

IN THE CONSISTORY COURT OF THE DIOCESE OF GLOUCESTER

BEFORE ALICIA COLLINSON, DEPUTY CHANCELLOR

**IN THE MATTER OF ST. LUKE, TUTSHILL**

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PETITION FOR A MAJOR REORDERING SCHEME

**INTERIM JUDGMENT**

Introduction

1. St. Luke's church, Tutshill, in the parish of Tidenham with Beachley and Lancault, was built to a design of 1852 by the Victorian architect, Henry Woodyer, and was consecrated in 1853. Woodyer was a pupil of William Butterfield, a disciple of A.W.N.Pugin, and was responsible for a number of Gloucestershire churches with distinctive Victorian features. The style was based on a 14<sup>th</sup> century decorated motif. The sanctuary retains some features dating back to that time, with characteristic encaustic patterned floor tiles (attributed to William Godwin of Lugwardine). The East Window and the South Window both date from 1853 and were designed by Wailes. The church was subsequently altered, with the addition of a north aisle, to plans by Woodyer in 1872, with the creation of 4 internal pillared arches.
2. In the twentieth century there were further additions and repairs. Two reredos panels were carved and erected with a war memorial in 1920 on the altar wall (see below). Electric light was introduced in 1925 (see below). In the 1960s, the choir stalls were replaced with new. In 1995 a faculty was granted for the construction of an extension to the north side to create additional rooms, including the St. Luke's meeting room, a kitchen and toilets, all designed to be in keeping with the original Victorian plans. In 2008 the south roof was retiled with handmade tiles, following a major fundraising exercise.
3. The church has Grade II listing, reflecting its relatively recent construction but also the significance of its historical heritage. Its surrounding area is not in a conservation area. There are unlikely to be any significant archaeological features, since this was a Victorian new build on an open site. It is, however, close to Offa's Dyke path (which passes a short distance to the west) and I am told that it has some links with the author, J.K.Rowling. Its surrounding churchyard was closed in February 2003.
4. The Church stands close to the church school and is well used within the village. It is said to have a regular congregation of 80, and these numbers are greatly increased when the school pupils attend services. The housing provision in the local area is expanding and it is anticipated that there will be a growing and more diverse congregation.
5. In the light of this, there are vigorous plans to develop the ministry and mission of the church through improved and flexible accommodation within the existing building as set out in the undated Statement of Significance and Needs ("the Statement") enclosed with the Petition. The updated Supporting Arguments document ("the Supporting Arguments") from the PCC states: *"The core aim of the proposed works is to create a flexible space which can be adapted to meet the day to day needs of our contemporary church and community, whilst at the same time remaining a dignified place of worship sympathetic to its heritage and architecture."*

## The Petition

6. The petitioners are the priest in charge: the Rev'd David Treharne, and the two churchwardens, Mr David Burr and Mr Peter Jones. The petition seeks a faculty to allow a major reordering of the church. Primarily this will include complete replacement of the nave pews with chairs, and substantial upgrading of the facilities including underfloor heating, rewiring and lighting and the introduction of a servery within the nave. There are a plethora of additional changes which have been included into the petition, and I will consider each one, individually, below.
7. The Petition, commenced in May 2016, followed a very prolonged consultation process within the parish, and amongst other local churches, from about March 2008 onwards as set out in the Statement between pages 9 and 11. (I do not have complete details of the consultation process and the various permutations, but I can follow the gist in the DAC site visit notes from 19.10.10, 7.4.14 and 12.11.15. For some reason, I do not have any notes from the visit on the 15.1.13.) There have been some unavoidable delays during this time: first an interregnum and then the need to consider what would happen to nearby Tidenham Church, which was put on the Endangered Church Buildings list.
8. The PCC held a meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and unanimously approved that the Faculty Petition be submitted (although it was accepted there was outstanding information to be included in the papers.)
9. The DAC, after a long consultation process, provided their summary report on the 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017. They gave general approval to the works subject to the following:
  - (a) *Details of the design and colour of the floor tiles shall be submitted to the DAC for approval prior to the commencement of the scheme.*
  - (b) *If the Chancellor is minded to approve the use of an upholstered chair, details of the colour shall be submitted to the DAC for approval.*
10. There were further discussions with the parish which resulted in some changes to the initial plans, particularly in relation to the inner main door.
11. The public notices appear to have been properly displayed, between the 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2017 and the 19<sup>th</sup> February 2017 (although only one copy of the original has been sent to me). From the information provided, I am satisfied that opinion has been canvassed as widely as possible within the parish.
12. The Registry has received no letters of objection from parishioners, following the public notices being aired.

## Consultations with external bodies

13. The Forest of Dean council has granted planning permission for those of the external changes to the building which are within their remit. (The external glazed door and the minor alterations such as the gas meter/flue.) Such permission is conditional on the detailed external door proposals and the detailed plans for the external flue being submitted to the Council for approval.
14. The Victorian Society sent a letter on the 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016, objecting to the removal of all the pews and objecting to the use of upholstered replacement seating on the basis they would cause harm to the church. (They also objected to the previous plans for the removal of the main entrance door.) On the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, Ms Laird sent an email, after considering further comments from the parish, indicating that they remained opposed to the total removal of pews and any use of upholstered chairs. Their specific

comments will be considered below with each of the relevant elements. The Society has very properly asked for its objections to be taken into account, and I will do so.

15. Historic England carried out a site visit on the 24<sup>th</sup> June 2016 and in their letter of the 27<sup>th</sup> June 2016, queried the need for the servery. They sought more justification for the removal of the pews. They urged the retention of the internal entrance door. They declared the relocation of the reredos to be ‘unjustified’. As with the Victorian Society, their specific comments will be considered below with each of the relevant elements.
16. The Ancient Monuments Society expressed some concern about the relocation of the reredos (although they may have misunderstood the layout from the photographs provided with the Statement). The email provided is undated.
17. There were late representations received from the Tidenham Historical Group by letter of the chairman, Keith Underwood, dated the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017, particularly concerning the relocation of the two reredos panels (see below).
18. I take full account of all the representations from those bodies, but I note that none has sought to become a party opponent in relation to the Petition for the Faculty.

#### Further considerations

19. The architect chosen by the PCC to design and oversee the works is Mr Chris McGonagle, of Liddell & Associates. He is not the architect appointed under the Inspection of Churches Measure 1955, but was chosen following competitive tender on the grounds of “*experience, ideas, accessibility and price*”
20. On the 19<sup>th</sup> May 2017, I undertook a site visit (“the Visit”) with Lorna Medcraft from the Registry. We were assisted by Chris McGonagle, architect; the two Churchwardens, Mr Burr and Mr Jones; and Janice Hamilton, Tony Harris, Ewen Hamilton and Tania White from the parish. I reminded them that I was not taking evidence from them. Where information did become available during the Visit, I note it below.
21. At the Visit, I was given an updated copy of the Parish’s ‘Supporting Arguments’ (and a copy has been retained at the Registry.) This was identical to the original ‘Supporting Arguments’ document included with the Petition, save for the changed details about the proposals for the internal main door.
22. At my request, I was provided with the complete bundle of current Drawings from the architect. I was also helpfully lent a book, published in 2014 by the Tidenham Historical Group: entitled “The Churches and Chapels of the Parish of Tidenham; their history and architecture.” (to which I refer respectively below by the initials ‘THG’ and by the abbreviation ‘Churches and Chapels’).

#### The Law:

23. In relation to all the proposed changes listed below, I follow the framework and guidelines commended by the Court of Arches in the case of *Re St. Alkmund, Duffield* [2013] Fam 158, by asking a series of questions:
  - (1) Would the proposals, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest?
  - (2) If the answer to Question (1) is ‘no’, the ordinary presumption in faculty applications ‘in favour of things as they stand’ is applicable, and can be rebutted more or less readily, depending on the particular nature of the proposals. ... Questions (3), (4) & (5) do not

arise.

(3) If the answer to Question (1) is ‘yes’, how serious would the harm be?

(4) How clear and convincing is the justification for carrying out the proposals?

(5) Bearing in mind that there is a strong presumption against proposals which will adversely affect the special character of a listed building ... will any resulting public benefit (including matters such as liturgical freedom, pastoral well-being, opportunities for mission, and putting the church to viable uses consistent with its role as a place of worship and mission) outweigh the harm? In answering (5), the more serious the harm, the greater will be the level of benefit needed before the proposals should be permitted. This will particularly be the case if the harm is to a building which is listed Grade 1 or 2\*, where serious harm should only exceptionally be allowed.

24. I refer to these below as the “Duffield Questions”.

### The layout of this interim judgment

25. In the absence of any letters of objection from parishioners or any application by an external body to become a party opponent, I have concluded there is no need to hold a consistory court at this particular time. The current proposals are entirely suitable for interim consideration on paper.

26. This is an interim judgment because there are many elements of the proposed reordering which are reasonably clear and which can proceed, subject to conditions, as set out below in Sections A to K. However, there are other elements of the proposals which require further consideration, as set out below in Sections L to U. In particular, the recent opening up of the decorative panel on the East wall (Section M), demands a general reappraisal of all the plans for the chancel. That reappraisal may be more contentious, and I do not rule out the possibility of a consistory court being necessary.

27. For ease of consideration, I will give my decision in respect of each of the elements of the proposed scheme under the individual lettered Section headings. These are yellow highlighted on this document.<sup>1</sup> There follows a collection of ancillary comments on the proposals. I will provide a separate document including all the faculty permissions and directions, using the same paragraph numbers.

28. This is a long document, which I trust will be self-explanatory, but I will be happy to elucidate anything which requires further explanation.

