

Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

MINUTES

A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held remotely (by written electronic means and online conferencing) on Wednesday, 8th December 2021 at 2.00 pm

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Opening prayers were said by the Ven Megan Smith (Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent).
- 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, Andy Foster, Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat, the Revd Neil Hibbins, David Litchfield, Bryan Martin, Adrian Mathias, Brough Skingley, Julie Taylor, Andy Wigley, Peter Woollam.
In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Phil Collins (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
Observing: the Revd Zoe Heming (Diocesan Enabling Church Adviser and prospective DAC member).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: Sarah Butler, Edward Higgins, Mark Parsons, Andy Smith.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Adrian Mathias, items 4.2.3, 4.3.1; Mark Parsons, item 4.3.2; Bryan Martin, item 4.3.3.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

2. Matters Arising

2.1 Update on time frame for forming new Lichfield DAC in 2022, following the end of the Synodical period 2015–2021

The DAC Secretary updated members on the time frame for forming the new Lichfield DAC, as previously raised at the 15th September 2021 DAC meeting (New Matters, item 3.1). In accordance with [schedule 2](#) paragraph 6 of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018, which governs the DAC constitution, it is required that a new Lichfield DAC 'must be made within the period of one year following the formation of the second new diocesan synod after the latest appointments'. In relation to which, and following consultation with Dr David Knight, Senior Church Buildings Officer at the Church of England's Cathedral and Church Buildings Division, the DAC Secretary confirmed that the new DAC is required to come into effect by 1st August 2022.

As per the 2018 Measure, the 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, to allow for time to advertise and recruit for the role, with the new DAC first meeting as a statutory body at the 20th July 2022 DAC meeting (see item 2.4 below).

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).

Action: The DAC Chair and DAC Secretary to liaise on planning the advertisement and recruitment of members of the new Lichfield DAC

2.2 Update on proposal for Architectural Advisers to the DAC

The DAC Secretary updated members on the proposal to appoint Architectural Advisers to the DAC, as previously raised at the 16th June 2021 DAC meeting (Any Other Business, item 9.1). At that meeting, the Ven Paul Thomas (Archdeacon of Salop) proposed that one or more conservation-accredited architects might be approached as prospective members of the DAC by co-option, or as advisers to the DAC on matters relating to architectural proposals, to include participation in DAC and adviser site visits.

At that time, the DAC Secretary recommended the then recent model of the appointment of five new DAC Heating Advisers, previously reported at the 24th March 2021 DAC meeting (Matters Arising, item 2.2), and that an advertisement seeking expressions of interest for the role – with a view to the appointment of two DAC Architectural Advisers in the first instance – might similarly be published on the DAC web pages of the diocesan website.

At the present meeting, the DAC Secretary confirmed that the proposal would be best incorporated into the wider advertisement and recruitment of members of the new Lichfield DAC (item 2.1 above), including architect members, but that this aspect would be prioritised ahead of the seeking of other members (including by co-option to the current DAC, in the first instance). It was recommended that additional architects could provide consultation advice on List B (Archdeacon's permission) applications and the processing of quinquennial inspector applications by delegated authority (see item 8 below).

Action: The DAC Secretary to publish an advertisement on the diocesan website in early 2022 for expressions of interest for the role of DAC Architectural Adviser and/or architect member of the DAC (with a view to continuing as member of the new Lichfield DAC)

2.3 Update on proposal to revise Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy to broaden use of delegated authority procedure for processing faculty applications

The DAC Secretary updated members on the proposal to revise the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#), as previously raised at the 27th October 2021 DAC meeting (New Matters, item 3.2).

At that meeting, the DAC Chair indicated that the Committee had previously confirmed, at the 24th March 2021 DAC meeting (Any Other Business, item 9.1), the suitability of processing applications for DAC advice on quinquennial inspectors by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018. This use of delegated authority extended the Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy, as approved by the DAC at its meeting on 6th May 2020, then in relation to the coming into effect of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 on 1st April 2020.

At the 27th October 2021 DAC meeting, the DAC Chair and DAC Secretary proposed a further, broader use of delegated authority, for the DAC statutory function of giving informal advice on faculty applications (rule 4.3 of the [2019 Rules](#), therein 'initial advice' of the DAC). This would be in addition to the giving of formal advice on minor faculty applications, as currently undertaken (see item 5 below). It was also proposed that formal advice following external consultation, where no formal objections had been raised by external consultees and where no material changes had been made to the proposal (rules

4.7–4.8 of the 2019 Rules), could be given through delegated authority, as the application and related DAC advice would not have changed since the informal DAC advice stage.

At that time, following comments from the DAC members nominated by Historic England and the National Amenity Societies (New Matters, item 3.2), the DAC Secretary reiterated that such an agile system would create a more focused agenda, on the most significant cases (i.e. with more cases being processed between DAC meetings). The DAC Secretary indicated that those items currently processed under agenda 4.1 (as below), for reorderings and new facilities, would not be applicable for delegation and would always require, and benefit from, full Committee consideration. The DAC Chair confirmed that for other matters a robust system of processing and reviewing cases would be required, as well as ensuring Committee oversight of the overall process, including the reporting of delegated applications through the DAC agenda, as currently undertaken (see item 5 below).

