

Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

MINUTES

*A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held by online conferencing
on Wednesday 2nd October 2024 at 2.00 pm*

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The opening prayer was said by the Ven Dr Susan Weller.
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair), the Ven Dr Sue Weller, the Revd Jim Trood (Acting Archdeacon of Walsall), the Revd Preb Jo Farnworth (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Mary Thomas (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, the Revd Geoffrey Eze, Andy Foster, Chris Gill, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Dr John Hunt, Bryan Martin, Adrian Mathias, Candida Pino, Dr Andy Wigley, Peter Woollam.
In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant), Rosie Nightingale (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: The Revd Julia Cody (Acting Archdeacon of Walsall), the Revd Margaret Brighton, Edward Higgins, Mark Stewart.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Adrian Mathias, items 8.2.1, 9.2.1, 9.5.1.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

2. Matters arising

- 2.1 Vacancy for DAC (clergy) member appointed from elected members of Diocesan Synod (since 5th July 2024)
- 2.2 Assumptive standing down of Jonathan Ansell (DAC Clock Adviser), 1st August 2024
- 2.3 Expressions of interest sought for DAC advisers on [building services](#) (lighting, electrics, audio-visual, CCTV) and [turret clocks](#) (vacancies)

Decision: The matters were noted

Action: The DAC officers to continue to seek new DAC member and permanent advisers (vacancies)

3. New matters

- 3.1 Standing down of the Revd Dr David Isiorho (DAC clergy member), 10th August 2024

Decision: The matter was noted; the Committee extended a vote of thanks to the member for their contribution to the work of the Lichfield DAC

Action: None

4. Adviser site visit reports

4.1 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

None this meeting

4.2 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

- 4.2.1 Leigh, All Saints (trees), 10th July 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.2 Doxey, St Andrew (trees), 19th July 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.3 Whittington, St Giles (trees), 31st July 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Lichfield Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.4 Lilleshall, St Michael and All Angels (trees), 20th August 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Salop Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.5 Ashley, St John the Baptist (trees), 17th September 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)

Decision: The reports were noted

Action: None

5. Forthcoming DAC site visits

- 5.1 Kingsley, St Werburgh (Grade II) [project architect: Simon Smith]
Reordering rear of church for meeting room (OFS [2024-101331](#)) (item 7.2.2 below)
Date and time: 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

6.–9. 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

6. Walsall Archdeaconry

6.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

Unlisted

6.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-093044	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620190	Church Name:	West Bromwich: Holy Trinity
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Holy Trinity, West Bromwich

Applicant Name:	Revd Neil Robbie	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper (retd) [project architect: Jeremy Bell]
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	02-Apr-2019
Proposal:	Reordering to improve access and heating		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third	Cost Est:	£1,026,330
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 5th June 2024 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents.

The Committee continued to support the principle of the reordering proposal, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and setting of the church building had not yet been fully identified and justified, pending further development and submission of the scheme for formal (statutory) DAC advice in due course. However, in relation to which, and in accordance with rule 4.4 of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, Statements of Significance and Needs are not required to be submitted as part of a faculty application for a church building that is not listed.

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following additional advice:

1. The Acting Archdeacon of Walsall continued to commend the proposal, and gave a verbal update to the DAC following their recent Archdeacon's site visit to the church. This on-site meeting was proposed by the Committee, in order that a representative of the DAC might further meet with parish representatives and to contextualise the Committee's previous advice.
2. At the present DAC meeting, the Committee reaffirmed its support for the principle of the reordering proposal. However, it observed that the scheme remains at a high level, and that further details are required before a faculty, or indeed preceding formal DAC advice, can be considered.
3. The Committee noted that the applicant has provided a written response to the matters raised by the previous informal DAC advice, and that the parish continues to seek in-principle agreement to the scope of alteration and design put forward.
4. In its written response, the parish refers to the 7-stage RIBA (Royal Institute of British Architects) Plan of Work 2020, but which the faculty jurisdiction and procedures do not directly follow. The current scheme is at an informal consultation stage (akin in part to RIBA stage 2), where the DAC can offer its 'support' and raise areas of concern requiring further resolution as the more detailed design works are undertaken. The DAC is not able to confirm 'informal approval' based on basic layouts alone.
5. The parish lists a number of elements of the works, which are accepted, and, where not specifically mentioned, were previously supported in principal subject to detailed design.
6. Some additional information has been supplied. However, the concerns previously raised by the DAC with regard to the design of the new glazed entrance porch remain. The access and opening to the north of the church is supported. But there is insufficient design information to ascertain how the proposed structure, and its irregular form, would sit alongside the architecture of the original church.
7. Whilst the reasons for a bold design, its size and location, are understood, its form at present is not harmonious with the rectilinear historic form of the church building. A

rectilinear form would be easier to support at this early stage, if the parish is not able to provide further design information and detailing, to enable a full assessment of this significant alteration to this historic church.

