

Neutral Citation No. [2025] ECC Lon 3

IN THE CONSISTORY COURT

DIOCESE OF LONDON

**In the matter of
ST ANNE, LIMEHOUSE – *Faculty No. 4732***

-and-

**In the matter of
THE PETITION OF THE REVEREND RICHARD ANTONY BRAY (RECTOR),
GABRIEL EZEMAH (CHURCHWARDEN), AND HITEN RAJGURU
(CHURCHWARDEN)**

-and-

**In the matter of
REPAIR AND REDEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH TO IMPROVE
ACCESSIBILITY AND PROVIDE COMMUNITY SPACE (INCLUDING REPAIRS TO
THE INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING), DEMOLITION OF THE
CRYPT AND REMOVAL OF BURIALS AND RECONFIGURATION OF THE SPACE
AS A HERITAGE QUARTER. PROVISION OF MEETING ROOMS, KITCHEN AND
LAVATORIES, INSERTION OF RAMPS, A LIFT AND STAIRS TO THE NAVE
LEVEL, INSERTION OF A LAVATORY AND NURTURE SPACE. PROPOSED
REMOVAL OF THE PEWS AND REPLACEMENT WITH CHAIRS, REINSERTION
OF THE CHANCEL FURNITURE AND OF THE PULPIT ON TRACKS,
RELOCATION OF THE FONT, RECONFIGURATION OF THE GALLERY FLOOR
LEVELS AND RELOCATION OF ALTERED PEWS FROM THE NAVE TO
GALLERY, NEW LIGHTING AND AUDIO-VISUAL SYSTEMS, RE-WIRING AND
NEW MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SOLUTIONS INCLUDING AIRSOURCE
HEAT PUMPS AND PHOTOVOLTAIC PANELS ON THE SOUTH AND EAST
ROOFS**

-and-

**In the Matter of:
AN OBJECTION BY JAMIE SUNDERLAND**

Judgment of the Chancellor

July 29, 2025

Etherington Ch:

1. This judgment has taken longer for me to consider and deliver than would normally be the case. Apart from the amount of documentation, which amounts to more than 1100 pages, it became clear to me that I should give an opportunity at this stage for either or both of the Victorian Society (VS) and the Georgian Group (GG) to become Parties Opponent if they so wished, as some of their concerns were not resolved by the consultation process. They have written to the Registry to indicate that they do not so wish. I have taken their views, together with those of other consultees, into account in reaching my decision.
2. There is an Objection by Jamie Sunderland, who elected at an earlier point not to become a Party Opponent but who wishes his submissions to be taken into account. Mr Sunderland is an “interested party” within the meaning of Part 10 of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 (as amended) [“FJR”] in relation to a petition for a faculty as he is a “person who is resident in the ecclesiastical parish”. I have taken his representations into account.
3. There was consultation with statutory consultees and amenity societies: the Church Building Council (CBC) raises some points of detail but does not object overall, deferring consideration to the Diocesan Advisory Committee (DAC); Historic England (HE) has no objection to the proposals and welcomes “the positive endeavours to conserve this highly significant building”; the VS has concerns about removing all of the pews and also has concerns with the proposed works at the gallery level, but welcomes proposals to retain the pulpit and re-use the chancel furnishings. Finally, the GG maintains, *inter alia*, its concerns as to the removal of all the pews from the nave and aisles, although its assessment of the proposals as a whole is that they would cause “less than substantial harm to the significance of the building”.
4. The church is Grade I listed. Accordingly, given the extent of the works, the enhanced *Duffield* principles (***In Re St Alkmund, Duffield [2013] Fam 158***) are applicable. I am satisfied that the petition can be decided on the papers under Part 14 (1) of the FJR having regard to the overriding objective in Part 1 of the Rules. In particular, although not exclusively, I have borne in mind (i) that there is no Party Opponent (ii) the importance of avoiding unnecessary expense and (iii) that it is desirable to deal with the petition as expeditiously as possible. I have been aided in making this decision by the clarity of the Petitioners’ submissions, the observations of those consulted and Mr Sunderland’s written objections.
5. This petition is seeking permission for an ambitious redevelopment of this church, designed by Nicholas Hawksmoor and known colloquially as one of the *Queen Anne Churches*, although the building was finished in the reign of George I (1727) and consecrated in 1730. The church was built by Edward Strong the Younger who had enjoyed close ties with Christopher Wren. Its genesis lay in an enabling Act of 1711, implementing the New Churches in London and Westminster Act 1710. The original intention was to build 50 new churches. Such an ambitious target was not met under this legislation. 12 churches were built. The ecclesiastical parish came into being through the

