

**IN THE CONSISTORY COURT OF THE**  
**DIOCESE OF ELY**

**IN THE MATTER OF A FACULTY PETITION FOR THE “TRANSFORM PROJECT” AT**  
**HOLY TRINITY CHURCH CAMBRIDGE**

**BACKGROUND**

1. Holy Trinity Church is located in Market Street in the centre of Cambridge. It is a Grade II\* listed building with 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century origins and much altered both in Georgian and Victorian times. It is a church with a congregation bursting at the seams and which has, since 2010, been working to provide a scheme which will increase its seating capacity, provide appropriate facilities for what it sees as its mission and will create a welcoming atmosphere.
2. There are few churches which can claim that they need to increase their seating capacity, and it is clear that the thriving evangelical ministry at Holy Trinity, and which has been at the heart of this church for over 230 years, continues to attract a great many people of all ages. Its ministry to the young, and in particular to University undergraduates, is significant. There is a strong tradition of combining their pastoral message with a meal. Such is the demand that they can no longer provide sufficient space for all in the Henry Martyn Hall which is attached to the church (and which they lease from a charitable trust rather than own) and now provide lunch on a regular basis in two sittings for several hundred young people.
3. The church has been much altered in modern times and before my tenure as Chancellor; in particular, the Chancel has been stripped of its stalls and the pulpit steps have been removed because the pulpit has fallen into desuetude. In addition I have agreed to the removal of an organ which was never played so as to free up space for much needed meeting rooms. The church applied for this Faculty in advance of the present Petition so as to take advantage of a substantial offer for the organ and casing which have now been transported to Germany.

4. The plans for the “Transform Project” are bold and far reaching and involve an extension over four floors on the site presently occupied by the vestry, building works to connect the hall to the Church and to improve the entry area as well as major reordering to the interior. Planning permission has been granted together with listed building consent for the works outside the Church. There have been objections raised to aspects of the proposed works, both internal and external, by Historic England, SPAB, the Georgian Society and the Victorian Society. None of these societies wish to become Parties Opponent but ask that I take into account their views in reaching my decision, which I will.
  
5. In order to assess the issues raised by those societies I visited the Church on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2016. It is unarguable that the present state of the Church is a mess, in particular the Chancel which is dominated by a drum kit between the altar and the congregation with no room to store it in that area, and such furniture which remains in the chancel is scattered and without order. Tarpaulin covers the space left by the organ as they await permission to begin the internal reordering. That is no criticism of the clergy, staff and congregation but the inevitable result of trying to make the best use of the existing building during five years of stagnation as the plans have been made and amended, and as they wait for a resolution of the matter.

#### **HISTORY**

6. Although there was a church on this site before the Cambridge fire of 1174, the chancel was rebuilt in the 13<sup>th</sup> century and added to in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century. In 1782 Charles Simeon was appointed as vicar; he firmly established Holy Trinity as the centre of evangelical Christianity in Cambridge. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century galleries were added, removed or planned to the north side of the nave, north and south transepts, south aisle and the west end of the church, all with the intention of adding to the seating capacity.
  
7. In the 1830’s the chancel was rebuilt and a new vestry was built at the south-west corner of the church. It was at about this time that an elaborate pinnacled Gothic screen made of brick and plaster with a gabled reredos was installed just proud of the east end of the church, and which allowed space for a robing room behind it. It is likely that the octagonal pulpit was erected at about the same time.

8. By 1878 there was a complete overhaul of the interior of the church during which the reredos was moved against the east wall and the robing room done away with. This was on account of the need for yet more seating in the church. This alteration remained for just over a decade. The vestry erected in 1833 was replaced or incorporated with a newly built and larger vestry. That required the demolition of the mediaeval porch.
9. The church petitioned for a Faculty in 1887 to rebuild the east end of the chancel and to replace the rather handsome stone reredos. In 1889 funds were provided for an oak, flat topped, reredos with side panelling and a new timber pulpit was installed. The pulpit may have been to the design of AC Luck who was the architect at the time.
10. In 1907 the architect George Bodley suggested that there was general colouring of the walls and provided a design for an elaborate new reredos of triptych form. Objections to the figures that were to be carved in the panels was over-ridden and the design was accepted in 1908, a year after Bodley's death. The final design was overseen by Cecil Hare, Bodley's assistant. The wings of the reredos were at some stage removed. This was done, it seems, because they obscured the east window. It should be observed that what remains of the reredos still rises above the base of the east window and obscures approximately the bottom quarter of the window, much in the same way as the stone reredos of the 1830's had done.
11. The alterations of the last half century have been of a minor nature but have included an extension to the vestry, projection of the chancel floor into the crossing, the altar being moved forward accordingly (which seems now to have retreated to the east end of the chancel) and new communion rails were installed at the edge of the projection. These have since been removed. The chancel choir stalls were removed and rehoused in the south transept. The floor is made of various different materials including stone, parquet flooring and some cork tiles installed when the heating system was renewed.

