Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

MINUTES

A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held in person (not by online conferencing)
in the Reeve Room at St Mary's House, Cathedral Close, Lichfield
on Wednesday 16th July 2025 at 2.00 pm

1. Introduction

1.1 The opening prayer was said by the Ven Nick Watson (Archdeacon of Salop).

1.2 Present: The Revd Phillip Johnson (DAC Chair), the Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair), the Ven Nick Watson, the Revd Lynn McKeon (Assistant Archdeacon of Lichfield), the Revd Preb Terry Bloor (Associate Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent), Chris Gill, the Revd Geoffrey Eze, Andy Foster, the Revd Preb Pat Hawkins, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Ed Higgins, Bryan Martin, Mark Stewart, Peter Woollam.
In attendance: Sam Rushton (Diocesan Secretary & CEO), the Revd Preb Jim Trood (Associate Archdeacon of Walsall), Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Felicity McWilliams (DAC Casework Officer), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Clerk), Rosie Nightingale (Diocesan Registry Clerk).

1.3 Apologies for absence: The Ven Dr Sue Weller, the Ven Liz Jackson, the Revd Preb Simon Davis (Assistant Archdeacon of Lichfield), the Revd Preb Jo Farnworth (Associate Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Margaret Brighton, Dr John Hunt, Adrian Mathias, Candida Pino, Dr Andy Wigley.

1.4 Declarations of interest: The Revd Lynn McKeon, item 6.2.1; Candida Pino, item 9.2.1; the Revd Preb Pat Hawkins, item 9.3.1.

1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

2. Matters arising

None this meeting

3. New matters

3.1 Commencement in post of Dr Felicity McWilliams as new full-time DAC Casework Officer for delegated authority faculty applications (3rd July 2025)

Decision: The DAC Chair extended a formal welcome to the new DAC Casework Officer (observing at this meeting)

3.2 DAC advice sought by the Diocesan Chancellor on proposed new Churchyard Regulations, i.e. churchyard memorial permissions

Decision: The matter was noted
Action: The DAC members to submit comments on the proposal via the DAC Secretary

4. Adviser site visit reports

4.1 Reports for approval

The following reports relate to prospective or submitted proposals which accord with the

DIOCESE OF LICHFIELD

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 Wheaton Aston, St Mary (trees), 27th June 2025 (Andy Smith)
(Lichfield Archdeaconry)

Decision: The report was noted
Action: None

5. Forthcoming DAC site visits

Site visits to be undertaken in accordance with the DAC and adviser site visits procedure

5.1 Lichfield, St Michael (Grade II*) [quin. inspector: Adrian Mathias]
(Lichfield Archdeaconry)
Extension to south side of church, to provide rooms to replace church hall and office facilities (now demolished, on another site) (OFS 2022-069439) – last considered at 3rd April 2025 DAC meeting
Date and time (to be confirmed): 23rd July 2025 or 30th July 2025 (10 am or 2 pm)

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. Lichfield 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:	2024-107241	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620029	Church Name:	Gentleshaw: Christ Church
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Gentleshaw

Applicant Name:	Revd Linda McKeon	Quin. Inspector:	Graham Holland
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	01-Oct-2018
Proposal:	Reordering west end of nave, and glazing and draught-proofing inner west doors		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£10,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee did not wholly support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the internal setting and layout of the church building had not yet been fully identified and justified, pending further development and submission of the scheme for formal (statutory) DAC advice. However, in relation to which, and in accordance with rule 4.4 of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023, Statements of Significance and Needs are not required to be submitted as part of a faculty application for a church building that is not listed.

