

IN THE CONSISTORY COURT AT LINCOLN

In the matter of St John the Evangelist, Manthorpe

Judgment (II)

1. On 16/2/19 I gave judgement in this Petition granting a Faculty subject to certain conditions. Two elements of the internal reordering which I was unable to authorise were:
 - (i) The dismantling of the pulpit, and
 - (ii) The removal of the chancel pews.
2. On 5/3/19 Guy Foreman, the project architect, sent further explanations for these two elements. He explains that the reason for the removal of the chancel pews follows on from the repositioning of the altar rail which is to be moved westwards to allow more ease in administering communion. Photographs have been provided to show the difficulty for communicants if the altar rail moves westwards and the chancel pews are not moved. This explanation was not provided in any of the documents before me when I gave judgement. I am satisfied that this is adequate justification for the repositioning of the chancel pews. I would invite the Petitioners to consider where these pews may best be incorporated elsewhere in the church within the new scheme. I cannot permit their removal from the church.
3. Mr Foreman also explains the problems created by the existing pulpit's position. I understand the physical barrier it creates for those on the south side of the nave and the difficulties it creates with marriage ceremonies as explained in the email. I acknowledge all the problems that he identifies in his email. However, I cannot permit the disassembly of the pulpit (even by using existing mortar beds and not cutting stone). It is part of the original design of this estate

church and its 're imagining' into 2 separate items would be to inflict such harm on the church as a whole that it cannot be permitted.

4. It may be that the PCC have already fully considered this, but since the pulpit was moved 60 years ago, there may be merit in investigating further whether the pulpit could be moved again within the church to a better position for sight lines. This would be a matter upon which they could take further advice from the DAC, but I cannot permit to pulpit to be 'disassembled' as proposed in this Petition.
5. I have read further emails from the Petitioners. The removal of the electric organ at the base of the tower is authorised as part of this Faculty. I note that a decision for its replacement is deferred. A further Faculty application will be necessary for the new organ when that decision is taken.
6. I am satisfied that the final DAC proviso has been satisfied concerning the base level of lighting and what is proposed by the PCC is authorised by this Faculty.

The Reverend and Worshipful Chancellor His Honour Judge Mark Bishop

15th April 2019