

Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

MINUTES

*A meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held by online conferencing
on Thursday 3rd April 2025 at 2.00 pm*

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The opening prayer was said by the Revd Preb Jim Trood (Acting Archdeacon of Walsall).
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven Dr Megan Smith (DAC Vice Chair), the Revd Preb Jim Trood (Acting Archdeacon of Walsall), the Revd Preb Jo Farnworth (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Preb Mary Thomas (Acting Archdeacon of Salop), the Revd Preb Terry Bloor, the Revd Margaret Brighton, Andy Foster, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Ed Higgins, Dr John Hunt, Adrian Mathias, Candida Pino, Mark Stewart, Dr Andy Wigley. In attendance: Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: The Ven Dr Susan Weller, the Revd Preb Julia Cody (Acting Archdeacon of Walsall), the Revd Geoffrey Eze, Chris Gill, Bryan Martin, Peter Woollam.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Candida Pino, item 7.2.1; Adrian Mathias, item 8.2.1.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

2. Matters arising

- 2.1 Standing down of the Revd Preb Pat Hawkins as DAC Chair, and continuation as new DAC member appointed from the elected members of Diocesan Synod, following appointment by the Diocesan Bishop (Easter 2025), in accordance with [schedule 2](#) (DAC constitution) of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018

Decision: The matter was noted; the Committee to extend a formal vote of thanks to the outgoing Chair at the in-person DAC meeting on 4th June 2025

- 2.2 Standing down of the Acting DAC Lighting Adviser (16th March 2025), with expressions of interest continued to be sought for permanent DAC advisers on [building services](#) (lighting, electrics, audio-visual, CCTV) and [turret clocks](#) (ongoing vacancies)

Decision: The matter was noted

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

- 2.3 Soft launch of Church of England's Buildings Management Portal (the new Online Faculty System) to DAC offices nationally in April 2025, with public access from October 2025

Decision: The matter was noted

3. New matters

- 3.1 Standing down of the Revds Prebs Julia Cody and Jim Trood (Acting Archdeacons of Walsall), and the Revds Prebs Jo Farnworth and Mary Thomas (Acting Archdeacons of Salop), as ex officio DAC members, following installation of the [new Archdeacons of Walsall and Salop](#) by the Diocesan Bishop (4th May 2025)

Decision: The matter was noted; the Committee extended a formal vote of thanks to the Acting Archdeacons for their tenure on the DAC

Action: The DAC officers to provide training on the Online Faculty System (OFS) to the new Archdeacons of Walsall and Salop prior to 4th June 2025 DAC meeting

4. Adviser site visit reports

4.1 Reports for approval

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

None this meeting

4.2 Reports to note

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

- 4.2.1 Tutbury, St Mary the Virgin (trees), 17th September 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.2 Castle Church, St Mary (trees), 16th December 2024 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.3 Longdon, St James (trees), 9th January 2025 (Andy Smith)
(Lichfield Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.4 Adbaston, St Michael and All Angels (trees), 21st January 2025 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.5 Foxt, St Mark the Evangelist (trees), 22nd January 2025 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.6 Woore, St Leonard (trees), 12th February 2025 (Andy Smith)
(Salop Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.7 Hollington, St John the Evangelist (trees), 14th February 2025 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.8 Checkley, St Mary and All Saints (trees), 27th February 2025 (Andy Smith)
(Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry)
- 4.2.9 Ryton, St Andrew (trees), 24th March 2025 (Andy Smith)
(Salop Archdeaconry)

Decision: The reports were noted

Action: None

5. Forthcoming DAC site visits

None this meeting

6.–9. Casework for consideration

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

6. Stoke-upon-Trent Archdeaconry

6.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

- 6.1.1 Kingsley, St Werburgh (Grade II) [quin. inspector: Simon Smith]
Reordering rear of church for meeting room (OFS [2024-101331](#)), 5th March 2025 (Giles Standing, from site notes by Helen Cook)

Decision: The report was approved with some minor amendments (additions)

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the report to the parish

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

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

Grade I

6.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2025-109164	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620327	Church Name:	Madeley: All Saints
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Madeley
Applicant Name:	Revd Tim Watson	Quin. Inspector:	Graham Holland
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Nov-2024
Proposal:	Refitting of existing utility space to a kitchen		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£13,070
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A		
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, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified.