It was determined that external formal consultation under rule 4.5 the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable, as the church building is not listed. As such, the proposal will receive the formal (statutory) advice of the DAC only. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. However, the PCC should note that this does not remove any requirement for planning permission or other secular statutory consent, where applicable. In such cases, the PCC must check with the Local Planning Authority whether planning permission or other consent is needed.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

6.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

6.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

7. Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry

7.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

Grade I

7.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-081159	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620274	Church Name:	Eccleshall: Holy Trinity
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Eccleshall
Applicant Name:	Jonathan Jones	Quin. Inspector:	Simon Smith
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	19-Oct-2018 [Andrew Capper]
Proposal:	Reordering within the church: relocating two historic tombs; installing a kitchen and two toilets; improving storage and office facilities at the west end of church		
No. of Times to DAC:	Fourth (in this form)	Cost Est:	£300,000
Informal Consultations:	Church Buildings Council (CBC), Victorian Society, Historic Buildings & Places [formerly AMS], SPAB		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 4th October 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee continued to supported the principle of the proposal, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified. The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance and Needs, and recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England [guidance on Statements](#).

The Committee noted that external informal consultation (pre-application advice) had been undertaken by the parish on its previous (final) scheme. The DAC carefully appraised the external informal consultation responses and noted that objections from the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) had been raised, for consideration in the DAC's own informal advice.

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee noted that in light of the external informal consultation, and specifically the response from the SPAB, the parish now seeks to ascertain if the Saxon stones relocated into the internal walls at the west end of the church (Victorian reordering) can be removed, and better displayed and interpreted elsewhere in the church rather than within the proposed toilet and kitchen accommodation.
2. The parish has provided a conservator's report (Skillington Workshop Ltd), which confirms that this would be feasible, with some loss of adjacent minor ashlar stone blocks. This would remove these important artefacts from inclusion in toilet accommodation, and can be supported by the DAC.
3. The parish has provided an updated architectural plan, siting museum-style glass cabinets in the nave south aisle. The Committee determined that these are somewhat erratically positioned, and queried whether this highly significant stonework should be in a glass case or open for increased ease of viewing.
4. On which point, the DAC resolved that it is essential that an accredited conservation architect advises on the best means of display, and refines the design and layout of the south aisle, of this Grade I listed building.
5. The south aisle is also proposed to include the relocated tombs and is to be established as an interpretation space. As such, it needs to be suitably laid out and considered.

6. Finally, it was noted that a further storage cupboard is now proposed in the south-west corner of the church. This appears to be the same appearance and construction as proposed elsewhere in the scheme. However, there are no photographs of the existing area, to ascertain any physical or visual effect on historic fabric, which images should be provided.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the final revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional external informal consultation (pre-application advice) with Historic England, the Victorian Society, and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB).

Additionally, further informal consultation should also be undertaken with the Church Buildings Council (CBC), in accordance with rule 4.6(2) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, in relation to the conservation, alteration, setting or movement of articles of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, i.e. the Saxon stones.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

Grade II

7.2.2

Case Reference No.:	2024-101331	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620260	Church Name:	Kingsley: St Werburgh
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Kingsley
Applicant Name:	Ian Hough	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [ret'd]; Simon Smith [project architect]
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	07-Nov-2019
Proposal:	Reordering rear of church for meeting room		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£75,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee supported the principle of the proposal, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified. The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance and Needs, and recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England [guidance on Statements](#).

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee supported the improved arrangement of the accessible toilet and kitchen at the base of the tower in the submitted drawing (no. 1301-17-04 SCHEME 3) by the QI architect, with independent access to the toilet rather than through the kitchen.
2. However, the opening of the toilet straight into the adjacent narthex was raised as a concern, with the suggestion that the new partition proposed to the west of arch might be set further back, also allowing improved access to the stairs opposite within the tower.

