

Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

MINUTES

*A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held by online conferencing
on Wednesday 24th July 2024 at 2.00 pm*

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The opening prayer was said by the Revd Mary Thomas (Acting Archdeacon of Salop).
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven Dr Sue Weller, the Revd Julia Cody (Acting Archdeacon of Walsall), the Revd Preb Jo Farnworth (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Mary Thomas (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, Andy Foster, Edward Higgins, Dr John Hunt, Bryan Martin, Dr Andy Wigley, Peter Woollam. In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant), Rosie Nightingale (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: The Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair), the Revd Margaret Brighton, the Revd Geoffrey Eze, Chris Gill, the Revd Neil Hibbins, the Revd Dr David Isiorho, Adrian Mathias, Candida Pino, Mark Stewart.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Candida Pino, item 7.3.2; Bryan Martin, item 9.3.2.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

2. Matters arising

- 2.1 [Expressions of interest](#) sought for DAC advisers on lighting, electrics, audio-visual, CCTV, and clocks (vacancies)

Decision: The matter was noted

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

3. New matters

- 3.1 Cessation of the Revd Neil Hibbins as DAC member appointed from elected members of Diocesan Synod and continuation as ordinary (clergy) member by co-option, 5th July 2024
- 3.2 Cessation of the Revd Margaret Brighton as ordinary member with accessibility focus (casual vacancy) and continuation in new statutory role as member for accessibility, 5th July 2024

Decision: The matters were noted

Action: None

4. Adviser site visit reports

4.1 Reports for approval

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

None this meeting

4.2 Reports to note

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

- 4.2.1 Hadnall, St Mary Magdalene (trees), 11th June 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Salop Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.2 Brereton, St Michael (trees), 14th June 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Lichfield Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.3 Hollington, St John the Evangelist (trees), 19th June 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.4 Short Heath (Willenhall), Holy Trinity (trees), 20th June 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Walsall Archdeaconry)

Decision: The reports were noted

Action: None

5. Forthcoming DAC site visits

None this meeting

6.–9. Casework for consideration

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

6. Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry

6.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

Unlisted

6.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-089917	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620379	Church Name:	Derrington: St Matthew
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Derrington
Applicant Name:	Revd Catherine Brumfitt	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [ret'd]; Francis Turner [project architect]
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	10-Mar-2017
Proposal:	Accessible toilet, tea/coffee facility and pew removal		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 4th October 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the church building had not yet been fully identified and justified.

However, in relation to which, and in accordance with rule 4.4 of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022, Statements of Significance and Needs are not required to be submitted as part of a faculty application for a church building that is not listed. The Committee reaffirmed the view, however, that the church is of a quality that might be deemed to be worthy of being listed, such that its quality needs to be taken into consideration in its alteration and development.

The DAC confirmed that a number of the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been addressed, specifically through the increased detail in the design. In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following additional advice:

1. The Committee continued to commend the scheme and the consideration which the parish and quinquennial inspector (QI architect) had put into the proposal.
2. The DAC noted that the proposed toilet/kitchen enclosure is modelled on an existing cupboard opposite. The joinery design was considered to be neat and tidy, and that the proportions are fine. As such, the pod would fit reasonably well into the nave north-west corner, which is the most obvious and practical location within the main envelope.
3. However, the Committee questioned whether sufficient consideration had been given to re-working the boiler house, with a new connecting doorway through the main north wall. It was suggested that this location would also obviate or reduce the requirement for pew removal within the scheme.
4. The scheme proposes the retention of the majority of the pews, with a view to preserving the original character of the interior. However, the Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent commented that it would be an aesthetic improvement if the back edge of the pews on the north and south sides were in line, i.e. a balanced number of pews removed.
5. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies concurred with this view, but that the least number of pews possible should be removed. The Committee determined that one more pew should be left in, and for the pews to be evened up.
6. In relation to the affected memorials within the scheme, the DAC confirmed that these appear to be satisfactorily relocated in the updated proposal.
7. The DAC cautioned against the proposed application of non-breathing membranes and finishes to the flooring, which can push moisture into walls, and this should be addressed.
8. It was noted that the heating system will be unaffected, and is apparently capable of heating the new toilet compartment.
9. Detail about the location and form of the extract fan grille should be provided.
10. The drainage appears to be unresolved. A standard crate soakaway is proposed. However, the Committee cautioned that such soakaways are not usually designed for solid waste, or grey water, and which may not be acceptable to Building Control (whose informal view should be sought).
11. A connection to the mains appears to have been rejected due to the need for excavation and possibly levels, but which reasoning should be confirmed with further measurements and research.