Limehouse Parish Act 1729 which drew it from the original parish of St Dunstan's, Stepney. The money raised involved a substantial amount from taxation (effectively licensing the passage of coal on the River Thames) in the reign of the last Stuart monarch, which *may* account (according to popular folklore) for it being named for St Anne, the mother of the Virgin Mary. Historically, the church had a significant connection with the navy and is permitted to fly the White Ensign in perpetuity.

6. The church was the subject of a very serious fire on April 18, 1850 (Good Friday) and there was a substantial restoration in the 1850s by Philip Hardwick (who founded what became the Royal Institute of British Architects). There was further restoration and renovation over a ten-year period in the second half of the last century (in particular, the adding of roof supports) and, again, towards the end of the first decade of this century, including a thorough restoration of the organ and works on the altar and flooring. The Gray and Davison organ, replacing the 1741 Bridge instrument, has a very considerable reputation.
7. As frequently happens with substantial proposals of this kind, there is an inevitable tension between (i) the needs of a church in the first half of the twenty-first century including those relating to mission and (ii) the responsibility to conserve and protect exceptional buildings and the evaluation of individual features of a church in the context of its architectural and historical significance as a whole. There is also a further area of difficulty, not infrequently encountered in restorations, which relates to a potential misunderstanding as to what the architectural and historical significance is said to be. This is particularly so where it is said that the proposals are put forward in part to return a church, which has been subject to an earlier restoration, to its former state, or something more like it. To be clear, the architectural and historical significance the court is considering is that which exists at the time the proposals are put forward.
8. The DAC does not recommend the proposals to me but does not object to them. The DAC is of the opinion that the work, or part of the work proposed, is likely to affect both the archaeological importance of the building and the archaeological remains existing within the church or its curtilage. Notice of the proposals was given on the London Diocesan website in accordance with Rule 9.9.

THE PROPOSAL IN GENERAL TERMS

9. The Petitioners acknowledge and indeed celebrate the fact that the church has exceptional significance.
10. Repair and renovation of the church's plasterwork is seen as integral to the prospects of its being removed from HE's Buildings at Risk Register. This damage has been caused by prolonged water ingress from above the nave. It is the view of the Petitioners that only a project which incorporates proposals to achieve accessibility and encourage visitors would have been sufficient to secure funding, including that necessary for the plasterwork renovations. The

Petitioners say that a reason often given for there being less engagement with the local community than there otherwise might be is lack of facilities.

11. In the view of the Petitioners and their advisers, trying to separate works into repairs on the one hand and re-development on the other would be inimical to a successful funding application. They say that the congregation is enjoying steady and sustained growth and as such is approaching the point where the available space is insufficient. This, to an extent, contradicts the proposition referring to a lack of community engagement, but it is fair to say, however, that the intention is to attract a diverse congregation.
12. The crypt: it is proposed to 'clear' burial vaults and the desire is to subdivide it and heat it inexpensively using it for the night shelter ministry, events for smaller children, a staff working space, drop-in café events and improved kitchen and lavatory facilities.
13. The gallery level: the intention is to use the area as a permanent display space for archives and time-limited exhibitions.
14. There is a desire to use the nave area more flexibly including its use for a relaunched service for younger congregants and an open flexible space for older children to enable activities such as parachute games and occasional use for Christmas and craft markets, banquets, quiz nights and performances.

CONSEQUENTIAL PROPOSALS

15. There are significant additions and alterations which flow from the central proposals such as stairs, ramps and a lift from the crypt to nave level, the removal of all of the pews from the nave and aisles and their replacement with chairs, reinstatement of the chancel furniture and the moveable pulpit, relocation of the font and relocation of altered pews to the gallery area which will have its flooring reconfigured.