At the present meeting, the DAC architect members present confirmed that a more dispersed caseload, rather than through a single agenda, would be preferable, in relation to their own scheduling and work commitments. In view of the proposed date of the appointment of the new Lichfield DAC, to first convene at the 20th July 2022 DAC meeting (item 2.1 above), the DAC Chair recommended that the proposed expanded use of delegated authority should, in fact, precede the newly-constituted DAC, in order that the revised procedure would first be operated by the established membership (notably the current DAC architect members).

Decision: The DAC supported the principle of the proposal to revise the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#), to broaden the use of delegated authority for processing applications for both informal and formal DAC advice

Action: The DAC Secretary to draft a revised policy, for consideration and approval by the DAC at the 23rd February 2022 DAC meeting

2.4 Confirmation of frequency of DAC meetings and DAC site visit dates in 2022

The DAC Chair and DAC Secretary recommended, in relation to the proposal to broaden the use of delegated authority for processing faculty applications (item 2.3 above), that 6 [DAC meetings](#) would be held in 2022, rather than 8, as in 2021. The DAC concurred with this suggestion for less frequent, more focused, meetings. Additionally, to better facilitate the planning of DAC site visits, in accordance with practice prior to COVID-19 (Coronavirus), the Assistant DAC Secretary will liaise with the Archdeacons to plan and publish dates for prospective visits throughout 2022, which will be distributed to all DAC members for the purposes of forward planning and scheduling.

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with the Archdeacons' PAs on dates for prospective DAC site visits in 2022, and to circulate these to DAC members

2.5 Publication of completed church buildings strategic review and toolkit, Buildings for Mission: a Strategic Toolkit, as part of Shaping for Mission diocesan programme

At the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting (New Matters, item 3.2), Andy Mason (Director of Glebe and Church Buildings Strategy, former Director of Property) introduced a new diocesan plan for a church buildings strategy, which would constitute a proactive (rather than reactive) approach to church buildings and link directly with the diocesan [Shaping for Mission](#) process. At that meeting (New Matters, item 3.1), Dr Lindsey Hall (Discipleship,

Vocations and Evangelism Strategy Enabler) introduced Shaping for Mission as a new and far-reaching diocesan programme of change.

At the 21st July 2021 DAC meeting, the DAC Secretary indicated that a detailed diocesan strategic review of church buildings had been undertaken, including the appraisal of the latest QI report for each of the 550-plus churches in the diocese, and that a resultant modular toolkit for parishes had been prepared by the review group (including the DAC Secretary). The new resource, [Buildings for Mission: a Strategic Toolkit](#), was presented at Diocesan Synod on 28th July 2021, and thereafter published on the diocesan website. It was anticipated that the Archdeacons, and DAC, may have an important role in the proposed model of an early intervention protocol and holistic support for parishes.

At the present meeting, the DAC Secretary indicated that a presentation on Buildings for Mission was given by the review group at a training day for parochial church officers on 16th October 2021. Extending from which, a [Next steps and contact](#) section has been developed as a conclusion to the strategic toolkit, which allows PCCs to complete an [online response form](#), for receipt by the DAC Secretary and onward co-ordination by the respective Archdeacon.

3. New Matters

None this meeting

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.:	2021-063282	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620548	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Tong
Applicant Name:	Revd Pippa Thorneycroft	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Aug-2012
Proposal:	Provision of toilet facilities and a tea point		
No. of times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 21st July 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, and the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable. The

Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

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

1. The Committee reaffirmed that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not been sufficiently identified or justified, and that the Statements of Significance and Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [reorderings](#) and [Statements](#).
2. The view was restated that any extension to this highly-listed and significant church building, which is largely unaltered as an intact 15th-century collegiate church, will be controversial, and will require both faculty and planning approval.
3. However, the Committee supported the principle of the proposal for the introduction of toilet facilities and a tea point into the church building.
4. It was advised that it may be less problematic to incorporate these facilities within the church footprint, but noted that this would involve the loss of a number of pews. It was noted that the QI architect considers that these are historic (pre-16th century) and should be retained. The Committee concurred that the views of a suitably experienced archaeologist would be beneficial in ascertaining the provenance of the pews, to establish their significance and effect on possible internal intervention.
5. It was recognised that the parish is keen to explore an extension to the north of the church. Due to the prominence of this elevation, further exploration of the potential form of the extension is needed, beyond the one sketch provided. The general photograph of the north elevation shows the original design is somewhat compromised by the block design of the vestry – would the new extension read better as a north porch, to sit in better context?
6. The treatment of the historic damage to the stone at this location will need clarification as part of the proposals, and it is likely that an archaeological assessment of the site will be required at the pre-faculty stage.

The Committee recommended that the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies and a DAC architect member should undertake a site visit, to meet with parish representatives and the QI architect at the church. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. Following which, external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England, the Victorian Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), and the Church Buildings Council.

