

Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

MINUTES

A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held hybridly (in person and by online conferencing) in the Reeve Room at St Mary's House, Cathedral Close, Lichfield on Wednesday 30th November 2022 at 1.00 pm

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The opening prayer was said by the Revd Preb Terry Bloor.
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven Dr Megan Smith, the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, the Revd Jo Farnworth, Andy Foster, Chris Gill, the Revd Zoe Heming, the Revd Neil Hibbins, the Revd Dr David Isiorho, the Revd Andrew Lythall, Bryan Martin, Adrian Mathias, Candida Pino, Brough Skingley, Julie Taylor, Peter Woollam.
In attendance: Peter Bemrose (DAC Heating Adviser), Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: the Ven Julian Francis, the Ven Paul Thomas, the Ven Dr Sue Weller, the Revd Geoffrey Eze, Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat, Edward Higgins, Steven Matthews, Mark Stewart, Andy Wigley.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Bryan Martin, item 4.1.1; Candida Pino, item 4.2.1.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

2. Matters arising

None this meeting

3. New matters

3.1 Meeting of DAC Chair with new DAC members (clergy and Synod-appointed) on 17th November 2022

The DAC Chair confirmed that a successful meeting/training session had been held with the new DAC members appointed by Bishop's Council to the DAC constituted for the Synodical period 2022–27, being specifically the three new clergy members and the lay member appointed from the elected members of Diocesan Synod (as listed on the [DAC members and advisers](#) web page of the diocesan website).

The session focussed on the role of these church DAC members in providing the 'parish voice' at DAC meetings, and the requirements of the [Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018](#) for members to have 'due regard to the role of a church as a local centre of worship and mission', as well as 'the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England'. The identification and articulation of parishes' stated needs was also addressed, in relation to the national [Duffield questions](#) (used by Chancellors in their determination of faculty petitions), where 'public benefit' includes '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'.

3.2 Appointment of the Revd Mike Newbon as DAC Audio-Visual Adviser from 23rd November 2022

The Committee warmly welcomed the Revd Mike Newbon (in absentia), recently appointed

as a DAC Audio-Visual Adviser, who will join the team of two existing Lichfield DAC Audio-Visual Advisers. The Revd Mike Newbon will undertake the diocesan-wide role of DAC adviser in addition to that of Vicar in the benefice of Caverswall and Weston Coyney with Dilhorne (Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry).

4. Site visit reports for approval

The following reports relate to prospective or submitted proposals which accord with the agreed criteria for a 'major' faculty case, which must be considered by the full DAC and to which the [delegated authority](#) faculty procedure is not applicable

4.1 Adviser site visit reports

4.1.1 Heath Town, Holy Trinity (Grade II) (heating), 27th September 2022 (Peter Bemrose)

A clergy member of the DAC suggested that the PCC might consider use of the hall for worship during winter, rather than the church building, but which point the Committee considered should be discussed by the Archdeacon with the PCC, rather than being incorporated into the DAC-approved site visit report by the DAC Heating Adviser.

Decision: The report was approved without amendment

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the report to the parish

4.1.2 Blurton, St Bartholomew (Grade II) (audio-visual), 2nd November 2022 (Brough Skingley) (see item 7.2.3 below)

Decision: The report was approved without amendment

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the report to the parish

4.2 DAC site visit reports

4.2.1 Eaton Constantine, St Mary (Grade II) [quin. inspector: Andrew Arrol; project architect: to be determined]

Creation of a community space at the church, to include an accessible toilet and servery (not currently on OFS), 26th October 2022 (Giles Standing)

Decision: The report was approved with one minor amendment

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the report to the parish

5. Adviser site visit reports to note

The following reports relate to prospective or submitted proposals which can be or have been processed under [List B](#) (Archdeacon's permission) or the [delegated authority](#) faculty procedure, which are not required to be considered by the full DAC

