

IN THE CONSISTORY COURT OF THE DIOCESE OF SOUTHWARK

IN THE MATTER OF ST MARY MAGDALENE, RICHMOND

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PETITION BY MR ANTHONY BELL, MR JOHN BUCKINGHAM  
AND MS JACKIE HARRISON

## JUDGMENT

### Introduction

1. This is the petition dated 9 March 2025 of Mr Anthony Bell, Mr John Buckingham and Ms Jackie Harrison, the churchwardens and tower captain respectively of the church of St Mary Magdalene, Richmond<sup>1</sup> in respect of the following work:

*The remodelling of the church's bells by the retention, tuning and re-hanging of the three Bartlett bells, and the introduction of five new bells, to create a ring of eight bells (using the existing bell-frame); melting down the Lester & Pack bell (the metal of which will be used for the casting of the new bells); and the storage and display of the four Catlin bells within the church building (of which one will be in the clock room of the bell-tower, one in the Lady Chapel, and two in the South aisle).*

2. By a resolution dated 29 January 2025, the PCC decided to apply for a faculty for this work; which is recommended to me for approval by the DAC by exercise of delegated authority dated 6 December 2024.
3. Although there are no objections to the work, I think that it is appropriate for me to write a judgment. The case raises the question of how the *Duffield* guidance<sup>2</sup> is appropriately applied to bells; and, in that context, the practical application of the *Code of Practice* in respect of the *Conservation and Repair of Bells and Bellframes* published by the Council for the Care of Churches.<sup>3</sup>

### The facts

4. The church is listed Grade II\*. The body of the church dates from the eighteenth century but the tower from the mediaeval building remains and dates from the late fourteenth century.<sup>4</sup> The listing does not mention the bells.<sup>5</sup>
5. The tower of contains nine bells; eight hung for ringing in the traditional way and a clock bell, which is rung by means of a hammer. The current proposal affects only the eight bells hung for ringing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Following the retirement of Revd Canon Wilma Roest, the church is currently in an interregnum.

<sup>2</sup> That is the guidance of the Court of Arches contained in *In re St Alkmund, Duffield* [2013] Fam 158.

<sup>3</sup> *In re St Michael Cornhill* (2010), which is a comparable case, pre-dates the *Duffield* guidance.

<sup>4</sup> See Pevsner and Cherry *London 2: South* (1983).

<sup>5</sup> This appears to be the original listing description, dating from 1950. Contemporary listing descriptions are much fuller. The fact that something is not specifically mentioned in the listing description does not necessarily mean that it is not of historic or architectural interest.

6. A ring of six bells for the church was cast in about 1680 by James Bartlett. They were augmented to eight by Robert Catlin in 1740; one of the Bartlett bells became the clock bell and five new bells were cast. The tenor apparently proved unsatisfactory and was replaced by a new bell by Lester and Pack in 1760. The current ring is made up as follows:

1 - 3 Robert Catlin

4 James Bartlett

5 Robert Catlin

6 -7 James Bartlett

8 Lester and Pack.

7. The treble weighs  $4\frac{3}{4}$  cwts and the tenor  $18\frac{1}{2}$  cwts, so it is intrinsically quite a heavy ring.
8. They have always been what is termed a “difficult” ring of bells: because of the size of the tower the wheels are smaller than would ideally be the case, and the bells feel heavy to ring.
9. The bells were rehung in 1981 in a new cast iron frame (the old wooden one was falling apart) but it did not assist the go of the bells; in fact, because the canons were removed from three of the Catlin bells, it may have made it worse.
10. The sound of the bells is also not good. The three Bartlett bells are of better quality and can be improved by modern tuning, but the Catlin bells are tonally very poor and the tone of the Lester and Pack tenor also leaves something to be desired.
11. To rectify the difficulty in ringing the bells and improve their sound, the obvious remedy is to install an entirely new ring. Understandably, this was indeed the original proposal. However it attracted objections from, among others, Historic England. The DAC did recommend it but only on the basis that the bells were “rehomed” in another tower. As one might expect, this was a condition that it was not possible to fulfil.
12. Against this background, the bellringers, supported by the PCC and in full consultation with the relevant stakeholders, have progressed an alternative, compromise, proposal. This retains the Bartlett bells within the new ring, retains the Catlin bells as artefacts on display within the church and recasts the Lester and Pack tenor to provide metal for four new bells. The new ring would be made up as follows:

- 1 New bell 3-3-14 tuned to G
- 2 New bell 4-0-00 tuned to A
- 3 New bell 4-1-00 tuned to B
- 4 New bell 4-3-00 tuned to C
- 5 Existing 4 (Bartlett 1680) 6-1-00 retuned to D
- 6 New bell 7-1-00 tuned to E
- 7 Existing 6 (Bartlett 1680) 9-2-00 retuned to F<sup>#</sup>
- 8 Existing 7 (Bartlett 1680) 13-1-00 retuned to G.

In each case the weight of the bell is indicated in cwts, quarters and lbs.

13. It is proposed that the Catlin bells be displayed within the church: two at the west end of the south aisle; one in the Lady chapel; and one in the clock room of the tower. The possibility arises that at least one of the bells could be mounted so that it could still be sounded; the

bellringers have imaginative ideas about creating an interesting display which would be both intrinsically interesting to visitors and potentially also stimulate interest in bellringing.

14. The benefits of the proposal are that a much more tuneful ring of bells would be achieved which would be easy instead of difficult to ring.

15. The latter benefit needs to be elaborated. I have been helpfully assisted in this matter by the observations of Mr Paul Flavell, Master of the Surrey Association of Church Bellringers. As one would expect, he is very experienced – the Tower Captain at All Saints’, Kingston upon Thames and someone who has rung over 600 peals and 1450 quarter peals. He writes:

*As a result of [the deficiencies of the existing ring], the Association rarely visit Richmond for meetings and almost never use the bells for any sort of training event. Training new ringers at Richmond is at best both challenging and an unsatisfactory experience for new learners. New ringers are the life blood of any tower and unless action were taken at Richmond, ringing would be likely to die out in the near future.*

16. The bellringers at St Mary’s explain that there is a long history of the training of new ringers being a frustrating experience because new recruits give up after feeling that they are not getting anywhere; and that this in turn makes experienced ringers reluctant to start teaching new recruits. I would add that, if ringing were indeed to die out, this would be very sad for the art and practice of bellringing but it would also mean that the bells would no longer summon the people of Richmond to worship.

17. The Church Building Council, Richmond upon Thames LBC, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, the Georgian Society and the Victorian Society have all been consulted upon the proposals and none have raised an objection. By a letter dated 20 January 2024, Historic England set out its reasons for not objecting:

*Although the new scheme will result in change to the ring which has been in place for over 250 years, and the loss of one bell, it appears it would make a real improvement to the playability of the bells and support continued bell-ringing at Richmond, whilst greatly limiting harm. The three oldest bells would remain together and in use (albeit tuned). The 1740s Catlin bells would remain in the church and mostly publicly accessible, losing their original function but bringing a new appreciation of these elements to the public and maintaining a role in the building. The one loss, the tenor, is the youngest bell and not part of a group cast together, and as already noted is the most difficult to ring; it would also have its metal reused in the new bells. We consider the proposal to be a very reasonable compromise to address the long held aims of the bellringers and church, whilst keeping all of the bells, in one form or another, as an active part of this historic place of worship. We thank the church for the continued work and engagement on this proposal, and confirm that, were this submitted for a faculty, Historic England would raise no objection to the works.*

## **Guidance**

18. Historic England publishes guidance on its website on *Bells and Bellframes*. This was last updated in May 2024. Relevantly, this states:

*In some places of worship the tower area is the least modernised part of the building. This often means that the bells, bell frames and floors are near contemporaries which add greatly to their historical significance.*