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

1. *Draught stripping west doors and glazing upper panels*: The Committee considered this aspect of the proposal to be supportable and uncontroversial. However, the upper panels appear already to be glazed in the photos submitted. It was queried whether the fitting of safety glass is therefore intended, but which is not referred to on the detail drawing. Clarification on this point should be provided.
2. *Removal of pews*: The DAC understands that approximately half of the existing pews are proposed to be removed, and as such the effect would be transformative and open plan. However, the view was expressed that the pews are of no specific significance, and it was noted that pews from the cleared area would be used to replace pews of lesser quality elsewhere.
3. *Carpeting the cleared areas*: The Committee observed that red-coloured carpet already exists in the adjacent narthex and centre aisle, but that its addition in the cleared area would give a very sizeable overall expanse. The view was expressed that this would arguably be more suited to a more domestic environment. A more neutral colour carpet (such as stone grey) may assist in lessening the impact in this specific area of the church, but which conversely could lead to a loss in visual unity. Detail of the boarded areas that would be covered should also be provided, noting that if these are suspended floors, they need to breathe (to avoid dry rot).
4. *New chairs*: The DAC noted the proposal to acquire more of the chairs already used in the church, which are fully upholstered, and to match the red carpet. Whilst their introduction could be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of List A matter A5(9) (i.e. not requiring faculty permission), the DAC considers the proposed chairs to be an integral part of the reordering put forward and therefore to fall under the present faculty.
5. With this in mind, though, the view was expressed that these chairs are ill-proportioned and inappropriate to their setting. It was recommended that the parish should give greater consideration to how moveable or stackable the chairs are, as well as how they will be stored, in order to that the intention of the cleared area as a flexible space can be fulfilled. It was suggested that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on seating (2018) on all of these aspects accordingly.

It was determined that external formal consultation under rule 4.5 the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is not applicable, as the church building is not listed. As such, the

proposal will receive the formal (statutory) advice of the DAC only. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

6.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

6.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

7. Walsall 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)*

Unlisted

7.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-093044	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620190	Church Name:	West Bromwich: Holy Trinity
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Holy Trinity, West Bromwich
Applicant Name:	Revd Neil Robbie	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper (retd) [project architect: Jeremy Bell]
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	02-Apr-2019

Proposal:	Reordering to improve access and heating		
No. of Times to DAC:	Fifth	Cost Est:	£1,026,330
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 4th June 2025 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents.

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

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

1. The Committee carefully considered the written and illustrated response from the parish's project architect to the points raised in the informal DAC advice arising from 4th June 2025 DAC meeting.
2. In relation to which, the following advice of the Committee continues to be limited to comments and queries relating to details (i.e. on an agreed architectural form).
3. The DAC offered the following advice on points 4–10 in the project architect's response, which itself mirrors the numbered points in the preceding informal DAC advice. The advice below should therefore be read alongside the project architect's response accordingly.
4. *Previous point 4*: The Committee confirmed that a number of details are still awaited, and which cannot be conditioned at the next, i.e. formal, advice stage. The DAC noted that the project architect will provide additional details as part of RIBA Stage 4 drawings to be submitted in due course.
5. *Previous point 5*: The DAC observed that there is no notation on the detail provided as to the depth of construction. However, the roof joists and roof deck appear to be only 300mm in depth. The project architect has suggested that with a build-up of 920mm there would only be a 500mm opening height left – this could be shown more fully in an overall section through the height of the window and floor level.
6. *Previous point 6*: The Committee was grateful for the photographs in the project architect's written response. The DAC determined that each opening has a stained glass window beneath balcony level only, with clear leaded lights above. It would be acceptable to relocate to the one available window to the south. However, details are required of how the other windows are to be repositioned and where.
7. *Previous point 7*: The DAC observed that there are small window openings to remain beneath the balcony, as shown in drawing BROM 02.134 Section E-E. These are small but will permit natural light in above the new external roof. This relates to point 5 above and potential for more glazing. The Committee resolved that the natural lighting in this area is a decision for the parish.
8. *Previous point 8*: The Committee understands that the new framed lights will sit on the line of the existing leaded light, and the leaded light will be reinstated internally. In relation to which, an existing section to compare would be useful. The DAC awaits details to show

how the framing is to be sized and integrated, 'so that the windows look the same as they did from the inside and the outside', as per the project architect's response.

9. *Previous point 9*: The DAC confirmed that details are required in order to make an assessment, as per point 8 above.
10. *Previous point 10*: The project architect has indicated that the current drawings are at RIBA Stage 2. The DAC affirmed, as per point 4 above, that faculty permission cannot be conditioned. Details are required for discussion and faculty consent. This will include outline construction details of kitchen fittings/servery, glass screen and doors, joinery details, sunken baptistry, lift, balustrades, internal partitions, external ramp and covered porch (none of which are shown on the existing plan).
11. In addition to these specific points, the Committee offered the general advice that the project architect's present response includes such references as 'propose to' and 'probably be', in relation to e.g. existing and new windows, as per point 9, which supposition should be avoided in the final (written and drawn) submission.