## **MATTERS APPROVED, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS**

### **A THE PEWS**

#### Current observation of the pews

29. There appears to be general agreement that the pews, whilst of Victorian origin, do not appear to be of Woodyer design. The Statement describes them as ‘original but

---

<sup>1</sup> Editor’s Note: As some people will only be able to print this judgment in black and white, the yellow highlighting has been replaced with bold italics.

uncomfortable'. The 2010 DAC site visit described them as: "...fairly standard and of no particular quality. They are upright (no rake) but by no means uncomfortable." The Supporting Arguments point out that the pews are not comfortable, with narrow depth of seat and a straight back. It is said that they can only comfortably be used for 15 to 20 minutes. (There is often diversity of opinion as to what constitutes 'comfort' in these circumstances.)

30. I note with interest that Churches and Chapels (page 114-5) records that the interior of the church was badly damaged by fire on the 18<sup>th</sup> January 1881, when '£50 worth' of damage was suffered. It is possible that the original pews may have been irreparably damaged at that time, and that the current pews were purchased as replacements. (It may well be that THG have further information on this in their records.)
31. The current capacity of the pews is said to be 160. The average Sunday congregation is about 80, with peak attendance of 140 for festivals and a maximum usage of about 200 for some funerals. When school services are held, over 250 children and parents may need to fit into the existing pews (which is presumably feasible because children take up shorter portions of the pews when they 'squash up'. The pews which extend beyond the columns towards the north wall have extremely poor sight lines to the chancel.
32. Visual inspection at the Visit confirmed the observations to be found in the papers, that the pews in the nave are in poor condition. I observed extensive wear and tear, with widespread wood worm damage. There are splits in some of the seats and some splintered edges which are likely to tear clothing. The weight bearing struts appear relatively flimsy.
33. I pondered, at the Visit, whether any of the pews could be made moveable by being fitted onto castors, and took the view that such an exercise, even for those free of wood worm, would be unsuccessful because of the need for major reinforcement and a high centre of gravity. I accept the contention made in the Supporting Arguments that the pews rely on their fixing for stability and that this could potentially be difficult on tiles.
34. At the east end of the nave, it is apparent that the original separate pew fronts have been removed at some point, and that the front pews were modified so that their seats can fold down. I was told at the Visit that this increases the space within which music and singing can take place. The current cut out areas of the floor carpet and the gap where the southern pew front was formerly attached to the southern dado rail, show their original location. The resultant carpet layout is visually unattractive and constitutes a trip hazard. It is not apparent that this work was carried out under a faculty when it was carried out in the 'early 2000s' (although I and the Registry records are open to correction on this point).
35. ***I direct the PCC to provide details of any faculty granted in respect of the removal of the pew fronts and the alterations to the front pews, and to provide a written explanation if one was not sought.***
36. Although the 2015 DAC note recommended that the dado rail be retained on the south wall, as a protection for the wall against being knocked by chairs, during the Visit I noted that it was built around the ends of each pew where they abutted the wall, and would not be capable of being retained as a continuous band of boarding once the pews were removed. Each pew back is cut into the dado rail with a V-shaped cut.

Proposal for the removal of the pews:

37. The Petition seeks to remove all of the nave pews together with the dado panelling on the south wall. The Statement points out: "*The space for welcoming people and*

*mingling before and after services is very restricted and narrow aisles cause a bottleneck and are not conducive to people lingering. We need to create a better space for circulation.” “Communion services using a nave altar have been introduced but aisles and front pews again cause bottlenecks for movement interrupting the flow of serving the elements.” “The majority of music for church services is currently provided by a growing music group who squeeze into a space at the front of the nave. This layout adversely affects group dynamics and hampers communication between musicians. There is need for greater space for the group to arrange themselves appropriately to lead sung congregational worship.”*

38. Documents provided with the Petition give examples of the wide range of activities which the church could house if the pews were removed. The list was extremely persuasive. I considered the meeting room during the Visit, and accept it is not sufficiently large or properly heated to host the sort of large gatherings which the parish wishes to house. There is no dedicated church hall, and it is not always possible to hire the school hall (where the furniture is ‘child sized’) or other community halls.
39. Similar points are made in the Supporting Arguments which conclude: *“The retention of any section of pews would only serve to diminish the effectiveness of the scheme both in terms of flexibility and heating, and nothing of any meaningful value to the architecture and heritage would be gained.”*

Views expressed as to the removal of the pews:

40. It was questioned, by the DAC in 2010, whether all the pews need to be removed or whether some could be retained as perimeter seating. The parish continues to propose full removal of the nave pews, and they explain this in the Supporting Arguments as being the need to be able to conduct services around the font, in the round or half round, which cannot be done without the whole nave being free of pews. They do not want the available space to be limited by having a remaining block of pews, where the underfloor heating could not be installed. I accept that this is a small church, with limited space.
41. The section of the Statement dealing with ‘evidence of support’ has recorded a number of public consultations about the removal of all the nave pews, and noted, over the years, that there were expressions of sadness about this proposal. A poll in 2010 showed 20% were not in favour of replacing the pews with chairs. When over 40 people attended in 2016 only one or two people were expressing such views. However, those expressions of sadness have not led to any parishioners becoming objectors to the scheme.
42. The Victorian Society, by Sophia Laird, their Churches Conservation Officer, in June 2016 said: *“The removal of the pews from the church would have a significant impact on the character of the interior, and the harm this would cause would need to be well justified. The Statement of need does not adequately justify this harm.... The parish should produce an options appraisal which explores various alternatives to the removal of all of the pews from the church. The pews add a significant amount of richness and interest to the interior, which would be lost if they were removed. If a central block of pews were retained and made moveable, this would retain the character and richness the pews contribute to the interior and allow for increased flexibility.”*
43. I should add that there is no indication in Sophia Laird’s letter of the 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016 or the email of the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017 that she has visited the church or inspected the pews. I find I have to differ from her as to the idea that these particular pews add ‘richness and interest’ to the interior of the church.

44. Historic England, in June 2016, said: *“The complete removal of pews in the nave will significantly alter the sense of arrival within this Victorian church. The current arrangement retains a strong architectural facet of Victorian worship with a reinforced east-west axial. Whilst we accept that styles of worship have changed, and we encourage the increased use of historic buildings by enabling a more flexible arrangement, we also urge some retention of this historic fabric to protect the important east-west emphasis. The removal of a portion of these pews to the rear of the nave and within the north aisle will still provide a significant usable space, combined with the existing meeting space, whilst retaining a moderate block of pews. If complete removal is pursued, we advise further justification is provided to demonstrate that this degree of undisturbed space is essential...”*
45. It is worth noting that Ms Laird added in her email of January 2017: *“Our advice, like that of the CBC, is based on our years of experience with church re-ordering and seeing the impact that different types of seating[have] in the whole spectrum of churches. There is no uniform answer when it comes to new seating in historic churches, as each church has a unique set of circumstances.”*

Decision as to the removal of the nave pews:

46. I have carefully considered the Statement and the Supporting Arguments put forward by the Parish, and the contrary observations made by the Victorian Society and Historic England, concerning the removal or retention of the nave pews. My own careful inspection of the state of the pews during the Visit was also weighed in the balance, together with the proposals for underfloor heating in the nave and the poor state of many of the current floorboards.
47. My response to Duffield Question (1) is ‘no’: the removal of these particular pews will not result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest. The pews, in themselves, have for the most part more than reached the end of their useful life. The ordinary presumption under Duffield Question (2) can then be rebutted by the need for replacement seating within the church.
- 48. *For the reasons set out above, I permit the complete removal of the nave pews.***
49. I was attracted by the suggestion that some of the pews might be capable of being retained as one line of perimeter benching. I can see that this could be achieved along the southern wall (starting at a point just clear of the position to be taken by the Victorian timber door) and fixed against the wall (resting on the new floor, but not penetrating it with fixings), leading round to the side of the pulpit. This might well form an attractive and coherent historical link between the door and pulpit on that side of the church. This is a possibility which has not been put, in terms, to the Parish for their consideration. There is the opportunity to do this, given this is only an interim judgment, not a final determination.
- 50. *I direct that the Parish shall consider the feasibility of retaining one line of better quality pew benching along the southern wall and, should they choose to do so, that they will provide Drawings and plans of the proposed lay out.***

**B THE CHOICE OF REPLACEMENT SEATING:**

Views expressed as to the issue of upholstered or un-upholstered seating:

51. The Victorian Society in June 2016 observed: *“Any new seating should be wooden and*

*un-upholstered as upholstered seating negatively affects the aesthetic quality of the church. This type of seating is also suggested by the Church Buildings Council.”*