THE CONTENTIOUS ISSUES

16. As one might expect, the scheme has evolved as a result of consultation and for other reasons and I intend to concentrate on the consultees' final position in relation to:
 - a. Concerns about the proposed removal of all of the pews;
 - b. Concerns about proposed works at the gallery level.
17. Jamie Sunderland is resident within the ecclesiastical parish although he worships elsewhere. He has a particular interest in Baroque churches. He supports the proposals in respect of the crypt and the installation of solar panels and air source heat pumps as part of the proposed works. His major concerns relate to:
 - a. the proposal to achieve a level access by cutting a new doorway through one of the windows on the south of the crypt and punching a lift (as he

- terms it) from crypt levels through the nave to the galleries and cutting a new staircase from the nave down to the crypt;
- b. removal of the pews.

18. He does not object to the principle of facilitating access but he believes that the chosen method will cause real harm to the primitive basilica that Hawksmoor created at St Anne's. He also says that the church had previously contemplated using the north porch to house a lift which could, in his view, be paired with a platform lift down to the crypt which he considers would be less damaging to the 'existing volume of the nave'. He does not understand why a large staircase from crypt to nave is thought necessary.
19. Lastly, he contends that the parish has for a long time sought to "rip out" the church's Victorian box pews, asserting repeatedly that they are of poor quality and made of cheap woodwork. He believes that the pews are an essential part of the worship in the church both now and in the future. He concludes that he will "not get into the current PCC's distinctive theology, and its substantial distance from the mainstream church", but says he does "not support the permanent alteration of the building to support the preferences of the current incumbents."
20. The Rector responded to the Objection and began by expressing his gratitude to Mr Sunderland for his support for a number of the proposals. He explained that the earlier plans had run into difficulties. They would have necessitated the removal of an unknown quantity of bodies present in this area; the loss of a World War Two first-aid post and alterations to the crypt levels and the west tower. He said: "Weighing over 6,000 tons, the tower leans to the east and conservation accredited engineers were concerned that any works which affected the foundations could cause further movement."
21. The Rector further observed that HE and other bodies accept the present proposals and that the Petitioners considered a range of further options, but that all these either compromised the tower or were unsuitable for other reasons. The Rector added: "The location was chosen because part of one of the vault bays has already been damaged, and this location allows easy access to the exterior of the church on the south side. This is imperative to allow level access unimpeded, and as a second means of escape as advised by the fire engineers. Without this doorway the crypt cannot be occupied by more than 30 people. Our architects have carefully minimized the visual impact of this necessary new ramp and exit."
22. In respect of the staircase, the design was thought to be the least disruptive to the surviving building and meant that proper staircase access to the crypt could be provided, as the eastern staircases did not comply with modern access requirements. The original timber will be repaired and conserved as part of the present proposal.
23. He said that the proposed part-glazed 'nurture' space under the north-west gallery balanced the necessary enclosure for lift and staircase on the south-west side and provided valuable amenity, not only on Sundays for quickly

removing disruptive infants, but also at other times for counselling and as a space for volunteers.

24. The Rector stated that the proposals were not motivated by the ecclesiology of St Anne's, itself unchanged for 50 years, but represented a careful balance between the particular significance of the building and the needs of a growing and thriving ministry – especially for those who are least able and most vulnerable.

25. The particular considerations of *Duffield* apply, dealing with the necessary balancing exercise when determining petitions affecting listed buildings attracting the ecclesiastical exemption. It is this:

- (1) *Would the proposals, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historical interest?* It is conceded that the answer here is 'yes';
- (2) *If the answer to the first question is in the affirmative, it is necessary to ask how serious the harm would be;*
- (3) *Then, it is necessary to assess how clear and convincing is the justification for the proposals;*
- (4) *Generally, the greater the harm, the greater the benefit that will need to be demonstrated to justify the proposals and, importantly, in the case of a building that is listed grade 1 or II*, if serious harm would result then the justification would need to be exceptional.*

ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND HARM

Crypt

26. The Petitioners assess the significance of the crypt as a whole as *exceptional*. Of *some* significance is said to be the burial vaults, the Second World War lavatories, blast walls and sick-bay doors. The alteration of the modern era (1990s) is not said to have any significance.