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

*Grade II**

4.1.2

Case Reference No.:	2021-067433	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620483	Church Name:	Baschurch: All Saints

Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Baschurch
Applicant Name:	Michael Randall	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe (Project Architect: Michael Randall)
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-May-2018
Proposal:	New accessible toilet under the west tower (Scheme B)		
No. of times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	£18,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC previously considered the proposal in a different form (application ref. 2019-042964, under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015, since abandoned) as an application for informal advice at the 2nd October 2019 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, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The Committee noted that the parish had upheld its previous preference for Scheme B in the revised application, which option is for the replacement of the existing toilet in the entrance hall, under the west tower, but enlarged by forming a recess in the main wall of the tower to provide a wheelchair-accessible toilet layout.
2. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal for a new accessible toilet, and the parish's identified needs, including provision for churchgoing wheelchair users from care homes in Baschurch.
3. However, members reaffirmed that the parish should carefully balance such needs against the proposed impact on the historic fabric of the Grade-II*-listed church building. In this way, the parish should demonstrate the least harmful option.
4. The Committee did not find compelling the revised case, put forward by the project architect, of comparing degrees of harm caused to the fabric by previous, historic alterations. This obviates the balancing process of public benefit against loss of significance that is embedded within the Duffield framework, and which underpins the faculty jurisdiction. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Lichfield Diocesan Registry guidance on the [Duffield Questions](#) (section 17 onwards).
5. In this way, the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) still 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 [Statements](#).
6. Members accordingly re-expressed caution against Scheme B, which would require the excavation of at least 400 mm or more out of the west tower, and which would expose the core work of the thirteenth-century fabric.
7. The DAC Archaeology Adviser further queried whether such invasive work would be structurally sound. Separately, the DAC Lighting and Electrical Adviser recommended that the parish should satisfy itself that the project architect has current professional indemnity insurance in place, and that he will continue to maintain such insurance for a minimum of 5 years after the project is completed.

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 the building, 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 and the project architect at the church. The revised scheme, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, when further developed, should then be resubmitted for external informal consultation (pre-application advice) with Historic England and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB).

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant; the Assistant DAC Secretary to co-ordinate a DAC site visit (item 7.1.3 below)

Grade II

4.1.3

Case Reference No.:	2020-055875	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620216	Church Name:	Willenhall: St Giles
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	St Giles Willenhall
Applicant Name:	Revd Susan Boyce	Quin. Inspector:	Simon Smith
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2017
Proposal:	To develop back of church and improve the heating		
No. of times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£350,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC previously considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 21st July 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, 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 a DAC site visit should be undertaken, to meet with parish representatives and the QI architect at the church, and that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

At the site visit, the QI architect presented a revised drawn scheme (drawing no. 986-10-04, dated 9th November 2021), but which the DAC visitors considered to be more than an iterative step in relation to the previous draft drawing submitted for informal DAC advice. The DAC Secretary indicated that specific DAC members, including those nominated by Historic England and the National Amenity Societies, were not able to be present. Further to which, the DAC Chair and the Archdeacon of Walsall (as site visit chair) have confirmed that the new design could be more widely considered by the full Committee, including those particular members, at the same DAC meeting at which the site visit report was to approved (i.e. the present meeting).

As such, more specific DAC opinion on the revised architectural design, beyond that of the DAC visitors, would be issued as additional informal DAC advice, alongside the DAC-approved site visit report, in order to best inform and assist the parish and architect in the development of the scheme.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents in relation to the DAC site visit report, which was approved with minor amendments at the same meeting (item 7.2.3 below), and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC reaffirmed 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 a proposal.
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. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [reorderings](#) and [Statements](#).
3. The Committee reinforced that it is essential that the Statements of Significance and Needs are fully developed to also allow wider, early consultation with external statutory bodies under the faculty jurisdiction. The Statements must provide an understanding of what alteration/intervention is needed and why, reasons for the sizing of the intervention, and an analysis of the impact on the historic fabric and space.
4. The revised proposal has taken a significant turn in the design approach since the original informal DAC advice was sought. The Committee supports the principle of the proposal for wider community and school use of part of the church. The scheme seeks now to create this as a standalone ark or pod, sealed acoustically and thermally, separated visually from the rest of the church, and raised at first floor level. This will be a challenging approach, and represents a transformation rather than an evolution of the original scheme.
5. The meeting room pod is proposed to resemble the hull of a boat and will be raised above the western half of the nave. This will present a significant visual alteration to the worship area. The detailing around the various junctions with the historic fabric, the relationship of new construction against the arcade etc., all need clarification and design.
6. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that the inserted pod would become the most dominant visual feature within the whole interior, and would not reflect the liturgical hierarchy of the west end to east end of the church.
7. A DAC architect member suggested that consideration might be given to two stories within an aisle, with a flatter west-end scheme.
8. Members queried the effect of the current scheme on capacity and layout for larger civic services and ceremonies.
9. The Committee indicated that the elements below the first-floor mezzanine structure, to house the refreshment facilities, and the adjacent toilets and stairs, are acceptable in principle, but require much further clarification of design and relationship with the church fabric and wider spaces within the church. A lift should be incorporated to give upper access.
10. The DAC member nominated by Historic England recommended that early consideration should also be given to the proposed furniture within the scheme, in relation to the existing west-end fittings.

