

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, 6th April 2022 at 2.00 pm

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Opening prayers were said by the Revd Jo Farnworth (Associate Archdeacon of Salop).
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven Julian Francis, the Ven Paul Thomas, the Ven Sue Weller, the Ven Megan Smith, the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, the Revd Jo Farnworth, Andy Foster, Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Edward Higgins, David Litchfield, Bryan Martin, Adrian Mathias, Mark Parsons, Julie Taylor, Andy Wigley, Peter Woollam.
In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Phil Collins (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: the Revd Zoe Heming, Brough Skingley, Andy Smith, Clare Beavon (Diocesan Pastoral Officer).
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Edward Higgins, item 4.1.2; Adrian Mathias, item 4.6.1; Mark Parsons, item 7.1.3.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

2. Matters Arising

2.1 Nominations for membership of new Lichfield DAC for 2022–2027

The DAC Chair invited current DAC members to put their names forward, via the DAC Secretary, for consideration as prospective members of the new Lichfield DAC for 2022–2027, as last raised at the 8th December 2021 DAC meeting (Matters Arising, item 2.1). In accordance with [schedule 2](#) of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018, prospective (and returning) members are required to be appointed by Bishop's Council. The DAC Chair confirmed that the names of members would be put to Bishop's Council at its meeting on 25th May 2022, with the new DAC first meeting as a statutory body at the 20th July 2022 DAC meeting.

At the present meeting, the DAC Chair requested that the Archdeacons give consideration to the nomination of specific members of clergy within the diocese, with the suitable skills and experience to join the new DAC. Separately, the DAC Secretary confirmed that a limit on successive terms of office for DAC members has been brought into effect by [section 11](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2020, which will apply with the commencement of the forthcoming new appointments (including re-appointments).

The DAC Chair additionally indicated that the role of DAC Vice-Chair had become vacant from 1st November 2020, following the cessation in that role of the then Ven. Matthew Parker, at that time Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent, to become Bishop of Stafford. As a non-statutory appointment, which does not require external consultation, a nomination for DAC Vice-Chair will be made by the DAC Chair to Bishop's Council (as above).

Action: The Archdeacons to give consideration to nominating specific members of clergy to join the new Lichfield DAC; the DAC Secretary to consult external statutory bodies and individuals on the prospective appointment of the DAC Chair and other statutory positions requiring consultation, under [schedule 2](#) of the 2018 Measure

2.2 Update on appointment of additional architect members and advisers to the DAC

The DAC Secretary updated members on the proposal to appoint additional architect members and architect advisers to the DAC, as last raised at the 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting (Matters Arising, item 2.1). Following publication of a call for [expressions of interest](#) on the diocesan website, ten conservation-accredited architects have expressed an interest in joining or advising the Lichfield DAC in either capacity.

The DAC Secretary indicated that the newly-created role of DAC architect adviser would encompass the giving of consultation advice on List B (Archdeacon's permission) applications and the processing of quinquennial inspector applications by delegated authority. There would be no requirement for architect advisers to attend DAC meetings or DAC site visits, though they would be welcome to do so. It is envisaged that the role would be suitable for a senior practitioner who does not wish to be a sitting member of the DAC, perhaps on grounds of time commitment, or a more junior practitioner, to be mentored in the role by a senior colleague within their practice (continuing professional development).

By contrast, the established role of DAC architect member would be suitable for a senior practitioner who wishes to be a sitting member of the DAC, with voting rights and direct input on the operation of the committee.

The DAC Secretary confirmed that following informal conversations (interviews), conducted by the DAC Chair, Secretary, Assistant Secretary and two current DAC architect members, with the ten prospective DAC architects on 3rd, 8th and 10th March 2022, seven names are to be taken forward. Three names would be put to Bishop's Council at its meeting on 25th May 2022 (see item 2.1 above), for proposed appointment as DAC architect members (in addition to two current architect members), to commence in role at the first meeting of the new Lichfield DAC on 20th July 2022. Four names would be proposed to the Diocesan Bishop for direct appointment as DAC architect advisers (in addition to one current DAC architect member becoming an architect adviser), in accordance with [schedule 2](#) of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018, to start in role from April 2022.

