

**IN THE CONSISTORY COURT IN THE DIOCESE OF LONDON**

**IN THE MATTER OF ST JAMES THE APOSTLE, ISLINGTON**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PETITION FOR CHANCEL REORDERING**

1. The petition to which this Judgment relates was received in the Registry on 14 September 2015, dated 9 August 2015. This was supplemental to a previous Faculty application, which was the subject of a Hearing in Open Court in the Church on 17 January 2015. Judgment in that matter was handed down on 24 March 2015. A copy of that is annexed to this Judgment and details facts and matters set out in there and this Judgment is to be read in conjunction with that and deals briefly with unresolved matters since then.
2. The current Petitioners are The Reverend Aubrey John Burniston, Incumbent and Mrs Maria Etheleve Anesta Flavius and Mrs Hilary Roden (Churchwardens). By this petition they seek authority for:

Chancel re-ordering, consisting of: removal of green curtain from sanctuary; carpeting of chancel; installation of new lighting scheme; removal of tabernacle and sanctuary lamp to new Blessed Sacrament chapel in north aisle; provision of new carpeted floor surface to area in front of Blessed Sacrament chapel, vestries, pulpit steps, font base and children's play area in south aisle; provision of wheels for nave (St Philip's) altar; alterations to existing mains wiring and sockets in chancel; sale of two pews currently located near font; provision of new cushions for nave pews.
3. All of these works were recommended by the DAC by a Notification of Advice dated 5 August 2015.
4. In response to general citation, two letters of objection were received. One from Mr Alastair Hume (parishioner) and the other from Ms Vera Taggart (PCC member). Both were objecting to the proposed lighting scheme only.
5. Mr Hume served Particulars of Objection on 4 October 2015. He objected (inter alia) on the basis of lack of consultation with PCC and that the congregation was content with the lighting in its present state. Islington Proms would benefit from new lighting

(and that was the reason for doing it) and the Incumbent should therefore have declared an interest – as was laid down in my earlier Judgment of 24 March 2015.

6. Ms Taggart objected on basis of little discussion at PCC meetings and no consultation with the congregation.
7. Neither Petitioners nor the Party Opponent insisted on a hearing and the matter was dealt with on basis of written representations. Because of the matters raised in the Particulars of Objection, Mr Hume made further submissions at my direction, to clarify certain issues he had raised. I had also received further representations from the Petitioners.
8. I determined the matter on 19 February 2016 and concluded that whilst the matters raised by the Party Opponent apparently disclosed serious irregularities that warranted further investigation they were principally procedural and went to the probity of the process rather than the merits of the proposals, including the lighting. Since I had already indicated my approval in principle to the proposed re-ordering of this unlisted building, I have granted a Faculty on condition that the works are carried out in accordance with:
  - (i) the recommendations of the DAC and the Inspecting Architect/Surveyor and
  - (ii) all relevant electrical regulations currently in force.



Seed, Chancellor

10 March 2016