5.1 Darlaston, All Saints (heating), 15th August 2022 (Andrew Baker)

5.2 Tipton, St Matthew (heating), 15th August 2022 (Andrew Baker)

5.3 Chasetown, St Anne (trees), 15th September 2022 (Andy Smith)

5.4 Oulton, St John the Evangelist (trees), 18th October 2022 (Andy Smith)

5.5 Ellastone, St Peter (trees), 22nd October 2022 (Andy Smith)

5.6 Stoke-on-Trent, St Peter ad Vincula [Stoke Minster] (external lighting), 2nd November 2022 (Brough Skingley)

5.7 Eaton Constantine, St Mary (trees), 11th November 2022 (Andy Smith)

5.8 Lapley, All Saints (trees), 11th November 2022 (Andy Smith)

Decision: The reports were noted

Action: None

6. Forthcoming DAC site visits

6.1.1 Eccleshall, Holy Trinity (Grade I) [quin. inspector: Andrew Capper (retd); Simon Smith (project architect)]

Reordering with addition of kitchen and toilets, and to move and make more accessible items of historical significance (OFS [2019-044302](#))

Date and time: To be confirmed

Attendees: To be confirmed

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with the DAC attendees and PCC representatives on the date and time of the DAC site visit

7. Casework for consideration

The following applications relate to submitted proposals which accord with the agreed criteria for a 'major' faculty case, which must be considered by the full DAC and to which the [delegated authority](#) faculty procedure is not applicable

7.1 Reorderings and new facilities in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

a) Informal advice (before external formal consultation, if applicable)

Grade I

7.1.1

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2021-063282 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620548 | Church Name: | Tong: St Bartholomew |
| Archdeaconry: | Salop | Parish: | Tong |
| Applicant Name: | Revd Pippa Thorneycroft | Quin. Inspector: | Tim Ratcliffe |
| Listing: | Grade I | Date of Last QI: | 22-Aug-2018 [Sarah Butler] |
| Proposal: | Provision of toilet facilities and a tea point | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Third | Cost Est: | Not stated |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The Committee last considered the proposal as a DAC site visit report at 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting, following a site visit on 21st February 2022. The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 8th December 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, and the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The Committee reaffirmed that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not been sufficiently identified or justified, and that the Statements of Significance and Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [alterations and extensions](#) and [Statements](#).
2. The view was restated that any extension to this highly-listed and significant church building, which is largely unaltered as an intact 15th-century collegiate church, will be controversial, and will require both faculty and planning approval.
3. However, the Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal for the introduction of toilet facilities and a tea point at the church, and to recognise the pastoral and missional case for this. It noted the parish's continued preference for the position of the tea point at the north-west end of the nave and a small extension for the toilet on the north side of the nave.
4. It was noted that an illustrated report on the pews by Richard K Morriss & Associates (November 2022) has been submitted, as proposed in the DAC site visit report (above), but that the report is not specific on the pews in the north-west corner where the tea point has been suggested. Overall the report indicates that the pews at Tong are of 'considerable heritage value', and the Committee acknowledged that a modest extension would allow for the removal of fewer pews from the significant interior.
5. However, no details or revision to the scheme for the tea point at that location have been made within the application. As such, the internal proposal requires additional input and discussion between the parish and QI architect.
6. The QI architect has submitted four sketch options (single elevations) for the potential extension to the north aisle, and all follow a similar gabled format. Consideration should be given to alternative forms, which might include parapets.
7. The two timber options appear incongruous with the form and construction of the church. The plain finished stonework is too simply detailed, whilst the inclusion of hood moulds and stringcourses might be seen as seeking to overly copy the adjacent stonework. A stone solution should include a suitably-detailed plinth and offset to ground the building. However, further options should be explored alongside the development of any internal alterations.
8. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that the medieval roof pitches at Tong are relatively shallow, and considered that the steeper gable of the current designs was not in keeping; a simple stone parapet was suggested as a more fitting alternative. This point was more widely echoed, and a crenelated top was suggested as a possibility, in relation to the adjacent nave roofline.
9. Separately, it was cautioned that the height and/or pitch of an extension may allow access to the adjacent nave aisle roof, which may exacerbate the risk of metal theft at that location (thefts are understood to have previously taken place at the church).

