

Christleton St James - Correspondence with parish and others

Date	Message
07/10/2020 To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier	<p>I suspect a phone call is going to be easier, though am not around until Friday afternoon now due to an induction and residential. But, perhaps by way of preparation.</p> <p>We have had some drawings done by our QA Re developing the inside of the church. His, Tony Barton, recommendation is for a preliminary DAV visit to discuss them. Would this be possible please? If so, please can we think about dates and times, and any other requirements. Thank you.</p>
09/10/2020 To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton	<p>Thank you for your message. The DAC is always keen to be involved in proposals at an early stage and will be very interested to see the church development scheme. I tried to call this afternoon to have a chat about the development proposals - I'll try again on Monday.</p> <p>Please could you send me the drawings that Tony Barton has done. That will be very helpful for when we speak.</p> <p>Also, just so you are aware - in order for a DAC Sub-Committee site visit to be arranged a Statement of Significance and Statement of Needs must first be provided to the Committee</p> <p>In the meantime I look forward to speaking with you, to discuss the proposed development and the documentation required for the site visit.</p>
10/11/2020 To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier With attachments	<p>Please find attached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft Statements of Significance and Need for our Church Development. These offered in order to facilitate a visit/comments by the DAC prior to submission of the faculty, and thereby the documents proper. 2. I also attach a document entitled Future Uses of St James which we have created in response to the discussion around seating in the church. 3. A copy of the feasibility/design for the church development produced by Tony and his firm. <p>Hopefully, the combination of these documents is sufficient to move things forward a little as we discussed a while back. Many thanks.</p> <p>On a separate note, we have tendered for an AV/Streaming upgrade. This will be the subject of a separate faculty application, most likely to arrive in Q1 of 2021.</p> <p>Draft Statement of Significance, draft Statement of Need, Future Uses document, Feasibility Study</p>
13/11/2020	<p>Many thanks for sending these very helpful documents. We will need to take this to the DAC. Unfortunately, I don't think we'll be able to fit this</p>

<p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>as an extra item on the agenda for next Friday's meeting, and the next DAC meeting is on 18 December so it will definitely be on the agenda for that. With the information you have provided, I'm sure the DAC will be happy for a Sub-Committee site visit to be arranged.</p> <p>In the meantime, please could you send me some photographs showing a variety of views around the church interior, and some of the exterior in particular the north west corner area where the proposed extension would be? That would be helpful for the DAC to be able to view alongside the documentation.</p>
<p>16/11/2020</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>Here is the link for you. It expires in 7 days. I have protected your emails by sending it to mine, and extracted the link. Caroline or Katy please confirm when in receipt. Thank you.</p>
<p>16/12/2020</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Katy Purvis</p>	<p>We have now heard back from the reviewing architect regarding the reordering proposals to be discussed at the DAC meeting on Friday. He has commented as below</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"This is an important church building, largely rebuilt by the very eminent 19th C architect, Wm Butterfield, his only church in Cheshire. The scheme is to provide much needed facilities, toilets, kitchen, storage etc, enclose the side chapel to make a separate meeting room and remove pews and have flexible seating (possibly stacking benches). The parish have done a lot of work to prepare documentation to support the scheme, including thorough statements of need and significance and quite detailed drawings have been prepared.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">You mention that a site visit is to be planned and this would be very helpful. At the visit the key things to look out for appears to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Siting and external modelling of the proposed extension. The extension doesn't appear to have too big an impact on the setting of the church, but they need to provide better photos from some distance across the churchyard to help explain this. A site plan would also help. They need to consult with the local planners, since this will need planning permission. They should get on with that now. b. Impact on graves. The parish are aware that this is an issue. I wonder if they shouldn't get an archaeological assessment undertaken now. c. Impact on stained glass. They are again aware, but the DAC visitors need to explore options. It's Kemp glass, so important.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. The significance and quality of the pews and whether their removal can be supported. e. The enclosure of the chapel and the architectural implications of this work. It is currently enclosed by some delicate iron screens. f. Impact on the tiles floors <p>It would help to have a set of existing plans as well."</p>
<p>23/12/2020</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From Katy Purvis</p>	<p>DAC Advice</p> <p>I am writing to let you know that at its meeting of 18 December 2020 the DAC considered the latest proposals and resolved to offer the following informal advice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A Sub-Committee site visit would be arranged, and in the current Covid-19 situation the possibility of an online meeting would be explored b. It wished to commend the parish on the hard work it had clearly done in preparing this initial information to the DAC c. Care would be needed in how the existing Lady Chapel screens are dealt with. It referred the parish to the Church Buildings Council note regarding the enclosing of screens, advising that if glazing is proposed then reflections should be considered, and also acoustics. It noted that at Barthomley St Bertoline the Lady Chapel screens had been glazed onto and suggested the parish may find it interesting to look at this example. d. Another initial point to consider was that the parish should carefully assess the roofscape to avoid awkward junctions and avoid future maintenance problems.
<p>15/06/2021</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>Thank you for the warm welcome at the site visit last Thursday. It was great to finally be able to get on site and experience the building, and meet you all in person. As mentioned at the meeting, we will report to the rest of the DAC at its meeting on Friday 25 June and you will then receive the feedback of the Committee during the following week.</p> <p>In the meantime, also as discussed, I now write with guidance and examples regarding options for seating in the church.</p> <p>Please see this link to the Church Buildings Council guidance: Guidance Note - Chairs . This guidance note also offers some practical points to consider when thinking about the most suitable chairs for the space – eg how easy they are to move and what the method will be for storage and stacking. In case it may also be of use, I have also attached the 'Seating Options' advice sheet produced in 2016 by my predecessor, which has similar advice and examples to that provided in the above Church of England web link.</p>