#### **THE PROPOSALS UNDER THE TRANSFORM PROJECT**

12. I do not intend to set them out *in extenso* because many parts of the scheme are uncontroversial. Some of the more controversial plans, such as removing all the stained glass and doing away with the altar entirely have been abandoned. I am glad that they have.
13. The alterations which are controversial and for which a faculty is sought are as follows:-
- (a) Demolition of the vestry and replacement with a four storey building which will provide much needed additional meeting rooms.
  - (b) Opening up the passageway to the hall to create a foyer and entrance lobby.
  - (c) Installation of a new kitchen under the gallery in the north transept.
  - (d) Knocking through a doorway to give access into the south gallery because the stairs from the chancel will go when the kitchen is installed.
  - (e) Removal of all the pews except in the south gallery (the seating was probably installed in 1806 whereas the seating in the nave was put in in 1878).
  - (f) Reduction in the height of the reredos which is to be covered from sight by a partition with storage space behind it.
  - (g) Removal of the pulpit.
  - (h) Removing all the remaining furniture from the chancel with the exception of a mahogany chair which was used by Charles Simeon. The raised chancel floor is to be shortened so as to allow room for more seating.
  - (i) Carpeting over the stone floor, which will be reinstated, throughout the ground floor.
  - (j) Knocking a door through to the organ chamber to give access to meeting rooms and offices in this space.

#### **THE OBJECTIONS**

14. By a letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2012 the Victorian Society objected to the majority of what was proposed but deferred to the judgment of SPAB. They did expand on their objections to the new entrance lobby to the Henry Martyn Hall which they considered did not respond either

to the church or the hall, as to its juxtaposition of the entrance to the north porch and the loss of attractive wrought iron grilles.

15. In their next letter, dated 21<sup>st</sup> September 2015, by which time the proposals had been amended by the Petitioner, the Victorian Society remained "...very much opposed to the church's proposed reordering...". They accepted that Holy Trinity was substantially a medieval building, but pointed out that it was the subject of a number of significant alterations and adaptations during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. In particular:

- (a) They identified the significance of the reredos and the carved gilded timber altar as being of most significance from that Victorian period. The reredos is one of five principal reasons for its Grade II\* designation in the list description.
- (b) They objected to the removal of the pulpit which makes "...a valuable contribution to the richness and visual appeal of the east end of the church."
- (c) So long as those items ((a) and (b) above) are retained, they would not object to the majority of the pews being removed, but with the exception of the decorated poppy headed pews and frontals which they suggest should be restored to the chancel from which they came to mitigate the loss of the pews from the chancel.
- (d) They recommended the retention of the nineteenth century vestry which contains a "pleasing interior" and which could be incorporated into the new building. I should interpose that this has since been considered by the architect and rejected as unworkable.
- (e) They repeated their objection to the new entrance to the hall.

16. The Georgian Society provided limited comments in December 2011 in respect of those areas with which it was concerned whilst deferring to SPAB and the Victorian Society for detailed comment on the project.

17. SPAB responded on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2015. They had "...serious concerns about the incremental damage and harm to the historic fabric...". In particular:

- (a) Whilst acknowledging that the four storey building to replace the vestry has planning permission, they consider it to be one storey too high.
- (b) Whilst they do not object to the new lobby entrance, they pointed to issues over lighting, the gutters failing to take the additional rainwater and access to clean gutters and for maintenance and repair of the historic tower.

- (c) Whilst accepting that the south transept would be likely to work much better in practice than an earlier plan, it will inevitably change the appearance, atmosphere and significance of the church. This, they accepted, could be mitigated by "...exceptionally carefully detailed design work." It will also require a third new entrance to be cut in the 15<sup>th</sup> century walls at first floor level which they find deeply regrettable.
- (d) As to the panelling, reredos and choir stalls, whilst accepting that they are not to the taste of current church members, they are important fittings and of importance to the history of the church and should be retained, even if it is brought forward to create storage space behind.
- (e) They are not convinced that a new north east entrance is required which would alter the appearance of a fifteenth century window in the north transept.