52. The Church Buildings Council guidance, which the Victorian Society commented upon in their letter, provides: *“The Council’s experience is that wooden chairs have the greatest sympathy with historic church environments, present the best value for money with long lifespans, and that a well-designed ergonomic wooden chair can provide as much comfort as an upholstered design. Upholstered seats are not considered to be appropriate for the following reasons: They have a significant impact in terms of colour, texture and character which is not consonant with the quality of a highly listed church.”*
53. This guidance was referred to in the case of *Re Holy Trinity, Long Itchington* [2016] ECC Cov 7 which related to a Mediaeval church which had the higher Grade II\* status.
54. The Parish has pointed out in a supplementary document: “Choice of Chair for St.Luke’s church Tutshill” that they had not until very recently been made aware of the CBC guidelines and that none of the DAC site visits had alerted them to the possibility of there being a ban on upholstered seating. The document sets out a carefully reasoned case in favour of upholstered seating. It should be noted that a few seat cushions are already brought into church haphazardly, so that the general appearance is already being impacted upon.
55. In considering what needs to be provided as replacement seating, the Parish has been particularly guided by the need to be able to accommodate the school service congregations of up to 250 people, in a very small church. To this end they are looking to have chairs which can be attached to one another to form a continuous block of bench seating, so that children can easily ‘squash up’. Whilst plain flat wooden chairs would also enable this to happen, the join would still be uncomfortable to sit on, and the recommendation of a wooden chair with a moulded back and seat, suitable for a single adult, would not permit multiple use by children.
56. There is an additional argument in favour of upholstered seating, which is that the acoustics may be radically changed in this particular church by the removal of the nave carpet and that upholstered seating would dampen potential reverberations.
57. I note that the church has made use of wooden framed upholstered chairs for the past 22 years, to supplement the pews for more populous services, so is well aware of what is needed and how well they last. It is their analysis that the fabric on these chairs has lasted well over that period, whereas the frames have needed repair because they were only constructed with dowels. (I read this as an indication that their upholstery has lasted over 20 years, whereas Ms Laird, in her email of January 2017, suggests that ‘the parish’s own admission their upholstered chairs have started to fail and had to be strengthened’ supports her contentions in favour of un-upholstered chairs.)
58. I take the view that provided the PCC appreciates that upholstery may possibly need replacing in the medium term, then it is for them to balance that possibility with the immediate and prospective needs of their congregation.
59. Ms Laird, in her email of January 2017, asserted: *“In this instance the harm caused to the building by the introduction of upholstered seating has not been justified.”* Whilst I take into account her professional expertise and all the various points she makes in her letter and email, I differ from that opinion. I have seen the interior of this church and have considered the prospective change of the flooring material. I bear in mind the whole aesthetic of the building as it is and as it will be. As she has accepted: *“There is no uniform answer when it comes to new seating in historic churches, as each church has*

*a unique set of circumstances.”*

60. Taking into account all the representations, I conclude that the Parish has made out an argument for introducing upholstered chairs in the nave.

The proposals for the replacement chairs:

61. The parish has indicated a strong preference to buy 80 to 100 Winscombe-Hudson Wood stacking chairs to form the usual seating option for services. These have an under seat shelf for books and papers. They can be joined together to form a continuous bench of seating. There is scope for there to be arms on some of the chairs. These are chairs which will rarely need to be stacked, as they will mostly be laid out in the nave, predominantly in the traditional east facing array.
62. As overflow seating, the parish would like to buy 50 to 60 Rosehill lightweight stacking chairs, which have a metal frame, but a padded back and seat. They can be stacked on trolleys in piles of 25, which could be wheeled to and from storage as required.
63. Possible colours of fabric were provided at my visit to the church on the 19<sup>th</sup> May 2017. Having considered the options within the church as it currently appears, I recommended that a dark brown or green was most likely to enhance rather than clash with the vibrant colours of the stained glass windows. The Parish will discuss this further and will make a proposal to the DAC.

Decision as to the replacement seating:

64. ***I am satisfied that the Parish has made out a case for the use of upholstered chairs as replacement seating in this Grade II listed building. I agree they should purchase 100 of the Winscombe Hudson Wood Stacking Chairs. Of those, at least 10 should have arms.***
65. ***I agree that the Parish should purchase 50 of the Rosehill lightweight stacking chairs, with the metal frame, together with two trolleys to move them in and out of storage. I do not stipulate that these should have arms. (If they have the finances, I recommend they purchase 75 of these chairs and 3 trolleys, given the planned increases in numbers.)***
66. ***I direct that the dimensions of each trolley stacked with 25 Rosehill chairs be provided, so that calculations can be made as to the total amount of storage space they will require.***
67. ***The colour of the fabric for all of those chairs shall be the same and shall be a muted reasonably dark colour, to be agreed with the DAC (or by myself, if there is disagreement).***
68. ***For the avoidance of doubt, permission is refused to introduce two sofas in to the north aisle as suggested by Drawing 2e. This may just be no more than a ‘design’ suggestion, but permission has not been sought and they would be inappropriate, in my judgment, in those locations.***

**C THE NAVE FLOOR AND HEATING SYSTEM:**

Current observation:

69. The nave floor is wooden throughout and currently covered by rather tired carpet. On the north side, adjacent to where the additional building was added in 1995, it is apparent that there is considerable rot in the wooden flooring, which would require

repair in any event. The 2014 DAC site visit opined that the extension had cut off ventilation to the underfloor in this area: something which was not apparently appreciated at the time.

70. The current heating system in the nave involves a series of under pew heaters. At the Visit, I noted warning signs on each pew advising that there was a danger of being burned if these were touched. I have some doubts that these would sufficiently exculpate the parish if school children came into contact with the heaters, but I was advised there had been no known insurance claims.
71. There are also a number of overhead infra red heaters around the church. These are apparently inefficient and can give rise to headaches and to people fainting.
72. The Statement mentions that the proposed heating would be less intrusive, both audibly and visibly, than the present system. The heating was not on when I visited, so I was not able to establish whether there was such an intrusion from its use. I do, however, agree that the entire system is outdated and in need of replacement.

Proposal for the replacement of the nave floor and current heating system with a new underfloor heating system:

73. The Faculty seeks permission to remove the wooden floor in the nave and to install an underfloor heating system as designed by Jupiter Heating systems. At the Visit, I was able to examine examples of the permeable material which would be used. Drawing 15a shows that above the subsoil at the lowest level, there would be a Geotextile membrane, then 100 mm of Technopor aerated glass foam (which would carry uPVC ducts for electrical services), then a Visqueen 1200 gauge damp proof membrane, then 30 mm of crushed slate levelling material, then 20 mm of Fermacell; then 50 mm of Kingspan insulation; then the Jupiter underfloor heating panels and pipework (at 125 cm intervals); then screed replacement tiles and finally a tiled finish.
74. The walls would be finished with a damp proof course against the wall, then vertical battens with plasterboard and plaster painted, finished with a skirting board and a timber closer at the appropriate height up the wall to that currently occupied by the dado rail on the south wall.
75. There is a plan to use floor tiles which would enable heat to be readily conducted. At the Visit, I was shown an example of a light brown wood effect tile. I said it was too light in colour and would not be appropriate for the proposed flooring. I note that the DAC was also unhappy about the use of such a wood effect tile. Those present at the Visit from the parish were extremely resistant to the idea of any patterning to the floor tiles which might suggest a specific east-west layout of the floor plan.
76. The PCC has suggested that laying rectangular tiles with an east-west axis would be sufficient to draw the eye towards the east end of the church. They will be invited to reconsider this.
77. The heating system would be run from a gas boiler in the vestry (see below) with controls in the vestry.
78. Approximate costings for running the heating system have been provided, on the basis that it is recommended the system runs at 14°C all the time, and is boosted to 18°C for events. These have been approved by the DAC following additional questions.
79. It is proposed that there be a ramp up to the vestry at the north east corner of the nave..

80. The documents provided with the Petition included a table setting out the current uses of the church and the proposed additional usage with the availability of heating. This persuasively demonstrated the many benefits to the church of having reliable heating.

Views expressed as to the replacement of the nave floor with a new underfloor heating system:

81. Historic England in June 2016 expressed concern about a 'wood effect tile' or a 'lino finish' and recommended a flooring design that incorporated and reinforced the east-west axis in the corridor currently between the pews from the chancel to the west window. I apprehend that the Victorian Society would share those views. I take them into account in my decision below.

Decision as to the replacement of the nave floor and current heating system with a new underfloor heating system:

- 82. *I am satisfied that the parish has made out a good case for the installation of the proposed underfloor heating system. This will be subject to the following conditions:***

***(a) The carpet will be removed in full throughout the nave and will not be replaced.***

***(b) The floor tiles to be used in the nave are to have full slip resistance, even when wet in adverse weather conditions or when coffee or tea might be spilled.***

***(c) The design and colour of the floor tiles are to be approved by the DAC prior to the commencement of laying the new floor. In the event of disagreement, I will rule on the appropriate tile from the specimens offered.***

***(d) The PCC shall reconsider the feasibility of introducing different coloured tiles to delineate the east-west axis of the church.***

***(e) The stone footings to the columns will be preserved throughout.***

***(f) Provision will be made within the scheme for a proper stone footing for the relocated font (as set out below).***

**D THE ELECTRICAL CIRCUITS, LIGHTING AND AUDIO VISUAL EQUIPMENT IN THE NAVE:**

Current observation of the lighting and electrical circuits in the nave:

83. The papers suggest the pendant lights were installed in either the 1950s or 1963. They are now very dated in appearance. They are not particularly well designed. They hang down from the ceiling and apparently intrude on sight lines when used with modern visual projection equipment. (I did not see such equipment being used on the Visit, but I can readily accept that they inconvenience many.)
84. In many places around the church there are visible and untidy bundles of cables. It will be important to deal with the hazards and fire risks associated with such overloading of the existing circuits.

Proposal for the updating of the electrical circuits, lighting and the introduction of audio visual equipment in the nave:

85. The proposed electrical circuits and lighting configurations are set out on Drawing 16d. There is also provision for two overhead projectors with two high level electronically operated screens (one over the pulpit and one somewhere near the entrance door) and

for various microphone points. A loop system around the nave (inside the aisle pillars) is proposed. There would be wall mounted speakers and spotlights in the rafters. An audio mixing desk would be sited against the west wall of the nave.

86. (I should add that the earlier Drawings 3 and 16c, which were included with the Petition papers, dating from the 14<sup>th</sup> December 2015 and the 26<sup>th</sup> May 2016, created very considerable confusion, since they provided for radically different set ups. For the purposes of the Petition, I am dealing with the configurations set out in Drawing 16d.)
87. The proposals set out on Drawing 16d give rise to a number of concerns (set out below and in Section O).