	<p>Please also see attached a list of examples of types/makes of chairs introduced in other churches around the diocese. You will see that some are un-upholstered and some are upholstered. The general preference of the DAC, CBC and statutory consultees is for un-upholstered chairs in churches. The CBC in its guidance note (in the above link) explains this preference as follows:</p> <p><i>The Council's experience is that wooden chairs have the greatest sympathy with historic church environments, present the best value for money with long life-spans, and that a well designed ergonomic wooden chair can provide as much comfort as an upholstered design.</i></p> <p>You will see the CBC guidance note then goes on to explain why they do not consider upholstered seats to be appropriate, in terms of aesthetics, durability/need for cleaning, reduced stackability and effect on acoustics. Where parishes have proposed upholstered chairs, they have needed to provide a robust level of reasoning and justification to support that choice.</p> <p>In case it may also be of help, here are two examples of chairs for café or occasional use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester St Peter obtained a faculty to replace its café area tables and chairs with Howe 40/4 chrome frame and oak veneer chairs (10 with arms), chair storage trolleys and flip top café tables with laminated tops to match the existing colours used in the church. (Please see attached photos – one shows the wooden chair, the others show the type of tables). • Alderley Edge St Philip & St James have replaced their plastic chairs in the west end of the church (which is used for café / after service hospitality) with Rosehill Maestro chrome framed blue stacking chairs and two transport trolleys. (Please see attached photos from Rosehill catalogue showing chairs and trolley). <p>As mentioned during the site visit, the type of seating proposed – eg whether benches or chairs, and how stackable will have an influence on the amount of storage space needed for seating when tidied away which will in turn have an influence on the size of extension needed. The type of seating will of course also affect how the overall re-ordered church space will look.</p>
<p>05/07/2021</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Katy Purvis</p>	<p>DAC Advice</p> <p>I am writing to let you know that at its meeting of 25 June 2021, the DAC considered the proposals for the extension and reordering, after the site visit, and resolved to offer the following informal advice:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee appreciated the need for the proposals and encouraged the parish to continue developing the scheme with their Architect. The scheme will in due course need to be referred to statutory consultees Church Building Council, Historic England and The

	<p>Victorian Society. The DAC office will carry this out on behalf of the parish.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. It commended the parish and their architect for demonstrating their consideration of a range of options which will be helpful for the DAC and statutory consultees' consideration of the scheme d. The parish will need to consult the local authority regarding the proposed extension e. The parish would need to carefully consider the extent of the pew removals, whether to remove some or all of the pews. f. The need, reasoning and justification for the removal of the pews would need to be robustly documented (setting out all reasons, even if they seem obvious) for the referral to statutory consultees. g. Whilst the Committee did not consider the pews to be of highest quality, they are an original element of this Butterfield church and the Committee recommended that the parish engage an independent person with knowledge of Butterfield to produce a report on the significance of the pews in relation to the church building. h. It understood the parish would further consider their choice of seating in light of the ongoing Covid situation, and also taking into account factors such as stackability and storage space required. An important point to consider is that the required amount of space for chair storage will be a major issue influencing the size of the extension, and of how the building is looked at and changed. i. It noted that the nave is quite narrow, and the parish should test plans for possible arrangements of benches or chairs to see how much seating can be fitted in j. The Sub-Committee encouraged the parish to make sure the meeting/café chairs they choose are of good quality so they are also suitable for use as extra congregation seating when required. k. The Committee was not convinced that the arrangement of pews facing each other in the café area was the best solution in terms of flexibility of the space and suggested the parish may wish to reconsider the configuration of this area l. It suggested that with regard to the treatment of the floor the parish may consider differentiating between the pews areas and aisles as this would make the floor more interesting m. The Committee considered in principle the proposal for the Lady Chapel seemed fairly straightforward as it is already being used as a meeting space (as it was at the site meeting)
--	---