Decision: The DAC confirmed the names of the four DAC architect advisers to be proposed by the Committee to the Diocesan Bishop for direct appointment

Action: The DAC Secretary to liaise with the Bishop's Office accordingly

2.3 Proposed addition to revised Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy (approved at 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting), for subsequent DAC approval

The DAC Chair confirmed that the revised Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy (v.3 February 2022) had been approved by the DAC at its meeting on 23rd February 2022. At that meeting, the Diocesan Registry Assistant present had proposed a possible addition to the policy, in relation to private faculty applications for gravestones that fall outside the requirements of the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#) (2013). That proposal would

be considered more fully by the Archdeacons, and the Committee, at the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting. Two such applications were on the agenda for the current meeting (see items 6.1.1–6.1.2 below).

At the present meeting, it was suggested that such applications might be delegated to the respective Archdeacon, for formal DAC advice. However, it was noted that the Churchyard Regulations (p. 1) recommend that clergy seek the informal advice of the Archdeacon where there is any doubt as to whether the proposed memorial is of a permitted type. Therefore, applications which require formal DAC advice are those which have not been resolved by reference to the Archdeacon, and the Committee determined that a wider DAC view on these cases would be valuable accordingly. Relating to which, the DAC Chair will consult the Chancellor on criteria for the assessment of such applications.

The DAC Secretary separately introduced two proposed technical additions to the current revised policy, for the processing of a) confirmatory (retrospective) faculties and amendments to faculties (where DAC advice is requested by the Chancellor), in addition to interim faculties as currently, and b) private faculty applications (other than non-conforming churchyard memorials), such as Local Planning Authority topple testing of memorials. It was confirmed that these would be subject to the same exemptions and provisos of the currently-approved policy.

Decision: The updated revised [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (v.4 April 2022) was approved by the DAC

Action: The DAC Secretary to publish the revised policy on the new public-facing web page, detailing the [delegated authority procedure](#), on the diocesan website; the DAC Chair to consult the Chancellor on criteria for DAC assessment of private faculty applications for gravestones that fall outside the Churchyard Regulations

2.4 Arrangements for temporary cover for DAC Lighting/Electrical Adviser (diocese-wide)

The DAC Secretary confirmed that short-term, interim cover on lighting and electrical matters was being sought through the voluntary secondment of advisers to Leicester DAC, in order to uphold the DAC's statutory responsibility to give formal advice on casework in these areas, as last raised at the 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting (New Matters, item 3.5). This proposal for cover is as previously arranged during a prior period of vacancy (14th October 2020 DAC meeting, New Matters, item 3.1).

Action: The DAC Secretary to co-ordinate short-term, interim cover on lighting and electrical matters through the voluntary secondment of advisers to Leicester DAC

3. New Matters

3.1 Proposal for standard DAC consultation advice response to quinquennial inspector applications for inspectors previously on Lichfield DAC's 'approved list' of architects and surveyors

The DAC Secretary reaffirmed that the procedure relating to the prospective appointment of quinquennial inspectors by PCCs had changed with the coming into effect of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2020 on 1st September 2020, as last raised at the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting (Matters Arising, item 2.1). That legislation amends [section 45](#) of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018, which governs the inspection of ecclesiastical buildings. Key changes are that a PCC is no

longer required to appoint a registered architect or chartered building surveyor in every case, or select from an 'approved list' of names administered by the DAC. Instead, a suitably qualified and experienced professional can be identified by the PCC, with the appointment made subject to DAC advice. Updated [guidance](#) on QIs has been issued by the Church Buildings Council (CBC), and new [procedures](#) (including applications for DAC advice) published by the DAC Office, as well as a [Lichfield DAC register of quinquennial inspectors](#).

The former DAC 'approved list' contained architects and surveyors who had already been appraised by the Committee, through a prior application process, and who were previously permitted by that pre-approval to inspect churches of any grade within the diocese. The Lichfield DAC policy for inclusion on the list required architects and surveyors to be conservation accredited.

At the present meeting, and in relation to the above, it was proposed that rather than bespoke DAC advice being given on the appointment of each quinquennial inspector who was on the DAC's previous 'approved list' (in its latest iteration before the change in legislation, i.e. as per 31st August 2020), such advice would instead be given on any prospective quinquennial inspector not previously on that list. The latter would include a) architects and surveyors who operated in the diocese but had not been approved (where such instances may exist), and b) new inspectors who wish to operate now but were similarly not previously approved (as their prospective appointments post-date the change in legislation).