27. The harm has been assessed as follows: of no harm, and indeed of positive benefit, will be the masonry and plasterwork conservation repairs. The removal of any existing floor finishes to the crypt itself, excavation down to formation level, installation of the new underfloor heating system throughout and new floor finishes cannot yet be assessed in terms of harm until completion of the trial pits. These will reveal, in particular, the existence of any burials. The lift and staircase will cause *significant* harm as described. Some harm will also result from the platform lift, assessed as moderate and the provision of the lavatories, assessed as *low*. The partitioning and provision of rooms will cause *moderate harm* mostly related to visual appearance (viewing). Similarly with the provision of storage space. *Moderate harm* will be caused by the removal of some burial vaults and would be caused if any lavatory was located in one of the retained burial vaults.

28. Mitigation has been considered in respect of all the proposals and steps will be taken to mitigate where possible. I have considered those measures and

will concentrate on the proposals in the sensitive or contentious areas. The lift will be panelled in its west-facing position to match that elsewhere in the crypt and the lift and staircase will be positioned in the same area to reduce impact. The groin walls will be re-built using existing brickwork.

Nave

29. Of *exceptional* significance is said to be the church as a whole, including the exterior as a whole and all of the elevations, the body of the church as an architectural design, the west porch, the north and south porches, the narrow tunnel from the west porch to the nave and the north-east and south-east vestries and staircases to the crypt. The north and south tunnels off the west to east tunnel are said to be of *considerable* importance. Of *some* significance is said to be the late 19th century draught lobbies, partitions and joinery, although the lobby to the south-east vestry is assessed as having *little* significance. The modern ceilings to the south-west vestry are assessed as having no significance and the three-light arcade windows introduced by Blomfield as well as the Perspex glazing and concrete within the porch are assessed as having *negative* significance (intrusive).
30. The removal of the existing pavement, excavation downwards and the construction of two new ramps to the west end and alteration to the existing door leaves will cause *some harm* to the built fabric of the west steps. By way of mitigation, the ramps have been located to reduce their visibility when approached from the west along St Anne's passage. The lowering of the western-most bay sill to create a new door opening is said to be going to cause *significant harm* to the built fabric of the southern elevation and total loss of fabric from below the sill together with any subterranean archaeology. There will also be an *adverse* effect on views of the church from the south. Mitigation will be afforded by the new door occupying a subsidiary position within the elevation as a whole. The introduction of new handrails and balustrades to the western staircase and replacement of the existing handrail to the northern staircase will cause *some harm* but the works are reversible. The same degree of *limited harm* will be caused by the installation of photovoltaic panels to the south-facing nave roof, but these have been positioned to limit the harm. The impact of the installation of the air source heat pump on the chancel roof is said to have *minimal impact* on views.
31. The installation of under-floor heating is assessed as likely to cause *significant harm* to the floor, although any existing floor finishes will be re-used.
32. The installation of two partially glazed enclosures beneath the gallery level at the west end and the construction of a new storage space and tea-point will cause, it is said, *significant harm* in terms of what is called the built fabric of the gallery and supporting piers and columns and the internal views within the nave. Mitigation will consist of a number of measures including location, concealment and using existing features to break up the visual impact of the changes.
33. Construction of a new lift and staircase in the south-west enclosure will

obviously cause *significant harm* including the removal of two of the brick groin vaults to crypt level. The mitigation includes having a lift to all levels, locating the lift and the staircase in the same area, rebuilding the groin vaults and the proposed panelling.

Gallery Level and Above

34. The tower rooms above the north and south porches are assessed as having *exceptional* significance.
35. Conversion of the north tower room into a primary plant and boiler room is assessed as causing moderate harm from the introduction of mechanical and electrical equipment. The construction of the lift in the south-west corner and its extension to the gallery level will result in *significant harm*. It is proposed to have no lift shaft and other steps have been taken to prevent any impact from the nave level. Alterations to the existing flooring to create level floors will cause *some harm*.