3. The DAC recognised the need for the parish to hold meetings and related gatherings within an independent part of the church building. The Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent affirmed that young families are active within the church community and building, but identified that the provision of new space would need to be suitable for young children, who presently enjoy moving about the wider building.
4. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies expressed the view that care should be taken with the arrangement of the proposed enclosed facility and the various historic monuments displayed on the nave walls at that location, and highlighted that the framed royal arms of George IV should not be partially concealed above the new room.
5. A DAC architect member observed that the current drawing lacks details of the proposed joinery, which is at present diagrammatic. It is understood that timber from existing pews is to be used in the construction of the new glazed timber frame partition wall to form the meeting room.
6. The DAC Bell Adviser commented that any changes within the west tower should not inhibit future maintenance or repair of bells, if raising/lowering into that space is required for such works.

The DAC determined that additional work is required by the parish on the development of the scheme, both conceptually and in detail. As such, the Committee suggested that a DAC site visit should be undertaken, to meet with parish representatives and the project architect at the church. The revised scheme, when further developed following the DAC site visit, should then be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

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

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

Grade I

7.2.3

OFS Application Ref:	2024-096800	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620450	Church Name:	Tutbury: St Mary the Virgin
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Tutbury
Applicant Name:	Judith Collison	Quin. Inspector:	Robert Kilgour
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	04-Mar-2019
Proposal:	Creation of community space at west end of nave, to include introduction of 36 free-standing (donated) chairs with light oak frames and blue upholstery		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£100
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 5th June 2024 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the proposal in its fuller explanatory form and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been considered.

The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, for the overall creation of a community space at the west end of nave, and considered that the impact of the proposed blue upholstered chairs on the aesthetics of the listed church building, in relation to its existing furniture and furnishings at that location, had been sufficiently identified and justified.

Specifically, the Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent highlighted that there is a missional need for the proposal, demonstrated by actual practice, for a community space to be established. Furthermore, there is sufficient room at the west end for such without impinging on regularly required worship space. The moveable nature of the current west end furnishings to cater for large services was also identified as a supportable feature.

The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies expressed the view that the proposed chairs are not in direct conformance with the Church of England [guidance on seating](#) (2018) in listed churches, from which upholstered chairs are a departure. However, the Committee resolved that in terms of practical and missional advantages, the proposed chairs can be supported on grounds of comfort, durability (more so when surface treated), stability and quality. The parish has provided demonstrable evidence of this.

The DAC concluded that the proposed works, as resubmitted, would not involve alteration of the listed building to such an extent as would be likely to affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, i.e. the proposals would result in public benefit that outweighs harm to the significance.

As such, it was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is not applicable, and that the application should advance to the giving of formal DAC advice. The Committee resolved to recommend the proposal accordingly.

Decision: Recommend

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

Grade II

7.2.4

OFS Application Ref:	2023-083568	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620409	Church Name:	Trent Vale: St John the Evangelist
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Trent Vale
Applicant Name:	Eileen Bithell	Quin. Inspector:	Geoff Hillman
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	07-Nov-2012
Proposal:	Internal restoration and reordering following extensive fire damage at the church (in April 2022)		
No. of Times to DAC:	Sixth (first as formal)	Cost Est:	£1,800,000
Formal Consultations:	Historic England, Victorian Society (formal consultation responses uploaded to application on OFS); no formal response from LPA (Conservation Officer)		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 10th April 2024 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the

present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

The Committee noted that external formal consultation (statutory advice) had been undertaken by the parish on its previous (final) scheme. The DAC carefully appraised the external formal consultation responses and noted that some concerns, rather than formal objections, had been raised by Historic England and the Victorian Society, as well as equivalent points in the previous external informal consultation response from the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), for consideration in the DAC's own formal advice.

In relation to the final development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee confirmed that the matters previously raised by the DAC's informal advice had been considered, and that the current submission includes a wide range of new and updated supporting documents relating to the architectural proposals (plans, elevations and sections), the internal contents, and the mechanical and electrical (M&E) aspects of the reordering scheme.
2. The DAC expressed the general consensus that the overall design has continued to move forward. In terms of the architectural elements, the Committee offered the following additional advice:

Aisle pod

3. The DAC maintains a degree of concern in relation to the proximity of the proposed pod to the arcade and inaccessibility of the first floor. The latest section drawing shows that the pod will clear the arcade capitals, but only by a very narrow margin. A DAC architect member expressed the view that, from a visual point of view, it needs to clear comfortably. The first-floor meeting space remains inaccessible to wheelchairs, but it is understood that other spaces will be used for meetings if necessary.