The Committee suggested that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. Following which, external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England, the Victorian Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), and the Church Buildings Council.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

Grade II

7.1.2

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|--|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-077946 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620458 | Church Name: | Gratwich: St Mary the Virgin |
| Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent | Parish: | Gratwich |
| Applicant Name: | The Revd Charles Dale | Quin. Inspector: | Mark Parsons |
| Listing: | Grade II | Date of Last QI: | 01-Sep-2017 |
| Proposal: | Installation of accessible toilet in churchyard | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | First | Cost Est: | Not stated |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 | | |

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC affirmed that the needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant building – in this case situated within the curtilage of a Grade II listed church – and specifically the visual impact of such an installation.
2. In relation to which, the principle of the proposal was supported, but it was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not yet been fully identified and justified, and that the Statements of Significance and Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [alterations and extensions](#) and [Statements](#).
3. Additional photographs of the church exterior and the churchyard should be submitted, to provide clearer visual context to the proposed location for the installation.
4. Whilst the Committee noted that a single drawn option was proposed for the siting of the accessible toilet, rather than a series of options to include the church interior, the DAC concurred with the parish's view that the least harmful location for installation, in terms of impact, would be within the churchyard rather than inside the church itself.
5. However, the DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the church occupies an ancient site, with the current nave dating to the 16th century and the remainder rebuilt in 1775. It is therefore likely that the churchyard was used for burials from the medieval period onwards, and specifically on the historically-favoured southern side of the church. It was noted that the building to house the toilet facility is proposed to be sited on this side, albeit in a discrete location near the churchyard boundary (with ready access from the porch via an existing concrete path).
6. The Statement of Significance acknowledges that, whilst there are no marked graves at this location, there is potential for unmarked burials to be present. The DAC Archaeology Adviser indicated that it is possible that the excavation of the service trench for the foul drain will also have the potential to disturb burials.
7. The PCC should commission an archaeological contractor of their choice (see below) to prepare an archaeological desk-based assessment. A small-scale archaeological field evaluation should also be undertaken, comprising the excavation of two test pits within the footprint of the proposed new building, on either side of the existing concrete path, to determine whether any burials are likely to be present.
8. This appraisal will inform the level of archaeological mitigation that needs to be secured as a condition of faculty consent, which as a minimum will comprise an archaeological watching brief during any intrusive groundworks, and for which the PCC will need to ensure that its budget makes sufficient provision.

9. The new building will also require planning permission from the local planning authority and it is likely that this information would also need to be submitted as part of any planning application. Additional advice, and a list of archaeological contractors, may be available from the [County Archaeologist at Staffordshire County Council](#).
10. Separately, the DAC member nominated by Historic England suggested that consideration should be given to how the route to the new building would be lit, such as with low-level path lights, as detached from the main church building.
11. Finally, in terms of the proposed design of the new building, a DAC architect member suggested that more information on the selected brick type and bond should be provided, and that the doorway and joinery could perhaps make visual reference to the existing porch. As the new building is proposed in close visual proximity, a purely utilitarian and functional appearance should be avoided.

It was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, in relation to its setting, and the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 was applicable. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

b) Formal advice (after external formal consultation, if applicable)

Grade I

7.1.3

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------------|--|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-070628 | Case Status: | Notification of Advice |
| Church Code: | 620614 | Church Name: | Whitchurch: St Alkmund |
| Archdeaconry: | Salop | Parish: | Whitchurch |
| Applicant Name: | Revd Canon Dr Judy Hunt | Quin. Inspector: | Nicholas Rank |
| Listing: | Grade I | Date of Last QI: | 12-Apr-2016 |
| Proposal: | Partial reordering, to include an accessible toilet and servery | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Fourth (first as formal) | Cost Est: | Not stated |
| Formal Consultations: | Historic England, Victorian Society, Georgian Group (all no objections) | | |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 28th September 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been addressed. Specifically, only the rearmost row of pews, north and south of the centre aisle, is now sought to be removed from the

west end of the nave, whilst two rows of pews are confirmed to be removed from each side of the aisle at the east end of the nave.