Furniture and Fittings

36. The pulpit is assessed as having *exceptional* significance. The organ, the font and the monuments are assessed as having *considerable* significance. The pews are reported as having *some* significance. The heating and lighting systems are said to have no significance; that of the communion table has not been assessed.
37. The removal of the pews will, it is said, cause *some harm*, particularly on the visual impact of the interior of the church. It is also said (and not I take to be the subject of much dissent) that the pews have no special aesthetic merit in themselves *per se* but rather that their total removal will cause damage to the visual impact of the interior.

ANALYSIS OF THE ULTIMATE ISSUE IN *DUFFIELD*

Crypt

38. The wider use of crypts (an area of this church which has historically had accessibility issues) is an increasing feature of applications before this court. Crypts also often have archaeological and historical features of significance but sometimes they can be little used (except for storage) and not infrequently have problems of accessibility. They may also suffer from difficulties associated with their location underground, especially damp. They will not, in that state, necessarily be areas of priority for PCCs with the many calls on their time and available funds and the breadth of their responsibilities. Finally, and very importantly however, crypts usually house vaults and human remains that are only discovered by geophysical surveys or by the effect of the works themselves.

39. Crypts also present opportunities: additional and largely self-contained space which allows for activities less easily accommodated in the main body of the church and chapels and are often especially suitable for visitors and outreach which is an important element of mission. Here, the use of the crypt, in part to provide shelter for those in need as well as for essential facilities which take up valuable space at ground level, is a particular part of this church's mission.
40. The Petitioners have also developed and amended their proposals as far as the crypt is concerned. HE is content to let the court make its own decision, aside from a few details of which the Petitioners are aware, although it emphasises that further consultation will be needed prior to the commencement of works and during them. The VS defers to other consultees on the issue of the crypt. The GG concludes that less than substantial harm will be caused by the works as a whole and reminds the court of the test it must apply.
41. In my judgment, these proposals (outside of remedial works which are necessary and beneficial) within the crypt are amply justified by the need demonstrated by the Petitioners and the damage to the significance of the area has to be judged against its limited accessibility in its present state.

Nave

42. I will consider the pews as a separate feature. I echo the VS's view that some of the proposals are welcome, including the retention of the pulpit. I accept that the moving of the font is inevitable given the proposals as a whole.
43. I have considered very carefully the issues surrounding the siting of the lift and the staircase and I accept that this will cause damage to the architectural and historical significance of the crypt and the nave, but I am satisfied that the Petitioners have considered numerous possible alternative solutions and have had to reject them for good reason as explained by the Rector in his response to Mr Sunderland's objections. Both the lift and the stairs are essential if accessibility is going to be achieved. I judge that the proposals as they stand are the best that can be advanced and I approve the mitigation that has been adopted.
44. I have reached the same conclusion with respect to the gallery level. The conversion of the north tower will cause moderate harm primarily through the introduction of equipment. Likewise, alteration to the floors will cause low to moderate harm, but the principal bringer of significant harm is the lift and associated works and for the reasons I have already given relating to accessibility I judge it, exceptionally, to be justified.

Nave Pews

45. As already stated, the VS, GG and Mr Sunderland all object to the removal of the pews.
46. Hugh Harrison and Jane Root authored a specialist report on, *inter alia*, the pews. Although the information is relatively sparse, it is clear that pew benches

were in use for congregational seating before the fire, numbering some 112 fixed pew benches on the ground floor. These were oak benches.