*Bell ringing is an important part of the life of many historic places of worship and Historic England is keen to encourage the continuation of this tradition.*

19. In 1993, the Council for the Care of Churches (now the Church Buildings Council) published a *Code of Practice* in respect of the *Conservation and Repair of Bells and Bellframes*. This was re-issued in 2007 with minor corrections and is available on the website of the Church Buildings Council. Relevantly, this states:

*Lists have been drawn up of bells which should be preserved because of their historical importance. These lists aim to include all bells cast before 1600, important bells of subsequent date, and a selection of complete rings of bells by one founder. The lists are held by the CCC and available from [www.churchcare.co.uk](http://www.churchcare.co.uk). Each DAC will have knowledge of the historically important bells in its diocese. The fact that a bell is not identified as historically important does not imply that it is not worthy of preservation. An assessment should always be made of its importance to determine the appropriate treatment, using the procedure in Appendix 1.*

...

*Bells identified as historically important should not be recast. Where a bell is damaged, welding is often a solution ... If it is beyond repair, it should be preserved and a new bell provided to take its place in the ring. Other bells cast before 1700 should not be recast if welding is possible. Bells cast after 1700 may be considered for recasting only after an assessment has been made in accordance with Appendix 1. Where a bell is to be recast, it is normal practice to reproduce all inscriptions and marks in facsimile, with the date of recasting and the founder's name or mark added.*

...

*Some bell installations exist complete with their original fittings, so that they have survived virtually as they were 200 or more years ago. These cases require special consideration, and repairs should, as far as possible, be carried out so that identical fittings are used and the character of the installation is not lost.*

20. Appendix 1 provides as follows:

*The following factual technical information should be established and documented: (a) the position of the bell in the ring; (b) the identity of its founder; (c) the date of casting; (d) its diameter (across the mouth of the bell) (e) its weight; (f) its strike-note and, if possible, the principal harmonics; (g) its scale of thickness; (h) whether the bell is sound or, if cracked, the extent and possible cause of any crack; (i) the overall casting quality; (j) the detail and overall quality of inscriptions, special features, and the shape and position of moulding wires; (k) whether it has canons and argent, their condition, and any special features; (l) whether the bell has been drilled and to what extent; (m) whether the bell has been tuned and to what extent; (n) whether the bell has been turned; (o) the extent of clapper and hammer indentations; (p) whether it retains its cast-in crown staple.*

*Qualitative considerations (a) is the bell historically noteworthy locally or nationally? (b) with reference to its date, style and size, is the bell an important or rare example of the founder's work? (c) is the bell unusually fine in tone and tune? (d) does the combination of shape, quality of casting, inscriptions, and canons create a bell of particularly fine appearance? (e) does the bell relate in size, pitch, tone, and style to the other bells in the set? (f) are there any features other than those listed above which make the bell noteworthy? (g) taking account of the criteria for bells identified as historically important, does the bell come within this category?*

21. As explained above, the Court of Arches has set out general guidelines for the assessment by Consistory Courts of the effect of proposals that affect churches that are listed in *In re St Alkmund, Duffield*. These are as follows:

- (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 proceedings “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: see Peek v Trower (1881) 7 PD 21, 26–28, and the review of the case law by Bursell QC, Ch in In re St Mary's Churchyard, White Waltham (No 2) [2010] Fam 146, para 11. Questions 3, 4 and 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 (see In re St Luke the Evangelist, Maidstone [1995] Fam 1, 8), will any resulting public benefit (including matters such as liturgical freedom, pastoral wellbeing, opportunities for mission, and putting the church to viable uses that are consistent with its role as a place of worship and mission) outweigh the harm? In answering question (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 I or II\*, where serious harm should only exceptionally be allowed.*
22. As I explained in *In re Holy Trinity, Clapham*,<sup>6</sup> the words *serious harm* in the Duffield guidelines derives from and is essentially synonymous with the words *substantial harm* in secular guidance.<sup>7</sup> As regards the meaning of *substantial harm*, the following in paragraph 018 of National Planning Guidance is of assistance:
- Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision-maker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.*
- While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later additions to historic buildings where those additions are inappropriate and harm the buildings' significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm, depending on the nature of their impact on the asset and its setting.*

---

<sup>6</sup> [2022] ECC Swk 4.