	<p>n. The parish should bear in mind that that Historic England (and the local authority) may strongly consider that the size of the extension should not protrude beyond the line of the tower.</p> <p>o. The Sub-Committee suggested that an external door be considered for the extension.</p> <p>p. The Committee wondered if the kitchenette may be too small and if two or more people were using it they may find it congested</p> <p>q. It considered that in the proposal the travel distances for evacuation from the facilities in case of fire may exceed the permissible distance under Building Regulations and the parish should therefore check this (although including an external door as suggested at (o) would address this.)</p> <p>r. The Sub-Committee appreciated that the boiler was replaced quite recently and there is not currently felt to be a need for improvement of heating, however it commented that the parish will in due course need to plan ahead for what they will do next for their heating, considering the Church of England's target for net zero carbon by 2030.</p> <p>s. It wondered whether the parish may be underestimating the overall cost of the scheme (i.e. it is likely to be higher than the £250-300k ballpark figure suggested by the parish)</p>
07/07/2021 To: Katy Purvis From: Stefan Collier	<p>Just working my way through this. A couple of questions please.</p> <p>1. Do you have any suggestions for an independent pew expert please? I seem to recall mention of a Butterfield Society meeting in Wales once, but don't have any details - I wonder if they may have a contact?</p> <p>2. Do we wait until we have submitted the faculty before approaching the council or do this before?</p>
08/07/2021 To: Stefan Collier From: Katy Purvis	<p>Question 2 is easy (ish) Question 1 is very hard!</p> <p>2. You can submit a planning application at the same time as the faculty application, Tony will be able to advise on when the plans are at the right stage of development to submit. The faculty would usually have a proviso which says "The parish to obtain any necessary planning consent", so you wouldn't be expected to have consent in place when you submit the faculty application, although if you did that would be good and the proviso would be omitted. You might be able to get some pre-app advice from CWAC, I would ask Tony's advice on that</p> <p>1. I've done a lot of research this morning, and I can't find anything particularly helpful in identifying a furniture specialist with knowledge of Butterfield. Generally, we are aware of three independent experts who have helped parishes assess pews, they can be quite expensive, and in one case a parish had to employ two as the first was not considered enough of a furniture expert by the consultees.</p> <p>Charles Tracy Hugh Harrison</p>

	<p>If neither of the above can help, perhaps they can suggest someone else who could. I've trawled the internet and waded through Trevor Cooper's "Pews, benches and chairs" trying to find a lead from footnotes and basically learnt almost nothing. Geoff Brandwood writes about Butterfield pews in "Pews, benches and chairs" but as an architectural historian, he may not be expert enough for the consultees either. I've emailed Trevor Cooper to ask if he knows of anyone</p>
<p>08/07/2021</p> <p>To: Katy Purvis From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>Thank you for this. It is very kind of you to spend a lot of time on it, and it is very much appreciated. I have endeavored to find out information as well from the internet, and made contact with some people for advice too. I shall follow up on your leads also. I shall let you know how we get on, so you can pass on anything useful in future. Many thanks once again.</p>
<p>08/07/2021</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Katy Purvis</p>	<p>In case you want to contact Richard, here is his email address. Please can you say that Trevor Cooper provided this contact detail and that he suggested Richard may be able or willing to help</p>
<p>08/06/2022</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>Hopefully, the faculty for the St James church extension is now submitted.</p> <p>If you need anything, I know you will be in touch.</p> <p>Thank you for your oversight and advice to date in getting to this point. It has been much appreciated.</p>
<p>04/07/2022</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>DAC Advice</p> <p>I am writing to let you know that at its meeting of 24 June 2022 the DAC considered the latest details provided with the faculty application for extension and re-ordering and it wished to offer the following informal advice:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee in principle considered this to be a good and much needed scheme, however; It queried how confident the parish was of the support of the local community for the scheme. It appreciated the parish efforts for local consultation regarding the proposals, however it noted that the number of respondents was very small and advised that they should carry out further local consultation to demonstrate that a higher number of people had been given the opportunity voice opinion. It also queried to what extent the local community was aware of the proposals effect on graves/memorials in the churchyard, as there may some local opinion on this The DAC office would consult the Statutory Consultees and Amenity Societies <p>Further to the DAC feedback points above, a further comment was offered by one of the architect members that the proposed toilets did not comply with Building Regulations as the doors should not open inwards.</p> <p>If you have any queries please do let me know.</p>