It was determined that external formal consultation under rule 4.5 the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable, as the church building is not listed. As such, the proposal will receive the formal (statutory) advice of the DAC only. The Committee suggested that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice. The PCC should note that this does not remove any requirement for planning permission or other secular statutory consent, 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

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. Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry

8.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

Grade II

8.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2025-115079	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:	06-Dec-2018
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	Andrew Capper (retd)
Proposal:	Installation of a portable outdoor fully-accessible toilet facility		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£30,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC has previously given formal advice on a proposal for the provision of accessible toilet facilities and a refreshment bar at the west end of the church (OFS 2019-036058), which faculty was granted on 5th February 2020, and subsequently subject to an amendment to faculty on 7th January 2022 and an extension to the same on 4th October 2024 (extant until 4th October 2026).

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the new proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, for a standalone wood-clad accessible toilet facility in the churchyard, which has been put forward by the PCC on grounds of cost. 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 recognised that the proposed unit would provide a much-needed toilet facility, and understands that the parish has identified that the cost of the original scheme is now considered to be prohibitive. In relation to which, the DAC also recognises that the new proposal is a cheaper option.
2. It was noted, however, that only one external location had been proposed, rather than an options appraisal. In relation to which, given the close proximity of the unit to the listed church building, and its size at 8ft^2, concern was raised regarding the visual impact of the facility on the church and the churchyard setting, both at a distance and up close.
3. The Committee expressed the view that the proposed toilet facility 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, albeit that provision is planned to be made for a separate ramp.
4. Related to which, it was observed that as an external facility, away from main church entrance, other issues of access may pertain, including the ability or otherwise of users to

locate the unit in the dark, or to safely and conveniently access the facility during adverse weather conditions, in all seasons. It was suggested that such matters have a pastoral and missional dimension alongside.

5. The Committee additionally cautioned that the proposed septic tank would need to be emptied some distance from the frontal road access, which situation would need to be checked with the suppliers.
6. It was suggested that there could be potential archaeological sensitivity at the identified location for installation, potentially requiring archaeological mitigation. It was also identified that additional consideration would be required to bringing power to the cabin, presently proposed through a broken or missing church window, which is unsatisfactory.
7. 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.
8. Overall, after careful consideration of the issue of cost, the DAC recommended that the PCC should revisit the current internal scheme, under the faculty already granted, perhaps seeking an additional professional view on the present costings.

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 the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer). The PCC should note that this is a separate undertaking from seeking planning permission.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

8.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

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

*Grade II**

8.5.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-082416	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620267	Church Name:	Ashley: St John Baptist

Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Ashley
Applicant Name:	Noel Brown	Quin. Inspector:	Stephen Hart
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	16-Aug-2022
Proposal:	Build a Memorial Wall and extend the Area for the Burial of Cremated Remains (ABCR)		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£80,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee did not wholly support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the setting of the listed church building had not been fully identified and justified. In relation to which, the DAC encouraged the parish to develop focussed Statements of Significance and Needs, also to serve as a written rationale for the overall proposal, and recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on Statements.

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

1. The Committee recognised that the centrepiece of the proposal is a new retaining wall, along the line of the existing timber plank retaining wall. The new wall is to be of mottled Hollington stone, and to include three rows of applied memorial stones to the east elevation and two rows to the west elevation.
2. Whilst not directly referred to in the submission, this proposal is considered to have been brought forward in relation to the Chancellor's Churchyard Regulations (2013), and specifically the requirements relating to memorialisation within an Area for the Burial of Cremated Remains (ABCR). The Regulations indicate (p. 9) that 'The normal approach will be to require the points of interment to be unmarked and for a single collective memorial, or if there are to be individual memorials for these to be placed on a wall or equivalent structure (which could be the collective memorial itself)'.
3. It was noted, however, that only one location for the memorial wall has been proposed, rather than an options appraisal. In relation to which, given the proximity of this feature to the listed church building, and its size (both width and height), concern was raised regarding the visual impact of the installation on the churchyard setting, both at a distance and up close.
4. As such, the Committee determined that whilst in principle the positioning of a structure in this location could be acceptable, there will need to be additional information provided with regard to the impact on the setting of the Grade II* listed church and whether other locations have been considered. It was noted that the Harding memorial to the south of the church is also Grade II listed.
5. The proposed location appears to be on the boundary of the original churchyard. As such, there may be archaeological issues with the proposed structure that will need to be addressed. The DAC encouraged the parish to seek advice from the DAC Archaeology Adviser (via the DAC Secretary) accordingly.
6. It was also observed that some trees will be affected by the proposal. The DAC noted that the DAC Tree Adviser has been consulted (constituting a site visit report) prior to the submission of the application, and that no specific objections had been raised.
7. 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.

