

Re St Margaret, Angmering

Judgment

Mr Andrew Johnson, solicitor, of Messrs Batt Broadbent, for the Petitioners
Mr David Garrard, for the Victorian Society
Mr Matthew Saunders, for the Ancient Monuments Society

1. By a petition dated 22 March 2006, the rector and churchwardens of St Margaret, Angmering petition this court for a faculty for the demolition of an existing office, vestry and store; the erection in its place of a new meeting room with ancillary facilities; the erection of a vestibule; and the internal reordering of this Grade II* listed church.
2. The petition is opposed by the Victorian Society, the Ancient Monuments Society, and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. Although the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings and the petitioners were agreeable to the matter being determined on written representations, the other two amenity societies were not. In consequence a hearing was convened which took place in the parish church on Thursday 26 April 2007. The petitioners were represented by a solicitor specializing in ecclesiastical law, who called evidence from the Reverend Canon Mark Standen, rector of the benefice, Mr Richard Hance, the chairman of the PCC's building committee (now a churchwarden and, with the leave of the court, substituted as co-petitioner), Mrs June Hawke, churchwarden, Mrs Carole Mason, chairperson of the Angmering Community Association, Mr Nicholas Lee Evans, the parish's inspecting architect, and the Venerable Douglas McKittrick, Archdeacon of Chichester. A statement was tendered by Mr Henry Haig, a glass artist expert, for whom incapacity prevented attendance at the hearing. The Victorian Society was represented by Mr David Garrard, its Historic Churches Adviser, and the Ancient Monuments Society by its secretary, Mr Matthew Saunders. They had each provided witness statements and tendered themselves for cross-examination. I wish to express at the outset my appreciation to each of the representatives for the dignified manner in which they advanced their respective cases, enabling the evidence and submissions to be concluded in one day, albeit a long one. Conduct during the hearing mirrored that of the lengthy consultation period which had preceded it. Strongly held differing opinions have been aired with conviction but with respect for those of other views. The exemplary behaviour of the parties in this regard has been matched by that of the other consultees to whom I shall shortly make reference. I trust that my adjudication, which has not been an easy task, will be accepted with a similar grace.

3. By a decision notice dated 15 February 2006, Arun District Council granted planning permission for the substantial demolition and rebuilding works referred to in the petition but not the internal reordering, in relation to which, as the council properly recognized, it has no jurisdiction. A bat survey report was commissioned from Batbox Limited and this raised no issues of concern. The Diocesan Advisory Committee had considerable involvement with the project in the consultative and planning stage and on 13 June 2006 issued a certificate of recommendation subject to a number of conditions. There were pre-application discussions with the Angmering Society, Angmering Parish Council, the congregation, and the residents of the parish.

Letters of objection

4. Public notice resulted in eleven individuals sending letters of objection to the registry, some of them in joint names. I do not propose to identify them individually in this judgment. The writers of these letters were informed in a pro-forma notice from the registry, sent pursuant to rule 16(3) of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2000, that they may either leave the court to take their letter into account when determining the petition or become a party to the proceedings by serving written particulars of objection in Form 4. One replied choosing the first option. In the absence of a reply from any of the others I treat their letters likewise and take the contents of each and all of them fully into account in considering the merits of this petition.
5. More recently, in March 2007, a notice was placed in local newspapers which elicited letters from a number of individuals and organizations. Again, I do not propose to name them in this judgment but this correspondence also formed part of the trial bundle, together with those elicited following public notice. A further letter was handed to me on the day of the hearing during the luncheon adjournment. I showed it to the parties at the commencement of the afternoon session and invited their observations. Although I do not address every comment individually in this judgment, I have taken all of these responses fully into account in my determination of this petition, including those received out of time, having ensured that they had all been disclosed to the parties to the proceedings for the purpose of comment or rebuttal.