Views expressed as to the electrical circuits, lighting and audio visual equipment in the nave:

88. Historic England, in June 2016, observed: *“Further information is required to advise on the lighting scheme (light units and predicted effect of lighting proposals). The most sympathetic lighting will reinforce natural light in daytime, while night time lighting will reflect historic methods of illumination. ChurchCare ... offers useful guidance on lighting which we would wish to see inform these proposals.”*

Concerns as to the electrical circuits, lighting and audio visual equipment in the nave:

89. No details are provided about the appearance of a projector and screen over the pulpit. The appearance of such equipment needs to be as unobtrusive as possible. Further details are needed to ensure that they will be appropriate.
90. No rationale whatsoever is provided to justify the provision of a second projector and screen near the entrance door. In what circumstances will people be looking towards the south? The details themselves are confused. The high level screen relating to the projector near the entrance door is not included on Drawing 16d (although it appears on an earlier Drawing 2d with a projector in a different location). It is not clear that Drawing 16d takes into account the revised proposals for the Victorian internal door to be permanently sited in that area, unless it is proposed that any screen would be extremely high on the wall which would be uncomfortable to view.
91. I note that a double socket is proposed just to the right inside the doorway in a position which will be covered by the internal door. Reconsideration is needed.
92. At present, there is a lantern light at the apex of the door frame on the external wall above the main mesh door. The Statement mentions that a replacement external light with sensor will be installed. It is not clear whether it is proposed that the existing light, which suits the character of the entrance, is intended to be retained. No specification has been provided for the new light on Drawing 16d. Indeed, no cabling is shown extending to that point of the exterior wall, at all.
93. There are particular concerns about the proposed lighting on the altar wall which are set out in full in Section O.

Decision as to the lighting and the general updating of the electrical circuits:

94. ***I agree that the wiring, lighting and audio visual equipment set out on Drawing 16d may be implemented save for the following matters:***

***(a) The projector and screen over the pulpit will not be installed until full elevation drawings and photographs of the proposed equipment have been approved by the DAC.***

***(b) A full written justification explaining the need for a second***

***projector and screen at the western end of the southern wall will be provided, together with supporting drawings and photographs of the proposed equipment and no equipment shall be installed at that location without the prior approval of the Deputy Chancellor.***

- (c) Wiring in preparation for the possible installation of the proposed projectors and screens may be put in place at the same time that other overhead electrical works relating to the lighting are carried out.***
- (d) The precise details of the exterior light above the main doorway are to be provided, including information about whether the current lantern will be retained. No changes shall be made to the existing fitting until they have been approved by the DAC.***
- (e) The locations for double electrical sockets will be reconsidered so that there are adequate numbers in the chancel and there is no clash with the location of the Victorian internal door.***
- (f) The wall washer lights shall not to be installed on the altar wall, although preliminary wiring may be provided as part of the wiring installation.***
- (g) The wiring for the overhead heaters in the chancel may be installed, but no overhead heaters will be connected until an opportunity to test the working of the full under floor heating system has been taken, and a further decision is taken by the DAC as to whether such overhead heaters are necessary.***

## **E THE GAS SUPPLY AND NEW BOILER IN THE VESTRY:**

### **Proposal for the provision of new incoming gas supply and new boiler in the vestry:**

- 95. The Petition seeks to install a new gas supply and a new weather compensating gas boiler in the vestry as part of the nave underfloor heating system. This will require the creation of a balanced flue, venting to the exterior of the north wall (as shown on Drawing 13a) above the point where the new gas main enters.
- 96. That drawing does not show the gas meter which will also need to be installed on the external wall of the vestry, nor does it make reference to the pipe work which will be needed to join with the gas main in the road outside. It will be of crucial importance to ensure that no graves in the churchyard are affected by the cutting of the trench for that pipe. (Since there are trees at that side of the church, it may well be that there are no graves there, but this fact must be checked.)

### **Views expressed as to the gas supply and new boiler:**

- 97. There is an email note from Chris Kollmer of Jupiter Heating of about July 2016 explaining the size of the boiler required to heat the floor area, using pipework spaced at 125 mm. This was acceptable to the DAC.

### **Decision as to the gas supply and new boiler:**

- 98. ***I agree that, as part of the installation of the underfloor heating system, the proposed gas supply, boiler, flue and gas meter shall be installed in the vestry and on the exterior wall of the vestry. This is on condition that:***
  - (a) Prior to such work commencing, the planning permission condition must be fulfilled and a full plan be provided to the Forest of Dean Council.***

***(b) Confirmation shall be provided to the DAC that the link pipe and associated trenching between the gas main in the road and the new boiler will not affect any graves in the graveyard.***

## **F THE RELOCATION OF THE FONT:**

### Current observation of the font:

99. At present, the font is situated to the right of the entrance door, close to the rear pews. It was designed by Woodyer and is an octagonal shape with exterior panels, resting on a six sided column set into a heavy stone base. It has a font cover, also of Woodyer's design, in a mid-oak coloured wood. It has the very stylised words 'Faith', 'Repentance', 'Salvation' and 'Remission' cut into four of its faces, according to the Grade II listing details.
100. Given that the pews will be removed under the scheme set out above, the font would be left in an inconvenient place within the revised layout.

### Proposal for the relocation of the font:

101. The Faculty seeks permission to relocate the font about a metre from its current site, to a position below the west window and slightly to the west of the line of the entrance door. There has been no objection made by any body as to the relocation of the font.
102. At the View, it was suggested that the font needed to be installed flush with the floor because it is currently alleged to be too high for safely and conveniently holding a baby for baptism. However, with the celebrant standing on the plinth base, there is likely to be a better view of the ceremony for those seated around. I expressed my concern that without its current robust stone base, the font might not be adequately anchored in its new location. The architect stated that this was entirely feasible to anchor it suitably. I indicated that I would need to see and approve proper plans, particularly given the intention to relay the floor with the underfloor heating system.

### Decision as to the font:

- 103. The font may be moved from its current location, to the proposed new location near to the west window. I direct that it shall have a sufficiently robust and solid base stone in its new location to ensure there can be no possibility of settling or tipping. This is on condition that prior to the font being moved and relocated:***

***(a) In the event that it is proposed that the font in its new location shall be at a different height above the floor level to the current location, the Parish shall submit justification for such a change in writing and only if that is approved by the Deputy Chancellor shall such change be made; and***

***(b) Precise drawings and plans for the relocation of the font and its foundation shall be submitted to the Deputy Chancellor for approval, which shall include details of the height, shape and dimensions of the proposed plinth.***

## **G THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL ENTRANCE DOORS:**

### Current observation of the doors and frames:

104. The external door to the south porch comprises a timber frame with wire mesh (to prevent birds getting into the porch). The relatively narrow wooden frame is very

weather worn and cracked at the lower ends and I wondered, at the View, whether there is a problem with storm water ingress on occasion.

105. The internal door between the porch and the nave is a substantial piece of Victorian carpentry (believed to date from Woodyer's 1853 designs).

Amended proposals concerning the external and internal external doors and the porch:

106. The PCC wishes to install external and internal doors which are predominantly of toughened glass, to create a more welcoming vista into the church for chance passers by.
107. Initially it was proposed that the wooden internal door would simply be removed. This was widely criticised and the proposal has been amended. Permission is now sought to attach the internal wooden door to a system of double angled hinges which will enable it to be bolted open against the internal wall, immediately to the right of the doorframe on entering the nave from outside, but also for it to be closed in the existing doorway when necessary. This will enable the Victorian door to be retained.
108. In the internal and external door frames, it continues to be proposed that toughened glass doors will be installed, which will provide an appropriate level of heat insulation to sustain the underfloor heating system, and will fit in with the PCC plan for the church to be more inviting and welcoming to those passing from outside. The new internal door will wholly comprise toughened glass, with no wooden elements. The new external door will have wider and more substantial timber elements than the current door and a slightly smaller area of toughened glass. This change is appropriate and does not change the general appearance of the church.
109. There is an additional feature, which appears to be proposed in connection with the entrance porch, but which is not adequately set out in the papers. The Statement suggests that the threshold at the entrance will be 'removed' and the floor 'levelled'. Drawing 2e does not provide details of this, but mentions 'barrier matting'. There is no elevation drawing showing the existing floor and the proposed new floor. At no point is it explained whether the existing red and black chequered tiles will be retained in any shape or form. It is presumed that the red and black tiles date from the original Victorian building.
110. This complete lack of detail makes it impossible to determine whether this is necessary or appropriate. In particular, there is no mention of the method by which rain water would be prevented from entering the building in the event of surface flooding following heavy rain, if the threshold were to be removed.

Views expressed as to the proposals for the external and internal doors:

111. Historic England in June 2016 effectively put forward the scheme which is now being proposed to preserve the internal wooden door.
112. The Forest of Dean Council has provided their planning permission in relation to the replacement of the external doors, subject to the provision of detailed plans.
113. At the View, I queried whether the measurements of the Victorian wooden door were such that when it was open and bolted to the internal wall, it would come very close to the existing protruding wall vent. Whilst I accept that the curved head to the door may avoid the overlap, I wished to be reassured, prior to the work commencing. I requested that the architect should carry out precise measurements and should confirm that there will be no overlap.