8. In relation to the individual stone memorial plaques themselves, to be applied to the wall, concern was raised by the DAC regarding their dimensions, and thereby their physical and visual dominance, also in relation to the more standard size of individual memorials where they are granted in ABCRs (i.e. small square tablets). The cost of such substantial individual memorials, in Hollington stone, for the families or heirs-at-law, was similarly queried.
9. Lastly, the incorporation of some flower vases on the wall, but only in limited number, was also queried, as this appears to be only partial provision for the number of memorials envisaged over time (i.e. issues around fair use).

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

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

8.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

9. Salop Archdeaconry

9.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

*Grade II**

9.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2025-109469	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620577	Church Name:	Eyton: St Catherine
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Wellington with Eyton
Applicant Name:	Revd Tim Carter	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall [project architect: Candida Pino]
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	02-Aug-2024
Proposal:	Construction of an extension to the north side of the tower to house an		

	accessible toilet facility, with associated groundworks for water and waste connections to adjoining property		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 3rd April 2025 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 updated Statement of Significance. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and setting of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified.

The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statement of Significance, and specifically the 'Impact of the proposal' section in the submitted Statement, in relation to the external parts of the church building, and their immediate setting, where the extension is proposed to be sited. It suggested that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on Statements.

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

1. The Committee continued to support the parish's stated needs for an accessible toilet facility at the church, in both pastoral and missional terms.
2. The DAC recognised that the quinquennial inspector (QI architect) had responded to the Committee's previous request for a fuller options appraisal, to confirm the most beneficial, and least harmful, location for such a facility, as well as a more developed version of the tower proposal.
3. The Committee observed that three options (A–C) had been developed to review the footprint and size of the proposed extension, further to the DAC's query as to whether the annexe requires a lobby and a storage area in addition to the primary toilet facility.
4. It was determined that the PCC and QI architect had resolved that Option A, in relation to the ground plan for the extension, would be taken forward.
5. The DAC had previously raised concerns regarding the very large roof, with steep pitch, in the original design, which would have been highly impactful. Instead, a revised design (elevation sketch drawing dated June 2025) has been put forward by the QI architect.
6. In relation to which, the revised hipped roof form is a notable improvement, offering a more harmonious fit with the overall building. The assumed proposed materials – brick, stone, and a tiled roof – are appropriate and consistent with the architectural character.
7. However, the treatment of the fenestration raised some concerns. The combination of a small window and a corresponding blind recess appears unresolved. It is assumed that the absence of a kitchen window is due to the requirement for wall-mounted cupboards, though this design decision could benefit from further clarification. As the extension is asymmetrical (to the tower), the blank window could be omitted without damage to the design.
8. Additionally, the detailing around the smaller stone sections framing the opening is unclear and may not be successful in execution. A simpler solution, such as placing a single window on the north elevation, might offer a more coherent resolution.
9. Separately, the DAC Archaeology Adviser (in absentia) had previously noted that the present church replaced an earlier church on the site, and that there is some archaeological

sensitivity accordingly. In relation to which, an archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) will be required as a first step to appraising the archaeological potential, including at the base of the tower.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice, and that external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England, the Georgian Group, and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer).

In addition to which, it was recommended that the parish should seek pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority on planning permission, which matter is separate from, but can be run alongside, the faculty application.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

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

None this meeting

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

Grade I

9.3.1

OFS Application Ref:	2025-115548	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620487	Church Name:	Ellesmere: St Mary
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Ellesmere
Applicant Name:	Revd Preb Pat Hawkins	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Jan-2022
Proposal:	To decommission the Gilbert Scott font, leaving it in situ, and introduce a new portable font		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£1,940
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 internal setting of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

Specifically, the DAC recognised that the proposal principally seeks to regularise an existing practice. In relation to which, it was noted that the Scott font is significant, but relatively unusable with its sizable cover, and is not easily visible from the main body of the church. The baptistery is too small for a modern baptism congregation. For pastoral and evangelistic reasons, which carry considerable weight with the PCC, current practice is to use a portable font.