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

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

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

6.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

6.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

Private faculty – Formal advice

6.6.1

OFS Application Ref:	N/A	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Closed Churchyards:	Alsagers Bank: St John Audley: St James Chesterton: Holy Trinity Kidsgrove: St Thomas Madeley: All Saints Mow Cop: St Thomas Mucklestone: St Mary Newcastle-under-Lyme: St George Newchapel: St James Talke: St Martin Wolstanton: St Margaret	Council Cemeteries:	Attwood Street (Kidsgrove) Cemetery Chesterton Cemetery Knutton Cemetery Madeley Cemetery Newcastle Cemetery Silverdale Cemetery
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Applicant Name:	Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council

Proposal:	Memorial safety testing – five-year rolling programme		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, which petition has been made by Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, which body is responsible for the maintenance of the closed churchyards and, as applicable, the consecrated areas of cemeteries within the proposal. The Committee supported the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the memorials, within the setting of the church buildings and in relation to the churchyards and cemeteries, had been sufficiently identified and justified.

The Committee suggested that the Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent, or the Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent, might expedite resolutions from those PCCs that have not to date responded within the application process.

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

Decision: Recommend with the following provisos:

- The operators should inform the respective PCCs at the commencement of the public consultation period, constituting the display of notices on individual affected memorials, of any memorials that are deemed to be unsafe and are intended to be laid flat, in order that the PCCs might facilitate making contact with any heirs-at-law to those memorials known to them.
- The operators should note that if any memorials are separately listed (i.e. on the National Heritage List for England (NHLE)), then a subsequent faculty should be sought for the proposed laying down, where required, of those memorials.

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

7. Salop Archdeaconry

7.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

Grade I

7.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2024-096029	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620614	Church Name:	Whitchurch: St Alkmund
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Whitchurch

Applicant Name:	Revd Christopher Precious	Quin. Inspector:	Edward Kepczyk [project architect: Nicholas Rank]
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Dec-2021
Proposal:	Installation of accessible toilet in north lobby (flower vestry), and automation of inner doors to north and south lobbies		
No. of Times to DAC:	First (in this form)	Cost Est:	£45,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal, for an amendment to the faculty granted (in 2023), as an application for informal advice at 26th July 2023 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal, which now includes the automation of the inner doors to the north and south lobbies, and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee confirmed that the majority of matters previously raised by its informal advice had been addressed. Specifically, it was noted that the QI architect has responded to the technical queries raised by the DAC in writing and with amendments to the design, which are largely acceptable. The detailing of the accessible toilet pod has now been illustrated and is to a suitably high quality.

The Committee reaffirmed that the need for additional toilets has previously been established and continues to be supported. However, the proposed works are invasive in part and will affect the original Georgian fabric. In relation to the development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following final advice:

1. A DAC architect member observed that whilst there is a physical alteration to the fabric requiring amendment to the base of the stair, and a visual alteration to the porch and the setting of the stair balustrade, there is a direct copy of this existing arrangement in the south lobby, which will be retained.
2. The DAC member nominated by the Local Government Association cautioned that if the pod were to be removed later in time, however, the two staircases would no longer match, in an unaltered way, as an historical entity.
3. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies supported the principle of the location for the pod, but expressed concern regarding the non-reversible changes proposed to the early-18th-century staircase joinery. It was recommended that the parish should seek the informal advice of the Georgian Group on these works.
4. Details are required of service and drainage connections. The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the site of the church has medieval origins and that there is potential for archaeological remains to be present if any significant service runs are required, e.g. to connect to foul drainage. An appropriate level of mitigation will be required, and further information should be provided.
5. In relation to the new works, the Committee noted that the automation of the doors replaces existing overhead door closers. The new automated closers are to be finished brown to match the doors. However, details of the cable runs between the opening device and the push pads are required.
6. In relation to which, the DAC recommended that wall-mounted controls would be preferable to post-mounts, on grounds of minimising impact on fabric and archaeology. The DAC member nominated by Historic England suggested that the controls might be mounted on the timber doors themselves.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the updated application should be resubmitted for external formal consultation with Historic England, the Georgian Group, and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