Amenity societies and other consultees

6. The position of the various amenity societies and consultative bodies can be summarized as follows:
 - i. The Ancient Monuments Society and the Victorian Society each entered a formal objection to the petition in Form 4. I deal later in this judgment with the substance of their objections and the evidence advanced in support.
 - ii. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings also entered a formal objection in Form 4 but was content for the matter to be determined on written representations. A witness statement prepared by Ms Sara Crofts, Project Director of Faith in Maintenance, was presented on behalf of the

Society's Guardians and Ms Crofts was cross-examined on the content of her statement.

- iii. English Heritage did not oppose the petition, nor did it support it. It regards the simplicity of the treatment of the extensions as acceptable. Mr David Brock, in his letter of 20 June 2006, commends the retention, albeit elsewhere in the church, of the wooden Teulon screen, taking issue with the parish's assertion that it is damaged. English Heritage chose not to play a part in the hearing of this matter but invited me to consider its written observations contained in various correspondence which I have done.
 - iv. The Council for the Care of Churches considered the rebuilding of the office space to be acceptable in principle, but was initially unconvinced with regard to the need for a new entrance. The Council's chairman attended the hearing to give the Council's views, and to explain the manner in which those views had changed during the consultation process and the evolution of the proposals.
 - v. The Diocesan Advisory Committee furnished a written statement of its views and Mr Richard Andrews, a representative of the DAC, attended the hearing. As it transpired none of the parties wished to question him and in the event he was not required to give any supplementary evidence.
 - vi. Arun District Council did not participate at the hearing but a number of documents concerning the grant of conditional planning permission were before the Court. By letter dated 1 November 2006, the Council indicated that it had no planning objections to the external alterations and extensions, confirming what is implicit from the grant of planning permission. The Council very properly recognized that internal alterations are subject to the ecclesiastical exemption upon which the writer of the letter did not wish to comment save to support the comments made by English Heritage.
7. On any account this is a substantial proposal, but one which falls to be considered incrementally and thematically. I intend to deal first with broad matters of background and principle before discussing the specificity of the project. There is very little which is controversial in the evidence which I heard. The content of the various witness statements stood as evidence-in-chief and cross-examination was limited and issue specific. The real contention, as I view the case, lies in the weight to be afforded to the conflicting evidence and an assessment of the dissonance in the various opinions, all advanced in good faith. Since I am not required to make substantive findings of fact on disputed matters, I can deal with the evidence much more briefly than might otherwise be the case.

The church

8. Angmering lies on the outskirts of Littlehampton, both of which have expanded considerably in the latter part of the twentieth century. The original St Margaret's church was built between 1180 and 1220 but only the tower and some medieval arches remain. The church was developed significantly in the fifteenth century

and, more recently, in the 1850s according to the design of the distinguished Victorian architect Samuel Sanders Teulon. Mr Saunders is an acknowledged expert on Teulon, and the court had the advantage of considering some of his published work on the life and achievements of an individual whom he described as roguish and quirky, but whose work was engaging, not least because of the closeness of Teulon to his craftsmen. He indicated that St Margaret, Angmering was one of 112 churches with which Teulon had been involved, but accepted that there were better examples of Teulon's work elsewhere.

9. Much of the church furniture was also fabricated to Teulon's design although a number of these pieces have been removed or altered, notably a pulpit which now resides in a church in Rye. The Victorian reordering was made possible through the benefaction of the Gratwicke family, but the family's mortuary chapel has subsequently been altered in both appearance and content. The twentieth century saw works creating a vestry and office in the north eastern corner, which are said to be of little architectural significance, being a single storey structure which sits awkwardly with its surroundings. A church hall lies to the south east, whose appearance can best be described as functional.