In these two cases, the current CBC criteria for appraising inspectors in relation to church grade listing (as reproduced on the [appointing a quinquennial inspector](#) web page of the diocesan website) would be rigorously applied. In accordance with the updated revised [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (v.4 April 2022) (item 2.3 above), quinquennial inspector applications will be processed by delegated authority (see item 8 below). The DAC officers will obtain the written advice, through consultation, of a DAC architect member and the respective Archdeacon, prior to issuing the resultant advice to the applicants.

Whereas, if an inspector who was previously approved by the DAC is now proposed for appointment by a PCC (rather than reappointment by the same PCC), their prior inclusion on the list will be imparted to the PCC accordingly. In relation to which, a standard form of words on their suitability will be given (i.e. not subject to consultation by delegated authority), in connection with the current CBC criteria, thus still constituting DAC advice under the new legislation.

Decision: The proposal was approved by the DAC, to commence with immediate effect
Action: The DAC officers to process quinquennial inspector applications accordingly

4. Casework for Consideration

4.1 Reorderings and New Facilities

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

Grade I

4.1.1

Case Reference No.:	2022-070628	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:	Partial reordering, to include an accessible toilet and servery		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The Committee previously considered the proposal as a DAC site visit report at 12th February 2020 DAC meeting, following a site visit on 21st January 2020. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. 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 I listed – and specifically the visual impact, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
2. Whilst the DAC commended the level of detail provided by the parish and architect in this informal advice application, it was considered 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 [reorderings](#) and [Statements](#).
3. The revised proposal presents a thorough reordering of the interior of the church. Whilst it was noted that the pews are Victorian, and not the original Georgian pews, they do still have a significant visual impact on the church interior. Although it is understood that space is required to allow greater accessibility and usage, it is essential that a minimum number of pews are removed as required.
4. The DAC considered that one too many rows of pews are proposed to be removed from the west end. This would leave the base of the column exposed, which would look incongruous (all other columns are very much integral with the pews and panelling). It was considered that these pews should remain to cover the base of the column, and that this will have little impact on the space available at the back of the church.
5. Similarly, the removal of multiple sets of pews at the east end will further dislocate the nave seating from the sanctuary, which is some distance away. The DAC concurred that access across the front is restricted. However, there is no proposal for a ramped access to the chancel.
6. There are various loose furnishings within the Lady Chapel, including four types of good-quality chairs – can these be reused elsewhere? An inventory of existing loose furnishings and their provenance would be useful. Similarly, the type of new chair to be brought into the church requires clarification, along with proposed temporary positions and areas for storage. Consideration should be given to the Church Buildings Council (CBC) [guidance note](#) (2018) on church seating. The current floor surfaces, including blue carpet, should also be reappraised as part of any reseating of this space.

7. There is much stored material in the vestry, and consideration will need to be given to how this might be removed, or housed, to improve the appearance of this space, if the toilet is to be installed in this location.
8. There is little option available for the location of the accessible toilet. However, this will have a significant impact on the west window, restricting natural light into the vestry space (which is further restricted by downstand beams). Can the height of the proposed unit be reduced accordingly? A section drawing through the toilet and vestry would be useful.
9. Separately, the DAC Organ Adviser noted that the organ of 1715 was moved to its current position in the eastern bay of nave north aisle as relatively recently as 1894, and consideration could be given to resisting the organ to its original position in the west gallery, freeing space in the north aisle for alternative use within the scheme. Precedent for this original location is provided in the example of the organ (albeit much larger) of 1771 still in the west gallery at Burton-on-Trent, St Modwen (Grade I).

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 (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the revised scheme, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, 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 Georgian Group, the Victorian Society, and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer).

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

*Grade II**

4.1.2

Case Reference No.:	2021-067216	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620444	Church Name:	Rangemore: All Saints
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	All Saints Rangemore
Applicant Name:	Dr John Fawn	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [retd]; Simon Smith [project architect]
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	02-Nov-2018
Proposal:	Development of nave aisle to meet the needs of parish community		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£250,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

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 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, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
2. It was considered 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.