The proposal seeks to establish the current practice, decommissioning the historic font, whilst leaving it in situ as a missional and educational aid, and providing a new portable font. The latter appears to be of good quality and is of a design widely used. No harm is to be done to the fabric of the church by this proposal, but which is considered will significantly enhance the life and worship of the parish.

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.

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

*Grade II**

9.3.2

Case Reference No.:	2024-100697	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620531	Church Name:	Welsh Frankton: St Andrew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Welsh Frankton
Applicant Name:	Helen Richardson	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	01-Jul-2021
Proposal:	Fit a handrail to the chancel steps to aid accessibility		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second (first as formal)	Cost Est:	£1,125
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 2nd October 2024 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the updated proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had been sufficiently identified and justified.

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

1. The Committee reaffirmed its previous view that the proposal to fit a handrail to the chancel steps to aid accessibility would constitute a significant health and safety improvement for the worshipping congregation at the church.
2. The DAC understands that a DAC architect has reviewed an updated proposal under the delegated authority faculty procedure, between DAC meetings, in order to seek to assist the parish in resolving its proposal for approval under faculty.
3. Further to which process, the specialist contractor has submitted a summary document of the development of the proposed handrail, including the latest design submitted for the present DAC meeting.

4. The Committee carefully considered the new information provided, in the context of the points raised in the informal DAC advice arising from 2nd October 2024 meeting.
5. In relation to which, the Committee continued to express concern regarding the form and operation of the proposed handrail. Seeking to assist the parish in progressing its proposal, the DAC resolved that the solution at nearby Welshampton, St Michael and All Angels (Grade II), cited as a model by the parish, was not actually comparable, as the interior at that church is more traditionally Victorian, with a bespoke handrail to match.
6. A DAC architect member instead redirected the parish to the fact that the interior of Welsh Frankton, St Andrew (Grade II*), and specifically the screen wall either side the steps, as well as the architecture and furniture beyond, is more monumental. A handrail design which is simple and straightforward, constituting uprights and a rail, should be introduced at this location accordingly.
7. Further to which, the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies upheld their original view that the decoration on the handrail, and mid-rail beneath, should be made less ornate, in order to give way to the significant (listed) original church interior at that location.
8. The Committee also observed that the current proposal did not include specific details of the method of fixing the handrail into the floor and/or for its removal. The sketch drawings provided, including the latest engineering drawing, do not depict the socket fixing and are therefore insufficient to determine how the handrail is to be fixed. These drawings do not demonstrate compliance with Building Regulations.
9. It was observed that the contractor has raised their own queries, including whether the handrail needs to be removable (as specified by the parish), whether the handrail should have a middle (third) post (as recommended by the DAC) due to the extra weight for lifting during removal, and whether the handrail would now be installed in the centre of the steps as a carpet runner in the centre aisle was not present when the work was first quoted for.
10. Overall, the Committee determined that the parish should address all the above issues through consultation with its quinquennial inspector (QI architect), as professional adviser to the PCC, including with a view that the architect might undertake their own design for a bespoke handrail.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is not applicable. As such, the Committee indicated that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

The Committee resolved that the giving of formal DAC advice could be processed by delegated authority, in accordance with the Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy (Amended October 2023). In relation to the current submission, the Committee would not recommend the proposal.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant, and to process the giving of formal DAC advice by delegated authority through consultation with a DAC architect member

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

None this meeting

10. Casework by delegated authority to note

10.1 Faculty applications

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

10.1.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-090473	Church Name:	Blithfield: St Leonard
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Conservation of the west window and tower windows, which contain fragments of medieval glass, and the installation of internally ventilated environmental protective glazing [confirmation of final details under delegated authority]		
DAC Consultee:	Candida Pino	Date NoA Issued:	11th June 2025

10.1.2

OFS Application Ref:	2025-109282	Church Name:	Bradwell: St Barnabas
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Replacement of old and damaged wooden entrance doors to the church and church hall, and installation of 16 LED bulkhead lights with built in DTD sensor externally around the building		
DAC Consultees:	Mark Stewart; Heather Loosemore†	Date NoA Issued:	23rd June 2025

10.1.3

OFS Application Ref:	2025-110748	Church Name:	Caverswall: St Peter
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Repairs to dislodged gatepost and damaged boundary wall		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	23rd June 2025