The proposals

10. The proposal comprises 'two bold modern exterior extensions' to adopt a phrase from paragraph 3.04 of the Statement of Significance. It is motivated by a wish to make the church 'more suitable for worship and mission', as appears in paragraph 6 of the Statement of Need, which sets out in considerable detail the wide variety of activities undertaken in the parish. I do not propose to rehearse these matters in this judgment save to note the priority given to the mission and Christian witness in all parts of what is a growing and vibrant community. There was no challenge to the sense of vitality which pervades this Christian community. However it was maintained by the objectors that neither the current layout of the church's interior nor the lack of substantial new structures on either side of the chancel impeded the promotion of the Christian gospel.
11. The Statement of Need seeks to explain how the church is compromised by poor sightlines, uncomfortable pews, a poorly located entrance, the absence of a welcome area, under-used sections such as the Gratwicke chapel, lack of kitchen or toilet facilities, and cramped office space. To address these perceived shortcomings, the three substantive elements of the proposal are as follows:
 - i. the removal of the pews, pulpit and choir stalls, and the repositioning of the lectern and font;
 - ii. the construction of a meeting room, WC, kitchenette and office on the north eastern side of the church;
 - iii. the construction of a new main entrance to the church through the walls of the Gratwicke chapel.

The incumbent, in his evidence, indicated that although the parish pursued the petition as a composite whole, it could be approached in three separate and severable stages in the order they appear above. This was not an 'all or nothing'

petition.

12. The intention is to have a flexible approach to the varied liturgical and appropriate secular uses of the church. Advice from the Right Reverend Graeme Knowles, Bishop of Sodor and Man, chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches, has helped the parish develop plans focusing on the east/west axis of the church with provision for the word and sacrament to take place under the organ pipes at the west end. Other arrangements were also demonstrated in various plans and projections. However, the Bishop was dismissive of the expression 'flexibility' when used as a mantra, preferring to concentrate upon the liturgical use of the sacred space and for the promotion of the mission of the church in a variety of other ways.
13. The main entrance is currently to the south, invisible from the lych gate. The south porch is described as unwelcoming, and there is no gathering space within. A new entrance is proposed into what is currently the Gratwicke chapel and which would become a generous welcome area. This entails the erection of a substantial extension, and the installation of a glazed internal door.
14. On the opposite side of the church from this proposed new entrance lies the current office. It is intended that this unsatisfactory twentieth century addition be demolished and a better and more sensitive structure be erected in its place. This would house a small meeting room, kitchenette and toilets at ground floor level with office space above. The significantly enlarged eastern façade which is proposed would include substantial glazing, unashamedly modern in style.

Preliminaries

15. Two matters require comment before passing to my adjudication. The first concerns the status to be afforded to the grant of conditional planning permission by the local planning authority. The petitioners did not suggest that it is in any way binding on this court but drew my attention to section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which provides that:
 'in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority ... shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

Mr Saunders, with whom Mr Garrard concurred, made the point that none of the amenity societies was consulted by Arun District Council in relation to the application for planning permission. Only English Heritage was invited to comment. He emphasized that the consistory court was in a much better position to consider the heritage issues raised in this case than the local planning authority because it had a corpus of expert opinion before it which had been tested in cross-examination. I accept that there is merit in both these arguments. However, I must also give appropriate weight to the fact that working within the statutory framework, Arun District Council nonetheless saw fit to grant planning

permission and, prior to doing so, afforded to local residents the opportunity to make representations on the proposal. Different considerations apply to the planning permission on the one hand and listed building consent on the other, and the procedures relating to the grant of a faculty are every bit as demanding as those for listed building consent. The fact that planning permission has been granted is not dispositive of this petition, but it is a factor to be taken into consideration.

16. The second preliminary matter arises out of the evidence of the Archdeacon of Chichester, the Venerable Douglas McKittrick. His statement was served late by the petitioners but was admitted into evidence with the consent of the other parties. It added very little to the other statements relied upon by the petitioners and was largely a matter of reiteration. However the Archdeacon did make mention of other churches throughout Sussex for whom the grant of the faculty in Angmering would be ‘an inspiration’. In his oral evidence he suggested that this decision might set a precedent for other churches in the diocese. In this the Archdeacon is mistaken. Every case brought before the consistory court is decided on its own particular facts. All church buildings are different and no church community is the same as any other. Cases are determined on their own merits in accordance with the evidence which is presented relating to a particular proposal in a particular place at a particular time. It would be inappropriate and improper to treat this judgment as being of any wider application. It is not. It relates solely to petition CH132/06 for St Margaret, Angmering and to the evidence, correspondence, representations and submissions made therein.