<p>05/07/2022</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>Thanks for the informal advice from the DAC.</p> <p>As to b and c) we have also offered a board presentation and feedback box at the Christleton fete (one of the major events). We received nothing back. We will keep plugging away, however, and log any other supporting docs on this front.</p> <p>Other than this, I assume we are waiting for d) and for our architect to further flesh out the design.</p>
<p>20/07/2022</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>Sorry for the delayed reply to your message below. Yes, the DAC office needs to consult the Statutory Consultees and Amenity Societies and we will let you know the feedback we receive.</p>
<p>24/10/2022</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>Do you know of a DAC accepted expert pew assessor please you could recommend?</p> <p>As you know the local historian searched the record office for St James records about the pews, and as noted in our supporting documentation, any information was inconclusive.</p>
<p>05/12/2022</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>FAO: Bob Munn also since he was at the meeting. Thank you.</p> <p>Following on from the recent visit to St James, and our further preparations to evidence our case.</p> <p>Another line of evidence could be as follows.</p> <p>To collect cases used in other churches (and cathedrals) for removal of pews/making of flexible space, understand their rationale and correlate with our own. This then forms another body of evidence and asks the question of the decision makers about consistency of their judgments for these places. Why are pews removed from one and not the other?</p> <p>This clearly is valid in the real world and an often used method of evidence, but I wonder whether this is how the church process works. I suspect not. Therefore, please could you clarify and respond to me as soon as possible as to whether the DAC/chancellor will consider evidence of the type above or not (we want to focus the evidence gathering in the right places). Thank you.</p>
<p>08/12/2022</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>Further to my voicemail to you from yesterday, having also relayed your question to Bob Munn I write in response regarding the use of examples of pew removals from other churches as a line of argument for the pew removal proposals at St James's. (Sorry it has taken a few days to get back to you).</p> <p>If you can show examples of pew removals from similar church buildings and needs to St James's then this would be useful to include in the documentation as examples of what has been done elsewhere. Please note, however that each case is considered by the DAC and Chancellor on its own merit dependant on many factors such as relative significance of the building and the pews and fixtures, the configuration of the building, patterns of use and particular needs around the use of the space and what meeting space is available</p>

	<p>locally. It is the effect of the pew removal on the significance as balanced against the demonstrated need that will be carefully considered by the Chancellor and DAC. In each case where there is loss of/effect on historic features of a listed church then the Chancellor will consider the Duffield questions, which help them to decide whether to grant the faculty or not.</p> <p>The Duffield questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would the proposals, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest 2. If the answer to question 1 is "no", the ordinary presumption in faculty proceedings "in favour of things as they stand" is applicable, and can be rebutted more or less readily, depending on the particular nature of the proposals. 3. If the answer to question 1 is "yes", how serious would the harm be? 4. How clear and convincing is the justification for carrying out the proposals? 5. Bearing in mind that there is a strong presumption against proposals which will adversely affect the special character of a listed building, will any resulting public benefit (including matters such as liturgical freedom, pastoral well-being, opportunities for mission, and putting the church to viable uses that are consistent with its role as a place of worship and mission) outweigh the harm? In answering question 5, the more serious the 'harm', the greater the level of benefit needed before the proposals should be permitted. This will particularly be the case if the harm is to a building which is listed Grade I or II*, where serious 'harm' should only exceptionally be allowed. <p>Please see the Church of England webpage that explains how the Chancellor uses these questions via the (very long!) link: https://www.churchofengland.org/resources/churchcare/church-buildings-council/how-we-manage-our-buildings#:~:text=If%20your%20project%20causes%20the%20loss,plans%20will%20have%20on%20the%20building.&text=If%20your%20project%20causes,have%20on%20the%20building.&text=project%20causes%20the%20loss,plans%20will%20have%20on</p> <p>With regards to the consistency of the decision making between judgements, it is about consistency in applying the Duffield questions rather than how the results work out between similar churches.</p> <p>If I can help any further please do let me know.</p>
<p>08/12/2022</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>Thanks Caroline and Bob. This is really useful, as we continue to shape our case. We intend to continue with the submission as is. And will provide further supporting documentation as it is prepared.</p>