10.1.4

OFS Application Ref:	2024-101398	Church Name:	Kings Bromley, All Saints
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Installation of an electric under-pew heating system, within the nave, south aisle, and chancel (choir stalls)		
DAC Consultees:	Malcolm Price; Andy Foster	Date NoA Issued:	23rd June 2025

10.1.5

OFS Application Ref:	2025-111078	Church Name:	Hanford: St Matthias
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent

Proposal:	Felling of a tree in the churchyard with a vertical split in the trunk following storm damage (granted under interim faculty no. 5332)		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	25th June 2025

10.1.6

OFS Application Ref:	2025-112921	Church Name:	Stafford, St Chad
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Works to proposed elevation of wall plate of north aisle (interim faculty no. 5316)		
DAC Consultee:	Candida Pino	Date NoA Issued:	25th June 2025

10.1.7

OFS Application Ref:	2025-108700	Church Name:	Darlaston: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Removal of ground that is causing damp to penetrate walls in the choir vestry and construction of a concrete block retaining wall		
DAC Consultee:	Bryan Martin	Date NoA Issued:	27th June 2025

10.1.8

OFS Application Ref:	2024-105288	Church Name:	Wrockwardine Wood: Holy Trinity
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Installation of automatic winding system and pendulum regulator to tower clock		
DAC Consultee:	Robert Ovens†	Date NoA Issued:	27th June 2025

10.1.9

OFS Application Ref:	2024-097887	Church Name:	Mavesyn Ridware: St Nicholas
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Electrical rewiring of Trinity Aisle and replacement of light fittings, rewiring of nave ceiling lights, and replacement of main fuse board		
DAC Consultees:	Tim Bowden; Heather Loosemore†	Date NoA Issued:	30th June 2025

10.1.10

OFS Application Ref:	2022-074898	Church Name:	Bednall: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Repairs to boundary wall following collision by farm contractor (granted under interim faculty no. 5030)		
DAC Consultee:	Candida Pino	Date NoA Issued:	9th July 2025

10.1.11

OFS Application Ref:	2024-101231	Church Name:	Bloxwich: All Saints
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Confirmatory installation of broadband cabling into church building		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Woollam	Date NoA Issued:	9th July 2025

10.1.12

OFS Application Ref:	2025-111339	Church Name:	Cheswardine: St Swithun
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Archaeological investigation comprising 3 trial pits in churchyard, to inform wider proposal for external access ramp system (separate faculty application 2023-083734) [NoA of 23rd May 2025 reissued following revision to application by parish]		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	9th July 2025

† 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 Weston-upon-Trent, St Andrew (Grade II*), Philip Wootton proposed inspector
10.2.2 Beckbury, St Milburga (Grade II*), Candida Pino proposed inspector
10.2.3 Hilderstone, Christ Church (Grade II), Philip Wootton proposed inspector
10.2.4 Shelton, St Mark (Grade II), Edward Kepczyk proposed inspector
10.2.5 Bramshall, St Lawrence (Grade II), Valeria Passetti proposed inspector

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

11. Any other business

11.1 Chancellor's judgment arising from delegated authority consultation: OFS 2025-108809, Darlaston, All Saints (11th July 2025)

A DAC architect raised a matter relating to faculty application 2025-108809, having previously been consulted on that case under the Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy (Amended October 2023), and having given formal advice, on behalf of the DAC, to not recommend the works for approval.

These works had already been completed, in accordance with the permission granted by the Deputy Diocesan Chancellor under interim faculty no. 5337 on 21st January 2025. The current confirmatory faculty is required, as standard, to uphold the works undertaken.

At the present meeting, it was highlighted that the Diocesan Chancellor had published a written judgment (Neutral Citation No. [2025] ECC Lic 1) on 11th July 2025, alongside the granting of the confirmatory faculty, with reasoning for the non-adoption of that DAC advice in the present grant of faculty.

In connection with which, the DAC architect recommended that the policy for seeking DAC advice, or otherwise, on interim faculty applications, that is prior to emergency works

being granted, might be reviewed, with a view that DAC architects might be invited to give advice on such cases at the time of the interim faculty application itself, rather than afterwards, that is potentially following the completion of works.

Action: The DAC Secretary to liaise with the Diocesan Registry Clerks accordingly

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 24th September 2025 at 2.00 pm**
to be held by online conferencing

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

Felicity McWilliams, DAC Casework Officer
felicity.mcwilliams@lichfield.anglican.org