18. Historic England responded on July 2015. They were involved in discussions about the original scheme and have limited their comments to the alterations in that scheme. They point out, and I agree, that "Holy Trinity is a fine medieval church, much altered – sometimes to its detriment – in subsequent centuries". In relation to specific concerns:

- (a) Whilst the emphasis has changed over time of the place of the chancel in a church in response to changes in theological perspective and liturgy, it remains the focal point of the church for both aesthetic and historic reasons. They questioned the parish's continued wish to remove the reredos which forms "...a fixture of considerable quality and importance..." not least because of its close association to Bodley. They do not consider that the church's wish to have a building which accords with their style of worship provided sufficient justification for its removal.
- (b) Whilst they understand the rationale behind the decision to put the kitchen under the gallery in the south transept when one already exists to serve the hall, they submitted that there has to be a clear justification for it being necessary because it will, to some degree, compromise the church's architectural character. The enclosure of the space under the gallery will erode the spatial character of the transept and affect the character of the gallery. Historic England acknowledge that the space provides the obvious place in which to site this sort of facility.
- (c) They questioned whether the work to create a doorway from the north transept which would rise above the sill can be justified because of the rationale of the scheme overall.

19. The CBC responded on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2015:

- (a) They felt that a case had been made for relocating the kitchen but that the position in the south transept would have the effect of diminishing the potential for flexibility of the church interior. If it was to be used then care would need to be taken to ensure that the kitchen design worked successfully with the existing arcade. They believed that the pews which had come from the chancel should be retained somewhere else within the building.
- (b) They were unable to support the removal of the reredos and suggested that the reredos could be brought forward to provide storage space behind. They were in favour of retention of a font and pulpit within the church even if they were of a modern design so as to retain something of the broader Anglican tradition as laid out in Canon Law.
- (c) They are not against the removal of the pews so long as they are replaced with good quality un-upholstered chairs.

20. The Petitioner responded to the consultation letters at some length:

- (a) The pulpit blocks the sight lines, takes up space and is never used.
- (b) The vestry does not fulfil the description given it of having a “pleasing interior”. Retaining it would pose structural challenges with the new build.
- (c) The work on the new entry will retain all but one of the grilles. The north porch is unwelcoming and the space which it is proposed should be used is at present wasted and difficult to maintain. The plans have taken account of the need for additional rainwater drainage.
- (d) The church would like the focal point of the chancel to be light, clean and uncluttered. Removal of the reredos to floor level (and behind a screen) will allow the full extent of the east window to be seen. The space will be one of simplicity and practicality.
- (e) They need two kitchens so as to cater for approximately 200 people. Various alternative positions for the kitchen have been considered and rejected. The south transept option met all Building Control requirements and the most needs of the church.
- (f) They intend to install Howe 40/4 chairs which fulfil the requirements of the CBC.
- (g) Without the new door into the organ loft there will be disturbance to services because the only point of access will be through the chancel.
- (h) They need the space provided by a fourth floor on the new build which has been approved by the planning authority.

21. In December 2015 the DAC broadly approved the plans, including the reduction of the reredos to floor level.

## THE POSITION IN LAW

22. In considering whether I should grant the Faculty I have followed the guidance on the development in the interpretation of “the Bishopsgate Questions” laid down in In Re St Alkmund, Duffield [2013] Fam 158:-

- (i) Would the proposals, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest?
- (ii) If the answer to question (i) 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 Questions iii, iv and v do not arise.
- (iii) If the answer to question (i) is “yes”, how serious would the harm be?
- (iv) How clear and convincing is the justification for carrying out the proposals?
- (v) 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 that are consistent with its role as a place of worship and mission) outweigh the harm? In answering this question, 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.