The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance, and specifically 'Section 3: Assessment of the impact of the proposals' in the submitted Statement of Significance, in relation to the specific part of the church building to be developed. 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 Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent expressed their support for the proposal. The view was given that this is a highly missional church context that supports a varied and effective programme of worship and community outreach, whilst seeking to balance the significance of the church's heritage.
2. The DAC affirmed both this view and that the church building is Grade I listed. It therefore sits within the top 2.5% of all listed buildings nationally. In relation to which, it is considered

that the present scheme is likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, due to this heritage significance.

3. The Committee also confirmed, however, that the parish's proposal represents an excellent opportunity to significantly improve this area of the church. The photographs within the submission suggest that the present utility space is an ad hoc formulation, with an overburden of stored materials and a highly impractical refreshment facility.
4. In fact, the photographs reveal that because of the stored material, a technical appreciation of the stonework within this space cannot be achieved. In relation to which, the DAC questioned whether there are any carved or profiled elements of interest, which may have bearing on the proposal. In order to be able to give its fullest view, the Committee suggests that the parish should temporarily clear the space, as practicably as possible, and to provide revised images.
5. The DAC considered that the sketch drawing by the QI architect is competently laid out as a facility. It was noted that the existing timber screen and door are to be retained, which will conceal the new facilities from view within the worship space.
6. More specifically, the fitted kitchen units are shown vented, but which should be to top and bottom to ensure cross-ventilation of the stone walls. Further details are required as to the construction of these units, including drawn sections.
7. It was identified that there is existing drainage and water to this area. Details are needed, however, as to whether these are suitable for reuse, together with any other mechanical and electrical (M&E) elements, e.g. lighting.
8. An external door also appears to be obscured by the proposed work, on the north elevation, and consideration should be given as to whether this is a loss of a required means of escape, including in relation to building control.
9. A kitchen builder's drawn plan is also included within the submission, which marks a cooker unit within the space, but which is not shown on the QI architect's drawing. It was cautioned that a cooker requires consideration of other issues including ventilation and fire risk, which will need to be addressed in the design development.
10. The DAC recommended that the QI architect should coordinate the overall proposal accordingly.

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).

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

Grade II

6.2.2

OFS Application Ref:	2025-111008	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620466	Church Name:	Stramshall: St Michael & All Angels
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Stramshall
Applicant Name:	Stephen Dobson	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Parsons
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Sep-2020
Proposal:	Installation of toilet and kitchen facilities		

No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£19,986
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A		
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 the missional imperative for the works, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the listed church building had not yet been fully identified and justified.

The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance, and specifically 'Section 2: The significance of the area affected by the proposal' and 'Section 3: Assessment of the impact of the proposals' in the submitted Statement of Significance, in relation to the proposed removal of pews and external archaeological works for drainage. 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 DAC affirmed that in order to best understand, and be able to appraise, the proposal, additional information is required regarding the specifics of the scheme. As such, the Committee would pose a series of questions to the parish and QI architect, as follows.
2. What is the detail of the new floor construction within the accessible toilet? The pew platform is at a higher level than the tiled floor; more detailed information of the new levelled floor would be welcome (a detailed and annotated section through the toilet would be sufficient). Is the area between the existing aisle and the toilet door going to be tiled to match the existing floor pattern?
3. Has any thought been given to the possibility of better integrating the toilet 'pod' with the tongue and groove (T&G) screen (i.e. a moulded cornice to the screen at the same height as the pod)?
4. Could the portion of screen immediately adjacent to the toilet be removed, in order to open up the catering point space for after-service gathering and have an unobstructed view of the west window? The space to the south end of the screened space could then have a door and be used for possible storage.
5. Has consideration been given on plan drawing no. N22-03C to hanging the toilet door the other way round, so as not to require disabled users to go around the door to access the facility?
6. The current downpipe arrangement to the north (as shown on the submitted photo) is potentially concerning, as it appears that this discharges into a plastic container. Is it the intention to introduce a new gully and a water butt with a diverter?
7. There are two internal downpipes (to the south and the north elevation): where do they discharge?
8. What kind of external cover grille has been specified for the new ventilation pipe?
9. Lastly, it was observed that drawing no. N22-03C indicates that the proposed trench arch drainage system is detailed on drawing no. N22-04, but which does not appear to the present within the current submission (and should be added). The DAC Archaeology Adviser noted that an archaeological watching brief would be required for these works, due to historic and/or prehistoric structures having been recorded on or near the site.

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 the Victorian Society and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer).