Legal analysis

17. This petition, in common with all petitions, is to be evaluated in the context of the heavy presumption against change which is the governing principle where, as here, changes to a listed church are proposed. The onus of proof lies with the proponents of change. The burden is not readily discharged. The practice of the consistory court is to follow the so-called *Bishopsgate* questions as expressly approved by the Court of Arches in *Re St Luke the Evangelist, Maidstone* [1995] Fam 1. The parties all agreed that this is the correct approach. No other legal authorities were cited to the court. Although the principles were common ground, there was little meeting of minds as to how they should be applied to this case, particularly the balancing exercise required by the third question. Differing views are apparent from the evidence of the petitioners, the objectors and those whose correspondence has been carefully considered by this court.

(1) Have the petitioners proved a necessity for some or all of the proposed works either because they are necessary for the pastoral well-being of the parish or for some other compelling reason?

18. A significant number of representations, articulated most forcefully by Mr Garrard for the Victorian Society, were to the effect that the works (or at least some of them) were unnecessary. He pointed to the limited seating capacity of the church, and to the existence of other halls and meeting spaces in the village in which

secular activities of the type envisaged by the petitioners could take place. He argued that the administrative functions of the parish could be re-located to the church hall, thereby freeing up space. These arguments coincided with similar representations made in much of the correspondence elicited by public notice. I have taken regard of the fact that whilst a number of local residents object to the proposals, a similar number are supportive. This petition cannot be determined on a head-count but on the merits of the underlying proposal, taking all observations and representations into account.

19. Having considered the competing representations I am of the opinion that the petitioners have proved to the required standard that at least some of the proposed works are necessary. I have particular regard to the evidence of mission and witness advanced by Canon Standen. I found him a compelling witness who was thoughtful and reflective, generous in the making of concessions, and a man of patent sincerity. He spoke of his experience since his institution as rector and was able to deal in cross-examination with each of the alternatives suggested to him. It was apparent that he had not set himself against other possibilities. On the contrary, he had been responsive to matters raised in consultation or otherwise and in many instances could indicate how the proposal had evolved in consequence of responses from consultees. Indeed it seems to me that the parish has suffered from a readiness to act upon all of the professional advice which it has received, even where in some instances it had been mutually contradictory.
20. I was also impressed by the evidence of Mrs Hawke concerning the deleterious effect of the current building and its interior on particular congregations. Her anecdotal reflection upon events during the Easter liturgies was poignant. Equally, Mrs Mason's evidence provided a different perspective, she not being a member of the church. This court must have some regard to *Building Faith in Our Future*, a statement on behalf of the Church of England by the Church Heritage Forum in 2004 and, in particular, to making church buildings available for multiple community uses, and for extending such uses throughout the week and not merely on Sundays.
21. This is a self-evidently thriving Christian community, exemplified by high attendances, by church plants (both in the past and proposed), and by a variety of events catering for different age and interest groups. I am satisfied that its activities are currently curtailed by the fabric of the building and that change is necessary.

(2) Will some or all of the works adversely affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural and historical interest?

22. Mr Johnson, on behalf of the petitioners, conceded that the works, both individually and cumulatively, would have an adverse effect on the character of the church as a building of special architectural and historical interest. I consider that such concession was correctly made. I also have in mind the setting of the church within an ensemble of buildings of Teulon design: the lych gate, vestry

hall, cottage and school.

(3) Is the necessity proved by the petitioners such that in the exercise of the court's discretion a faculty should be granted for some or all of the works?