7.2.2

OFS Application Ref:	2024-099899	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620548	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Tong
Applicant Name:	Frederick Myerscough	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2024
Proposal:	Introduction of a wood-clad accessible toilet pod within the churchyard		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£20,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal for accessible toilet facilities as part of a broader faculty application for provision of a tea-point servery within the north-west corner of the nave and external drainage (OFS [2021-063282](#)), upon which the DAC has given formal advice (item 10.1.8 below). The proposal for external toilet facilities, then as an extension to the church building, was previously removed from that application, as remaining unresolved.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the new proposal, for provision of a standalone wood-clad accessible toilet pod in the churchyard, and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal for the introduction of a toilet facility at the church, but considered that the impact of the new proposal on the setting of the listed church building had not been fully identified and justified.

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

1. The Committee affirmed that various positions for an extension for an accessible toilet had previously been considered by the PCC and DAC, but that this is a cheaper option.
2. The DAC recognised that the proposed pod would provide a much-needed toilet facility, and noted that the parish plans to connect it to the mains drainage and water supply, which elements relate to the existing broader faculty application (as referred to above).
3. The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that the toilet pod will have the advantage of being freestanding and will not therefore require the construction of any foundations, with ground disturbance limited to creating drainage connections. It was noted that the schedule of works indicates that the excavation of the drainage runs will be subject to an archaeological watching brief.
4. The proposed siting of the facility, including the visual impact on the highly significant setting of the Grade I listed church and churchyard, is a considerable issue. The DAC observed that the new location is proposed immediately to the west of the main porch. In this position, the pod will be visible from a distance and will have a significant visual impact up close.

5. The Committee queried whether there were alternative locations to site such a unit, perhaps away from the foot of the building, ideally concealed by trees or vegetation. Alternatively, it was questioned whether its location could be softened with planting, although the paths look too tight.
6. It was recalled that a previously suggested location for a permanent installation, as a minor annexe, was to the east of the porch. The pod located here, and screened off, would be less conspicuous.
7. More broadly, the Committee expressed the view that the proposed toilet pod is a very utilitarian timber-clad box of no architectural merit. It was also cautioned that the facility does not appear to be fully accessible externally, with the requirement to step up/down into the unit.
8. The Committee resolved that, as a fully plumbed-in box, the proposed pod cannot be considered to be temporary in any way. Costs such as installing drainage runs should be invested instead in a permanent solution.
9. The PCC is advised that planning permission would be required for the present proposal, in addition to faculty permission, upon which advice should be sought from the Local Planning Authority.
10. Lastly, the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies reiterated the DAC's previous informal advice, relating to 30th November 2022 DAC meeting, for the PCC to give consideration to a stone-built, architect-designed minor extension, to house an accessible toilet, to the north aisle of the church.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the present scheme, if further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer). The PCC should note that this is a separate undertaking from seeking planning permission, where applicable.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

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

Grade I

7.3.1

OFS Application Ref:	2024-099996	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620568	Church Name:	Shrewsbury: St Chad
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	St Chad with St Mary Shrewsbury
Applicant Name:	Susan Kelly	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe

Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2019
Proposal:	Essential repair and refurbishment of inner vestibule lead roof, to incorporate terne-coated stainless steel, and plaster ceiling		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£186,233
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

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

The Committee resolved that the giving of informal DAC advice, and the determining of whether external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable, could be processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (Amended October 2023). Further to which, the application should advance to the giving of formal DAC advice accordingly.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

*Grade II**

7.3.2

OFS Application Ref:	2024-100272	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620543	Church Name:	Sheriffhales: St Mary
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Sheriffhales
Applicant Name:	Revd Chris Thorpe	Quin. Inspector:	Candida Pino
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	31-Aug-2022 [Andrew Arrol]
Proposal:	Internal repairs, drainage system upgrade, new downpipes/gutters, and bell frame repairs		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£150,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