Servery hatch

4. The Committee understands that the parish has investigated other such hatches and are content with the width as previously shown. As such, this is now supportable.

Treske liturgical furniture

5. A DAC architect member expressed the view that the proposed bespoke furniture remains mediocre, tending to the insubstantial. There is no obvious reference to this particular setting, and no brave contemporary forms either. However, this new work is deemed to be supportable.

Chairs

6. The Committee observed that the parish remains committed to the previous style of upholstered chair, but which the DAC considers has a somewhat ill-proportioned design. The parish has put forward the understanding that the new chairs will stack six high. The re-use of some of the pews, to be removed under the scheme, should still be considered.

Floor finishes

7. The parish remains committed to the inclusion of blue carpet, rather than adopting any of the previous suggestions put forward by the DAC. The proposal continues to include

vinyl flooring, but now with imitation parquet design. A DAC architect member expressed the view that this is still an inappropriate choice in relation to the setting.

Pulpit

8. The current proposal includes drawn options for the proposed relocation of the pulpit, in its complete, or partial, form. However, the Committee could not support the parish's preferred configuration, for the pulpit to be mounted, incomplete and inaccessible, on the south wall of the south transept (location 9 on drawing no. 6239-023).

After detailed discussion, the Committee suggested that the parish should undertake a final review of its proposal, including consideration of the concerns raised by Historic England and the Victorian Society, as well as the previous external informal consultation response from the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), alongside the above final informal advice of the DAC.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is applicable. The Committee indicated that the application should be resubmitted for external formal consultation with Historic England, the Victorian Society, and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice. This consultation should be undertaken in accordance with rule 4.8 of the 2022 Rules, constituting notification of material changes made in response to consultation or otherwise (the re-consultation to run for up to 21 days, rather than 42 days, under the Rules).

Decision: Defer

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

7.2.5

OFS Application Ref:	2024-098857	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620409	Church Name:	Trent Vale: St John the Evangelist
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Trent Vale
Applicant Name:	Eileen Bithell	Quin. Inspector:	Geoff Hillman
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	07-Nov-2012
Proposal:	New stained glass east window to replace one lost to fire (in April 2022)		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second (first as formal)	Cost Est:	£100,000 [included in cost of item 7.2.4 above]
Formal Consultations:	Historic England, Victorian Society (formal consultation responses uploaded to application on OFS); no formal response from LPA (Conservation Officer)		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 21st February 2024 DAC meeting (then as part of the main reordering case, OFS 2023-083568, now item 7.2.4 above), when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the proposal in its fuller explanatory, and slightly revised, form and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been considered.

The Committee noted that external formal consultation (statutory advice) had been undertaken by the parish on its previous (final) scheme. The DAC carefully appraised the external formal

consultation responses, and noted that no objections had been raised for consideration in the DAC's own formal advice.

After extensive discussion, the Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, for a new stained glass commission to replace the significant original stained glass by Gordon Forsyth lost to fire at the church. The Committee, by a majority, considered that the impact of the design on the aesthetics of the listed church building, in relation to the proposed new furniture and furnishings at that location, had been sufficiently identified and justified.

However, the Committee remained relatively split on the current proposed design for the Trent Vale window, including its subject matter and execution. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies reaffirmed their view that the lost glass should be replaced with a newly-commissioned stained glass window of similarly national quality, equivalent to that by Forsyth.

Conversely, other members of the DAC continued to recognise that the parish, and the local community surveyed in the process, had expressed positive support for the new window design, and that the parish considers the new work to reflect the heritage of both the church and its locality. In acknowledgement of which, the wider Committee considered that the final revised design is supportable.

There was accordingly some division of opinion within the Committee about the scheme, and the DAC Chair took a vote on whether the Committee determined to Recommend, Not Object, or Not Recommend the proposal, these being the DAC's statutory options. The result of which vote, from among those members present (15), including the DAC Chair voting, was: Recommend (9); Not Object (4); Not Recommend (2). As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

Decision: Recommend

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

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

7.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

7.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

8. Salop Archdeaconry

8.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

Grade II*

8.2.1

Case Reference No.:	2024-102178	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620278	Church Name:	Forton: All Saints
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Forton
Applicant Name:	Kevin Ottaway	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jan-2022 [Tim Ratcliffe]
Proposal:	Repair and move font, and install accessible toilet in nave [supersedes and replaces OFS 2021-058602 and 2021-059668, now as a single project]		
No. of Times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	£50,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal to repair the font (then as OFS 2021-058602, previously OFS 2019-030756 under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015), and to install an accessible toilet (then as OFS 2021-059668, previously OFS 2019-035698 under the 2015 Rules), as applications for formal and informal advice at 6th March 2019 and 26th June 2019 DAC meetings respectively, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the separate schemes.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposals, now constituting a single project, and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified. The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance and Needs, and recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England [guidance on Statements](#).