<sup>7</sup> See paragraph 37.

23. Section 35 of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of churches Measure 2018 provides that:

*A person carrying out functions of care and conservation under this Measure, or under any other enactment or any rule of law relating to churches, must have due regard to —*

*(a) the role of a church as a local centre of worship and mission...*

This provision does not apply to Chancellors, but it has been held that, if it did, it would add nothing to the existing duty and practice of Chancellors<sup>8</sup> - the idea being that this was something that Chancellors did in any event. In considering this matter I confirm that I have had regard to role of the church as a local centre of worship and mission.<sup>9</sup>

### Consideration

24. I should address first of all whether, if the proposals are to proceed, it is satisfactory that the three Catlin bells be preserved as proposed within the church. Potentially one can see that they might get in the way or be a distraction in some way. St Mary's is a large church and I think that it can appropriately accommodate them. They will be of general interest to visitors and may encourage interest in bellringing. It is a benefit (or at any rate a mitigation of harm that would otherwise arise) that seven of the ring that was assembled in 1760 are to be preserved within the church.<sup>10</sup>

25. It is often said that churches have always been changed and altered and that this what makes them what they are.<sup>11</sup> Although there are some rings of bells which have survived intact from the eighteenth century (or even earlier), the process of change can often be seen in relation to bells. So the present ring of eight is made up of bells from three dates: what is proposed is a continuation of the same process of renewal and improvement. The particular reasons why the bells of Richmond survived as a ring from 1760 without further alteration is unclear. The current composition of the ring means that the ring as a whole is of less interest than if the bells were (say) all of 1640 but of more interest if the ring had been altered in the nineteenth or twentieth century. These are the bells that have rung out over Richmond for nearly 200 years, whether tunefully or not, and I think that their loss is a matter of some significance.

26. As the guidance of Historic England and the *Code of Practice* of the Church Buildings Council makes clear, that significance would be greater if the wooden frame had survived from 1760 but, as explained above, it did not.

27. Considering the bells not as component parts of a ring of bells but as seventeenth century artefacts, all except one are to be preserved: three within the existing ring and four within the church itself. The Lester and Pack bell dating from 1760 is not rare; there are 323 examples.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See *In re St Luke, Maidstone* [1995] Fam 1 at p7, referencing section 1 of the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991 (which contained the same wording).

<sup>9</sup> See paragraph 36 below.

<sup>10</sup> The ringers have considered the risk of theft that would arise. There can be no absolute security in matters of this kind but the local geography makes the risk less (the church is surrounded by narrow streets).

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, Roy Strong *A Little History of the English Country Church* (2007) at p 234. He references country churches but the same process is of course observable in town churches.

<sup>12</sup> The Whitechapel Bell Foundry, which closed in 2017, represented a bell casting business in Whitechapel, the origins of which can be traced back to the fifteenth century. The Bartlett bells and the Lester and Pack bell were both cast by the Whitechapel Foundry. Thomas Lester was involved in the business between 1736 and 1776; there are a further 100 bells for the casting of which he was partly responsible. The National Bell Register lists 71 bells cast by James Bartlett and 87 cast by Robert Catlin who worked in Holborn between 1738 and 1751.

The answers to the questions raised in Appendix 1 to the Code of Practice are set out in the Appendix to this judgment.<sup>13</sup> The Statement of Significance assesses it as of low significance; recognising the difficulty of trying to make an assessment that combines both rarity, historic interest and intrinsic value, I would assess its significance as moderate.

