

ST JULIAN'S WELLOW Facilities Proposals Consultation Matrix R. 29-6-22	St Julians PCC	Bath & Wells DAC Site Mtg 26-10-17	Church Buildings Council	Historic England	B&NES	SPAB	AMS	PCC Responses to consultations
PCC Statement of Significance			Congratulations on comprehensive stmts of need & significance...			Needs more tailored to proposal & its impacts		
PCC Statement of Need			.... and on thorough appraisal of options			More detailed appraisal needed of options (now see Appendix 2)		Stmt of need revised; useful to read together with this matrix.
Option A Tower: internal WC & kitchenette to flank west doors	Not enough space for full access wc that retains west doors clear		Too restrictive of west door access & obstructive to bells maintenance		Kitchenette possible	WCs often fitted in towers		For fully accessible wc would need alcove in tower wall to allow clearance of west doors. West door regularly used, particularly for weddings and funerals
Option B Vestry: 1 wc and kitchenette with internal access	Enough space – but wrong location & access very difficult		No level int. or ext. access. Location conflicts with worship & events.	Recommends wcs in vestry: access can be achieved; use before/after	Internal access for wcs etc not appropriate	Possibly extend vestry to provide		JR's calcs: ramped wheelchair access to vestry obstructive and impractical
Option C North Field: 2 WCs, Kitchen & Mtg Rm	Good space – but grave risks; mid N. aisle poor location; door summer use.		High ext impact & agst N. door view & access; competes with village hall		Worth fuller investigation	Small detached bldg. better option?		The PCC feels very strongly that in the 21 <sup>st</sup> century to have to go outside to access toilets is unacceptable and a kitchen that is detached from the church is neither very useful nor acceptable.
Option D West end of North aisle: 1 WC and kitchenette	Loses pews; poor location for liturgy & events.	PH: suggests wc at w.end north aisle & kitchenette at w.end south aisle	Intrusive spatially & in use; requires unacceptable removal of 15thC pews	Recommends kitchenette and pews removal	Kitchenette possible			Removal of 15 <sup>th</sup> C pews is more destructive of this exceptionally and unusually intact interior than the extension or the doorway in the tower wall.
Option E – preferred Extension N. of tower for 2 wcs and kitchen (int.access)	Best location & access; discreet externally	Best scheme – but most difficult to achieve	Supportive of location: concern over access door – str survey required (now done)	'Uncomfortable' with tower door; more clearance of buttresses needed	Tower investigation required; doorway harmful; smaller might be better	Not against in principle but concerned over new door in tower	raise no concerns over the proposed breach of the tower shell;	New door in tower involves removal of just 0.5% of tower fabric – most of which can be reused in the doorway itself & extension; experience of the tower's historic fabric will be enhanced. Revision at buttresses to be drafted – now done.
Structural investigation of tower N. wall door location.		DAC St Eng's cmts: <i>"no structural objection to form doorway in this wall"</i>	....				stone re-use & arch. watching brief recommended (PCC agrees to both)	A positive result. DAC St Eng's cmts: <i>the writer is now content with the notion of creating a doorway</i>
GPRadar survey of option E site & drainage area		"no evidence of graves etc in this area"(GPR survey report)	....					A positive (though not conclusive) result

Other suggestions from consultees				More detailed options appraisal needed (now see appendix 2)	Separate lean-to against churchyard boundary wall			
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--