47. Although the calculation of the precise number of benches and numbers that could be seated is subject to some inconsistency, the authors felt that in the two Victorian re-orderings some pew benches were lost. The same is true during twentieth century interventions.
48. The authors are of the opinion that the replacement furnishings following the mid-nineteenth century fire were of a lesser quality than those in place before it. They have a historical significance in showing the priorities of a mid-century refurbishment. Those in the nave were markedly superior to those in the aisles (including some with doors) as were the front row gallery seats. The authors concluded that by 2008 "the congregational seating is so diminished in its practical role of providing accommodation for worship that it no longer fulfils its original purpose." They also describe the seating in 2008 as having "little intrinsic merit in construction or materials". The authors conclude that "it would be difficult to argue that it [the seating] should be retained in its present form..." In so far as its historical significance is concerned, the authors observe that "the congregational seating has been eroded through a process of incremental change...The significance it once had as part of a complete mid-nineteenth century refitting of an exceptional eighteenth century church has largely been lost."
49. I judge therefore that the architectural significance of the nave pew benches is very low and the historical significance has been substantially diluted as described by Harrison and Root.
50. The Petitioners say that the nave is currently an unhappy mix of flexible seating in the eastern half and fixed pews on platforms in the western part. There have been some safety incidents with the pew platforms. The church wants to include more flexible seating for public services and to make those services more diverse (presumably within the remit of the Canons). They would also want to use the church for concerts and other performances and be able to increase or decrease seating to accommodate variable numbers as well as being able to turn the seating around. They would also want this interior to be more child-friendly.
51. I am satisfied, having considered the Harrison and Root report carefully, that even given the objection of Mr Sunderland (all of whose representations I have taken into account) and those of the VS and the GG, the Petitioners have made out their case for the removal of all of the pew-benches in the identified location. I am not entirely sure, given the views of the Petitioners as to the quality of the pew benches, what the point is in placing some of them in the gallery. They will still lack any intrinsic architectural significance and will not even be illustrative of the original re-ordering. I am conscious, however, that the petition has been put forward on this basis and been consulted upon on it, so to the gallery they will go. I may also have misunderstood the basis on which the selection will be made.

52. I therefore grant this petition as prayed. As often is the case in major works of this kind, the DAC has advised me of a number of provisos and I impose the following ones, with some amendments, as Conditions of the grant.

53. I make no order as to costs in respect of this judgment.

Where, in the Conditions, the Petitioners are required to seek further approval from or agreement with the DAC, this is subject to the court's final decision if agreement cannot be reached between them.

Conditions

- 1st Following the development of RIBA Stage 4, details of the design and materials, as set out below, are to be submitted to the DAC for review and approval prior to entering into the construction contract. The DAC will consult Historic England.
- 2nd All new work must include a full specification for materials and finishes, referenced both in schedules of work and on the drawings.
- 3rd Samples of all new materials must be made available by the appointed contractor for further approval by the DAC and Historic England. Consideration must be given to the sustainability of sourcing and the durability of these materials.
- 4th Where economies are considered following receipt of either the pre-tender estimate or the tender itself, the proposals must be shared with the DAC and Historic England.
(Note that the submission of these documents is by uploading to the online portal for review and formal sign-off by the DAC and Historic England. The proposals must be reviewed and, if necessary, amended following the review. The volume of information required will likely mean that any external reviewers will require an extended period of time to review and agree amendments before signing off. This must be allowed for in the overall schedule for the project programme.)
- 5th The detail of the works approved by the DAC are to be carried out in accordance with the design and details agreed by the DAC following consultation with Historic England.
HISTORIC CHURCH BUILDING
a) Entire building:
- 6th Following a RIBA Stage 4 building condition survey, a phasing plan for the project must be agreed by the DAC in consultation with Historic England to ensure that sufficient investment is made to support long-term conservation repair. The plan must be implemented as agreed.
b) Entire site:
- 7th There must be an updated costed management and maintenance plan to demonstrate how practical, affordable, and effective upkeep of the Grade I listed building will be achieved.
c) Entire building:
- 8th Details of the proposed internal redecoration – materials, colours by painted sample, and proposed cleaning of historic polished joinery – must be provided. Full specification for all the joinery repairs, finishes and associated drawings for

all new work to be submitted at 1:10. The materials and finishes must be specified on the drawings.

d) Furniture: Pulpit:

9th The detailed proposals by a specialist furniture maker for alterations, including the introduction of the new track mechanism must be provided. The design of the new seating and its proposed general placement must also be provided in detail. The design of the chairs, including materials and finishes, must be provided to, and agreed by, the DAC. The court will expect (as it is understood the Petitioners wish) these chairs to be of a very high quality.