28. Against this background, I turn to consider the *Duffield* guidance.

**(1) Would the proposals, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest?**

29. I consider that the proposals would, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest.

30. I think that this harm arises in two ways.

31. First, in the loss of a ring of bells which was assembled in 1760 and has been unchanged since. This is not harm to the church as a building of special architectural interest but as of historic interest. Normally, of course, such harm will be experienced by an observer **visually**; this case is unusual in that here it will be experienced **aurally**. I do not think that this means that the loss cannot be harm that the listing of a building seeks to protect that building against.<sup>14</sup>

32. Second, a bell cast by a particular founder and dating from 1760 will be lost.

**(2) If the answer to question (1) is “no”, the ordinary presumption in faculty proceedings “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: see *Peek v Trower* (1881) 7 PD 21, 26–28, and the review of the case law by Bursell QC, Ch in *In re St Mary's Churchyard, White Waltham (No 2)* [2010] Fam 146, para 11. Questions 3, 4 and 5 do not arise.**

33. This guideline does not arise.

**(3) If the answer to question (1) is “yes”, how serious would the harm be?**

34. It is always difficult to assess harm. Using the UNESCO scale,<sup>15</sup> I would describe the harm as moderate adverse (that is between minor adverse and major adverse) but I think that such a categorisation only takes one so far. As always harm has to be seen in context. Perhaps all one can sensibly say at this stage is that the harm is not of such an order of magnitude as to make it unlikely that it could be outweighed by public benefit. I defer further consideration of the matter until I consider the fifth *Duffield* guideline.

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

35. The justification is clear and convincing – in terms both of the improvement to the sound of the ring and in the facilitation and encouragement of bellringing at this tower in Richmond. If the bells did fall silent as a result of a concern to preserve this historic ring of bells, that preservation

---

<sup>13</sup> I do not have answers to every question raised in Appendix 1 but have sufficient for current purposes.

<sup>14</sup> A similar issue can arise in respect of pipe organs. If (contrary to my view) the loss of the ring could not harm as envisaged by the *Duffield* guidelines, it seems to me that it would be necessary, nonetheless, for the faculty process to take this harm into account. However, taking the view that I do, I need not consider this aspect of the matter further.

<sup>15</sup> This can be found at paragraph 49 of my judgment *In re Holy Trinity, Clapham* [2022] ECC Swk 4.

would be in practice of limited value because no-one would hear the preserved bells. Moreover the mission of the church would be impaired as the bells no longer called people to worship. If the proposals go ahead they will enhance St Mary's as local centre of worship and mission.

- (5) Bearing in mind that there is a strong presumption against proposals which will adversely affect the special character of a listed building (see *In re St Luke the Evangelist, Maidstone* [1995] Fam 1, 8), will any resulting public benefit (including matters such as liturgical freedom, pastoral well being, opportunities for mission, and putting the church to viable uses that are consistent with its role as a place of worship and mission) outweigh the harm? In answering question (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 I or II\*, where serious harm should only exceptionally be allowed.**

36. I have no hesitation in saying that the public benefit will outweigh the harm that I have identified. The justification for carrying out the proposals is clear and convincing whereas the harm is limited. In aural terms the loss of an historic ring will be offset by the substitution of a more tuneful one; and in physical terms only a single historic bell is lost and that one not of the greatest significance. I am fortified in my conclusion by the fact that no-one, and more particularly, none of the heritage stakeholders have objected to the proposals. I attach in this context particular significance to the letter of Historic England, commending the compromise that is proposed.
37. I should add this. I think that if the tenor had been of, say, the fourteenth century from which only a comparatively few examples survive, it is likely that there would have been considerable objections and it would never have been proposed that it should be melted down. As it is, the Lester and Pack bell is not rare but it is an artefact that is more than 250 years old. I do feel some hesitation in permitting its destruction, albeit it is to be recast. I cannot help thinking that we may be approaching a time when the recasting of eighteenth century bells will not be permitted simply because of their age. In a similar way to that in which, in terms of the National Planning Guidance, the loss of a fourteenth century bell would now be regarded as minor work causing substantial damage, so, in the future, loss of eighteenth century bell may come to be so regarded.<sup>16</sup> However evidently this is a question for the future.
38. I conclude that a faculty should issue as prayed.