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee recognised that the (new) QI architect had prepared three drawn options for the combined scheme of works (Options A–C), constituting an ambulant-accessible toilet, with entry from the lobby or nave, and a fully-accessible toilet, with entry from the nave. The PCC has resolved to pursue Option C, for a fully-accessible facility.
2. The DAC considered each of the three options submitted as part of the parish’s application for informal DAC advice and concurred, as a majority, with the parish’s view that Option C is to be preferred, which proposal allows for the fully-accessible toilet to be entered from the nave, with the door opening outwards.

3. However, a DAC architect expressed reservation that the toilet opens up directly into the main body of the church. Whilst it was recognised that there would be acoustic tiles, there will be still be two spaces for two completely different purposes, with no filter/buffer between them. It was recognised, though, that whilst entry through the lobby (Option A) would mitigate this, the facility itself would then not be fully accessible.
4. The architect also identified that the toilet facility is proposed to be constructed from material that is existing, but further information on the cladding, as well as drawn details (e.g. an elevation) of the same, are required.
5. In terms of the proposed movement of the 18th-century font, from a liturgical perspective, the DAC highlighted the Church of England's [guidance on fonts](#) (2024). In relation to which, it should be borne in mind that the traditional location for a font is near the principal entrance into the church (in accordance with [Canon F1](#)), but subject to reasoned movement under faculty.
6. It was noted that the parish makes reference to this guidance in its current petition, but the reasoning should be expanded upon within the Statements (as above), in terms of the degree to which the proposals would result in public benefit that outweighs harm to the significance of the current arrangement.
7. The DAC member nominated by Historic England recommended that the parish might research any early illustrations of the church, to see if the original location of the font can be discerned.
8. The DAC acknowledged that the font would be required to be moved under scheme Option C, to allow sufficient space for the safe operation of the outward-opening door for the fully-accessible toilet. In this way, the proposed move would be supportable.
9. Finally, the DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that there would be ground disturbance associated with the installation of the proposed trench arch drainage system, which will require archaeological mitigation. The PCC should therefore engage with an archaeological contractor to seek quotes, so that the parish can build those costs into the project at an early stage.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

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

Grade II*

8.3.1

Case Reference No.:	2024-100697	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620531	Church Name:	Welsh Frankton: St Andrew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Welsh Frankton
Applicant Name:	Helen Richardson	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jul-2021

Proposal:	Fit a handrail to the chancel steps to aid accessibility		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£1,125
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee supported the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Acting Archdeacon of Salop confirmed that the parish had researched similar solutions at other churches, including nearby Welshampton, St Michael and All Angels (Grade II), and that the proposed installation would constitute a significant health and safety improvement for the worshipping congregation at the present church.
2. However, in relation to the submitted sketch drawing, the Committee suggested that a middle (third) post would be required to span the height of the steps, rather than the two posts currently proposed.
3. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies also expressed the view that the decoration on the handrail, and mid-rail beneath, should be made less ornate, in order to give way to the significant (listed) original church interior at that location.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is not applicable. As such, the Committee indicated that the revised 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

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

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

Grade I

8.4.1

OFS Application Ref:	2022-076298	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620548	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Tong
Applicant Name:	Frederick Myerscough	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2024
Proposal:	Conserve 6 historical monuments		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£37,000 [original scheme]

Informal Consultations:	Church Buildings Council (CBC)
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022

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 noted that this is a collection of monuments of national importance, and that the Lichfield DAC does not include a professional conservator among its members. As such, the Committee resolved to seek the advice of such a professional, in relation to such important monuments.

The DAC determined to undertake informal consultation with the Church Buildings Council (CBC) in accordance with rule 4.6(3) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, which consultation 'must be undertaken in any case where the Diocesan Advisory Committee considers that its advice would be of particular assistance'. The resultant informal advice consultation response from the CBC, dated 26th January 2023, was issued to the parish. In response to which advice, the PCC has updated its proposal to engage an alternative conservator (Mareva Conservation Ltd) for the works.