10th Details of the reinstated chancel furnishings remain outstanding and must be agreed.

e) All fixtures and furnishings

11th All fixtures and furnishings must be safeguarded throughout the project and a proposal to achieve this must be agreed. In respect of the organ, the detail of dustproofing for the protection of this historic instrument must be provided to the DAC. *(Note that any item removed from the church building for work or storage during the project will require a separate form of permission.)*

ARCHAEOLOGY

a) Entire building

12th There must be Level 4 recording, as set out in Historic England's *Understanding Historic Buildings - A Guide to Good Recording Practice*, and a report must be deposited at the Diocesan Record Office (The London Archives) and at the Greater London Historic Environment Record.

b) Crypt

13th No works can commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been submitted to the DAC for approval, including a recording of the structural elements to be demolished; the coffins and burials; and archaeological monitoring of excavations both within the crypt and externally. The final copy of this report is to be deposited at the Diocesan Record Office (The London Archives) and at the Greater London Historic Environment Record.

c) Exhumations

14th These will require an amendment of the faculty, with full detail of the archaeological recording, and detail as to where charnel and articulated remains will be reinterred.

NEW WORKS

a) Structural Engineer

15th The structural engineer must provide design detail, specification, routeing and fixing details for all structural and associated electrical solutions put forward for the construction of the lift (including at Gallery level) and the stairs; as well as the installation of the air source heat pumps, photovoltaics, the insertion of the chandelier, the tracking system for the pulpit and the relocation of the font.

b) Throughout the site

16th Detail of all new insertions in the crypt and nave (new doors, partitions, floor gratings, kitchenettes, storage, WCs, lobby and nurture space etc) must be provided with drawn plans at 1:20. Design detail (joinery etc.) must be also be provided, drawn at 1:10. The loss and dismantling of fabric and features must be clearly indicated on a strip out plan.

c) South ramp

17th There must be a detailed design proposal for the retaining wall, associated repairs, new balustrade, surface and landscaping, drawings at 1:20. The

submission must include detail of all repairs required to the south elevation as part of the construction of the ramp and entrance.

d) All porches and lobbies

18th There must be design detail, including the heating strategy, for these areas. The proposal must clearly demonstrate an improvement in heating along the entry route to the church building.

e) Nave

19th In respect of the new stone flooring, there must be a full specification for the materials, stone selection and setting-out, with drawings at 1:20. A supporting statement for the selection of materials must be included.

(f) Crypt

20th 'Heritage Quarter' and churchyard improvements must be submitted, revised if necessary, and agreed with the DAC. The installation is to be permanently maintained subject to any alternative and agreed proposal being accepted which may require amendment to the faculty or a fresh faculty, as advised.

(g) Crypt floor

21st Full details of the build-up of the crypt floor and the extent of excavation required are to be provided to the DAC.

(h) Crypt

22nd In respect of the new east window, there must be design detail drawings at 1:10 with a full specification of materials.

(i) New lift, associated staircase and gallery

23rd The details of the design, materials and joinery for the lift and staircase must be provided, containing drawn details with specifications at 1:20 and 1:10. With regard to the gallery, design details of the new handrails to the entrance steps and the balustrade in the gallery must be drawn at 1:10.

MECHANICAL AND ENGINEERING

a) Entire site both external and internal

24th There must be a developed M&E proposal with schematics (heat pumps, photovoltaics and inverters, underfloor heating, ventilation etc), details of insulation, an airtightness study and the calculations of energy usage of each heating solution and the way they interact with each other. All of these must be submitted to the DAC.

b) Entire site, both external and internal

25th There must be design detail for the new lighting scheme, including all wiring routes, fixing details and controls. The design must ensure the least intrusion on the historic building and its setting.

(c) Heating

26th Any new gas boilers should be justified in relation to Church of England guidance and agreed by the DAC prior to their installation and any proposal should include a 'transition pathway' to net zero carbon.

(d) AV system proposal

27th This requires to be properly developed, ensuring the least intrusion on the historic building and its setting.

(e) Insulation

28th The specification must be set out in detail and the proposed location must also be indicated.

(f) Photovoltaic panels and associated works

29th Details and drawings of any photovoltaic panels and associated M&E or other

safety access systems must be provided. The layout of solar panels must be justified by a shading study. The parish must engage an environmental consultant to assess the impact of the proposals, to produce carbon calculations and to form a strategy to reduce the operational and embodied carbon emissions of the project. This body of work must be submitted to the DAC, both for review and to inform the development of the project.