3. The Statement of Significance should consider in detail the level of impact on the affected fabric. The Statement of Needs should recognise existing local facilities, including the village hall. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [reorderings](#) and [Statements](#).
4. The Committee noted that the strategic plan document (2022 update) lists many items of work, but there is limited detail on each, and the only drawing (no. 1914-07-03 Scheme Layout B, dated April 2018) is somewhat diagrammatic.
5. The proposal to remove pews to open up the south aisle, whilst preserving the nave, has precedents, but this would be dependent on the significance of the pews, flooring, etc. at that location. Consideration should be given to the Church Buildings Council (CBC) [guidance note](#) (2018) on church seating, in relation to chairs proposed to be introduced.
6. The Committee expressed concern, however, about the proposed glazing of the aisle arcade, as the piers and arches have complicated forms, and this may not be in keeping.
7. The idea of positioning the toilet and servery behind the organ, screened from the aisle, has potential, but there are issues with abutment against the window on the south wall.
8. The proposal for ground source heating was noted, in the context of the Church of England, and diocesan, [target](#) to reach net zero carbon by 2030. It was recognised that land is available, and existing heating trenches may be reused, but much more detail is needed regarding other heat emitters, pipe routes, etc. Advice should be taken from a DAC Heating Adviser on this aspect of the scheme, by request through the DAC Office.
9. Consideration should be given to how to achieve level access to the vestry, proposed as a more useable space within the scheme. A route behind the organ could be possible, but then the toilet could not be incorporated. The DAC Organ Adviser suggested that consideration could be given to re-siting the organ, to give easier access to the vestry.
10. The cost of the proposals is substantial, but the DAC cautioned that with the requirement for high-quality and sensitive installations within the listed interior, and increasing costs of materials, this estimate may be subject to revision.

It was determined that the proposal would 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 is applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that a DAC site visit should be undertaken, to meet with parish representatives (including the two churchwardens and PCC Secretary) and the QI architect at the church, and that representatives of the National Amenity Societies, specifically the Victorian Society, should be invited. The revised scheme, when further developed, 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 (see item 7.1.5 below)

4.1.3

Case Reference No.:	2022-070861	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620469	Church Name:	Bolas Magna: St John the Baptist
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Bolas Magna
Applicant Name:	Gill Hughes	Quin. Inspector:	Simon Smith
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	24-Jun-2020
Proposal:	Creating space in the chancel area that will allow the church events to have a flexible seating area		

No. of Times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	Nil
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal in a different form (application ref. 2020-056663, since abandoned) as an application for informal advice at the 10th February 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and noted that no historic stalls or book rests are to be permanently disposed of (being repositioned within the church). The Committee determined to recommend the proposal, to make permanent the Archdeacon's Licence for temporary minor reordering ([2021-060389](#)) granted on 27th April 2021 (expiring on 27th April 2023).

Separately, it was noted that a faculty application for the heating and lighting scheme within the chancel was with the Registrar ([2021-066074](#)), awaiting the Chancellor's determination, having previously been recommended by the DAC.

The Committee resolved that the current 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

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

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

None this meeting

4.2 Alterations and Fabric Repairs

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

Grade II

4.2.1

Case Reference No.:	2022-071529	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620197	Church Name:	Bentley: Emmanuel
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Emmanuel Bentley
Applicant Name:	Revd Andrew Lythall	Quin. Inspector:	Francis Turner
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	16-Apr-2018
Proposal:	Reroofing to attached listed church hall and vestry wing (possible change of material)		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£46,000–£135,000 (excl VAT) (dependant on material adopted)
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

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 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, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
2. It was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had been sufficiently identified and justified (in the case of copper with insulation).
3. The Committee commented that this is a major post-war church of 1956, and that the copper roof is a significant feature, which has been repaired on a like-for-like basis previously. The hall and vestry roofs are also an integral part of the overall church design. It was noted that the submitted drawing (no. 21309.DD.01, dated December 2021) specifies replacement in copper. The incorporation of insulation is acceptable, and can be completed with minimal alteration.
4. However, it was noted that one of the costs submitted is for replacement of all copper sheet in Sarnafil single-ply membrane. The Committee cautioned that this would present a significant visual alteration, and would therefore not be acceptable. It would also present a change of material, and as such would require planning approval. This option was not supported.
5. The DAC supported the proposal for reroofing in copper sheet to match the original finish, but the parish should confirm its intention in this regard.
6. Separately, the DAC recommended that consideration should be given to the installation of roof alarm/s to mitigate against potential metal theft, which is permissible under [List A](#), matter A1(9), of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019, not requiring diocesan consultation or written permission.