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

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

- *New drainage to the tower roof:* The existing chutes are wetting the tower west wall. As such, re-forming the box gutters to fall to a new sump and a downpipe on the east wall is supported.
- *Replacement of rainwater goods:* This will be in good quality cast iron, and is again supported.
- *Replacement plaster:* This will be in traditional lime, and time is allowed for the wall to dry out before re-plastering, which is supported. The DAC member nominated by Historic

England suggested that archaeological recording (drawing masonry) should be undertaken if any significant exposure is planned, in relation to determining the structural history of the building. The QI architect should provide comment on the extent of exposure, in relation to the general arrangement drawings referred to in the schedule of works.

- *New drainage*: The new French drain will replace a defective existing system, and is supported. However, it is not clear if the other drain runs are existing, or proposed, or a mixture. The label 'assumed' on the main runs was highlighted as a concern, as this may mean there will be as yet unspecified works. The QI architect should clarify this point.
- The DAC Archaeology Adviser confirmed that archaeological monitoring of the excavation of a number of trial holes to investigate the existing drains revealed masonry remains of an early phase of the church at the base of the existing 18th-century tower.
- These findings indicate that there is potential for further such remains to be encountered during the laying of the proposed new French drain. Whilst no objections are raised to the proposed new drain, given the current drainage problems, an archaeological watching brief on the necessary groundworks should be secured.
- No archaeological objections are raised to the proposed removal of the c. 18th-century brick culvert on the south side of the nave and chancel, subject to archaeological recording.
- *Rehanging of the bells*: The DAC Bell Adviser has issued extensive informal advice to the QI architect, in relation to the current submission, which views the Committee endorsed at the present meeting. It was agreed that the 18th-century bell frame was badly designed (the bells all swinging in one direction, north–south) and is in a highly decayed state.
- The Committee may be minded to support the proposal for the removal, rather than repair, of the frame. However, an independent report or written opinion on the historic significance, or otherwise, of the frame is required. The DAC Bell Adviser indicated that they would seek advice from the Church Buildings Council (CBC), and other relevant parties or individuals, on how such a report may be origination (by the PCC).
- If disposal were supported, in light of such a report, and noting that the frame carries the date 1732, the Committee may seek to advise that the most indicative part of the frame should be retained for display elsewhere within the church.
- It was acknowledged that if the old frame were sought to be retained in situ, but the bells hung in a new metal frame below the louvres, then past precedent in the diocese indicates that the bells may be too quiet to be heard effectively.
- The current proposals for the tuning of the five 18th-century bells, and replacement of the sixth (additional) 19th-century bell, which is of low significance, were supported.
- Overall, it was suggested that the PCC give consideration to splitting off the bells/frame aspects from the broader fabric/archaeology elements of the faculty application, as a separate application for permission, in order to facilitate the additional research and reporting work, and the addition time, required regarding the frame.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee indicated that the application should be resubmitted for external formal consultation with Historic England and the Local Planning Authority (County Archaeologist), both in relation to the archaeological aspects of the scheme, and the Church Buildings Council (CBC), in relation to the existing bells and frame (as part of the current application or a separate one), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

7.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

7.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

8. Lichfield Archdeaconry

None this meeting

9. Walsall Archdeaconry

9.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

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

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

Grade II

9.3.1

OFS Application Ref:	2024-097772	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620156	Church Name:	Walsall: St Andrew, The Birchills
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	St Andrew Walsall
Applicant Name:	Angela Degg	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Hayward
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	14-Dec-2021
Proposal:	Repairs to roof and external fabric, 16 stained glass windows, organ (including temporary removal) and internal fabric, following fire damage (in March 2024)		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£155,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