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 Victorian Society, and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer).

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

b) Formal Advice

None this meeting

4.2 Fabric Repairs and Alterations

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

Grade II*

4.2.1

Case Reference No.:	2021-067155	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620034	Church Name:	Lichfield: St Chad
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	St Chad, Lichfield
Applicant Name:	Revd Rod Clark	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Hayward
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	10-Nov-2020
Proposal:	Redecoration and lighting		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£50,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, in relation to a site visit report by the DAC Lighting Adviser, following a site visit on 27th October 2021, which report was approved at the present DAC meeting (item 7.3.2 below). The Committee 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 a proposal.
2. It was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance), specifically in relation to the redecoration of the nave vault, 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 [Statements](#).
3. This is a fine church, believed to have been restored in the mid-19th century by the ecclesiologist Thomas Johnson, of Lichfield. It was noted that the QI report (2020) indicates that the nave vault is of plaster, steel framed, and of relatively recent origin.
4. The QI architect's design and specification for the plaster repairs and redecoration need to be supplied. The Committee noted that the proposed repairs have been identified in the latest QI report, whereas painting the vault in the style proposed constitutes elective works. It was accordingly recommended that the submission be split, with the QI repairs (including consideration of their root cause) to be applied for as a List B (Archdeacon's permission) application, and the painting scheme as a faculty application.
5. The Committee supported the principle of the proposal for the painting of the nave ceiling with stars on a strong blue background, being based on various medieval and 19th-century precedents, but noted that as this bold scheme would be transformational within the interior, it requires sufficient justification. Such support would also be predicated on the nature of the design. As currently illustrated, the even spread of stars tends to visually flatten the modelling of the vault. It was suggested that the architect might consider picking out the lines of the groins in some way, and perhaps having stars of different sizes.

6. A DAC architect member commented that the pale nutmeg wall colour may not be optimal, and suggested that a cream or other off-white might work better with the blue.
7. In relation to the proposed lighting, the DAC Lighting Adviser's report included in the application has several options, and the parish needs to decide which option it intends to develop. The DAC Lighting Adviser commented that the painting in blue will darken the interior and that the lighting will need to account for this, but that pendant lighting, referred to in the report, would still be suitable under these conditions. It was cautioned more generally, though, that the £10k allocated for the relighting may not be sufficient.
8. It was suggested that the painting might follow the lighting installation, to make good any damage, and as such a separate faculty for the lighting, for this different aspect again, might be sought (as not directly linked to the redecoration proposal).

It was determined that the proposals would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the revised schemes, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. Following which, external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England, the Victorian Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), and the Church Buildings Council.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant, and to advise them on the processing of the proposal as a List B (Archdeacon's permission) application and two separate faculty applications

Grade II

4.2.2

Case Reference No.:	2021-067250	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620616	Church Name:	Buildwas: Holy Trinity
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Buildwas
Applicant Name:	Nigel Bowen	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Jan-2017
Proposal:	Tower timber frame repairs		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£60,000
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 supported the proposal to fully replace and reinstate the planted oak facings of the tower, to include missing sections as noted on earlier historic photos. The justification for proceeding with lime render on stainless steel EML has been demonstrated through on-site assessment of these panels to frame, and that they appear to have always been a lath with render (timber then later metal); there is no evidence of wattle and daub framing.
2. The Committee noted that the inner structural oak framing is to be repaired/replaced, where decayed, on a like-for-like basis with green oak, tenoned and pegged.
3. However, some matters in the submission paperwork require clarification:

- *Planted timbers*: outer planted facings in sawn kiln-dried oak decorated with Sikken's Dark Oak external woodstain. Reference cannot be found as to how these planted timbers will be fixed back to the structural frame. Is there any concern about cupping, warping splitting etc. of the relatively wide shallow planks – 32mm x 125mm?
 - *Render*: the schedule of work states 3 coats of Ty Mawr lime putty lime render (which is assumed to be non-hydraulic) but the specification simply states NHL 3.5 render (which is hydraulic). The render mix onto the stainless steel EML will be important to minimise potential future cracking – the specification should be clarified. The lime render mix should match the existing as closely as possible.
 - *Render decoration*: the schedule of work states Keim Soldalit Colour Exclusiv 9295 (traditional off white) but the specification states lime wash. It is assumed that the schedule of work leads and it will be the former – the documents should co-ordinate.
 - *Water ingress*: it is assumed that the lime render is simply finished against the edge of the oak planted facings and that any water ingress along the open joint between the render and timber, at the junction, will not be an issue?
4. Separately, the DAC Bell Adviser commented that he had previously visited the church, and tower, and cautioned that at that time the tower internal floors were in a very poor condition, including rotting floorboards. It should be clarified whether the floors are subject to repair under the current scheme, as a health and safety issue may remain (including if internal access is required for the external tower repairs).
 5. An architect member of the DAC queried whether the actual structural frame had similarly been assessed. When the work commences on the tower, if rot is identified in the main frames, then the repairs could prove to be considerably more expensive. Some further investigation of the extent of the rot is to be advised.