Decision as to the external and internal doors :

**114. I approve the designs for the new internal glass and external glass and wood doors and I approve the hinging arrangement which will enable the existing Victorian internal door to be retained, as set out in Drawings 9a & 10d. This will be subject to the following conditions:**

**(a) The architect shall confirm that the Victorian wooden door will not overlap with the wall vent when bolted into place against the internal wall;**

**(b) If it is proposed to have a visible etched design on the toughened glass of the new internal and external doors which is different to the cross in outline shown on Drawings 9a and 10d, then such design must first be submitted for approval by the DAC.**

**(c) No works shall take place to alter the floor or the Victorian floor tiles of the porch or to change the threshold at the entrance to the church. In the event that it is proposed that changes should be made to the floor, the tiles or the threshold, full plans and elevations drawings shall be submitted to the Deputy Chancellor.**

**H THE PULPIT:**

Current observation of the pulpit:

115. The pulpit is of the original Woodyer design and always appears to have been situated on the south east corner of the nave. It has four steps, currently carpeted in the same carpeting that covers the nave floor.

116. The Faculty proposes no change to the pulpit. However there will be some consequential changes relating to the surrounding works which have been approved.

Views expressed as to the pulpit:

117. The 2014 DAC visit note recorded that the Parish had contemplated stripping the varnish of the pulpit to make it a lighter wood, but they were advised this could be difficult and possibly damaging to the wood and would seem unlikely to achieve anything aesthetically. They have agreed not to pursue this. It appears the Parish had contemplated moving or replacing it, but this is now confirmed not to be their wish.

Decision as to the pulpit:

**118. I agree that the pulpit may be moved during the process of installation of the underfloor heating system. This is subject to the following conditions:**

**(a) It shall be replaced at the same location as it currently occupies and shall be suitably anchored to the new floor;**

**(b) Proposals shall be submitted as to the covering for the steps up to the pulpit, given that the nave will no longer be carpeted.**

**(c) Proposals shall be submitted concerning the retention or otherwise of the current dado wall panelling which runs behind the pulpit on two sides and which may form a part of the securing of the pulpit in place.**

## **I THE PROPOSED SERVERY AND WATER BOILER:**

### Current observation of the provision for serving refreshments:

119. There is a room with a kitchen in the 1995 extension, but it is only reached from the church through the narrow door from the north aisle. It is plain that this is not conducive to easy circulation before and after services for refreshments. It has a servery hatch into the St.Luke's meeting room, but on a Sunday this is used for crèche and children's activities, so the service of hot drinks would be unwise.

### Proposal for the servery:

120. The Faculty proposes the creation of a small servery to the north west corner of the nave. It would have a sink, a water boiler and a range of cupboards and drawers. There would be a curved serving shelf facing into the nave, with a lower work surface and a small gate. Drawing 8b sets out the functional and unobtrusive design, which would have the possibility of under counter lighting.

### Views expressed as to the proposed servery:

121. The note of the 2014 DAC meeting observed: *"It was agreed that the current arrangements are somewhat awkward and that the identified space could accommodate a servery without undue impact on the interest of the church. The servery will need to be of a high quality in terms of choice of materials and design."*
122. Historic England in June 2016 queried the need to have a servery, given the close proximity of the kitchen. If the servery was felt to be justified, they went on: *"we question the appropriateness of light oak laminated/veneered MDF for the bulk of this work. As advised in Historic England's 'New Work in Historic Places of Worship' guidance, the provision of new facilities requires specially designed furniture combined with good craftsmanship that minimises the visual impact. Therefore materials and detailing should be of a high quality. If pews are removed, can these be adapted."*
123. At the View, I also expressed concern that the proposed light oak veneered MDF counter top and work tops would be insufficiently resistant to regular cleaning and would soon be showing signs of water ingress and wear.
124. I note that the proposals in the drawings are not those which are proposed in the Supporting Arguments document which states: *"The cabinet fronts could be of solid wood construction rather than MDF. In addition the design aims to introduce an original crafted feature in the curved counter which must be laminated ... in order to achieve the curve. The plans specify light oak veneer/laminate, by which is meant a genuine wood veneer rather than imitation, for the counter top, front and sides. On consideration, whilst requiring a veneer for the curve, we would prefer to have a solid light oak work surface for the counter which would be harder wearing and avoid laminates on edges which are more easily damaged."*
125. The drawings do not make any reference to how water will be piped into the servery. This will need to be clarified and approved by the DAC prior to the work commencing.
126. Drawing 8b refers to drainage from the sink being taken either to a new exterior gully and to the nearest manhole or to connect with drainage in the adjacent WC. It says, rather hopefully that 'This is to be agreed'. The major exercise of creating drainage through either of the relevant walls needs to be carefully planned and to be approved by the DAC prior to the work commencing.

Decision as to the servery:

**127. Having considered the representations made by the PCC, I agree that the proposed servery at the north west corner of the nave should be constructed. I make the following conditions:**

***(a) the cabinet fronts, the counter top to the servery and the work surfaces shall be constructed of solid wood; and consideration shall be given to the possibility of using parts of the existing pews to provide that solid wood.***

***(b) the floor tiles in the nave surrounding the servery shall be of a non-slip construction given the risks of spills of drinks and food in the vicinity of the servery.***

***(c) The route for piping water to the sink and the boiler shall be agreed in advance with the DAC.***

***(d) The route for drainage shall be agreed in advance with the DAC, together with any necessary outside works.***

**J THE ORGAN AND ITS REPLACEMENT WITH AN ELECTRONIC ORGAN:**

Current observation of the organ:

128. The Statement describes the organ as being a ‘sweet instrument’ but very limited and not up to the task of a lead instrument for the size of church. It is said that other organists have commented that they do not enjoy playing it, in part due to its condition and also because the single manual is offset from the foot pedals. The 2010 DAC note referred to it as “one manual 8,8,8,4,4, which does not speak well into the nave”.
129. The 2014 DAC visit observed that the organ needed to have some £7,000 to £8,000 expended on it. I did not hear it played, but am prepared to accept it requires replacing.
130. Ian Fox, the Diocesan Organs Adviser, has provided some advice to the parish about appropriate electronic replacements for the pipe organ. The 2015 DAC visit note made reference to this. There is an email from him on the 10<sup>th</sup> June 2016 setting out advice about electronic organs. The Parish is well aware that such instruments last less long than pipe organs.
131. There is a considerable concern that asbestos is used in the organ’s installation. Since the issue has been raised, it must be assumed that asbestos is present, and any removal must comply fully with all relevant health and safety regulations. This will require professional involvement from those who are trained and insured to carry out such work. (At the View, it was suggested the asbestos is only in the organ blower box and that the organ repairer will securely remove it. I do not know whether that is correct.)

Proposal for the removal of the organ and to replace it with an electric organ:

132. The Faculty seeks permission to remove the organ and to replace it with an electric organ. There are no objections received as to the removal of the organ.

Decision as to the removal of the organ:

**133. I agree that the organ may be removed. This is conditional upon all relevant health and safety regulations being complied with for the purposes of disposing of any asbestos contamination.**

**134. I agree that the Parish may purchase an electronic organ as a**

***replacement and I direct that they shall consult the DAC Organs Adviser prior to settling on a specific instrument.***

#### **K THE HYMN BOOK SHELVES:**

The proposal for the replacement of the hymn book shelves with movable shelved trolleys:

135. The Petition seeks to ‘replace hymn book shelves with movable shelved trolleys’. It is apparent that this would mean greater convenience for collecting books and storing them accessibly. The Statement suggested that this would also enable the west wall to be cleared of ‘clutter’, although the trolley and the planned audio visual desk would still be on view.

Views expressed as to the hymn book shelves and trolley:

136. No objections have been expressed. The existing shelves do not appear to have any particular historic significance, being utilitarian for the convenient storage of books. They will be in the way of the plan for the audio visual desk, if they remain in place.

Decision as to the hymn book shelves and trolley:

137. ***I am content that the hymn book shelves may be dismantled and the walls of the church made good where they are removed in preparation for the installation of the audio-visual equipment desk.***
138. ***I agree that the fixed hymn book shelves may be replaced with movable shelved trolleys.***

### **MATTERS NOT APPROVED AND REQUIRING FURTHER APPRAISAL AND INFORMATION**

#### **L THE TWO REREDOS PANELS AND WAR MEMORIAL:**

Current observation of the two reredos panels and war memorial:

139. The Statement of Significance and Needs at page 4 described the reredos as follows: *“Either side of the altar table fixed to the East wall is a dark stained wooden reredos made by Louis de Lauver, a Belgian refugee, in 1920. It is carved with large fruits and gargoyle faces. On the left hand panel is a brass plaque bearing the names of those of the parish who died in World War 2 [this should be World War 1]. There is a plaque on the wall of the porch drawing attention to the reredos.”*
140. The plaque is set into the porch wall reads: *“The parish of Tidenham supported two families of Belgian refugees from October 1914 - May 1916. One of them, Louis de Lauver, executed the carving of the panels on the east wall which were placed there by Evelyn Seys, widow as an act of thanksgiving to God for the preservation of her sons during the Great War.”* It would benefit from polishing, as it is somewhat tarnished. (There appears to be no suggestion in the faculty application that this plaque would be amended if the reredos panels and war memorial were to be moved.)
141. The reredos panels and their history are widely noted in internet records relating to the parish and the church, and are particularly noted in the Gloucestershire Archives under number GDR/F1/1/1920/68.