The DAC also carefully appraised the external consultation responses, and noted that no formal objections had been raised for consideration in the DAC's own formal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

Decision: Recommend

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

*Grade II**

7.1.4

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------------|---|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-073691 | Case Status: | Notification of Advice |
| Church Code: | 620483 | Church Name: | Baschurch: All Saints |
| Archdeaconry: | Salop | Parish: | Baschurch |
| Applicant Name: | Revd Linda Cox | Quin. Inspector: | Tim Ratcliffe [project architect: Michael Randall] |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Date of Last QI: | 01-May-2018 |
| Proposal: | Enlargement of social area by removal of four rows of pews at the back of the chapel in the south aisle | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Third (first as formal) | Cost Est: | £3,000 |
| Formal Consultations: | Historic England (no objections), LPA Conservation Officer (no response) | | |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 28th September 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been addressed.

The DAC also carefully appraised the external consultation response, and noted that no formal objections had been raised for consideration in the DAC's own formal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

Decision: Recommend

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

Grade II

7.1.5

| | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2019-034232 | Case Status: | Notification of Advice |
| Church Code: | 620504 | Church Name: | Hales: St Mary |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|---------------|
| Archdeaconry: | Salop | Parish: | Hales |
| Applicant Name: | Dr Marcus Griffiths | Quin. Inspector: | Geoff Hillman |
| Listing: | Grade II | Date of Last QI: | 26-Oct-2021 |
| Proposal: | Install toilet, refreshment area and improve access | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Fourth (first as formal) | Cost Est: | Not stated |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 (<i>i.e. case is pre-external formal consultation</i>) | | |

The Committee last considered the proposal as a DAC site visit report at 27th October 2021 DAC meeting, following a site visit on 22nd September 2021. At that meeting, the DAC also considered a revised drawing of the scheme (no. 5100/004C, dated 30th September 2021), produced by the QI architect after the DAC site visit but prior to Committee approval of the report. The DAC confirmed that the details of the drawing were in line with the DAC-approved site visit report, and suggested that the architect should next develop construction details, for submission by the parish for further informal DAC advice.

The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 10th February 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that informal consultation should also be undertaken with the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer) and the Victorian Society.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs (the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment dated September 2022), but resolved to defer the application, pending revision and resubmission by the parish. The Committee offered the following advice:

1. The DAC continued to support the principle of the proposal for improved access at the church, and installation of a toilet and refreshment area, to fulfil the parish's stated needs.
2. In support of these comments, the DAC affirmed that the needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade II listed – and specifically the visual impact, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
3. In relation to which, it was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had been sufficiently justified in principle, but that further mitigation is required within the three aspects of the proposal (as below).

External ramp and steps

4. The Committee noted the twin ramp at a reduced length on the latest drawings (no. 5100/004D dated 13th September 2022 and no. 5100/007 dated 25th August 2022). The members concurred with the parish view that steps and a single ramp would sometimes involve doubling back, and that steps on one side would still involve handrails.
5. It was observed that there is now only one set of railings, that the ramps are now shorter, and that the main approach from below will tend to reduce prominence. However, a DAC architect expressed the view that there is a somewhat clumsy detail and a water trap at the abutment with the porch. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies suggested that the pyramidal caps should be omitted, and for the wall to just run into the abutment.

6. It was concluded that the Committee continued to support the double ramp, but that revised detailing was required, which was considered to be eminently solvable. In order to illustrate these and related design points, and hoping to assist in progressing the narrative, another DAC architect took the unusual step of creating a sketch drawing for forward transmission by the DAC Secretary to the parish and QI architect.

Toilet

7. The Committee noted that the screen is set behind the tower arch, as previously advised, but the pronounced cornice moulding will still clash with the elaborate moulding of the tower arch. It was suggested that the screen should be set a little further back, and then returned to the flank walls of the tower arch.
8. The blue shading under the tower on drawing no. 5100/004D seems to indicate a 'vinyl plank' floor finish. The Committee observed that the existing floor appears to be stone slabs, and therefore that this change would not be acceptable. It was instead suggested that the stone slabs should be cleaned up and repointed, as necessary.
9. Information could not be located on the extract vent for the toilet, which intervention will need to be handled with care.