It was determined that the proposal (copper with insulation) 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. As such, the Committee suggested that the updated scheme, without reference to Sarnafil (as applicable), should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

Grade I

4.2.2

Case Reference No.:	2022-068905	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:	Introduction of removable handrails for chancel steps		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£1,338
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that as the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was not applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the resubmitted proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the Committee’s informal advice. As such, the Committee determined that the application should advance to the giving of DAC formal advice.

Decision: Recommend

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

4.3 Services and M&E

None this meeting

4.4 Furniture and Fittings

None this meeting

4.5 Memorials, ABCRs and Churchyards

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

Grade II*

4.5.1

Case Reference No.:	2022-070924	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620388	Church Name:	Weston-upon-Trent: St Andrew
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Weston-upon-Trent
Applicant Name:	Alan Hopkin	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [retd]
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	19-Sep-2006
Proposal:	New area for the burial of cremated remains (ABCR)		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC noted that the Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent had conducted an Archdeacon’s site visit on 24th February 2022 to discuss possible options for the location of a new area for the burial of cremated remains (ABCR), prior to the parish submitting the current application. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, and offered the following advice:

1. The Committee noted that three options were proposed for the siting of a new ABCR, which would have differing degrees of impact on the appearance of the churchyard and the setting of the church itself.

2. The DAC Archaeology Adviser cautioned that Option 1 (photo 3 in the parish's submitted appraisal document), at the base of the medieval tower, brings some risk of disturbing disarticulated remains from earlier burials. The parish has recorded that a modern gas main runs through the area, which also brings the risk of cremated remains being disturbed by contractors if they require access to the line of the gas main.
3. The DAC expressed a preference for Option 2 (photo 1 in the appraisal), with the new ABCR located adjacent to the path in the new part of the graveyard. By contrast, Option 3 (photo 2) appears to be less readily accessible from the existing path.
4. A clearly annotated plan, showing the exact location, and extent, of the parish's chosen location for the ABCR, should be submitted as part of the formal advice application.
5. The Committee considered that a case had not been made for exceptionalism in relation to the proposed adoption of individual memorials at the points of interment and the requirements of the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#) (p. 8–9). Instead, the DAC would support the adoption of a single, collective memorial, with the points of interment unmarked, as per the Regulations. In the case of Option 2, the memorial would be sited alongside the path, and would mitigate the visual appearance of a linear row of markers running directly parallel to the path.
6. Information on the design and materials of the proposed collective memorial should be submitted by the parish as part of its formal advice application.
7. A PCC resolution in support of the chosen location, and memorial design, signed by the Chair of the PCC (the minister), is required to be submitted alongside the formal petition for faculty.

It was determined that the proposal would be unlikely 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 is not applicable. As such, the Committee suggested 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*)

Grade II

4.5.2

Case Reference No.:	2021-064989	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620561	Church Name:	Shelton and Oxon: Christ Church
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Shelton and Oxon
Applicant Name:	Stuart Fox	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2017
Proposal:	Extension of the Garden of Remembrance and provision of a Book of Remembrance to be kept in the church		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third	Cost Est:	£400
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for formal advice at the 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting, when the Committee deferred the application, pending revision and

resubmission by the parish. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be unlikely 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 not applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

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 parish had considered the matters previously raised by the Committee’s informal advice.

However, the DAC noted that the PCC had resolved not to pursue the previous version of the proposal, to allow for brass memorial plaques to be fixed to an existing stone bench within the Garden of Remembrance. The Committee had instead previously requested that the parish confirm that the proposed memorial plaques would sufficiently adhere to the rough-cut stone bench, such that they would serve as permanent markers.

Similarly, the DAC had advised the parish to give consideration to providing an alternative, and related, means of commemoration, should a family not wish to have a brass plaque, such as including those names in a book of remembrance. The latter was not intended as a stand-alone option. Indeed, the Chancellor’s [Churchyard Regulations](#) offer the following guidance (p. 9):

The recording of those names in a Book of Remembrance retained in the church building while an appropriate measure is unlikely, of itself, to be a sufficient record of the departed.