	Is there a particular point when the decision goes before the chancellor? Is this post our response to the stakeholder consultations?
09/12/2022 To Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton	<p>In answer to your question I thought would be helpful to summarise the faculty application procedure so you can see when and how the Chancellor carries out his determination of the matter, and what happens before the application reaches the Chancellor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation with statutory consultees will have been carried out and their responses addressed and engaged with as much as possible, also; • the DAC will be further considering the proposals as any updated details, along with the feedback of consultees are received, and in due course will resolve to offer its formal advice to the Chancellor – either to recommend, not object or not recommend the scheme for his approval. (It is very rare that the DAC would ‘not recommend’ a scheme at this stage as the proposals would have been through a number of DAC meetings to iron out as many issues as possible. There has been the occasional ‘not object’ where the Committee has still been unconvinced about a particular element of a scheme which it would otherwise have been content to ‘recommend’. This formal advice is what is contained in the Notification of Advice that is raised once the DAC has made this decision. • Once the Notification of Advice has been raised the application can progress to the 30 day Public Notice period and the application can be submitted to the Registry on the Online Faculty System. • Once the Public Notice period has ended, if there are no objections raised, this will be the point where the Chancellor would look at the application and all the supporting documentation and consultation details to make his determination. • If the Registry has received any objections during the Public Notice period then the Registrar is required write to them and give them a three week window of time to reply and let her know whether or not they wish to become a party objector. The Chancellor would need to take into account any objection when he looks at the application to make his determination. If anyone wishes to become a party objector it will mean the matter will need to go to Consistory Court which will lengthen the <p>I hope that is of some help. If you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
09/12/2022 To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier	Thanks Caroline. This is really helpful.
21/12/2022 To: Stefan Collier From: Katy Purvis	DAC Advice <p>I am writing to let you know that at its meeting of 16 December 2022, the DAC considered the informal report provided by the DAC Chair and myself of the recent visit of officers from The Victorian Society and</p>

	<p>Church Buildings Council, and also the written comments of Historic England. The Committee wished to offer the following feedback:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It noted that the feedback of Historic England and that the reports of the CBC and The Victorian Society were awaited. It noted the parish would develop their Statement of Significance and Statement of Need and provide an options appraisal documenting the other options considered and rejected (including for partial pew removal) and explaining why those options had been rejected.
<p>24/01/2023</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton, Katy Purvis From: Ken Rivers</p>	<p>I am currently supporting Stefan Collier who is the Rector at St James with the church development.</p> <p>I understand that the flexible seating is causing some concerns so I am trying to put some data together to help contextualise this aspect of the application.</p> <p>What has struck me both through personal observations and also feedback from others is the size and scale of the pew removals that has taken place throughout the Church of England and also within the diocese.</p> <p>The Times reported in 2020 that over the last 10 years some 250 churches/year had submitted applications for more flexible seating and to remove pews. At a personal level , I have been struck on my travels at the number of cathedrals and significant historic churches that I have visited that no longer have pews .</p> <p>It therefore appears to be an issues that is being addressed across the Church of England and yet when I went on to the web and tried to find a review of these developments and an assessment of the general impact these changes are having I came up with a blank.</p> <p>At a more basic level, I similarly tried to find a list of churches that had made such changes and again could not find any compiled data.</p> <p>I wondered if there are reports or data sources that you might have or know of that I could access and put together the contextual background to the specific St James application.</p> <p>I am very happy to do the spade work if you could direct me to any reports or simply list of churches in the area and/or within UK.</p>
<p>24/01/2023</p> <p>To: Ken Rivers From: Katy Purvis</p> <p>With attachment</p>	<p>Thanks for your email, it reminded me that we were made aware of a study a few years ago which may or may not help you. I'm sorry I didn't think of it before, I hope it will be helpful in that it may give you some pointers as to why some applications are successful and some are not.</p>