It was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is not applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

Grade I

4.2.3

Case Reference No.:	2021-067152	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	820004	Church Name:	St John's Hospital Chapel
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Lichfield: St John's Hospital
Applicant Name:	Jodhi Bostock [Bursar]	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Oct-2009
Proposal:	Re-roofing the chapel nave and north aisle, to include lifting the pitch to accommodate roof insulation and improve the weathering detail at the junction with the parapet walls		

No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC noted that the Chapel of St John’s Hospital, Lichfield, falls under the faculty jurisdiction, having opted to be included on the national statutory [list of places of worship](#), maintained by the Church Buildings Council under [section 38](#) of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 (replacing the repealed Care of Places of Worship Measure 1999).

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and determined to recommend the proposal, but offered the following advice (for the QI architect):

1. The introduction of continuous stone slips to the profiled cornice of the nave roof:
 - From the submitted photographs, the existing cast iron gutter appears to have a profiled section and slightly overhangs the stone cornice, so casting a slight shadow. The gutter also appears to sit on a lead flashing, which is dressed along the edge of the stone cornice.
 - The proposed detail shows a simple gutter section set back flush with the stone cornice and no lead dressing. If the interpretation of the photo is correct, should this arrangement be considered for the proposed, which will help to mask the new continuous stone slips?
2. The introduction of stone slips to stone gutter brackets of the north aisle roof:
 - From the submitted photographs, the stone blocks appear to be heavily blackened. Introducing new slips above these blocks will strongly read against these stained stones. Should consideration be given to localised gentle cleaning of the existing stone brackets, to bring back in with the red sandstone wall directly below and the proposed new slips above?

It was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, 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

4.3 Services and M&E

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

Grade II*

4.3.1

Case Reference No.:	2021-065504	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620429	Church Name:	Barton-under-Needwood: St James
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Barton Under Needwood
Applicant Name:	Raymond Holder	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	09-Nov-2016

Proposal:	Installation of drop-down screen and related projectors, and upgrading of the existing audio system		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£26,000
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 supported the principle of the proposal to install a drop-down screen and related projectors, and upgrade the existing audio system, at the church.
2. The Committee affirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade II* listed – and specifically the visual impact of such a proposal. It was recommended that the parish should consult the related Church of England guidance on [Statements](#).
3. It was noted that whilst the proposal has developed using the existing screen across the west window, the parish should consider using small LCD monitors on portable stands at the east end of the nave for the president of the service. A separate small LCD monitor might be required for the music group. Does the parish use the video system when there is a choir in the chancel? If so, does the parish require additional monitors in the chancel?
4. The side aisle projectors ought to be black to minimise the aesthetic impact of the projectors.
5. The nave projector will be aesthetically intrusive in the proposed location. The parish should consider locating this projector on the underside of the tower gallery beam. The projector in this location will require a long-throw lens.
6. The location of the control desk may become intrusive for the parish, as it will fill what appears to be an after-service social area. More significantly, it will have an impact on the font. Consideration might be given to removing the back rows of nave pews on the south side to make space for the control desk, where it will still have the essential sight lines of the nave and chancel.
7. It was noted that the parish is not proposing to change the installed speakers. Is this a cost saving? 100v line is an older way of installing speakers, which is unnecessary when there are only two. It was queried whether the speakers are up to the task, and, if not, that could hamper the other benefits of the system.
8. Would it be possible for the CCTV camera to move west to abut the tower arch without reducing its coverage?
9. The parish needs to consider how all of the new cables will be installed so that the aesthetic impact is kept as minimal as possible.

It was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the DAC Audio-Visual Adviser (Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry) should undertake a site visit, with the DAC Audio-Visual Adviser (Lichfield and Salop Archdeaconries) and possibly the Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent, to meet with parish representatives at the church. The revised scheme, when further developed, should then be resubmitted for external formal consultation with Historic England and the Victorian Society.

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

4.3.2

Case Reference No.:	2021-066891	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620288	Church Name:	Biddulph: St Lawrence
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Biddulph
Applicant Name:	Jill Gover	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Parsons
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jun-2017
Proposal:	Update cameras on AV system		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£5,600
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC Secretary informed the Committee that in consultation with the parish, the submitted application had been withdrawn from consideration at the current meeting, as incomplete. Instead, the DAC confirmed the view of the DAC Secretary and the DAC Electrical Adviser that in line with the Adviser's report following a site visit to the church on 23rd August 2021, approved by the Committee at 15th September 2021 DAC meeting, the revised application, when further developed, could be processed by the delegated authority faculty procedure, to be recommended by the Adviser between meetings.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant, and to process the revised application by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018

Grade II

4.3.3

Case Reference No.:	2021-064180	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620145	Church Name:	Bloxwich: All Saints
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Bloxwich
Applicant Name:	Revd David Candlin	Quin. Inspector:	Bryan Martin
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Sep-2018
Proposal:	Complete and full replacement of the heating system		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£40,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, in relation to comments provided by a DAC Heating Adviser following a site visit on 7th December 2021. The Committee offered the following advice:

1. The DAC recognised that at present the existing heating system within the church building is non-functioning, the boiler having previously been condemned and disconnected.
2. The DAC Heating Adviser considered that the proposed ChurchEcoMiser scheme, specified by Chris Dunphy, is inadequate and underpowered. The Adviser questioned some of the information regarding the performance of the scheme, cautioning that the overall output is less than half of what is actually required.