23. Further assistance has been given by the Arches Court of Canterbury as to how the Duffield Questions are to be interpreted in In re St John the Baptist, Peshurst (9<sup>th</sup> March 2015). Having set out the five Duffield questions, the judgment continued:

“22. We make four observations about these questions:

- (a) Question (1) cannot be answered without prior consideration of what is the special architectural and/or historic interest of the listed church. That is why each of those matters was specifically addressed in Duffield paras 57-58, the court having already found in para 52(i) that “the chancellor fell into a material error in failing to identify what was the special character and historic interest of the church as a whole (including the appearance of the chancel) and then to consider whether there would be an overall adverse effect by reason of the proposed change”.
- (b) In answering questions (1) and (3), the particular grading of the listed church is highly relevant, whether or not serious harm will be occasioned. That is why in Duffield para 56 the court’s analysis of the effect on the character of the listed building referred to “the starting point...that this is a grade I listed building”.



- (c) In answering question (4), what matters are the elements which comprise the justification, including justification falling short of need or necessity (see Duffield paras 85-86). That is why the document setting out the justification for the proposals is now described in rule 3.3(1)(b) of the FJR 2013 as a document “commonly known as a “statement of needs”” (italics added), in recognition that it is not confined to needs strictly so-called.
- (d) Questions (1), (3) and (5) are directed at the effect of the works on the character of the listed building, rather than the effects of alteration, removal or disposal on a particular article.

24. In my judgment, where I am faced with a wholesale reordering and restructuring of the church the need to have in mind the effect on the listed building overall rather than the effects of alteration, removal or disposal of a particular article is paramount. That said, where the work, as it is here, is to various delineable areas of the church, I ought, in addition, to have regard to the effect that the alterations proposed in any one area will have to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest.

#### DECISION

25. In answering the Duffield questions:

- (a) If the proposals are implemented, they will result in harm to the significance of the church as a Grade 2\* listed building of special architectural or historic interest.
- (b) The harm to certain aspects of the building will be substantial and serious.
- (c) The Statement of Need and other documents provided by the Petitioner provide in many respects a clear and convincing justification for carrying out the proposals which outweigh the harm. Much, but not all that is proposed, will result in a public benefit bearing in mind that there should be liturgical freedom subject to the requirements of Canon Law, opportunities for mission, and putting the church to viable uses that are consistent with its role as a place of worship and mission.
- (d) Bearing in mind that this is a Grade 2\* listed building, as a consequence
  - (i) I have to bear in mind that the more serious the harm, the greater will be the level of benefit needed before the proposals should be permitted, and
  - (ii) Serious harm should only exceptionally be allowed.

before I can permit all the works which the Petitioner has requested to be carried out.

26. I shall deal with the limits on the work by area.
27. **The Chancel:** the reredos and, as already agreed, the altar must be retained. I judge that the significance of these two items to the church are of too great an importance to permit the reredos to be covered or reduced in height. I do not see that the worthy aims set out in the Statement of Need which is summarised in the purpose statement as, “to create a space to transform lives that will change the world” will be affected by the retention of the reredos. Whilst it may affect their overall vision for the chancel to be light, clean and uncluttered, in my judgment that does not outweigh the loss of the reredos which is one of the significant features which contributes to its listed status.
28. If the Petitioner wishes to do so, the reredos can be moved forward to provide storage space behind it together with a false wall to each side of the reredos painted in the same colour as the walls of the church. I will allow the removal of the wood panelling at the east end of the chancel, save for that on which the reredos sits, which ought, together with a professional cleaning of the reredos itself, do much to lighten the chancel. The altar and the reredos, which were installed at the same time, will provide an important focal point to the chancel.
29. I agree that the pulpit can be removed. In my judgment it does not share the same significance as the reredos and altar. The other furniture, with the exception of Simeon’s chair can be removed from the church. Simeon’s chair does not necessarily have to remain in the chancel, so long as it is displayed within the church.
30. **The Vestry:** whilst there is no denying that the vestry is a pleasant room, there is nothing exceptional about it. The need for more meeting rooms and offices in order to fulfil their mission is well made and to retain it would put in jeopardy the opportunity to build to four floors. In the same way that a medieval porch had to be lost to build the vestry in Victorian times, the Victorian vestry must now give way to the legitimate needs of the church.
31. **The South Transept:** there is a real and urgent need to provide better and larger kitchen facilities in the church because of the intention to use the nave, cleared of seating, as

additional space to set out tables to accommodate as many as 200 diners. This is central to the church's mission. I am satisfied that, despite its impact on the layout of the church, it is the best place to site the kitchen. I agree with the submission of SPAB that the effect of the kitchen on the church can be mitigated by "...exceptionally carefully detailed design work." I require the detailed plans for this to be reconsidered by the DAC who should make any recommendations they see fit to fulfil this requirement.