142. At the time of the 2010 DAC visit, there was some consideration of screening off the chancel, and reorientating the nave north to south, which was subsequently not pursued. The note observed: *“Members ... felt that the chancel furnishings generally should be retained. There was undoubtedly a danger of throwing out quality fittings, and leaving the church denuded and lacking any visual focus...”*
143. By the 2014 DAC visit, the notes read: *“the Parish wish to relocate the two panels because the carvings do not represent Christian images and the colour of the timber does not match other joinery within the church. One of the panels has a World War I memorial plaque attached to it. The panels have interest and much care has been taken in their carving. If another location is to be found for them, it should give the panels prominence rather than hide them away. Relocating them could offer enhancement to the memorial if the panels are placed in a more accessible location.”*
144. Historic England, in June 2016, said: *“The proposal to relocate these [chancel panels] to the vestry arches is unjustified and we do not support this aspect. The carved panels are referred to in the list description and the necessity to resize one panel to fit within the arch will result in damage, and a potentially awkward result.”*
145. The email from the Ancient Monuments Society observed: *“There is increasing interest in the craftsmanship produced by some of the many Belgians who fled to this country during the Great War. Some were housed personally by David Lloyd George, then Prime Minister, at his home in Wales, and a number of key works were created for churches in North Wales.”*
146. The letter from the Tidenham Historical Group of the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 observed: *“These panels are of considerable significance. They were carved by one of the Belgian refugees whose families were cared for by the parish during the First World War. Several of the refugees were professional wood carvers from Malines and connected with the cathedral there, and the panels were a way of [saying] thanking the people of Tidenham for their hospitality and marking the end of the difficult years of the Great War. ... In our experience it is very unusual for a war memorial to be sited beside or behind an altar and this adds to its interest. As there is no outside war memorial anywhere in the parish, the St.Luke’s plaque is of particular importance...”* The letter also expressed anxiety about the need for the reredos panels to be cut to fit the proposed new space, and pointed out the potential insensitivity of moving a war memorial at the time of the centenary.
147. The PCC’s Statement observes: *“... there needs to be a focal point to draw the eye to the primary purpose of the building to worship God. The cluttered chancel area with its hotch potch of furnishings, including lots of different woods, needs to be cleared to give a more coherent appearance. The addition of effective feature lighting on the altar and colour wash lighting on the east wall will create this focus.”* It goes on to say: *“The east chancel wall will be cleared of unsightly clutter and painted white with optional colour wash lighting and craftsman designed furniture”.*
148. The Supporting Arguments speak of the scheme aiming: *“... to restore some of the focus to the chancel area by removing visual distraction from around the striking east window.”* *“It is part of the holistic plan for the refurbished interior that unnecessary clutter be removed from around the walls, in order to better display the key features of the architecture.”*
149. On the Visit, I noted the rich carving. There is melted wax from badly placed candles on some portions, which need to be carefully cleaned, but otherwise they are in good condition. The brass World War I memorial, which takes up one of the four panels of the reredos, was well polished and in good condition, and is a fittingly worded and

reverential memorial.

150. I observe that as we pass through the centenary of that conflict, the historical associations are all the more important. The church also has a framed Roll of Honour in memory of those who fell in World War II.
151. Views were expressed during the Visit that the faces on the reredos panels were ‘gargoyle’s or ‘Green Men’ and therefore in some way ‘pagan’ or ‘not Christian’ and inappropriate for a church building. I could not agree with such suggestions. They are plainly lions, given the non-human shape of the noses and the flowing hair on the upper lip. There are six of these faces, three on the top of each panel, and each of slightly different design to fit in with the flow of the design. All have two thin streams, indicating water, issuing from either the mouths or behind the mouths. Undoubtedly they are stylised, but they are vibrantly carved. They form only a limited part of the design. The predominant feature of the decorative parts of the reredos are garlands of pomegranates, sheaves, flowers and other fruit, covering the two uprights and three cross bars of each reredos panel. Again, these are attractively and vividly carved. The wood is oak, now darkened with age.
152. I note the motto on the Parish logo: “*where the river flows everything will live*”. That seems rather apt when looking at the reredos carvings.

Proposal for the relocation and shortening of the reredos panels and war memorial to the chancel:

153. The Faculty seeks permission, in the baldest of terms, to “reposition existing timber screens to chancel”.
154. This would involve removing by cutting or sawing the entire side of one of the panels and butting it to the other. Plainly such a process would not be reversible. There is no indication of what would happen to the upright which would be removed in that process, nor as to how it would be disposed. (A specific question at the View did not elicit any answer.)
155. The proposal would involve turning the reredos panels so that they would face across the chancel from where the organ pipes currently stand. There is no technical specification as to how the panels would be secured, nor even whether they are sufficiently collectively robust to be made free standing without additional support behind them. Drawing 2e seems to suggest it may be envisaged that the panels would be attached to some form of new wall, but it is wholly unclear what such a wall would comprise: how high it would reach within the current arch. I noted that the four plain panels were apparently only a thin single thickness of wooden planks.

Directions as to the proposal for the relocation of the two reredos panels and war memorial:

- 156. *I reach no conclusions as yet on the proposal to relocate the two reredos panels and the war memorial and to cut off one side of one of the panels.***
157. I remain open to persuasion that these panels, which have been on view in this church for nearly a hundred years, are inappropriate in their current location, but would be appropriate in a different, less visible, location in the church. I take note, however, of the comments of Historic England, the Ancient Monuments’ Society and the Tidenham Historical Group, as to the historical significance of these panels and their location. I feel I should add that to describe these reredos panels as a ‘visual distraction’ or ‘unnecessary clutter’ or ‘not Christian’ is somewhat troubling, particularly when the Supporting Arguments seek to keep the church ‘*sympathetic to its heritage and architecture*’.

- 158. I direct that the Parish considers the Duffield Questions listed above, and provides responses and justification for the proposal to relocate and reduce the size of the reredos panels on the basis that the answer to Duffield Question (1) is likely to be Yes, on the present information.**

#### **M THE VICTORIAN DECORATIVE PANEL HIDDEN BEHIND THE ALTAR:**

##### The revelation of the decorative panel:

159. The photograph of the altar on page 4 of the Statement of Significance & Needs showed that between the two dark wood carved reredos panels, there was a board of mid-brown wood (the 'plain panel'). (An earlier photograph on page 1 shows the chancel arch decorated with the words "*Unto us a child is born - Alleluia*" but does not show clear details of the altar or altar wall.)
160. The 2014 DAC note recorded: "*there is a plain central panel between the two carved panels. The purpose of this panel is unclear but apparently it may be covering up something else. It was suggested that some careful investigation should be carried out to establish exactly what it is covering.*"
161. The THG letter of the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 observed: "*It is said that a previous vicar installed a plain, modern, wooden panel to cover an art work which he found disagreeable, but nobody seems able to remember exactly what form this took. We would very much like to see permission granted through an Archdeacon's Licence to remove that panel temporarily to investigate what lays beneath. A rational decision could then be reached as to whether to re-cover it, leave it exposed or remove it to another location in the church.*"
162. A day or two before the Visit on the 19<sup>th</sup> May 2017, both the plain panel and a decorative panel, which it had been covering, were taken down, and I observed them stacked beside the altar (the decorative panel being upside down). Amongst those attending the Visit, there were recollections of the decorative panel having previously been on view between the two reredos panels. The vague recollection was that the plain panel had been installed in the 1990s. It was possible to imagine that the incumbent at the time might have found the colourful panel a distraction during worship ('too much of a good thing'). It is not known whether a faculty was obtained to cover it with the plain panel.
163. Although the removal of the panel was supposed to have been carried out pursuant to a licence for Temporary Minor Re-ordering, I note that the Archdeacon's Licence dated the 9<sup>th</sup> May 2017 (a copy of which eventually reached me on the 16<sup>th</sup> June 2017) provided simply for the "*Removal of the plain panel, between the wooden reredos above the altar to allow for inspection of what is underneath*". It is not clear why the decorative panel was removed from the wall as well as the plain panel, but an explanation will be needed. It clearly ought to have remained on the wall.
164. The conditions to the Archdeacon's Licence unfortunately contain a typing error. They state: "*The panel is to be removed with causing damage to the surroundings and is to be stored in a safe place to allow for future reinstatement.*" Plainly, the word 'with' should be replaced by the word 'without'. Given that the decorative panel has actually now been removed as well as the plain panel, I will amend the Archdeacon's conditions for the avoidance of doubt (see below).
165. The decorative panel is a triptych panel, plainly of Victorian origin, with a central cross flanked by two circular motifs including IHS decoration. The two flanking panels are somewhat water damaged to their outer edges. The panel appears to have a metal backing. I looked carefully, but could see no obvious makers' marks or other means of

identifying the provenance. It did not appear designed to mirror or match the motifs or colours of the Godwin tiles in the sanctuary.

166. It may be that the decorative panel originally appeared on the front of the altar. It is noteworthy that the joinery of the current altar is somewhat basic, and may represent a more modern creation. From consideration of Churches and Chapels, I wondered whether the design is similar in style to the altar front at St Michael & All Angels Church at Tidenham Chase. It would be helpful to know of any historical research which might link the two. Churches and Chapels (pages 147, 149-150) speaks of the St. Michael & All Angels altar having a centre panel containing a fluted cross of letters and 'the conventional scrolls of vines and wheat', designed by Parry, coloured by Heaton & Butler and made by Messrs Jones & Willis. Equally, the decorative panel may have been used as the original reredos at some period in the church's history.
167. Enquiries have been made of the DAC and the initial comments from Alan Brooks (co-author of the two Pevsner Buildings of England books for Gloucestershire), having perused my photographs of the decorative panel from the Visit, are: *"It looks like a most interesting panel and I should guess that almost certainly it was part of the original 1853 work on the church by Henry Woodyer. It seems from the photograph to make a good fit to the front of the altar! My guess though is that it may have been originally set up as the reredos in Woodyer's original church of 1853, and if so it would probably [have] been painted by Hardman of Birmingham (or perhaps by the Wailes firm when they installed the contemporary chancel windows) – Henry Woodyer would no doubt have been involved in either case. ... if this panel could be used as a 'frontal' to the altar, I should strongly make the case for that purpose (or something similar). Failing that I think it is of sufficient importance, as almost certainly original work of 1853, to be retained in the church in some capacity!"*
168. My current working assumption is that the reason the two reredos panels were put up on either side of the window is that the decorative panel was probably already on the wall between them, whether or not it was originally attached to an altar front and later moved. That would explain why the two panels were separated by a stretch of wall which is narrower than the width of the window above.