3. The Adviser indicated that there might also be additional costs, outside the quotation, which could increase the overall project cost by a potentially significant amount. The DAC understands that the potential running costs, which do not appear to be referred to in the quotation, are beyond the means of the parish.
4. However, the lack of any reasonable heat within the church building is starting to have an adverse effect on equipment within the church, and the Adviser noted that the parish is keen to rectify this within a reasonable time frame, whilst wanting to make the best choice for the building and congregation.

The Committee suggested that the DAC Heating Adviser should next liaise with the parish direct, and that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

It was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is not applicable.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant; the DAC Heating Adviser to next liaise with the parish direct

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

Grade II

4.3.4

Case Reference No.:	2021-066417	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620585	Church Name:	St George's: St George
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	St George's
Applicant Name:	Revd Kevin Evans	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [retd]
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	30-Oct-2013
Proposal:	To remove and replace existing time-expired chancel lighting circuits and replace light fittings		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£10,560
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC previously considered the proposal as a site visit report by the DAC Lighting Adviser, following a site visit on 7th July 2021, which report was approved by the Committee at its meeting on 15th September 2021. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and resolved to recommend the proposal.

It was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, 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

4.4 Furniture and Fittings

a) Informal Advice

None this meeting

b) Formal Advice

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.:	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 including the installation of a notice board		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£400
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 supported the principle of the proposal to extend the existing Garden of Remembrance. The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the additional interments of ashes will result in very limited additional ground disturbance within the churchyard and the likely archaeological impact is therefore considered to be negligible.
2. However, some matters in the submission paperwork require clarification. The formal application, upon resubmission, should be accompanied by an accurate location plan, based either on an annotated Ordnance Survey plan or, as an absolute minimum, an annotated aerial photograph (an un-annotated aerial photo has been added to the online application by the DAC Office, which the applicant could mark up).
3. Details of the design of the new noticeboard, ideally in the form of a drawing or otherwise a product sheet from the manufacturer, are also required. Details are also required of any proposed new pathways.
4. Confirmation is sought as to whether it will be necessary to relocate the existing bench visible on the submitted photographs.
5. Clarification should be given as to the proportion of green interments, without caskets or memorial stones, and the interment of ashes with memorial stones. The petition form currently indicates: *'The proposed extended area will be for the green interments which*

means interment of ashes without caskets or memorial stones. This area will be 75% of the whole extended area. The remaining 25% will be for the interment of ashes under memorial stones'. The first sentence appears to suggest that the extension will be used for 100% green interments, rather than 75%.

6. The Committee considered that a case had not been made for exceptionality, in relation to the adoption of individual stones rather than a collective memorial, the latter as per the requirements of the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#) (p. 9). Information on the design and materials of the proposed stones should also be submitted, or otherwise confirmation given that the stone types will accord with those specified in the Churchyard Regulations (p. 12).

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 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)

Grade II*

4.5.2

Case Reference No.:	2019-035468	Case Status:	Awaiting DAC recommendation
Church Code:	620278	Church Name:	Forton: All Saints
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Forton
Applicant Name:	Martin Shakespeare	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Apr-2015
Proposal:	Placing a WW2 memorial in the chancel underneath the existing WW1 memorial, for the 75th anniversary of the end of WW2		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£150.00
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 (i.e. case is pre-external formal consultation)		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, but resolved to defer the application, pending revision and resubmission by the parish. The Committee offered the following advice:

1. The DAC supported the principle of the proposal to introduce a WW2 memorial underneath the existing WW1 memorial in the chancel.
2. The Committee affirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade II* listed – and specifically the visual impact of such a proposal. It was recommended that the parish should consult the related Church of England guidance on [Statements](#).
3. The DAC expressed reservations about the design of the memorial plaque, as drawn in the submission, in the context of its prominent location within the chancel of the highly-listed church building. The Committee understood why a brass plaque would be preferred to a carved timber inscription panel, but the oak surround should seek to exactly match

the WWI memorial in size and profile. The members expressed a preference for bronze, rather than brass.

4. The proposed lettering was considered to be very modern, and consideration should be given to lettering closer in style or matching the WWI memorial. The centred names were considered to look unbalanced, and it may be preferable to follow the line and set out/ justification (to the left-hand side) of the WWI text, even if there are two names per line.
5. As the memorial is to all the fallen of the parish, omitting the three Boughey family members makes the memorial incomplete as an historical entity (and contradicts the plaque title as a statement of fact). The addition would also re-balance the number of names (two each per line across the whole plaque). Clearer reasoning for the omission should be provided by the PCC.
6. The proposed fixing using standard Rawlplugs and stainless steel screws would be preferable, with the number of fixings kept to a minimum.