23. It is this third question which has proved most contentious, because its very nature involves making a value judgment on issues which are finely balanced. It concerns a subtle evaluation of two concepts, each of which have an element of elasticity. The manner in which the question is framed makes it apparent that there are degrees of necessity. It is not absolute. The level of necessity required to tilt the balance of discretion in favour of granting a faculty depends upon the nature of the works proposed. The greater the adverse effect, the more powerful and convincing the necessity to be shown by the petitioners in discharging their burden of proof. Mr Johnson argued against this at some length and with some passion, but I am unable to accept his submissions on this matter. The wording of the third *Bishopsgate* question is clear and it is a formulation which has been consistently adopted by chancellors of both provinces in recent years. In order properly to resolve this third question, the component elements of the proposed works need to be examined separately. In relation to the overall cost, different views can legitimately co-exist as to how a local church uses its funds. The relief of poverty in the wider world is undoubtedly part of Christian witness. However, if a PCC decides to expend its funds on a building project and if members of the community pledge money for that purpose, it is not for this court to interfere with that discretion in the absence of bad faith or the avoidance of financial contribution to the diocese, neither of which is the case here.

(i) The internal reordering

24. Dealing first with the general reordering, I consider that the necessity proved by the petitioners is such that it justifies the adverse effect upon the character of the church as a building of special architectural and historical interest. I take particularly into account the professional evaluation of the DAC, the CCC and English Heritage. I also note that the Ancient Monuments Society does not, on balance, oppose the removal of the pews, but acquiesces in this 'drastic change with great reluctance' and 'in a spirit of compromise'. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings does not pursue an objection in relation to the internal reordering. The Victorian Society did not object to the removal of a portion of the nave pews but objected to wholesale clearance. Mr Garrard proposed the adaptation of the pews so that they could be moveable, but this proposition had not found favour with the petitioners, because of the size and weight of the pews, the fact they were uncomfortable, and the petitioners preference for chairs in various arrangements for liturgical and secular uses. I cannot criticise the petitioners for reaching this conclusion, on entirely reasonable and convincing grounds.
25. I also have regard to the preparedness of the petitioners to abide by any condition which the court deems fit to impose as to the retention of certain original features of Teulon's furnishings, a concession welcomed during the course of the hearing

both by Mr Garrard and Mr Saunders. It should be recorded that much of Teulon's original work has already been lost: the galleries have disappeared and the pulpit moved to a church in Rye. Even with the reordering, a considerable amount is to be retained: in addition to the furnishings, the intricate stone carving will remain on the columns in the nave and elsewhere.

26. I note in passing that the provision of more than one font, though a departure from the norm, is not contrary to English canon law nor does it offend against the doctrine, teaching, or liturgical practice of the Church of England. See *Re St Barnabas, Kensington* [1991] Fam 1 and *Re St George's, Deal* [1991] Fam 6. The fact that there will be three fonts (the historic font of Teulon design, a total immersion font, and a portable font) is not a reason for refusing the faculty, and no objection was taken on this basis. I am satisfied that a discrete ground of necessity is made out in this regard: borrowing a pool from the diocese and enlisting the assistance of the fire brigade is unseemly for the sacrament of baptism which signifies initiation into the Christian church.

(ii) *The north extension*

27. As to the north extension, it is generally agreed that the post-war addition is of little architectural merit, and, having used one part of it for robing for the consistory court hearing, its practical limitations became quickly evident. A case of necessity for the provision of proper office space and a meeting room is well made out and, in my opinion, that necessity is such as to justify the mildly adverse effect on the character of the church as a building of special architectural and historical interest. I use the word 'mildly' because this corner of the church is already compromised by the single storey flat-roofed addition, and I also take into account the fact that planning permission has already been granted for the extension which increases both the footprint and the bulk of this corner, and introduces a new gabled elevation. However, I have a reservation in relation to the glazing, which for convenience I address in the following section.

(iii) *The south extension*

28. Here we come to the most contentious part of the proposal, and the matter upon which the greatest time and attention was given at the hearing. The only destructive element in the entire proposal relates to the breaking through of an aperture in the west wall of the Gratwicke Chapel beneath the existing stained glass window. It is argued that although it may well be 'necessary' to have a larger, better and more visible welcome area, it is not so necessary as to justify the adverse effect that it will have on the character of the church by the creation of this new entrance and the erection of a large extension to provide a porch or lobby. This part of the proposal, it is suggested, is not so central to the worship and mission of the parish as to justify the grant of a faculty permitting so substantial a change. If the church is currently unwelcoming, say the objectors with some force, this can be remedied by improved signage pointing visitors to the existing entrance. Equally they argue that the clutter resulting from pushchairs and buggies is not as significant as the petitioners suggest. The point is made that

the welcome desk is very secular in its appearance.