The DAC resolved to defer the application, and proposed that the parish should consult the Archdeacon of Salop on how best to progress, in view of the above. If the PCC wishes to petition for just the use of a book of remembrance, then a clear case needs to be made as to why a collective memorial, as per the Churchyard Regulations (p. 8–9), is not to be incorporated into the extension (i.e. the green interments intended to be entirely unmarked).

The Committee suggested that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for final formal DAC advice.

Decision: Defer

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant; the Archdeacon of Salop to advise the parish

4.6 Landscaping

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

Grade I

4.6.1

Case Reference No.:	2022-070928	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620104	Church Name:	Tamworth: St Editha
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Tamworth
Applicant Name:	Gwen Wilkinson	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade I		

Proposal:	Existing footpaths through the churchyard to be resurfaced, relit and realigned to enhance the routes linking the proposed public realm to Church Lane, Little Church Lane, St Editha's Close and Church Street		
No. of Times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	£252,000 [to be paid for by Staffordshire County Council]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC noted that an earlier version of the proposal, in a different form, had previously been considered for formal advice, and recommended by the Committee, at 29th June 2016 DAC meeting, but had not been taken forward to the grant of faculty. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the new proposal and the supporting documents, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC supported the principle of the proposal, and noted that the paths within the churchyard are generally poor and would benefit from the public realm works proposed by Staffordshire County Council.
2. Final details should be provided, however, in relation to the kerbing type. The DAC recommended that existing (rounded and weathered) kerbing should be incorporated into the scheme, rather than modern angular kerbing if required, to preserve the character of the setting.
3. In relation to the proposed pathway finish, it was also recommended that rather than black macadam, consideration should be given to using resin-bonded gravel, which, although expensive, would be the best option in terms of the historic church and environment.
4. The thin black lighting columns with simple LED lamps shown in the supporting photos were considered acceptable. However, it is important that upward and outward light spillage is minimised. This is in order to make the church and surrounds more visible in their natural setting, and to minimise disturbance of the local bat and bird population. Confirmation of such mitigation should be provided.
5. The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the groundworks do have some potential to affect archaeological remains, in terms of disarticulated human remains and, just possibly, burials within the churchyard. However, it was noted that the scheme has been designed by Staffordshire County Council and that the County Archaeologist has provided input.
6. The Adviser commented that the submitted Method Statement confirms that all ground works will be subject to an archaeological watching brief that will be monitored by the County Archaeologist. However, a related Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) should be submitted for approval by the DAC Archaeological Adviser.

It was determined that the proposal may be likely to affect archaeological remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. However, the Committee resolved that this requirement had been met by virtue of the direct involvement of the Staffordshire County Archaeologist, who would have been consulted under the Rules. 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

4.7 Bells, Clocks and Organs

None this meeting

5. Casework by Delegated Authority

The following faculty applications, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, are to be processed by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018 and in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#), on behalf of the DAC

5.1

Case Reference No.:	2022-070303	Church Name:	Ash: Christ Church
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Repairs to roof, masonry, drains, guttering and repointing tower		

5.2

Case Reference No.:	2021-068233	Church Name:	Audley: St James the Great
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Introduction of two internal fixed Pan/Tilt/Zoom (PTZ) cameras, within the nave and tower base respectively		

5.3

Case Reference No.:	2022-069340	Church Name:	Bolas Magna: St John the Baptist
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Removal of an urn from the south-west corner of the tower and relocation to the porch (granted under interim faculty no. 4926)		

5.4

Case Reference No.:	2021-067250	Church Name:	Buildwas: Holy Trinity
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Tower timber frame repairs		

5.5

Case Reference No.:	2022-070470	Church Name:	Edgmond: St Peter
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Removal of three unsafe tower pinnacles (granted under interim faculty no. 4977 and amendment no. 4983)		

5.6

Case Reference No.:	2022-069734	Church Name:	Fradley: St Stephen
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Upgrading of outdated storage heaters in church and meeting room		

5.7

Case Reference No.:	2021-066085	Church Name:	Gratwich: St Mary the Virgin
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Rewiring and replacement heaters and lights (granted under interim faculty no. 4948)		

5.8

Case Reference No.:	2021-067528	Church Name:	West Bromwich: St Philip
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Replacement of gas heaters (granted under interim faculty no. 4946)		

In relation to items 5.3 and 5.5, for which interim faculties for emergency works had already been granted by the Chancellor, the DAC member nominated by Historic England commented that in both cases the removal of the urn and the tower pinnacles respectively will have had a harmful impact on the significance, character and visual integrity of these highly-graded listed churches. It was also suggested that the works may have also required planning consent.