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

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

1. *Roof repairs*: These will be confined to the south aisle, and comprise like-for-like repairs to tiling, roof timbers and rainwater goods. The proposed works are well specified and unproblematic.
2. *Internal repairs*: It appears that the full extent of required internal works has not yet been established, but the main repairs will primarily be new lime plastering. These works are again well specified and unproblematic.
3. *Repairs to stained glass*: The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies confirmed that the stained glass panels, by the noted Victorian firm of John Hardman & Co. of Birmingham, include saints rarely portrayed in English stained glass and are clearly specially commissioned for this church. The DAC observed that the damage appears very significant, but that the written specification is minimal. The Committee accordingly recommended that an historic glazing specialist undertakes the work, in consultation with the QI architect, which should be confirmed within the application.
4. *Repairs to the organ*: The DAC Organ Adviser cautioned that the report by Hawkins Organ Builders for removal, storing, and re-erecting the instrument is not very detailed. There is no information indicating whether the organ has previously been restored and, if so, when.
5. The instrument is by Walsall firm Nicholson & Lord, fine builders from 1878 until 1919, and most probably dates from the building of the church or thereabouts. The DAC Organ Adviser expressed some concern that perhaps more work will be needed when putting back. As this is a substantial undertaking, the Adviser strongly suggested that a second firm be invited to report and tender for professional comparison.
6. The [Institute of British Organ Building](#) (IBO) launched a technical advisory service in 2020, specifically designed to meet the needs of insurance companies and parishes. The IBO can also provide assistance and information in assessing proposals. The DAC Organ Adviser urged that the Institute be involved to help the parish and insurance company, with IBO contact details supplied upon request through the DAC Office.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee indicated that the application should be resubmitted for external formal consultation with the Church Buildings Council (CBC), in relation to the conservation of the stained glass, prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

9.3.2

OFS Application Ref:	2024-100286	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620208	Church Name:	Heath Town: Holy Trinity
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Holy Trinity, Heath Town
Applicant Name:	Revd Richard Merrick	Quin. Inspector:	Bryan Martin
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Oct-2021

Proposal:	Redevelopment of north porch and associated doors		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£48,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

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

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

1. The DAC confirmed that there is an identified access issue with the north porch, as the principal entrance into the church, with the heavy inner oak door particularly being inaccessible to wheelchair and related users. Whilst there is existing external level access, via a concrete ramp up to the porch, the operation of the porch doors is a considerable barrier to internal access.
2. The DAC acknowledged that if the inner door is pinned open, draughts in the winter months lead to tangible heat loss and the commensurate requirement for additional heat input (and associated costs). In relation to which, the parish is seeking to address this environmental, as well as accessibility, issue.
3. It was noted that the scheme includes a pair of new external and internal doors, with fully automated sliding doors into the porch entrance, but with the original heavy inner door retained and operated manually, proposed to be held back by ushers when the church is occupied.
4. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies queried whether the outer doors could be retained, rather than replaced with new doors, albeit that these are to be a copy of the existing. It is understood that the doors are required to be replaced in order to open outwards, rather than inwards as currently, to allow for the positioning of the automated sliding doors within.
5. It is also understood that the PCC originally wished to have both outer and inner automatic doors, but that an access consultant had identified that the doors could not be made to open and close rapidly enough, under safety regulations, to make an airlock.
6. Further to which, the DAC queried whether the church is open during the week, in addition to services, such that ushers might always be available to assist with facilitating access via the retained inner door. The Archdeacon of Lichfield, as former Archdeacon of Walsall, indicated that the church and nearby hall are both well used, including a hospitality area at the rear of the church, rather than the church being left open unattended. Equal access would be considered to be facilitated, therefore, at all times when the church is in use.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee indicated that the updated application should be resubmitted for external formal consultation with the Victorian Society and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer), prior to receipt of formal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

9.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

9.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

Amendment to faculty – Formal advice

9.6.1

OFS Application Ref:	N/A	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620124	Church Name:	Penn: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Penn
Applicant Name:	Richard Pithers	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Arrol
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Feb-2019
Proposal:	To leave the 94 headstones that have not been re-erected flat on the ground – amendment to faculty 2018-026971 (original faculty granted on 20th June 2019)		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third (in this form)	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal, for an amendment to the faculty granted (in 2019), as an application for formal advice at 5th June 2024 DAC meeting, when the Committee deferred the giving of formal advice. At that meeting, the Committee indicated that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for final, formal DAC advice.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee’s deferral advice had been addressed. These include possible trip hazards, sharp corners, and signage, with a professional risk assessment, discussion with the stonemason, and confirmation of regular maintenance of the churchyard.