29. It is correct that the effect of the internal reordering would be significantly compromised if the Gratwicke Chapel were to remain separate. The advantages of the opening up of the interior would be less apparent if this portion of the floor space were to be untouched and left 'sterile'. Whilst I am not convinced that any additional seating in this area would be significant (and here I note that Mrs Hawke's evidence was somewhat at variance with the various projections created by the architect) leaving it untouched would place limits on the usage which could be made of the church, whose size is not generous, both liturgically and for other dramatic or musical presentations.
30. Mr Saunders, Mr Garrard, and Ms Crofts each spoke of the importance of hierarchy of sacred space and of the sense of progression which is achieved on entering into ecclesiastical buildings. Ms Crofts opinion concerning the visual impact of the altar at the east end, carries less weight when one considers that the reordering is likely to result in collegiate seating with the focus of word and sacrament being elsewhere than the existing sanctuary. Each say that a large extension to the south cannot objectively be justified to this grade II* listed building. Ms Crofts and Mr Saunders, whilst not advocating it, argue that if the entrance must be through the east wall of the Gratwicke chapel, then an appropriate doorway could be created by skilled craftsmen without the need to erect an extension. They contend that the double height gabled extension serves no purpose, and is likely to overwhelm the chancel. The advantage of partial symmetry (which is not conceded) is offset by the size of the extensions and the change to the eastern façade.
31. I consider that the balancing exercise comes out very narrowly in favour of the grant of the faculty. I am satisfied that the worship and mission of the church necessitates the works even though there will be an adverse effect on the building. Enhanced provision for welcome and gathering is essential for meaningful Christian witness in the twenty-first century and I am persuaded that the parish has considered all other possible ways of achieving this result before coming to the conclusion that this is the only feasible way forward, albeit at a cost to the historic integrity and heritage of the building. I have regard to the grant of planning permission, to the support given to this proposal by the DAC and the CCC and to the acquiescence of English Heritage.
32. However, I am concerned with the extent of the glazing in the eastern façade of each of the two extensions. It is extensive. Canon Standen spoke of the wish to make a 'big impact' and to send a message to the community 'we are here – come in'. This may be laudable and desirable, but I am not convinced that it is 'necessary' in the manner envisaged by the *Bishopsgate* questions such as to justify the grant of a faculty when it will have an adverse effect on the character of the church as a building of special architectural and historical interest. Mr Lee Evans had to accept what was put to him by Mr Saunders, namely that glass does

not mellow with time: at best it fades or weathers. He suggested that the appearance of the glazing would be less brash than his computer generated images showed. When questioned about the design of the extension being 'loud and raucous' Mr Lee Evans volunteered that the only assertive piece was the glass art. He also accepted that there was something incongruous in having a stained glass window for a sacred building facing a two storey part of that building in office use. He accepted that people would be visible (albeit in blurred form) moving behind the glass. He said that the glass artist had incorporated into her design the balustrade for the stairs and the ceiling/floor between the two storeys.

33. Further, although the 'arrowhead' appearance of the glazing, with glazing directly beneath the eaves, may be regarded as desirable by the petitioners and the architect, I do not consider that it can properly be styled 'necessary'. Mr Haig's statement, which was admitted in evidence, speaks in favour of the proposal in preference to 'a rather impoverished pastiche' but his evidence is not focused on the issue of necessity. I accept without question, however, that the design 'is both technically and artistically of very high merit'. Mr Saunders drew attention to the proportion of solid to void – masonry to glass. Although his remarks were directed primarily towards his objection to the construction of the southern extension, they are pertinent and forceful more generally. I cannot accept the unsupported proposition of the petitioners that the extent of the glazing is the minimum necessary, although I note this is put in terms of 'achieving the effect we desire' (see page 855 of the hearing bundle) rather than for any architectural, structural or pastoral reason. I consider that glazing which is more restrained, muted and modest in its extent is to be preferred and that, in this single respect, the necessity contended for does not justify the adverse effect which the excess of glazing would have on this building. It follows that the faculty to be issued by this court will be subject to a condition requiring a reduction in the expanse of the glazing, which of course, will require a revision of its design. Whether the petitioners will wish to implement the faculty subject to this condition is a matter for them. A faculty is a permissive right. They are not required to carry it into effect. However, if they chose to do so, then it must be in accordance with each and all of the conditions on which it is granted.