Additional informal consultation has been undertaken with the CBC, on the revised scheme, under the same rule 4.6(3) of the 2022 Rules, with that most recent response dated 22nd August 2024.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and contents of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

The DAC carefully appraised the external informal consultation response, and noted that no objections had been raised for consideration in the DAC's own informal advice. However, the Committee confirmed the view of the CBC that the PCC should seek the advice of its quinquennial inspector (QI architect), with input from the conservator, to find a long-term solution to the extensive algal growth at that location in the church, particularly in the corner near the Vernon/Ludlow tomb. This will require a careful appraisal of the drainage system.

It was determined that the wider proposal would be likely to affect the archaeological importance of the building, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is applicable. Specifically, subsequent formal consultation would be required to be undertaken with the CBC, in accordance with rule 4.6(2)(a) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, in relation to the conservation of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

The Committee resolved that the giving of formal DAC advice following external consultation, where no formal objections are raised by the external consultee and where no 'material changes' are made to the proposal (rules 4.7–4.8 of the 2022 Rules), could be processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (Amended October 2023). Where these criteria cannot be met, the application will return for full Committee consideration at the next DAC meeting following receipt of the external formal consultation response.

In relation to the current submission, the Committee would recommend the proposal with a proviso (algal growth/drainage system).

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

8.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

8.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

9. Lichfield Archdeaconry

9.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

Grade II*

9.2.1

Case Reference No.:	2022-069439	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620037	Church Name:	Lichfield: St Michael
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Lichfield St Michael and Saint Mary
Applicant Name:	Alan Toplis	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	02-Jul-2024
Proposal:	Extension to south side of church, to provide rooms to replace church hall and office facilities (now demolished, on another site)		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£1,055,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. Prior to which, the proposal was considered as a DAC site visit report approved at 30th October 2019 DAC meeting.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee continued to

support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and setting of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee confirmed that the matters previously raised by the DAC's informal advice had largely been considered. However, the Archdeacon of Lichfield recommended that the parish should return to the 11 points originally raised in the DAC's previous informal advice and to give a response to any outstanding matters, as part of the submission going forward.
2. In relation to which, the DAC Archaeology Adviser suggested that the PCC should seek additional advice at this stage and proceed in the first instance to commission an archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA), in order to ascertain the likely costs of any archaeological mitigation work, including resultant archaeological evaluation work, as this could potentially be quite significant in the proposed location.
3. In addition to which, it was recommended that the parish should seek pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority on planning permission, which matter is in addition to, but can be run alongside, the faculty application.
4. It was noted that the current submission includes a number of new and updated supporting documents relating to the architectural proposals (plans and elevations). The DAC expressed the general consensus that the overall design has continued to move forward. In terms of the architectural elements, in relation to the issues previously identified, the Committee offered the following additional advice:

Reconciling glass-roofed element with chancel S wall buttress and windows

5. The DAC noted that there is no sectional detail, so it is still not known how this will be handled. This information should be provided.

Relationship of 'fussy' NE entrance to chancel SE corner

6. This remains as in the first concept, but is considered to look acceptable on the elevations. Nonetheless, the junction of the glazed screen with the buttress will need care.

Abruptness of junction of new W wall with existing S wall

7. The new wall still makes something of a collision, and is now even closer to the window on the proposed plan. This needs to be better resolved.

Importance of walls and parapet detailing due to simple massing

8. The DAC considered the elevations and visuals to be helpful, but that they are still very much diagrammatic. Larger-scale studies of the masonry detailing, coursing, dressings, quoins etc. are required, as well as details of the materials.

Reference to the original architecture

9. The previous informal DAC advice indicated that the walls of the main block will need to be handled carefully. It was suggested that some form of buttressing could help to articulate the design and perhaps reference the original architecture.
10. However, as now shown in the main east and west elevations (drawing no. 36-268_250), concern was raised by DAC architect members and the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies regarding the further horizontal emphasis of the extension, with a large expanse of glass, now constituting 8 lights in the west elevation rather than

the 6 previously drawn, and specifically the uneasy association of lateral Gothic-style pseudo-buttresses with modern lintel-based design, further widening the expanse.

11. Additional horizontal detailing, now added to the fabric of the walls themselves, should be reverted to the original concept of plain stone walls to a high quality, as shown in the original sketch scheme (drawing no. 36-268_Opt 3 sheets – Concept Plan & Sketches v1), to constitute a simple/clean and low, modern cube.
12. A DAC architect member offered the concluding view that the new building should be pulled away from the south wall, so that it is a standalone modern building.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England, the Victorian Society, and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer).