The nominated member indicated that where architectural features are unsafe, the matter clearly needs to be addressed on grounds of public health and safety, and that the only way to do this may be their removal. However, the view was expressed that it is essential that such features are reinstated and that this is done in a timely manner.

The DAC recommended that a condition might be suggested for addition to such future interim faculties, or a proviso set on the full faculties arising, that such architectural features should be reinstated within 3 years of the grant of permission. This length of time was considered to be reasonable and proportional in relation to the raising of funds and restoration of the building.

Decision: The faculty applications to be processed by delegated authority were noted

Action: The DAC Secretary to process the faculty applications under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018 and in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#), and to issue the resultant Notifications of Advice to the applicants; the DAC Secretary to send the recommendation of the DAC on the matter of conditions/provisos to the Registry, for consideration by the Chancellor

6. Registry Matters

6.1 Private Faculties

Formal Advice

6.1.1

Case Reference No.:	N/A – see papers by email	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620351	Church Name:	Newchapel: St James
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	St James, Newchapel
Applicant Name:	██████████	Quin. Inspector:	Philip Wootton
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	06-Dec-2016

Proposal:	Introduction of churchyard memorial that does not conform with Chancellor's Churchyard Regulations		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered a private petition for the introduction of churchyard memorial to [REDACTED], which does not conform with the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#). It was noted that the proposed headstone is to be an irregular shape, unusual stone colour, and to include gold lettering. The DAC noted that the PCC had passed a resolution not in support of the introduction of the proposed memorial, including that the inscription wording (specifically use of the word 'Dad') was overly informal. Separately, reference is also made in the PCC minute to the minister having contacted the family to request that non-conforming portable items be removed from the grave.

The DAC observed that the petitioners had provided evidence of precedents for such a memorial in the context of this particular churchyard, by way of a case for exceptionality in relation to the Regulations. Further to which, the Committee determined, after detailed discussion, that the memorial would not adversely affect the specific churchyard setting.

On the matter of the wording of the memorial, the DAC noted that the Regulations allow for 'individuality and diversity', and inscriptions which are even 'quirky or eccentric' (p. 5). The Committee did not find that there was anything specifically 'which can be seen as inconsistent with the Church's message' or that 'flippancy and irreverence' (ibid.) were apparent. By this standard, the DAC resolved to recommend the proposal.

It was determined that as the proposal did not affect a building of special architectural or historic interest, 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

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the Diocesan Registry Assistant

6.1.2

Case Reference No.:	N/A – see papers by email	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620150	Church Name:	Pelsall: St Michael and All Angels
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Pelsall
Applicant Name:	[REDACTED]	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Hayward
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	01-Sep-2017
Proposal:	Introduction of churchyard memorial that does not conform with Chancellor's Churchyard Regulations		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered a private petition for the introduction of churchyard memorial to [REDACTED] (née [REDACTED]), which does not conform with the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#). It was noted that the proposed headstone is to be heart-shaped, with decorative

symbols, and to include silver lettering, with two smaller, detached inscribed hearts either side. The Committee also observed that the family wishes to incorporate the deceased's maiden name, rather than her married name as at the time of her death (but following divorce). On the latter point, the DAC resolved to defer to the Chancellor's determination, as a legal matter.

The DAC noted that the PCC had passed a resolution in support of the introduction of the proposed main heart-shaped memorial and inscription, but not the two flanking inscribed hearts. Although the petitioners had not provided evidence of any precedents for such a memorial in the context of this particular churchyard, by way of a case for exceptionality in relation to the Regulations, the Committee determined, after detailed discussion, that the central memorial would not adversely affect the specific churchyard setting. However, the adjunct hearts were considered to be duplicative in relation to the headstone, and would hinder churchyard maintenance at that location.