	<p>There isn't an easy way to extract diocesan data on pew removals, but if I can free up some time I will see what I can put together. I can't promise that I could do that this week, or even this month, but I will try.</p> <p>The other source I would recommend will require a bit more work for you, you can access ecclesiastical court judgements here (for all diocese), you can search for 'chairs', but may find you need to trawl through individual cases. Faculty applications which end up in consistory court are the extreme cases, but the Chancellors directions for these cases should indicate what our Chancellor/Consultees will be looking for in your case https://www.ecclesiasticallawassociation.org.uk/index.php/component/docman/search-result?filter_search=chairs&layout=columns&show_category=0&Itemid=0</p> <p>One of the issues in difficulty in identifying cases for you is that pew removal is not usually carried out in isolation, as with St James, it is usually part of a wider reordering. As such, our filing system may identify reordering, but I would need to check each case to discover whether that included pew removal and replacement of chairs. The online faculty system is not searchable in this way, so again would require a manual trawl and our electronic filing system is well populated for the last five/six years but very sparse prior to that, with very little data at all prior to about 2010</p> <p><i>An investigation into the removal of pews from historic places of worship</i></p>
02/02/2023 To: Stefan Collier From: Katy Purvis	<p>We have received comments from CBC via the online faculty system after their visit, you may have already seen them, but if not, here they are.</p> <p>They are mostly supportive overall, but do suggest partial pew removal, with a view to maybe taking the rest out later, which I've not come across before</p>
03/02/2023 From: Stefan Collier To: Katy Purvis	<p>I will go ahead and read and digest, and make time for what needs to follow and be in touch in due course.</p> <p>Thank you again for all you are doing to support, encourage, and enable our application. It really is appreciated very much.</p>
27/02/2023 To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton	<p>I am writing to send you the feedback of The Victorian Society which I have now received, following their attendance at the site visit with CBC on 30 November 2022. Please see below. I have added this to the agenda of the forthcoming DAC meeting on 17 March.</p> <p>Victorian Society feedback included in Consultation correspondence</p>
28/03/2023 To: Stefan Collier	<p>DAC Advice</p> <p>I am writing to let you know that at its meeting of 17 March 2023 the DAC considered the written feedback of The Victorian Society alongside</p>

<p>From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>that of the Church Buildings Council and it wished to offer the following feedback:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It was pleased to note that planning permission had been granted for the extension It understood the parish are working on their documentation in line with the feedback of the consultees and awaited this in due course It shared the CBC's view that one design of chair rather than two should be proposed The diocesan Engagement and Inclusion Officer offered to visit the church to carry out an accessibility audit (which may prove helpful for the parish in developing their Statement of Needs) <p>If you have any queries please do let me know.</p>
<p>05/05/2023</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p> <p>With attachments</p>	<p>Please see attached. I assume you will upload these for us - thank you. Please let me know if you need anything in addition. Further, please advise of next steps as appropriate. I am sorry it has taken us so long to return comment, but as you can see a major response has been offered. Note Church Uses replaces Future Uses, since the title better reflects the contents of the document.</p> <p>Thanks Caroline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> St James Church - Exec Summary v2.pdf StJamesFaculty_Statements-of-significance-and-needs May 2023.pdf Supporting Documentation - Church Uses.pdf supporting documentation - designIterations.pdf supporting documentation - heatingLighting.pdf Supporting Documentation - parishCarbonNetZeroRoutemap.pdf supporting documentation - parishCarbonNetZeroRoutemap.pdf <p><i>Superseded supporting documentation - sampleOfCommunityLetters.pdf</i></p>
<p>05/05/2023</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>Many thanks for sending these details. I've added this to the agenda for the forthcoming DAC meeting on 19 May.</p>
<p>09/05/2023</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p> <p>With attachment</p>	<p>I attach a revised document - sorry.</p> <p>The lady I worked with to deliver the I:Tea and Coffee Club sent a letter of support. So, I have added it to the others.</p> <p>Revised supporting documentation - sampleOfCommunityLetters.pdf</p>