#### Plans as to the decorative panel:

169. It is not yet known what the parish would propose for this decorative panel, since it only came to light a few days prior to the 19<sup>th</sup> May 2017. At the Visit, I noted its slightly damaged state and advised those present that thought would have to be given to its future place in the church building.
170. Further enquiries about the provenance of the decorative panel are going to need to be made. I ask the DAC to invite Mr Brooks to visit the church and to examine the decorative panel more closely and to provide a fuller historical assessment.
171. As part of this consideration, I add that there is no mention of the original Woodyer plans in my papers. Do they exist in the County archives or elsewhere? If so, I am sure Mr Brooks would wish to have them when considering this panel. It may be, as well, that there are records referring to the current altar table and its origins. I would suggest that the THG may have records which would be of assistance in establishing both its provenance and original situation in the church.

#### Decision and directions as to the decorative panel:

172. ***The Archdeacon's licence of the 9<sup>th</sup> May 2017 is to be corrected and amended, given the change of circumstances, to read:***

***“The plain panel and the decorative panel were both removed from the church wall, despite the Licence only permitting removal of the plain panel. An explanation shall be provided to the Archdeacon and to the Deputy Chancellor no later than the 7<sup>th</sup> August 2017 (now extended to 25 October 2017), as to why such additional work was carried out despite being unauthorised. Pending either the expiry of the licence on the 9<sup>th</sup> May 2018 (with subsequent full reinstatement of both the plain panel and the decorative panel) or the submission of a petition, both the plain panel and the decorative panel shall be stored in a safe place to allow for future reinstatement. The conditions to the Licence of the 9<sup>th</sup> May 2017 are so varied.”***

173. ***I direct that the DAC be invited to investigate the provenance of the decorative panel and that any body with information (whether about the full Woodyer plans or this particular aspect) is invited to provide details forthwith.***
174. ***I further direct that the Parish be invited to put forward proposals for the use to which the decorative panel should be put within the church in the light of such information as to its provenance which becomes available.***

#### **N THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CHANCEL FLOOR AND THE INTRODUCTION OF A NEW STEP AND A HAND RAIL:**

##### Current observation of the chancel floor:

175. The Statement contends (without any detail) that the step up to the sanctuary from the chancel may amount to a trip hazard on turning from the altar rail.
176. The 2014 DAC note observed: *“The chancel is currently carpeted but further investigation revealed some good quality inlaid tiles, matching those in the sanctuary and probably part of the original design.”*
177. On the Visit I unfortunately failed to lift the carpet, to check the extent of the Godwin tiles. I took some limited photographs, which appear to show that other tiles, possibly similar to the red and black chequered tiles of the porch, may be found in that area as well as the encaustic tiles. I am afraid that a proper survey is going to need to be undertaken, particularly in the light of the observations from the Victorian Society and Historic England.

##### Proposal for the chancel floor and the introduction of a new step and a hand rail:

178. The Faculty seeks permission to introduce a new ‘timber infill’ floor for the entirety of the chancel, slightly raising the level of the chancel floor so that it is on a level with the sanctuary floor. It is proposed that this area would be carpeted. There would be a new double step down into the nave and a single handrail would be introduced which would protrude into the nave to the north side of the steps.
179. The Faculty does not specify what would happen to any Victorian encaustic tiles in the chancel. They are not mentioned in the Statement. Whilst I was told, during the Visit, that the carpet would not cover the tiles in the Sanctuary, I was told no more about what currently lies under the chancel carpet.
180. Drawing 11b provides limited details about the proposed handrail which would protrude into the nave by some 300 mm. The design appears to be functional and not in keeping

with the choir stalls or the church architecture in general.

181. Aside from suggesting that there is a trip hazard at the eastern end of the chancel (which I confess I did not observe for myself at the time of the Visit) no other explanation is given for the suggestion that this full scale wooden floor is needed in the chancel.

Views expressed as to the chancel floor and the introduction of a step and a hand rail:

182. The DAC site visit in 2014 observed: “*it is likely to be difficult to lift the tiles without damaging them*”. Whilst that was said at a time when it was proposed that the underfloor heating would extend into the chancel, it is undoubtedly the case that laying a wooden floor on top of tiles would cause damage to them.
183. The Victorian Society in June 2016 observed: “*The pictures show that the chancel floor is richly decorated with encaustic tiles [I think they are referring to pictures of the sanctuary] These tiles are a characterful and handsome element of the space and reflect the liturgical importance of the space. These tiles should not be covered with carpet as proposed. The justification for the raising of the floor in the chancel and the installation of carpet is not clear and would cause harm to the chancel area by covering the characterful tile flooring.*”

Directions as to the chancel floor and the introduction of a new step and a hand rail:

184. ***I am not yet reaching a conclusion on whether or not the proposed timber infill floor should be installed in the chancel. Further justification and explanation, including details of the cost involved, is sought from the PCC.***
185. ***I direct that the carpet be lifted at as many points as possible across the chancel floor and that a photographic record is made of the design, nature and extent of any tiling found below the carpet. This shall be forwarded to the Deputy Chancellor and the DAC no later than the 7<sup>th</sup> September 2017 (now extended to 15th October 2017).***
186. ***I direct that full details be provided of the proposed hand rail between the chancel and the nave, including detailed design drawings.***
187. ***I direct that the Parish considers the Duffield Questions listed above, and provides responses and justification for the proposal to lay a new floor in the chancel on the basis that the answer to Duffield Question (1) is likely to be Yes, on the present information.***

## **O THE HEATING, ELECTRICAL CIRCUITS, LIGHTING AND OTHER ISSUES IN THE CHANCEL:**

Proposal for the heating in the chancel:

188. I note it is proposed that under pew heating and overhead heaters should be retained in the chancel and in the storeroom, but that they will be new installations of a modern type which will avoid the potential dangers and headaches. (Drawing 16d). Matt Fulford of Inspired Efficiency Ltd, in an email of the 31<sup>st</sup> July 2016, suggested that it might not be necessary to have overhead heaters in the chancel and that although wiring could be installed in case they were necessary, it would be wise not to install them initially until it could be seen how the underfloor heating in the nave progressed to provide heat.
189. ***I approve the suggestion that electrical overhead heaters in the chancel should not be installed, unless it becomes apparent that insufficient heat***

***will be generated in the church from the underfloor heating system in the nave. Nonetheless, I agree that the necessary overhead wiring should be installed in case such heaters are needed, and I have made provision for such wiring in the general comments about the electrics above.***

Electrical sockets in the chancel:

190. I note there is limited electrical socket provision in that area, which may need to be expanded.

**191. *I direct that the number and location of electrical sockets in the chancel shall be reconsidered.***

Proposal for colour wash lights to the altar wall:

192. There is no rationale, explanation or justification for the proposed lighting of the altar wall by way of two Arcus II DMX LED RGB Wall Washer lights listed on Drawing 16d. These apparently provide a wide range of colour effects. They will constitute a very major change to the appearance of the chancel and sanctuary and will undoubtedly fall within Duffield Questions (3), (4) & (5).

**193. *Until a decision is taken as to the final appearance of the altar wall and the location of the reredos panels, I do not approve the installation of the proposed wall washer lights. However, I do agree that the wiring necessary for the chancel lighting may be fitted into the relevant overhead channels in preparation for the introduction of wall lights if these are subsequently approved (and this is mentioned above in the general consideration of the electrics).***

The secure fixing of the choir stalls:

194. The choir stalls are only loosely fitted and the stall fronts rock slightly.

**195. *I direct that a full investigation is needed to ascertain whether and how the choir stalls can be securely fixed, without damage to the existing floor. In the event that the floor below the current choir stalls comprises or part-comprises Victorian tiles, careful note must be taken and marked on a detailed plan as to any holes which have already been cut or drilled in the tiled surface.***

The altar rail:

196. The altar rail is ascribed to the Woodyer plans. It is remaining in place in the sanctuary. The 2014 DAC visit noted some discussion about the possibility of moving it backwards into the sanctuary, but this was not pursued. The 2015 DAC note observed that it was somewhat flimsy and that some means of making it sturdier should be devised.

**197. *I direct that any proposals for the enhancement of the altar rail should be provided in writing.***

The damaged area of stonework below the east window:

198. Now that the cover and the decorative panel have both been removed behind the altar, it is apparent that one of the stones immediately below the East window on the southern side has been lifted from its position by a centimetre or two. It looks as if this has been caused by the metal fixing used to attach the right hand reredos panel to that area of the wall. Water has apparently penetrated (which may explain some of the damage to the decorative panel) and has caused the fixing to oxidize and expand. Whatever may be

decided about the reredos panels in due course, this damage will need to be remedied so that there is no risk to the stained glass window above by further movement of the stone blocks.

- 199. *I direct that the wall below the east window be surveyed and a proposal for remedying the lifting be put forward which does not alter the position of the reredos panels.***

#### **P THE PROPOSED DIVIDING WALLS IN THE VESTRY:**

Current observation of the vestry:

200. At present, the vestry is a large room with panelled cupboards to the east wall and the organ taking up a substantial part of the south wall. There is a Woodyer designed cupboard with sides curving up to an apex, with the two doors secured by original decorative hinges. At present the room is a little cluttered.