32. I have considered very carefully what should be done with the choir stalls which were in the chancel and were moved to under the gallery and are to be displaced again. I agree that they are the finest of the Victorian pews in the church. I reject the suggestion that they should be restored to the chancel which, in my judgment, would go completely against what the Petitioner is trying to achieve and which I have already decided is justified.
33. I have considered whether they could be moved elsewhere. The only stalls to be retained will be in the south gallery. It would make no sense to put them there and disrupt the Georgian stalls which are there. Wherever else they were put they would look isolated and out of place. With reluctance, I accept that their disposal is necessary; I judge that the need to allow the church to fulfil its mission and in particular provide chairs which will create more seating overall than the pews they replace, and which will allow areas to be cleared in the nave for tables and chairs to be arranged to provide food outweighs the harm caused by removing the choir stalls from the church.
34. The creation of the gallery in the south transept will inevitably require a door to be knocked through the medieval stonework on the first floor and I agree to this being done.
35. **The nave:** I will approve the removal of all the Victorian pews. I approve and commend the use of Howe 40/4 chairs in their place.
36. I understand that the floors throughout are to be paved in stone. It is then the intention of the Petitioner to cover all the floors with carpeting, an example of which I have seen. The justification for that is to ensure that the church has a comfortable, welcoming and homely appearance and to avoid injury to the young and the infirm who may fall onto the stone

floor. I have grave reservations about this plan. In my judgment it will alter the whole feel of the building turning it from a church into a domestic building. There is no evidence generally that stone floors in churches are a hazard causing injury to the users of the building.

37. There are practical aspects to the scheme which also concern me; the wear on the carpets will be significant and will involve the church in an on-going financial commitment. In addition, with food being served and eaten at tables in the nave, there is likely to be spillage which create problems with hygiene and with unsightly marks.
38. I will not permit the installation of carpet, except on the reduced raised floor of the chancel where there is already carpet and which will absorb some of the noise created by the instruments used to accompany worship. I will allow the Petitioner to renew their application for a faculty for carpet after two years from the works being completed within the church. It may be that the Petitioner will not want to reapply. If they do wish to do so, they will need to justify their application and I will want Historic England and the CBC to be asked for their views on carpeting.
39. **Entrance into the rooms created in the disused organ loft:** I am persuaded that there is a justifiable need to allow access into that area through a door which leads off the north transept rather than the chancel. Whilst I appreciate that a doorway will cause harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, I judge that the finest aspect of the window, namely the stone tracery at the high point of the window will be unaffected by the introduction of a doorway which will only raise the sill. In my view that militates in favour of permitting the work to be carried out.
40. **The new entry to the northwest corner:** having looked at this area on my inspection of the church and at the plans, I judge that there is a justifiable reason to permit the work to be carried out. Whilst I accept that there will be some conflict between the new entrance and the use of the north porch, I agree that a modern and welcoming entrance into a foyer and information area will better suit the mission of this church. I have considered the practical aspects of the design which have been drawn to my attention by SPAB have been

considered by the Petitioner and the architect such that they do not raise sufficient concerns to require me to prevent the work taking place. It is regrettable that one of the three grilles will be displaced whereas the other two will be hung on the wall alongside a further grille which was removed under an earlier scheme. However what remains will provide an historical context to that part of the church.

41. **General:** insofar as I have not mentioned any parts of the proposed scheme specifically, then the Faculty which I issue will cover those works as well. In respect of all works that will require it, and in particular the new build above the vestry and the northwest entrance, there must be archaeological oversight and, if the works uncover any archaeological or human remains, they shall cease pending further directions from the Registry.

#### **CONCLUSION**

42. It follows that I have been able to grant most of the alterations and additions which the Petitioner has requested. Where I have not, the Petitioner must bear in mind that they are custodians for future generations of a Grade II\* listed building of substantial architectural merit. Some constraints are therefore placed on what is permissible to allow in respect of alterations to the historic fabric whilst allowing the Petitioner to fulfil their mission, an evangelical mission which has been evolving in this building for over 200 years.
43. The church has a history of constant change with schemes only surviving a very short time in the context of a building which has been on this site for more than 700 years. I hope that these radical alterations will not need to be revisited for many years to come.