The Archdeacon of Lichfield, as former Archdeacon of Walsall, reaffirmed that this has been a longstanding and carefully thought through process after the initial mass toppling of memorials during topple-testing.

The DAC confirmed that its advice in this case is based on the particular circumstances of this churchyard, and that the proposal is the least unsatisfactory option to address the current situation. As such, this advice does not constitute a precedent for other churchyard memorials or risk-management regimes.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is not applicable. As such, the Committee resolved to recommend the proposal with provisos.

Decision: Recommend with the following provisos:

- In relation to the proposed signage, within the Conservation Area, the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 should be complied with, in liaison with the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer).

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

10. Casework by delegated authority to note

10.1 Faculty applications

The following 'minor' faculty cases, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018 and the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (Amended October 2023), on behalf of the full DAC

10.1.1

OFS Application Ref:	2024-098179	Church Name:	Chase Terrace: St John's Community Church
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Conservation cleaning of Grade-II-listed marble war memorial		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	1st July 2024

10.1.2

OFS Application Ref:	2023-090253	Church Name:	Prees: St Chad
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Conservation repairs to the 'Battlefield' stained glass window		
DAC Consultee:	Candida Pino	Date NoA Issued:	1st July 2024

10.1.3

OFS Application Ref:	2023-092687	Church Name:	Sandon: All Saints
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Introduction of a metal maintenance shed in churchyard		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	1st July 2024

10.1.4

OFS Application Ref:	2024-098628	Church Name:	Dilhorne: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Fit a pendulum regulator to the church clock		
DAC Consultee:	Robert Ovens†	Date NoA Issued:	1st July 2024

10.1.5

OFS Application Ref:	2024-097336	Church Name:	Stoke-upon-Tern: St Peter
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Salop

Proposal:	Replace broken and obsolete church clock winding mechanism (autowind)		
DAC Consultee:	Rupert Griffint	Date NoA Issued:	1st July 2024

10.1.6

OFS Application Ref:	2024-099200	Church Name:	Trefonen: All Saints
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Repair to bell-cote and rehanging of bell with electric clapper		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Woollam	Date NoA Issued:	15th July 2024

10.1.7

OFS Application Ref:	2024-100252	Church Name:	Stramshall: St Michael & All Angels
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Replacement of a land drain pipe in the churchyard (granted under interim faculty no. 5221)		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	15th July 2024

10.1.8

OFS Application Ref:	2021-063282	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Provision of tea-point servery within north-west corner of nave, including disposal of a 19th-century pew, and external drainage [toilet facilities removed from proposal] [confirmation of technical details under delegated authority]		
DAC Consultees:	Adrian Mathias; Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	16th July 2024

10.1.9

OFS Application Ref:	2024-093687	Church Name:	Shrewsbury: Holy Cross
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Introduction of a suspended timber floor in the choir vestry, and two associated screens with lockable doors [confirmation of technical details under delegated authority]		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	16th July 2024

† Acting DAC Adviser

Decision: The faculty applications processed by delegated authority were noted

Action: None

10.2 Quinquennial inspector applications

The following applications from PCCs, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, have been processed by [delegated authority](#), in accordance with the [Lichfield Diocesan Scheme for the Inspection of Churches](#) (Amended June 2022) and the [Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy](#) (Amended October 2023), on behalf of the full DAC

10.2.1 Clive, All Saints (Grade II*), Candida Pino proposed inspector

10.2.2 Hadnall, St Mary Magdalene (Grade II*), Candida Pino proposed inspector

10.2.3 Astley, St Mary (Grade II*), Candida Pino proposed inspector

10.2.4 Grinshill, All Saints (Grade II), Candida Pino proposed inspector

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

Action: None

11. Any other business

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 2nd October 2024 at 2.00 pm**

to be held by online conferencing

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary

giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 221152

Helen Cook, Assistant DAC Secretary

helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 221155