<p>30/05/2023</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>DAC Advice</p> <p>I am writing to let you know that at its meeting of 19 May 2023, the DAC considered the further justification for the proposed reordering and wished to offer the following informal advice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It commended the parish on the effort it had clearly made to produce the documentation. The DAC office would now send it to the consultees and would await their further feedback
<p>03/07/2023</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>Historic England have now uploaded their response to the online faculty application. Please see attached. We still currently await a response from CBC and The Victorian Society.</p> <p><i>Response of Historic England included in Consultees correspondence</i></p>
<p>31/07/2023</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>I am writing to let you know that at its meeting of 21 July 2023 the DAC considered the feedback of Historic England. (It also noted that the Church Buildings Council, The Victorian Society and Local Authority had not replied to the further consultation within the 21 days time limit). The Committee resolved, subject to the parish amending its proposal for chairs to consist of one design and confirming their preferred chair design (please see explanation for this point below), to recommend the scheme the following provisos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The works to be under the direction and subject to the inspection of the Church Architect b. Any electrical works should be carried out by an electrical contractor accredited with the NICEIC or ECA, to the standards recommended in the Churchcare "Guidance Note: Electrical Wiring Installations in Churches" available via https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/CCB_Electrical-wiring-installations-in-churches_Apr-2013.pdf c. The parish to undertake any archaeological watching brief required by the local planning authority d. If any human remains become exposed or are otherwise encountered during the course of the work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All work in the vicinity must stop immediately, • The remains must be lightly covered with soil • The Diocesan Registrar (and in her absence the Secretary to the Diocesan Advisory Committee) must be notified • The directions of the Diocesan Registrar must be followed. <p><i>Note of explanation regarding chairs</i></p> <p>The Committee was content to recommend the scheme on the basis that one chair type is used throughout. Bearing in mind that Historic England have expressed concerns about the overall impact on the interior the DAC considered a mix of chair types would have a more negative impact than sticking to having only one design, and the impact on the interior is considered more acceptable with one chair type (than with two). The parish will therefore need to confirm which of the two chair types previously seen by the DAC it proposes for the faculty application. If, however the parish wishes to maintain its proposal for</p>

	<p>two different types of chairs the matter will need to return to the Committee for further consideration.</p> <p>Please can you therefore let me know your response regarding the choice of chair. If you are content to amend the proposal so there is one chair type, and let me know which design, I will be able to raise the Notification of Advice so that you can start the display of public notices.</p>
<p>05/08/2023</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>Post consultation with the PCC, I can confirm they are content with a single, Icon 40, chair replacing the pews. Thank you.</p>
<p>23/08/2023</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton</p>	<p>Thank you for your message below, and for your further message confirming the choice of chairs.</p> <p>We have realised since the DAC gave its recommendation to the faculty application at its July meeting, that we still actually require the full architect specification details and drawings including for example the design of the Lady Chapel screen and door to extension as you mention below, before the scheme can be formally recommended. I do apologise for this not being picked up sooner. (The focus of the DAC at the July meeting had been its response to the consultees regarding the needs and justification and it had responded positively as it was supportive of the works.)</p> <p>We therefore raised this at the DAC Standing Committee that took place last Friday 18 August and the Sub-Committee gave the following feedback:</p> <p>The Sub-Committee resolved that the matter would need to be considered at a further DAC meeting for re-recommendation once the scheme architect had provided the specification and full drawn plan/elevation details including for the Lady Chapel screen, door to the extension, the configuration within the extension and flooring details. The Sub-Committee stressed however, that the DAC had been supportive of the scheme in principle and these remaining details were to be more for technical review so that the faculty application could be progressed</p> <p>As soon as those details have been provided we'll get them reviewed and put on the DAC meeting agenda. The next meeting is on 22 September. Hopefully this won't cause too much delay, my apologies again.</p>
<p>23/08/2023</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>Thank you for the email.</p> <p>We'll progress with Tony, the parish, and revert soonest.</p>