Servery

10. The Committee noted the pursuit of an enclosure approach to the servery, rather than an exposed counter, albeit of no great size. It was observed that the proposal incorporates existing panelling, which is of reasonable quality and broadly ecclesiastical form.
11. However, a DAC architect suggested that the depth should be reduced so that the doors are much closer to the servery, and also that it is pulled another 150 mm or so away from the tower arch, to give a more comfortable fit.
12. Further information is required on the proposed treatment of the floor, which appears to be a pew platform at present. Concern was raised regarding the 'vinyl plank' floor finish (as above), which does not sound breathable, rather than, for example, a timber floor or a solid ground-bearing floor. Details of the relocation or disposal of the pews from this location should also be provided.

It was determined that the proposal would affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice, and that formal consultation should also be undertaken with the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer) and the Victorian Society.

Decision: Defer

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

7.2 Extensive alterations (structural or liturgical) which affect the character of a listed church building

a) Informal advice (*before external formal consultation, if applicable*)

None this meeting

b) Formal advice (*after external formal consultation, if applicable*)

Grade I

7.2.1

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|--|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-073981 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620614 | Church Name: | Whitchurch: St Alkmund |
| Archdeaconry: | Salop | Parish: | Whitchurch |
| Applicant Name: | Revd Canon Dr Judy Hunt | Quin. Inspector: | Nicholas Rank |
| Listing: | Grade I | Date of Last QI: | 12-Apr-2016 |
| Proposal: | Sound system and camera replacement | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Second | Cost Est: | £35,000 |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 28th September 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. It was determined that the proposal, as then considered, would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been addressed. Specifically, the new nave speakers will be attached into the corner of the column nibs and the columns, and that the top of the speakers will be lower than the top of the nibs. It was also confirmed that the proposed sound desk is to be temporary, and of minimal impact within the existing pews. The installation of the streaming camera on the west gallery was supported previously.

It was resolved that the updated proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is not applicable, and that the application should advance to the giving of DAC formal advice accordingly.

Decision: Recommend with the following provisos:

- The parish should give consideration to relocating the existing 110v amplifier into the temporary sound desk.
- The parish should submit a separate and subsequent faculty application for a permanent sound desk if this is proposed to be constructed from timber from any pews which become redundant as part of the wider internal reordering (OFS [2022-070628](#), item 7.1.3 above), subject to the latter scheme being approved under faculty.

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

Grade II*

7.2.2

| | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2019-029359 | Case Status: | Notification of Advice |
| Church Code: | 620525 | Church Name: | Oswestry: St Oswald, King & Martyr |
| Archdeaconry: | Salop | Parish: | St Oswald, King and Martyr, Oswestry |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|---------------|
| Applicant Name: | Paul Crosby | Quin. Inspector: | Tim Ratcliffe |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Date of Last QI: | 01-Nov-2016 |
| Proposal: | Improve the choir-stall lighting, as a memorial gift | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Third | Cost Est: | £8,000 |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 (<i>i.e. case is pre-external formal consultation</i>) | | |

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for formal advice at the 26th June 2019 DAC meeting, when the Committee deferred the application, pending revision and resubmission by the parish. The DAC Lighting Adviser previously undertook a site visit to the church on 7th May 2019 and most recently on 15th November 2022 (verbal reports). At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, but resolved to defer the application, pending further revision and resubmission by the parish. The Committee offered the following advice:

1. The DAC supported the principle of the proposal for improving the lighting for the church choir, which is recognised to be of a high-quality choral tradition.
2. However, the DAC affirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade II* listed – and specifically the visual impact of such an installation.
3. In relation to which, it was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not been sufficiently justified.
4. In connection with stall-mounted fittings, the DAC Lighting Adviser referred to the book *Church Lighting* (2001) by Peter Jay and Bill Crawforth, published by Church House Publishing. The adviser confirmed that the parish had submitted photos of mockups which show that, in terms of height and spacing, the Jay/Crawforth recommendations would be complied with.
5. However, the DAC discussed the wider question of whether the new light fittings would be an aesthetic enhancement or detractor at this location within the chancel (restored by GE Street), including in relation to the choir stalls themselves, as an ensemble.
6. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies expressed the view that the proposed lampshades would not be appropriate for the Victorian choir stalls, as they would not improve or enhance their historic quality; an alternative should be considered which would preserve the character of the stalls.
7. The DAC member nominated by Historic England suggested that the parish should consider the declared need for lighting the choir stalls within a more holistic appraisal of the overall church lighting, such as how any proposed solution might best fit within a wider re-lighting scheme (the latter understood to be under consideration by the parish).
8. This should include consideration of the Church of England and diocesan target for net zero carbon by 2030. In relation to which, it was recommended that the parish should consult the latest Church of England guidance on [lighting in churches](#) (2022).

