1.8

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-083522</a>	Church Name:	Leigh: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Remove the rotten ramp and dais at the east end of the nave (confirmatory works), and re-board and treat the pew platforms below (works not yet undertaken)		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	15th May 2023

## 7.1.9

OFS Application Ref:	N/A [private faculty no. 5088]	Church Name:	Stretton w Claymills: St Mary
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Application by Stretton Parish Council for cleaning and restoration of two grave areas and memorials to the family of the late William Shrewsbury within churchyard		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	15th May 2023

## 7.1.10

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2023-084575</a>	Church Name:	Brereton: St Michael
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Localised repair of Church Room flat roof following removal of redundant cold water storage tank and wooden housing (granted under interim faculty no. 5086)		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	15th May 2023

## 7.1.11

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2022-079368</a>	Church Name:	Longsdon: St Chad
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Following extensive dry rot in floor of nave north aisle: treatment of floor; removal of redundant radiators and pipework; re-establishing social area with breathable carpeted floor finish (granted under interim faculty nos 5080, 5083, 5114)		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	16th May 2023

## 7.1.12

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2019-035396</a>	Church Name:	Tatenhill: St Michael & All Angels
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent



Proposal:	To restore the north and south face of the nave roof and the porch roof (granted under interim faculty no. 4778)		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	19th May 2023

### 7.1.13

OFS Application Ref:	<a href="#">2022-071001</a>	Church Name:	Rugeley: St Augustine
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Laying up Worcester Regimental Standard in nave gallery using a wall bracket		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Foster	Date NoA Issued:	22nd May 2023

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

**Action:** None

## 7.2 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 April 2023), on behalf of the full DAC*

7.2.1 Willenhall, St Giles (Grade II), Simon Smith proposed inspector

7.2.2 Whittington, St John the Baptist (Grade II), Geraint Roberts proposed inspector

7.2.3 Fradley, St Stephen (unlisted), Joanna Lawton proposed inspector

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

**Action:** None

## 8. Any other business

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 26th July 2023 at 2.00 pm**

to be held by online conferencing – *please note not hybridly*

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