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

Decision: Defer

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

4.6 Landscaping

a) Informal Advice

None this meeting

b) Formal Advice

None this meeting

4.7 Bells, Clocks and Organs

a) Informal Advice

None this meeting

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

Grade II*

4.7.1

Case Reference No.:	2021-060886	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620247	Church Name:	Alton: St Peter
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Alton with Bradley le Moors
Applicant Name:	Revd Preb Brian Leathers	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [ret'd]
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	05-May-2017
Proposal:	Refurbishment of bells, frame and fittings, and addition of two new treble bells		

No. of times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£99,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for formal advice at the 16th June 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee deferred the application, pending revision and resubmission by the parish, in relation to a site visit report by the DAC Bell Adviser, approved by the Committee at the same DAC meeting. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, 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 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 deferral advice and the DAC-approved site visit report. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

Decision: Recommend

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

5. Casework by Delegated Authority

The following faculty applications, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been 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.:	2021-062726	Church Name:	Ash: Christ Church
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Restoration of the single bell in west tower		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Woollam	Date NoA Issued:	25th November 2021

5.2

Case Reference No.:	2021-066385	Church Name:	Forton: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Removal of holly tree which is encroaching on ancient yew in churchyard		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	25th November 2021

5.3

Case Reference No.:	2021-066563	Church Name:	Loppington: St Michael and All Angels
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	To fell 2 self-set holly trees within grave spaces to enable repair of surrounding iron railings		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	25th November 2021

5.4

Case Reference No.:	2021-066887	Church Name:	Willenhall: St Giles
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Introduction of a commemorative plaque relating to the restoration work carried out on the church bells in 2020		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Woollam	Date NoA Issued:	30th November 2021

5.5

Case Reference No.:	2021-066631	Church Name:	Hednesford: St Peter
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Removal and disposal of all twenty 43-year-old wood and fabric worn-out heavy benches		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Foster	Date NoA Issued:	3rd December 2021

Decision: The faculty applications processed by delegated authority were noted

Action: None

6. Registry Matters

6.1 Private Faculties

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

6.1.1

Case Reference No.:	N/A (see papers by email)	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620241	Church Name:	Quarnford: St Paul
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Quarnford
Applicant Name:	Stephen Mansfield	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [retd]
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	20-Jun-2019
Proposal:	Erection of a fence with a handrail along the back of the churchyard		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£1,000
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 supported the principle of the proposal for the erection of a wooden fence (non-boarded) with an integrated handrail along the back of the churchyard, to provide independent, community access to a playing field without crossing through the churchyard among the graves. Reference to the unsuitable exercising of dogs within the churchyard was noted in the submission paperwork.
2. The Committee was content with the submitted design of the proposed fence and handrail. However, reference within the petition form to existing steps could not be reconciled in relation to this design, or location, and clarification should be provided.
3. A clear plan should be provided showing the whole alignment of the proposed fence – whilst this could be added to the existing map, a clean plan would be preferable.

4. The footpath marked as a brown/orange line on the submitted map is shown on the eastern boundary of the churchyard. Clarification should be given as to how this will be accessed on the north side, where it adjoins the school (in blue on the map), i.e. whether through the school grounds at that location, or directly from the road, etc. That location on Google [Street View](#), to the east of the school, from the road, appears to currently show a wire fence and no entrance/style.
5. A PCC resolution in support of the provided should also be provided.

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 updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the Diocesan Registry Assistant

6.2 Amendment to Faculty

Formal Advice

Grade II

6.2.1

Case Reference No.:	2019-036058	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620417	Church Name:	Hilderstone: Christ Church
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Hilderstone
Applicant Name:	Eleanor Bane	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [Simon Smith]
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	06-Dec-2018
Proposal:	Original proposal: Provision of accessible toilet facilities and refreshment bar in the church. Amendment proposal: Provision of accessible toilet facilities and omission of refreshment bar, with toilet on south side, rather than north side, of west entrance interior		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second as amendment (fifth in total)	Cost Est:	£50,000 [original proposal]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015		

The DAC last considered the original proposal as an application for formal advice at the 11th December 2019 DAC meeting, when the Committee recommended the proposal, prior to the grant of faculty on 5th February 2020. The Committee last considered the amendment to faculty proposal as an application for formal advice at the 15th September 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee deferred the application, pending revision and resubmission by the parish.

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 addressed the matters previously raised by the Committee's deferral advice. Specifically, the QI architect had amended the design of the toilet partitions, which now do not clash with the archway into the adjacent space (drawing no. 1626-16-17E). The photographs provided by the PCC were considered very useful in identifying the position of the toilet, its context, and how it

will sit against the existing fabric. The parish has also confirmed the position of the extract vent grille, and provided an updated marked photograph, which is acceptable. Updated layout drawings have now been provided to bring the application up to date.