It was determined that the proposal, in its present form, would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice, and that formal consultation should also be undertaken with Historic England and the Victorian Society.

Decision: Defer

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

Grade II

7.2.3

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|---|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-075032 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620413 | Church Name: | Blurton: St Bartholomew |
| Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent | Parish: | Blurton and Dresden |
| Applicant Name: | Revd Angela Bryan | Quin. Inspector: | Geoff Hillman |
| Listing: | Grade II | Date of Last QI: | 30-May-2021 |
| Proposal: | Installation of audio-visual system | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Second | Cost Est: | £8,000 |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 | | |

The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 28th September 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. It was determined that the proposal, as then considered, would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 was applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the DAC Audio-Visual Adviser should undertake a site visit, to meet with parish representatives at the church, and that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

At the present meeting, the Committee approved the site visit report by the DAC Audio-Visual Adviser, following a site visit on 2nd November 2022 (see item 4.1.2 above). The DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been addressed, in line with the DAC adviser's site visit report.

It was resolved that the updated proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable, and that the application should advance to the giving of DAC formal advice accordingly.

Decision: Recommend

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

7.3 Conservation, alteration or disposal of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest

a) Informal advice *(before external formal consultation, if applicable)*

None this meeting

b) Formal advice *(after external formal consultation, if applicable)*

None this meeting

7.4 Landscaping and areas for the burial of cremated remains (ABCRs) in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

a) Informal advice (before external formal consultation, if applicable)

Grade II*

7.4.1

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|--|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-072462 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620138 | Church Name: | Aldridge: St Mary the Virgin |
| Archdeaconry: | Walsall | Parish: | Aldridge |
| Applicant Name: | Jennifer Ford | Quin. Inspector: | Simon Smith |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Date of Last QI: | 02-Oct-2019 |
| Proposal: | Develop a Garden of Remembrance in the churchyard | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | Second | Cost Est: | £7,500 |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 | | |

The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 28th September 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. It was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable.

The Committee suggested that the DAC member with an accessibility focus, being the Diocesan Enabling All Adviser, should undertake a site visit, to meet with parish representatives at the church, which visit was undertaken in early November 2022 (verbal report). It was advised that the revised scheme, when further developed, should then be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. Following which, formal consultation should be undertaken with Historic England and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC supported the principle of the proposal for the creation of a dedicated area within the churchyard in which cremated remains could be suitably interred.
2. It was noted that the application now includes two sketch drawings (plan and isometric view) by a local landscape designer, which provide a clearer indication of the proposed layout and planting of the Garden of Remembrance.
3. The Committee confirmed its support for the location of the garden within the wider churchyard, as shown on a newly-submitted churchyard plan, in relation to the listed church building.
4. The DAC Archaeology Adviser restated that whilst there are no objections in principle to the proposed Garden of Remembrance on archaeological grounds, an archaeological watching brief would need to be carried out, by an archaeological contractor of the PCC's choice (see the [list of registered organisations](#) maintained by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists), and that the PCC would need to ensure that its budget makes sufficient provision for this.

5. Further to the site visit (above), the DAC member with an accessibility focus confirmed that the proposed garden area will be levelled flat and incorporate a resin-bound pathway intended to allow safe access by both wheelchairs and pedestrians. The path will be accessed via a gateway made in the boundary wall, which the member concurred to be the most accessible way into the garden, and for which planning permission is being applied by the parish.
6. However, the member cautioned that neither the garden space nor the path include a turning circle, so that the path terminates with the proposed bench, allowing only one-directional access. This was deemed to render the path inaccessible.
7. The Committee queried the intended visual focus for the garden, in relation to the memorialisation or commemoration of any cremated remains, such that neither the wall nor bench are proposed to carry any collective marker or individual memorials (e.g. plaques). In this way, it was cautioned that the garden may currently be closer to a reflection garden (i.e. not suitable for interments) than a Garden of Remembrance.
8. Further information on the materials to be used within the scheme should be provided, including the resin-bound path and the garden bench (e.g. a product sheet or catalogue entry).
9. Finally, as the garden is proposed to be situated directly adjacent to private land, it was advised that the parish should liaise with the landowner direct on the creation of this new public space/amenity.
10. In relation to the planning of the garden, care should be taken to avoid an area that is so shielded from view as to attract unwanted activity.