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

9.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

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

Grade I

9.5.1

OFS Application Ref:	2024-103415	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620104	Church Name:	Tamworth: St Editha
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Tamworth
Applicant Name:	John Mulvey	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Dec-2020
Proposal:	Erection of a plinth and bust of King Athelstan in the churchyard, immediately to the south of the church tower		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£1,200
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee did not unanimously support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the setting of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified. The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance and Needs, and recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England [guidance on Statements](#).

In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee affirmed that Tamworth, St Editha (Grade I listed) is a major medieval church with Anglo-Saxon remains and extensive work of the late 14th century and 15th century in Perpendicular style.
2. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies emphasised that this is a very fine building, and the proposed new composition will need to be of high quality to fit appropriately alongside and in association with it.
3. Discussion was had within the Committee regarding the felling of a tree to give way to new artwork, in relation to the national Church of England and diocesan goal around net zero carbon (by 2030).
4. More broadly, the Committee queried the choice of subject for the new work. It was noted that this year (2024) marks the 1100th anniversary of the start of Athelstan's reign as King of the Anglo-Saxons from 924, and that the church and town have undertaken a programme of events to celebrate this anniversary. It is understood from the parish's petition that the proposed installation 'will be a permanent memorial to his memory'.
5. The DAC advised the parish to appraise the narrative framework and interpretation for the piece, in relation to how it enhances, or otherwise, the role of the parish church. The Committee especially cautioned against the assumed association of Athelstan with Tamworth, which historically is likely misplaced and fleeting at best. Mercia's political 'centre of gravity' in these years lay in the Gloucester area rather than Tamworth. The view was expressed that Aethelflaed has arguably a better claim to the plinth, as a probable re-founder of the minster following the construction of the burh at Tamworth in 913. The DAC therefore observed that the proposed installation might speak more to visitors than underpin civic pride and local identity.
6. Although the submission does not appear to make reference to an inscription, there will presumably be one of some kind, as there is no reason otherwise to identify the bust with Athelstan.
7. The DAC member nominated by Historic England queried a number of details in the proposal. It was commented that the proposed column plinth of recycled marble is of a classicised design, although the base has some resonance with Romanesque column bases. However, the bust to be placed on top of this column does not share the classicised design, but is instead redolent of the heavily romanticised, heroic perception of Anglo-Saxon figures associated with 19th- and early-20th-century Whig historians like Edward Augustus Freeman.
8. In relation to its installation, prior disturbance in the area suggests that the likelihood of engaging with archaeological deposits is not high. However, the site sits at the edge of but within a probable Mercian palace and minster enclosure or platform, and therefore the removal of the tree and digging of a foundation could nonetheless reveal material of interest, and certainly the possibility cannot be dismissed.

9. As such, the DAC Archaeology Adviser concurred with the view that provision would be required to be made for an archaeological watching brief during the laying of the column foundation.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB).

Additionally, informal consultation should be undertaken with the Church Buildings Council (CBC), in accordance with rule 4.6(2)(b) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023, in relation to the introduction of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest (including new work), in relation to a Grade I (or II*) listed building.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

9.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

10. Casework by delegated authority to note

10.1 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 October 2023), on behalf of the full DAC

10.1.1

OFS Application Ref:	2024-098738	Church Name:	Malinslee: St Leonard
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Installation of gas boiler in same location as condemned boiler and connection to existing ground-floor radiators only (granted under interim faculty no. 5250)		
DAC Consultee:	Malcolm Price	Date NoA Issued:	30th July 2024

10.1.2

OFS Application Ref:	2024-098044	Church Name:	Sheriffhales: St Mary
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Installation of new short-wave infrared heaters within nave and chancel		
DAC Consultee:	Malcolm Price	Date NoA Issued:	1st August 2024

10.1.3

OFS Application Ref:	2024-096882	Church Name:	Church Eaton: St Editha
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	To retain the existing boiler and heating system but replace the oil tank (now beyond repair) and relocate		
DAC Consultee:	Malcolm Price	Date NoA Issued:	8th August 2024

10.1.4

OFS Application Ref:	2024-097442	Church Name:	Shrewsbury: St George of Cappadocia
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	New audio-visual system: new speakers in new locations; large TV on swinging mount; new control booth; upgrading loop system; extending internet connection		
DAC Consultee:	Simon Lewis†	Date NoA Issued:	9th August 2024