### **Conditions**

39. The money for this work has yet to be raised. Experience suggests that, backed by the enthusiasm of the bellringers and support within the community, fund raising for such projects is usually achieved. I will not impose a condition requiring the funds to be in hand before a contract for the work is placed; I can rely on the good sense of the PCC in this regard.
40. As the Code of Practice explains, there is a tradition when a bell is recast of replicating its inscriptions on a new bell that is cast from it. I would like the ringers to think about this in this case.

---

<sup>16</sup> Although a Lester and Pack bell is never going to be rare in the way that very historic bells are, it may be noted that there are about 1,000 bells cast in the fourteenth century so that, although spread throughout the country, they cannot be said to be intrinsically rare.



41. The DAC recommend that:

*A record is to be made of the existing ring of bells (including a sound-recording) and stored appropriately with parish records and offered to the local history library, County Records Office, and Diocesan Records Office.*

42. Evidently both a visual and aural record is intended; I direct that this condition be attached to the faculty. It is often the case that a final peal is rung on a ring of bells in circumstances such as these and, if this happens, it would be appropriate for such a peal to be recorded.

43. Finally, as is usual, there will be a condition that work be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the Church's Inspecting Architect.

**Concluding remarks**

44. A large number of people were involved in identifying and then progressing an appropriate way forward in this case. I am grateful to everybody who has helped. It remains to express my hope that the project comes speedily to fruition. Thus church bells will continue to ring out over Richmond, calling people to worship and reminding them of the presence of the church in their midst; and the ancient art of bell ringing will, I hope, flourish once again.

**PHILIP PETCHEY**

**Chancellor**

**July 2025**

## Appendix

### **Factual description of bells.**

**(a) the position of the bell in the ring;**

Tenor

**(b) the identity of its founder;**

Lester and Pack

**(c) the date of casting;**

1760

**(d) its diameter (across the mouth of the bell)**

47"

**(e) its weight;**

18 ½ cwt

**(f) its strike-note and, if possible, the principal harmonics;**

F. Its harmonics have been assessed; in summary, it has a sharp hum and a slightly sharp prime.

**(g) its scale of thickness;**

Not known

**(h) whether the bell is sound or, if cracked, the extent and possible cause of any crack;**

It is sound.

**(i) the overall casting quality;**

Unexceptional

**(j) the detail and overall quality of inscriptions, special features, and the shape and position of moulding wires;**

It is inscribed:

PERCIVAL HART & THOS ALLEN CHWARDENS 1760 LESTER & PACK OF LONDON FECIT

**(k) whether it has canons and argent, their condition, and any special features;**

The canons have been removed.

**(l) whether the bell has been drilled and to what extent;**

No.

**(m) whether the bell has been tuned and to what extent;**

I think that it has (I am told that five of the eight bells have been chip tuned and skirted).

**(n) whether the bell has been turned;**

Not noted.

**(o) the extent of clapper and hammer indentations;**

Not noted.

**(p) whether it retains its cast-in crown staple.**

Not noted.

**Qualitative considerations**

**(a) is the bell historically noteworthy locally or nationally?**

No. It is a bell that is not intrinsically fine; and is the product of a foundry the bells of which there are many other examples.

**(b) with reference to its date, style and size, is the bell an important or rare example of the founder's work?**

No

**(c) is the bell unusually fine in tone and tune?**

No

**(d) does the combination of shape, quality of casting, inscriptions, and canons create a bell of particularly fine appearance?**

No

**(e) does the bell relate in size, pitch, tone, and style to the other bells in the set?**

Yes, although it was not cast at the same time as any of the other bells of the ring.

**(f) are there any features other than those listed above which make the bell noteworthy?**

No.

**(g) taking account of the criteria for bells identified as historically important, does the bell come within this category?**

The criteria seem to focus on age and rarity. The bell is neither very old or rare.