However, the DAC Lighting and Electrical Adviser reiterated his previous position that in relation to the revised proposal (i.e. inverted location of toilet facilities), the original specification and drawings by the M&E consultant had not been amended. It is therefore not clear what elements from the M&E consultant's work has been 'pick and mixed' into the latest design by the architect. A DAC architect member alternatively commented that the proposed works will require the parish to seek and obtain building regulations in due course, which should address matters such as the emergency lighting. The DAC architect offered the view that the proposal is a relatively straightforward extension of the existing electrical and water services, which will not affect the principal worship area of the church.

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 (12), including the DAC Chair voting, was: Recommend (11); Not Object (1); Not Recommend (0). As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

Decision: Recommend

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

7. Site Visits & Reports

In relation to the [Health Protection \(Coronavirus, Restrictions\) \(Steps etc.\) \(England\) \(Revocation and Amendment\) Regulations 2021](#) (from 19th July 2021), and related Government and Church of England guidance, DAC and adviser site visits can resume from 19th July 2021, subject to individual requirements and local situations, and in accordance with the diocesan [policy and procedure](#) for site visits

7.1 Forthcoming DAC Site Visits

- 7.1.1 Blithfield, St Leonard (Grade I) [quin. inspector: Mark Parsons]
Location and type (flush/compost etc.) of a proposed toilet inside the church, and possible restoration work to the church windows
Date and time: Friday 10th December 2021, 11.00 am
Attendees: The Ven Sue Weller, Andy Foster, Revd Neil Hibbins, Adrian Mathias, David Litchfield, Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat [organ inspection]
- 7.1.2 Burton-on-Trent, St Modwen (Grade I) [quin. inspector: Adrian Mathias]
Internal re-ordering of both East and West ends (OFS [2021-065626](#))
Date and time: Thursday 20th January 2022 or Thursday 3rd February 2022
Attendees: The Ven Megan Smith, the Revd Preb Terry Bloor
- 7.1.3 Baschurch, All Saints (Grade II*) [quin. inspector: Tim Ratcliffe, project architect: Michael Randall]
New accessible toilet under the west tower (OFS [2021-067433](#)) (see item 4.1.2 above)
Date and time: To be confirmed
Attendees: The Ven Paul Thomas, Andy Foster, and other members to be confirmed

7.1.4 Rangemore, All Saints (Grade II*) [quin. inspector: Simon Smith]
Development of nave aisle to meet the needs of parish community (OFS [2021-067216](#))
Date and time: To be confirmed
Attendees: To be confirmed

7.1.5 Sandon, All Saints (Grade I) [quin. inspector: Adrian Mathias]
Proposed reordering/conservation repair project. The parish has made a successful Expression of Interest to the National Lottery Heritage Fund, with a view to making a Development Phase application in early 2022
Date and time: To be confirmed
Attendees: To be confirmed

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

7.2 DAC Site Visit Reports for Approval

7.2.1 Ightfield, St John the Baptist (Grade II*)
Provision of kitchen and toilet facilities (OFS [2020-048392](#); note also [2019-043924](#), removal of pews in nave north aisle), 2nd November 2021 (Giles Standing)

7.2.2 Whittington, St Giles (Grade II)
Reordering of west end and relocation of font (OFS [2021-058625](#)), 4th November 2021 (Giles Standing)

7.2.3 Willenhall, St Giles (Grade II)
Develop the back of the church and improve the heating (OFS [2020-055875](#)), 16th November 2021 (Giles Standing) (see item 4.1.3 above)

Decision: The reports were approved with some minor amendments

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the reports to the parishes

7.3 DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports for Approval

7.3.1 Stonnall, St Peter (heating), 7th October 2021 (Emma Varney)

Decision: The report was not approved

Action: The DAC Secretary to liaise with the parish and DAC Heating Adviser

7.3.2 Lichfield, St Chad (lighting), 27th October 2021 (Brough Skingley)

7.3.3 Church Aston, St Andrew (organ), 4th November 2021 (Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat)

Decision: The reports were approved without amendment

Action: The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the reports to the parishes

7.4 DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports to Note

7.4.1 Church Aston, St Andrew (trees), 15th October 2021 (Andy Smith)

7.4.2 Woore, St Leonard (trees), 15th October 2021 (Andy Smith)

7.4.3 Willenhall, St Giles (heating), Sept/Nov 2021 (Andrew Baker)

7.4.4 Walsall, St John, The Pleck and Bescot (heating), Oct/Nov 2021 (Andrew Baker)

7.4.5 Walsall, St Luke (heating), Oct/Nov 2021 (Andrew Baker)

Decision: The reports were noted

Action: None

8. **Quinquennial Inspector Applications**

The following applications from PCCs, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, are to be 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 Ashley, St John Baptist (Grade II*; CHR ref. [620267](#))
- 8.2 Mucklestone, St Mary (Grade II*; CHR ref. [620283](#))
- 8.3 Croxton, St Paul (Grade II; CHR ref. [620273](#))
- 8.4 Wolverhampton, Pond Lane Mission Hall (unlisted; CHR ref. [620225](#))

Decision: To process the applications by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018

Action: The DAC Secretary to liaise with a DAC architect member and to inform the applicants of the resultant advice, being that of the DAC

9. **Any Other Business**

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday, 23rd February 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