10.1.5

OFS Application Ref:	2024-097074	Church Name:	Caverswall: St Peter
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Replacement of section of north churchyard wall and rebuilding of adjoining stone pillar and gatepost (granted under interim faculty no. 5236)		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	9th August 2024

10.1.6

OFS Application Ref:	2024-095835	Church Name:	Bagnall: St Chad
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Retrospective approval for the burial of cremated remains, and the proposed localised relocation of a cremated remains headstone, within the churchyard		
DAC Consultees:	Ven Dr Megan Smith (lead) (Archdeacons corporately)	Date NoA Issued:	9th August 2024

10.1.7

OFS Application Ref:	N/A – private faculty no. 5174	Church Name:	Chasetown: St Anne
Listing:	Grade II* [churchyard wall not separately listed]	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	To remove and grind stumps of four unsafe sycamore trees and to reduce the adjacent churchyard wall (granted under interim faculty no. 5119); to lower wall to foundations and rebuild from ground level		
DAC Consultees:	Bryan Martin; Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	11th August 2024

10.1.8

OFS Application Ref:	2024-099996	Church Name:	Shrewsbury: St Chad
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Essential repair and refurbishment of inner vestibule lead roof, to incorporate terne-coated stainless steel, and plaster ceiling [confirmation of technical details under delegated authority]		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	11th August 2024

10.1.9

OFS Application Ref:	2024-097164	Church Name:	Stoke-on-Trent: St Peter ad Vincula [Stoke Minster]
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Installation of a new heating system		
DAC Consultee:	Andrew Baker	Date NoA Issued:	12th August 2024

10.1.10

OFS Application Ref:	2024-095007	Church Name:	Butterton: St Bartholomew
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Creation of Garden of Remembrance within churchyard		
DAC Consultees:	Ven Dr Megan Smith (lead) (Archdeacons corporately)	Date NoA Issued:	24th September 2024

10.1.11

OFS Application Ref:	2024-099565	Church Name:	Lichfield: Christ Church
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Installation of wire guards to external windows		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	26th September 2024

10.1.12

OFS Application Ref:	2024-094520	Church Name:	Edgmond: St Peter
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Repairs to the boundary wall (not separately listed) (in part granted under interim faculty no. 5212)		
DAC Consultees:	Candida Pino; Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	26th September 2024

10.1.13

OFS Application Ref:	2024-096843	Church Name:	Bolas Magna: St John the Baptist
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Repairs to the chancel roof and nave north-east gable, and to the internal chancel plaster		
DAC Consultee:	Candida Pino	Date NoA Issued:	26th September 2024

10.1.14

OFS Application Ref:	2023-091038	Church Name:	Whitmore: St Mary & All Saints
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Repair and refurbishment of the tiled reredos at the chancel east end		
DAC Consultee:	Candida Pino	Date NoA Issued:	26th September 2024

10.1.15

OFS Application Ref:	2024-102509	Church Name:	Bloxwich: Holy Ascension
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Replacement of existing portacabin with a storage container within church grounds		

DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	26th September 2024
----------------	--------------	------------------	---------------------

10.1.16

OFS Application Ref:	2024-100289	Church Name:	Heath Town: Holy Trinity
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Installation of two stainless steel handrails to the outside steps to the south porch door		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	26th September 2024

† Acting DAC Adviser

Decision: The faculty applications processed by delegated authority were noted

Action: None

10.2 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 October 2023), on behalf of the full DAC

- 10.2.1 Alstonfield, St Peter (Grade I), Simon Smith proposed inspector
- 10.2.2 Tong, St Bartholomew (Grade I), Candida Pino proposed inspector
- 10.2.3 Newport, St Nicholas (Grade II*), Philip Belchere proposed inspector
- 10.2.4 Himley, St Michael and All Angels (Grade II), Candida Pino proposed inspector
- 10.2.5 Little Drayton, Christ Church (Grade II), Candida Pino proposed inspector
- 10.2.6 Abbey Hulton, St John (unlisted), Geoff Hillman proposed inspector
- 10.2.7 Bentilee, St Stephen (unlisted), Geoff Hillman proposed inspector
- 10.2.8 Bucknall, St Mary the Virgin (unlisted), Geoff Hillman proposed inspector

Decision: The quinquennial inspector applications processed by delegated authority were noted

Action: None

11. Any other business

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 4th December 2024 at 2.00 pm**
to be held by online conferencing

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary
giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 221152

Helen Cook, Assistant DAC Secretary
helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 221155