<p>29/08/2023</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>We met with Tony on Monday, and have agreed for him to prepare a Full Architect Specification for the DAC at a cost of 12K plus another ~ 1K for the survey for cost estimates and then tenders to be sought. Hopefully, this will be sufficient.</p> <p>I have slightly in the back of my mind how odd this all is given we do not have formal permission and the project could be rejected after we have sunk in around 15K. Fingers crossed on that one I guess.</p> <p>I anticipate we are working flat out to try and hit the November meeting for you. Speak to you soon.</p>
<p>29/08/2023</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Katy Purvis</p>	<p>I'm pretty hopeful that this will be Ok, we would normally have had the full specification before the DAC recommended, so you would usually have already spent this sum by now. The DAC got a bit carried away and recommended before they should have based on the consultation and your justification, when really they needed to see the details first</p>
<p>14/11/2023</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>I have been sent the tender documents today for review.</p> <p>Please could you confirm the date(s) I need to aim for to get them to you in order to be considered soonest. Thank you.</p> <p>I think we have missed the Nov, so it has to be 1 December? Thanks.</p>
<p>14/11/2023</p> <p>To: Stefan Collier From: Katy Purvis</p>	<p>We could squeeze this onto November, if you can get the docs to us asap? If not 1st December for 15th Dec meeting</p>
<p>14/11/2023</p> <p>To: Katy Purvis From: Stefan Collier</p>	<p>That's kind. Realistically, I think we'll have to go for the 1 Dec deadline at this point. You can grab a copy if you want at - <i>Wetransfer</i></p>
<p>30/11/2023</p> <p>To: Caroline Hilton From: Ken Rivers</p>	<p>Good morning Caroline, many thanks for your help and support.</p> <p>As discussed this morning, we have identified a number of small changes to the drawings that Stefan has already shared with you (ref. Donald Insall Associates ,St James' Church Christleton , Tender Documents , November 2023) .</p> <p>We are in the process of updating the pack to reflect them but the drawings may not be with you till early next week.</p> <p>You asked that I highlight the changes we are making :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rechecked boundary lines (page 10) • Make path from doorway in extension along the north side of the church suitable for wheelchair access . Gravel to be replaced by suitable surface for wheel chair use and widen pinch point (page 11)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible additional kitchen fixture - fly zapper (page 17) • Ramp from nave to side chapel level - modify small bore piping by existing step to widen access for wheelchairs (page 26). • Disabled access through narrow doorways (D03/04) with right hand turn in very restricted space (page 27). If unsuitable then ramp could be removed . Disabled access is available via main entrance and doorway in new extension. <p>We will get the updated drawings to you as soon as possible ,but may miss the Friday deadline. The update is not materially different to the drawings already shared as the list above indicates,</p>
01/12/2023 To: Ken Rivers From: Caroline Hilton	Thank you for this. As discussed the proposals/existing drawings are on the agenda for the DAC meeting on 15 December. The points in your email below will be included and if you can send the updated drawings as soon as you have them we should be able to also include them for the DAC's consideration.
05/12/2023 To: Caroline Hilton From: Sinead Scullion of Donald Insall Associates With attachment	Please see below response to queries and attached updated drawings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rechecked boundary lines (updated on the drawing) • Make path from doorway in extension along the north side of the church suitable for wheelchair access . Gravel to be replaced by suitable surface for wheel chair use and widen pinch point (note included on the drawing) • Possible additional kitchen fixture - fly zapper (electrical outlet included for a fly zapper at high-level) • Ramp from nave to side chapel level - modify small bore piping by existing step to widen access for wheelchairs (note included on the drawing) • Disabled access through narrow doorways (D03/04) with right hand turn in very restricted space. If unsuitable then ramp could be removed . Disabled access is available via main entrance and doorway in new extension. (ramp removed at rear door) <p>Updated drawings</p>
21/12/2023 To: Stefan Collier From: Caroline Hilton	<p>I am writing to let you know that at its meeting of 15 December 2023 the DAC considered the detailed drawings that were provided, and it resolved to recommend the scheme,</p> <p>with the following provisos:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The works to be under the direction and subject to the inspection of the Scheme Architect b. Any electrical works should be carried out by an electrical contractor accredited with the NICEIC or ECA, to the standards recommended in the Churchcare "Guidance Note: Electrical Wiring Installations in Churches" available via https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/CCB_Electrical-wiring-installations-in-churches_Apr-2013.pdf c. The following details to be provided for further consideration by the Committee as Reserved Matters:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The detailing of the rainwater goods clarified (in drawing number 2201 and elsewhere), for example the hopper needs a profile. If not shown accurately in the drawings they need to be cross-referred to a photograph or specification ii. For all new windows - window details to be profiled, showing both the profile of any stonework and metal frames. Details of opening lights should be included, together with any other ventilation requirements (e.g. trickle ventilation). iii. The detailing of door D12 is needed. iv. The turning circle outside the accessible WC is slightly less than 1500mm when the step is taken into account. This will need to be justified. v. It understood the path surface is not proposed to be gravel, but details of the proposed are needed <p>This means I can raise the Notification of Advice on the Online Faculty System. I will let you know once this has been carried out.</p> <p>In the meantime, you will need to provide the details set out at (c) for the Reserved Matter for review so that the Reserved Matter can be discharged. (This will not delay the Notification of Advice being raised).</p> <p>If you have any queries please do let me know.</p> <p>Please also note that Katy Purvis is moving to a different role at the diocese from the start of 2024. Katy will be taking up the role of Net Zero Carbon Officer and will no longer work in the DAC office. Any further correspondence on DAC matters will need to be with me. (We are looking to recruit a new Assistant to DAC Secretary in the New Year).</p>