The Committee suggested that a further site visit should be undertaken, by the Archdeacon of Walsall and the DAC Garden Adviser (both in absentia), to meet with parish representatives at the church, and that the scheme should be further developed. Following which, formal consultation should be undertaken with Historic England and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant; the Assistant DAC Secretary to co-ordinate a site visit

7.4.2

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-077693 | Case Status: | Pre-formal consultation review |
| Church Code: | 620122 | Church Name: | Pattingham: St Chad |
| Archdeaconry: | Walsall | Parish: | Pattingham and Patshull |
| Applicant Name: | Geoffrey Dann | Quin. Inspector: | Simon Smith |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Date of Last QI: | 17-Nov-2016 [Andrew Capper] |
| Proposal: | Removal of slabs from churchyard paths and resurface with tarmac (gravel in a small area) | | |
| No. of Times to DAC: | First | Cost Est: | £42,000 |
| Legislation Applies: | Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 | | |

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC supported the principle of the proposal for the resurfacing, and making safe and accessible, of the churchyard paths.

2. Consideration should, however, be given by the parish to using a resin-bound surface of a suitable colour, rather than 'black top' MOT, at the western end of the church, within the old churchyard, to reduce the visual impact within the setting of the listed building. It was noted, though, that the other tarmac paths in the old churchyard are black.
3. A DAC architect member indicated that clarification is required regarding the treatment of the drains around the buttresses at the west end of the church – are these to stay as existing or are these to be replaced by tarmac (as this may adversely trap moisture)?
4. It was suggested that a clearer churchyard plan be produced to show the various proposed treatments, such as a topographical plan, and for the QI architect or contractor to provide a cross-sectional detail of the tarmac surfaces, including the arrangement of the kerbing.
5. The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the area around the west end of the church, within the old churchyard, is archaeologically sensitive, although the laying of the existing slabbed paths will have caused some disturbance and it is therefore unlikely that any burials would be disturbed in the proposed works.
6. However, as a precautionary measure, the Archdeacon and DAC Archaeological Adviser would be required to be notified, and their advice sought, in the event that any human remains were found in this area during the works.
7. The paths outside the old churchyard are not considered to be archaeologically sensitive.

It was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, or the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

b) Formal advice (after external formal consultation, if applicable)

None this meeting

8. Casework from Diocesan Registry

8.1 Private faculties

None this meeting

9. Casework by delegated authority to note

9.1 Faculty applications

The following 'minor' faculty cases, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed by delegated authority, in accordance with section 12(1) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018 and the Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy (Amended May 2022), on behalf of the full DAC

9.1.1

| | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-069144 | Church Name: | Bramshall: St Lawrence |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent |

| | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Proposal: | Restoration of the pipe organ | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat | Date NoA Issued: | 17th October 2022 |

9.1.2

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|--------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-072795 | Church Name: | Muxton: St John the Evangelist |
| Listing: | Unlisted | Archdeaconry: | Salop |
| Proposal: | Replacement of boiler in same location but including the creation of a new flue | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Andrew Baker | Date NoA Issued: | 19th October 2022 |

9.1.3

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|----------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-075570 | Church Name: | Rodington: St George |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Salop |
| Proposal: | Installation of new gas boiler in the ventilated cupboard in the accessible toilet, using the existing pipework and water supply | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Malcolm Price | Date NoA Issued: | 21st October 2022 |

9.1.4

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-070503 | Church Name: | Fulford-in-Stone: St Nicholas |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent |
| Proposal: | Removal of fallen conifer stem and adjacent 2 stems (granted under interim faculty no. 4951) | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Andy Smith | Date NoA Issued: | 16th November 2022 |