On the matter of the wording of the central memorial, the DAC noted that the Regulations allow for 'individuality and diversity', and inscriptions which are even 'quirky or eccentric' (p. 5). The Committee did not find that there was anything specifically 'which can be seen as inconsistent with the Church's message' or that 'flippancy and irreverence' (ibid.) were apparent. By this standard, the DAC resolved to recommend the proposal with provisos.

It was determined that as the proposal did not affect a building of special architectural or historic interest, 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 proviso:

- In the opinion of the Committee, the central memorial would not adversely affect the specific churchyard setting, and the wording of the headstone (deferring the legal question of the use of the maiden name) meets the standard for inclusion. However, the two smaller, detached inscribed hearts either side should not be included with the central heart-shaped memorial, as these were considered to be duplicative in relation to the headstone, and would hinder churchyard maintenance at that location.

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the Diocesan Registry Assistant

Post-meeting corrigendum: At the 26th May 2022 DAC meeting, the Committee indicated that the decision recorded above should be corrected on an error of fact. It was confirmed that at the 6th April 2022 DAC meeting the Committee had resolved to suggest that a rectangular, rather than heart-shaped, central memorial should be incorporated in the proposal. In all other respects, the record was confirmed as accurate. Subsequent discussion of the proposal, based on additional information, was undertaken by the Committee at the 26th May 2022 DAC meeting, which is recorded in the minutes of that meeting (Introduction, item 1.5, and Registry Matters, item 6.1.1).

7. Site Visits & Reports

7.1 Forthcoming DAC Site Visits

7.1.1 Baschurch, All Saints (Grade II*) [quin. inspector: Tim Ratcliffe; project architect: Michael Randall]

New accessible toilet under the west tower (Scheme B) (OFS [2021-067433](#))

Date and time: Wednesday, 13th April 2022 at 2.00 pm

Attendees: The Ven Paul Thomas (site visit chair), Adrian Mathias, Andy Foster, Edward Higgins, the Revd Neil Hibbins, the Revd Zoe Heming

- 7.1.2 West Bromwich, Holy Trinity (unlisted) [quin. inspector: Andrew Capper (retd)]
Internal re-ordering, including accessibility and heating schemes (not on OFS)
Date and time: Wednesday, 20th April 2022 at 2.00 pm
Attendees: The Ven Julian Francis (site visit chair), Edward Higgins, the Revd Zoe Heming
- 7.1.3 Ilam, Holy Cross (Grade I) [quin. inspector: Mark Parsons]
Creation of a community hub within the church building (OFS [2022-069621](#), under development)
Date and time: Thursday, 28th April 2022 at 2.00 pm
Attendees: The Ven Megan Smith (site visit chair), the Revd Preb Terry Bloor (Associate Archdeacon), Julie Taylor, Andy Foster, the Revd Neil Hibbins, the Revd Zoe Heming
- 7.1.4 Sneyd Green, St Andrew (unlisted) [quin. inspector: Andrew Capper (retd)]
Extension to provide café space (OFS [2022-069645](#), under development)
Date and time: To be confirmed
Attendees: To be confirmed
- 7.1.5 Rangemore, All Saints (Grade II*) [quin. inspector: Andrew Capper (retd); project architect: Simon Smith]
Development of nave aisle to meet the needs of parish community (OFS [2021-067216](#))
(see item 4.1.2 above)
Date and time: To be confirmed
Attendees: To be confirmed [to include the Victorian Society]

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with the DAC attendees and PCC representatives on the dates and times of the DAC site visits

7.2 DAC Site Visit Reports for Approval

None this meeting

7.3 DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports for Approval

None this meeting

7.4 DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports to Note

- 7.4.1 Yoxall, St Peter (trees), 4th February 2022 (Andy Smith)

Decision: The report was noted

Action: None

8. Quinquennial Inspector Applications

The following applications from PCCs, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed in accordance with [section 7](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2020 and the [Lichfield Diocesan Scheme for the Inspection of Churches \(2020\)](#)

- 8.1 Shareshill, St Luke and St Mary the Virgin (Grade II*; CHR ref. [620064](#))
8.2 Copenhall, St Laurence (Grade II*; CHR ref. [620057](#))

Decision: The quinquennial inspector applications processed by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018, were noted

Action: None – the DAC Secretary having liaised with a DAC architect member and informed the applicants of the resultant advice, being that of the DAC

9. Any Other Business

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Thursday, 26th May 2022 at 2.00 pm**

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