His Honour Judge Leonard QC

Chancellor

2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016

**IN THE CONSISTORY COURT OF THE**  
**DIOCESE OF ELY**

**ADDENDUM TO THE JUDGMENT IN**  
**IN THE MATTER OF A FACULTY PETITION FOR THE “TRANSFORM PROJECT” AT**  
**HOLY TRINITY CHURCH CAMBRIDGE**

1. A number of matters have been raised in a letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016 in respect of my judgment on the proposed reordering of Holy Trinity. I will deal with those in turn.
2. In §13(c) I referred to the installation of a new kitchen in the north transept. As I am sure was appreciated from what followed in §§31-34 (and headed “The South Transept”) that was an error on my part; I should have referred to the south transept.
3. In §§13(e) and 33 I refer to the stalls being retained in the south gallery. That was my understanding based on the Conservation Statement which is undated but was received on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2015 by the Registry. This date being three weeks before the public notice was issued, I believed I could rely on its contents. At p.40 it deals with the south transept and states:

“The south gallery with its fixed seating would be retained but the present stair to the gallery would be removed and a new access would be formed through a new doorway in the west wall...”
4. The Conservation Statement Addendum and Heritage Impact Assessment (dated May 2015 and also received on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2015), p.30 does not refer to the removal of all the pews. At that stage it envisaged:

“However three rows of pews will have to be removed while two rows will be adapted and reused for the front two rows of seating in the gallery.”
5. It is for that reason that I made my decision although I now understand that the proposal is for the removal of all the Georgian seating. However, in answering the fourth Duffield Question, I can find no clear and convincing justification for removing this good example of Georgian pews. The removal of the Victorian pews from the nave and transepts at ground

level can be justified because it provides for additional seating and, importantly, allows for flexible use of the space in the nave. Those dual aims provide a clear and convincing justification for carrying out the proposals and allows Holy Trinity opportunities for extending its mission as I explained in my judgment.

6. I will not grant a Faculty for the removal of the pews in the south gallery but, if it is necessary to shorten two pews and remove one completely to allow entry and egress through the new door on the first floor to the gallery, I will allow that subject to the detailed plans being approved by the DAC. In my judgment there should be as little disturbance to these historic pews as is possible, and it may be possible to reuse the pew(s) in the area no longer taken up by the staircase coming through to the gallery. If no agreement is reached the matter can be referred back to me.
7. In §§13(i) and 36 I refer to the floors being paved in stone. My sources for that were:
  - (a) The Conservation Statement at p.33, “The present floor, which is a mixture of parquet and cork tiles under the pews would be paved in stone.”
  - (b) The Conservation Statement at p.40 in respect of the South transept, “The issue of repaving and removal of pews have already been discussed under the Nave.”
  - (c) The Conservation Statement Addendum and Heritage Impact Assessment (dated May 2015) p.28, “New stone floor with underfloor heating: A new stone floor will be aesthetically appropriate to the character of the church and be a great improvement on the current parquet and cork tiling”
  - (d) On 20<sup>th</sup> February 2016 I asked whether stone floors were to be laid and confirmation was given by those present.
8. In the letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> March it was pointed out that the floor proposed by the church is a specialist underfloor heating system using a screed replacement tile with a carpet overlaid. I, of course, accept that that was the intention at the time that the Faculty Application was made. I had seen a reference to it in the Statement of Needs sent to the DAC on 27<sup>th</sup> November (p.2) which is why I asked for clarification when I visited the church.
9. Because I have rejected carpet as being appropriate in this church, and because the proposed screed replacement tile cannot be put in without a carpet covering, I agree that alternative floor types should now be proposed. I agree with Holy Trinity’s own Conservation Statement Addendum that a new stone floor would be aesthetically

appropriate to the character of the church. Whatever is submitted as an alternative should be sent to the DAC for comment and then to me for approval.

10. It is my understanding that the church wants to phase the work that they are undertaking. This is a massive and costly reordering and building programme and it comes as no surprise that the church wants to complete it in stages, and I welcome this approach.
11. My view has already been expressed in a letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016 sent by the Registry to Nicole Hanson, the Transform Project Co-ordinator. When the proposed plans are set out clearly, I will consider them. As is expressed in that letter, it should be possible to phase the work without asking for the Faculty to be amended, save for, perhaps, minor details.
12. I look forward to seeing those proposals, and I look forward to seeing the results of this exciting and challenging reordering and new build programme at Holy Trinity.

His Honour Judge Leonard QC

Chancellor

10<sup>th</sup> April 2016