9.1.5

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-073595 | Church Name: | West Bromwich: Holy Trinity |
| Listing: | Unlisted | Archdeaconry: | Walsall |
| Proposal: | Removal of playground equipment and resurfacing playground area (retention of existing railings and two benches) | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Mark Parsons | Date NoA Issued: | 16th November 2022 |

9.1.6

| | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-077598 | Church Name: | Perton: The Church at Perton |
| Listing: | Unlisted | Archdeaconry: | Walsall |
| Proposal: | Installation of new heating system | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Brough Skingley | Date NoA Issued: | 16th November 2022 |

9.1.7

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|---------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-078881 | Church Name: | Wrockwardine Wood: Holy Trinity |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Salop |
| Proposal: | Moving four rolls of honour, a wreath shelf and memorial book to a more prominent position within the nave | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Andy Foster | Date NoA Issued: | 16th November 2022 |

9.1.8

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-073724 | Church Name: | Rugeley: St Augustine |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Archdeaconry: | Lichfield |
| Proposal: | Repair of section of collapsed internal floor adjacent to nave south aisle wall, either side of parish door (to be read alongside OFS 2022-078078, pew removal) | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Candida Pino | Date NoA Issued: | 18th November 2022 |

9.1.9

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-078078 | Church Name: | Rugeley: St Augustine |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Archdeaconry: | Lichfield |
| Proposal: | Permanent removal of ten short pews adjacent to nave south aisle wall, either side of parish door (to be read alongside OFS 2022-073724, floor repair) | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Candida Pino | Date NoA Issued: | 18th November 2022 |

9.1.10

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-077543 | Church Name: | Cheddleton: St Edward the Confessor |
| Listing: | Grade II* | Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent |
| Proposal: | Laying up of a standard for a disbanded Royal British Legion group in the nave north aisle by the St Cecelia window | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Adrian Mathias | Date NoA Issued: | 18th November 2022 |

9.1.11

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|---------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-078500 | Church Name: | Aldridge: St Thomas |
| Listing: | Unlisted | Archdeaconry: | Walsall |
| Proposal: | Constructing a wooden fence within the hedged boundary of church back garden | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Adrian Mathias | Date NoA Issued: | 18th November 2022 |

9.1.12

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-079170 | Church Name: | Stramshall: St Michael & All Angels |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Stoke-upon-Trent |
| Proposal: | Replacement and treatment of wooden flooring in nave and associated works (granted under interim faculty no. 5060) | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Mark Stewart | Date NoA Issued: | 18th November 2022 |

9.1.13

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| OFS Application Ref: | 2022-075695 | Church Name: | Stonnall: St Peter |
| Listing: | Grade II | Archdeaconry: | Lichfield |
| Proposal: | Replacement of boiler in boiler room | | |
| DAC Consultee: | Peter Bemrose | Date NoA Issued: | 23rd November 2022 |

Decision: The faculty applications processed by delegated authority were noted

Action: None

9.2 Quinquennial inspector applications

The following applications from PCCs, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield Diocesan Scheme for the Inspection of Churches](#) (Amended June 2022) and the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (Amended May 2022), on behalf of the full DAC

- 9.2.1 Dilhorne, All Saints (Grade II*), Simon Smith proposed inspector
- 9.2.2 Rhydycroesau, Christ Church (unlisted), Anne Netherwood proposed inspector
- 9.2.3 Ashmore Park, St Alban (unlisted), David Powell (Integrity Surveying Ltd), proposed inspector

Decision: The quinquennial inspector applications processed by delegated authority were noted
Action: None

10. Any other business
None this meeting

The meeting was followed at 4.30 pm by festive refreshments in the Reeve Room, to which all DAC members and advisers were warmly welcomed to attend

Date of next meeting: **Thursday 23rd February 2023 at 2.00 pm – please note not a Wednesday**
to be held hybridly (in person and by online conferencing) in the Reeve
Room at St Mary's House, Lichfield

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary
giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 622540

Helen Cook, Assistant DAC Secretary
helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 622569