Proposal for the dividing up of the vestry:

201. Drawing 2e suggests that the vestry will be considerably reduced in size by means of partitioning walls and that a large storage area will be created together with a smaller room for the boiler. One of the dividing walls, on the drawing, would bisect the existing single window. Unfortunately, no detail whatsoever is given about the need for these dividing walls, nor how high they would reach within the space available.
202. An examination of the area beside the organ at the visit suggested a number of pieces of carved woodwork, particularly an arch, had been bolted in place in a haphazard fashion at some stage in the past. It was not clear what was original and what changes were proposed once the organ has been removed.

Views expressed as to the dividing walls in the vestry:

203. I am unable to find a reference in the papers dealing with the proposed vestry layout.

Directions as to the dividing walls in the vestry:

- 204. *For the present, I make no decision on the proposed dividing walls in the vestry, save to direct that full plans and elevations are needed, with a full written proposal and justification for the work. The Faculty needs to be amended to provide precise details about what is planned in the vestry once the organ has been removed, and the gas boiler installed. Given that there is a significant query about whether the carved reredos panels will be relocated to the side of the chancel, it may be as well to consider all options for the layout and segmentation of the vestry area - not only the height and location of internal walls, but their effect on the light from the two windows and the potential view through the side chancel arch.***

#### **Q THE NEW STORAGE CUPBOARDS IN THE MEETING ROOM:**

205. The Statement states that storage space is currently at a premium, with church corners and the meeting room get cluttered easily, looking unsightly and causing potential hazards.
206. It is suggested that floor to ceiling storage cupboards in the meeting room are the answer. Details are not provided of what would be stored there, as opposed to the proposed storage area in the vestry and the significant storage space being created in the new servery.

207. Introducing storage cupboards in the meeting room may simply reduce the size of space available for smaller meetings to take place. I wish to be assured that storage cupboards in the meeting room are definitely necessary.

Directions as to the cupboard in the meeting room:

- 208. I direct that the Parish sets out precise details of why a part of the meeting room needs to be taken up with storage cupboards, when there is a proposal for extensive storage around the servery and in the vestry.**

## **R THE DISPLAY BOARDS IN THE CHURCH:**

209. It appears that it is planned that display boards will be removed from the internal church walls and then 6 new boards of A1 size will be located to the north wall. Precisely which walls, and in what formation is not yet clear.

Views expressed as to the removal of the display boards:

210. No explanation has been provided as to why any existing boards need to be taken down and new boards erected. Notices on the north wall will only be legible if the electric lights remain switched on, and even then the lighting may not completely illuminate those walls.
211. I make the assumption that it is not planned to remove any of the noticeboards in the porch, nor other items on the porch walls.

Directions as to the removal of the display boards:

- 212. I direct that the Parish confirms in writing and with photographs/drawings:**
- (a) precisely which boards they suggest should be removed, providing an explanation for this change; and**
  - (b) that it is not intended to remove any boards from the church porch (and if such removal is intended, a full explanation is given); and**
  - (c) the proposed layout for the new boards, providing an explanation as to why they are necessary.**

## **S THE PLAQUE COMMEMORATING THE INSTALLATION OF ELECTRIC LIGHTS IN 1925:**

213. The brass plaque on the west wall of the nave, on the left on entering the church, commemorates the installation of electric light to the glory of God and in loving memory of Stanhope Stott-Stanhope by his widow, Annie, dated May 1925.
214. It is proposed that this plaque should be removed and relocated to the vestry “by the meters”.
215. It is not clear why this plaque has been singled out for removal from the body of the church. I note that six of the windows in the church have similarly worded memorial inscriptions, to the Glory of God and in memory of a number of worthy parishioners. The choir stalls are similarly dedicated. There are at least seven similar memorials in the St Luke’s meeting room.
216. No rationale has been provided for the necessity to remove this particular brass plaque to a place where it would no longer be on public view, nor to explain why it is singled out

for this demotion. There is a suggestion in the Statement that it constitutes “clutter” on the west wall, but it is not clear whether there may be another, more cogent, reason for moving the plaque.

Direction as to the relocation of the memorial plaque recording the installation of electricity:

**217. *I direct that the Parish provides a full written argument as to the need to relocate the brass memorial plaque recording the installation of electricity in 1925.***

## **T THE PORTABLE LECTERN:**

Current observation of the lectern:

218. This is of light oak construction on a plinth, which is fixed in place. The Statement of Significance and Needs describes it as being ‘a more modern addition’ but fails to provide any dates or provenance.

Proposal for the replacement of the current lectern with a portable lectern:

219. The Faculty seeks permission to replace the existing fixed lectern with one which is portable. As yet, no design has been presented. Save that it is fixed in place, there is little explanation for the need to replace this specific piece of church furniture..

Direction as to the lectern:

**220. *In the absence of a firm design for the proposed portable lectern, I cannot approve the replacement of the existing lectern although I remain open to a further explanation when a proper design has been submitted and adequate reasons given.***

**221. *During the works to install the underfloor heating system and to relay the nave floor, I direct that the existing lectern may be removed to storage (in St.Luke’s Room or some other suitable place) but that it shall not be disposed of and shall be retained in good order so that it could be reinstalled if a suitable portable lectern is not agreed.***

## **U THE PORTABLE ALTAR:**

222. During the visit on the 19<sup>th</sup> May 2017, I was shown a drawing of a possible portable altar. This had not previously formed part of the proposals in the petition, but is plainly part of the scheme, to make worship more accessible. I did not retain a copy of that drawing, since the proposal was still very much at an embryo stage.

223. This was despite the plan to change the altar being of some age: being mentioned in the 2014 DAC note: “*The altar appears to be a later addition and the Parish would like to replace it with a new altar that could be easily moved to introduce more flexibility.*”

224. The Statement suggests that the shapes and lines of the nave and chancel ceiling “*may be used in the design of the new portable furniture*”. At the view I agreed that such a design might be harmonious with the existing building, with a pleasing symmetry.

Direction as to the portable altar:

**225. *In the absence of a firm design for the proposed portable altar, I cannot approve the replacement of the existing altar. I direct that the existing altar shall be retained in the chancel pending further consideration.***

## ADDITIONAL NOTES

### Note as to the possible presence of bats:

226. The Standard Information on Form 1A included a tick to say that there is evidence that bats use the church, its curtilage or any adjoining structure. At the site view, I was advised that those present did not think that indication was accurate. This will need to be clarified.
227. It can be envisaged that if bats are present in the void above the ceiling and below the roof, then they may be disturbed by the various electrical works to introduce new lighting and cables in that area. In the event that bats or relevant traces of bats are discovered during such work, then relevant steps will need to be put into action to avoid them being disturbed.
- 228. *I direct that if bats or relevant traces of bats are encountered during the course of the works then a survey must be carried out by a Natural England licensed bat surveyor, to see whether sufficient mitigation measures can be put into place, or whether a European Protected Species licence will be required.***

### Note as to the hatch in the ceiling above the chancel:

229. I observed when looking up from the chancel that there appeared to be a hatch in the ceiling. It was open, and it was not clear to me what purpose this served. I enquired whether it should be shut, as a matter of safety. Further enquiries are needed, since none of those present at the meeting knew the answer.

### Alternative venue for worship during the period of the works:

230. The Bishop has given her permission to the parish in a letter dated the 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016 for worship to take place at the school hall during the period when the works will be carried out. The Petition estimated a period of some 3-4 months.

### The funding of the works:

231. The Petition provided a rough estimate of the cost of the works at £200,000 on the basis of 'advice from Quantity Surveyor, Lee Associates, plus estimates from professional services'. Of this sum, it was said that £40,000 was currently in the PCC's funds; £60,000 was expected from gifts and legacies; and £4,000 from grants or fund raising had already been raised. That left a sum of £96,000 still to raise. The Statement suggested that some £98,500 had been raised so far (but the two documents will have been prepared at different times.)
232. At the view, I was advised that the PCC was confident of raising that additional sum once the petition had been granted. Without wishing to be pessimistic, this is often something which is said at this stage of the process, and on occasion the fund raising efforts do not raise the required sums.
- 233. *I direct that full costed estimates for the work covered by Sections A to K above, which I have authorised, must be provided before work is commenced.***
- 234. *I direct, in relation to any work which has not been authorised by this***

***interim judgment, that full costings of each element of the further work which the PCC proposes should be carried out, must be provided at the same time as their request to me to proceed with the further work.***

Insurance issues:

235. Section G of the Petition refers to the PCC having been given a verbal indication that the alternative worship venue and the works would be covered. The PCC will need to have written confirmation that the works are fully covered.

A photographic record of the church:

- 236. *I direct that an accurate colour and black & white photographic record of the interior of the church building shall be made and deposited with the DAC secretary prior to the commencement of any works.***

The Costs:

237. The costs of this interim judgment are reserved until the full judgment is given.

Further Directions:

- 238. *The time for the authorised works to be completed is 3 years, namely the 7<sup>th</sup> July 2020 (now extended to 25<sup>th</sup> September 2020).***
- 239. *In respect of those matters which have not been approved by this Judgment and which are set out at Sections L to U above, the Parish is at liberty to make further representations, including submitting appropriate plans and drawings, no later than the 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017 (now extended to 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017).***
- 240. *There is liberty to the Petitioners to apply by letter for further directions, if so advised, in the meantime.***

7<sup>th</sup> July 2017 (amended and updated 25<sup>th</sup> September 2017)

Alicia Hester Collinson.

Deputy Chancellor, Diocese of Gloucester