Conclusion

34. I therefore order that a faculty pass the seal subject to the following conditions:
- i. that the concurrence is sought of the descendents of the Aubrey-Fletcher family for the re-location of memorial plaques within the Gratwicke Chapel.
 - ii. that attempts are made to find another home for the choir stalls, pews, pulpit, wooden screen, and blue wrought iron grill with gate in another church in the diocese or elsewhere. The choir stalls are to be kept as an ensemble and not broken up or disposed of separately.
 - iii. that the following furnishings are to be retained:

- (a) the boxed churchwardens' pew currently located against the west wall adjacent to the south porch;
 - (b) representative samples comprising at least two other pews including examples of bench ends, staves and newel posts;
 - (c) the font;
 - (d) the lectern/prayer desk to be sited in a position approved in writing by the chancellor following consultation with the amenity societies, and if possible, in proximity to one or more other retained samples of Teulon's work;
 - (e) if it is possible to include a representative sample of the choir pews within the church (such as at the west end of the north transept), this should also be considered, as should the possibility of the positioning of the wooden screen and/or the blue wrought iron grill to the Gratwicke chapel against the west wall above retained examples of Teulon's furniture.
- iv. that the extent of the proposed glazing in the eastern walls in the two proposed extensions be revisited in the light of this judgment and that before any works are commenced revised plans are submitted for approval by the chancellor. Such revisions are to comprise the removal of the 'arrowhead' glazing beneath the eaves and an overall reduction in the area of glazing. The petitioners will be expected to have consulted the DAC, CCC, Victorian Society, Ancient Monuments Society and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Monuments in relation to the revised plans, and the revised fenestration will need to be the subject of a further referral to Arun District Council.
 - v. that the architectural effects of solar gain and the need for consequent ventilation in the two eastern extensions be evaluated prior to the commencement of the works.
 - vi. any headstones which are displaced by the works are to be re-erected within the churchyard as close as possible to their original position. A plan of all such removals is to be submitted to the chancellor for approval in advance with the proposed new location clearly marked.
 - vii. the existing oak south doors are retained, together with all related ironwork.
 - viii. in the event that bats are found in the affected area during the building works, work on that area is to stop immediately and advice sought from the local English Nature office.
 - ix. an archaeological watching brief is to put in place to the satisfaction of a designated representative of the DAC in consultation with Mr Mark Taylor, the County Archaeologist.
 - x. details of the heating system are to be supplied to the DAC for approval, and

in default submitted to the chancellor for adjudication.

- xi. the specification should describe in detail those matters set out at (a) and (c) to (f) of proviso 2 in the DAC certificate. In (f) 'funerals' should read 'burials or interments'.
- xii. details of the electrical installation (including the proposed interior and exterior light fittings) and of all furniture, carpets and other soft furnishings to be submitted for prior approval by the chancellor following consultation with the DAC.
- xiii. no works are to be commenced or contracts placed until the registrar has certified in writing that the petitioners have satisfied him that the parish has adequate funds (either in hand or pledged) for the completion of the entirety of the works encompassed by this faculty, taking into account all matters arising from the conditions pursuant to which it is granted.
- xiv. the works are to be completed within twelve months of the issue of the faculty or such extended period as may be ordered by the court thereafter.
- xv. the works are to be executed under the direction of Mr Nicholas Lee Evans.

The Worshipful Mark Hill
Chancellor

10 May 2007