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

6.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

6.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

Private faculty – Formal advice

*Grade II**

6.6.1

OFS Application Ref:	N/A – see papers on OneDrive	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620444	Church Name:	Rangemore: All Saints
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	All Saints Rangemore
Applicant Name:	██████████	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	05-Oct-2023
Proposal:	Introduction of a non-conforming memorial to ██████████ in the churchyard		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A – Previously considered by the Archdeacons corporately, as relating to a churchyard matter, in accordance with the Lichfield DAC Delegated Authority Policy (Amended October 2023), on behalf of the full DAC. However, deferred by the Archdeacons for full DAC consideration (as per the Policy)		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents. The Committee noted that the application constituted a private petition for faculty for a churchyard memorial

that falls outside the requirements of the Chancellor's [Churchyard Regulations](#) (2013). It was deemed that the physical attributes of the proposed memorial are clearly understandable through the submitted description and drawing, and that the petitioner's rationale for an identifiable place of rest, and thereby a memorial in kind, is well articulated.

In relation to the latter, the DAC is aware that the deceased held a high-profile public status, specifically as a broadcaster, and had an international following. The Committee is also mindful of the fact that the burial occurred within Rangemore churchyard in [REDACTED], and that a permanent memorial is now sought by the heir-at-law with some degree of urgency. There are therefore issues of sensitivity, and pastoral matters, that pertain to the case.

The DAC identified that the memorial is proposed to constitute two parts, upstanding and flat, and that the latter is to be raised above ground level. Both are intended to be inscribed. The stone type is proposed to be a mid-grey and lavender-blue polished granite. Whilst these features individually, and collectively, fall outside the Churchyard Regulations, it is understood that this configuration is reflective of the [REDACTED] cultural heritage of the heir-at-law. It is not apparent from the petition papers whether this style of memorial was formerly sought by the deceased themselves.

The DAC also carefully considered the photographs of existing memorials within Rangemore churchyard, supplied as part of the application by the supporting memorial mason. The Committee noted that with few exceptions, such as the Bass family tombs located close to the chancel east wall, those depicted are Victorian or subsequent memorials which are in keeping with their time rather than the current Regulations. As such, these were not deemed to provide a sufficiently compelling precedent for the proposed memorial.

Indeed, the DAC observed that the churchyard, which lies in a conservation area and adjacent to the Grade II* listed church building, remains unusually uniform in its continued adoption of natural stone memorials, rather than graves in alternative stone types such as black or dark-grey granite. The Committee determined that the material of the memorial proposed for introduction would not be sufficiently in keeping with the character of the churchyard or the majority of the existing memorials. It was suggested that a local Staffordshire stone, such as Hollington, would be more suitable for this context and location.

With this recommendation in mind, the DAC further moved to suggest that the raised horizontal element of the proposed memorial would be better situated if designed flush with the ground. It is intended that this would also facilitate the upkeep of the churchyard, as referred to in the Regulations. With these amendments, to the choice of the stone and the positioning of the horizontal element, the Committee felt that the proposal was acceptable. In relation to the dual inscriptions, on the vertical and horizontal elements of the memorial, the DAC confirmed its support for the texts, and their positioning, as submitted.

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 final formal DAC advice. In relation to the current submission, the Committee would not recommend the proposal.

Decision: Defer

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the Diocesan Registry Assistant

7. Salop Archdeaconry

7.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

- 7.1.1 Selattyn, St Mary (Grade I) [quin. inspector: Anne Netherwood]
Replacement of obsolete oil heating system with electric infrared heating panels (OFS [2024-102900](#)), 14th March 2025 (Giles Standing, from site notes by Ed Higgins and Malcolm Price)

Decision: The report was approved with some minor amendments (additions)

Action: The DAC Secretary to issue the report to the parish

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

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

Grade II*

7.2.1

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:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A		
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, 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 Statements of Significance and Needs, and recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England [guidance on Statements](#).

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

1. The Committee supported the parish's stated needs for an accessible toilet facility at the church, in both pastoral and missional terms.
2. It was noted that this is a small, neat church on a tight, characterful site, with original Georgian and sympathetic Victorian features.
3. The Committee recognised that the parish has considered an internal accessible toilet facility, but that the parish had expressed concerns about the visual impact on the space and the reduction in capacity, including historic seating.

4. The DAC observed that the parish is instead proposing an extension on the north side of the tower, which the QI architect has put forward as being the most discrete location.
5. However, the Committee suggested that the plan of the proposed facility is twice as big as it needs to be, as it incorporates a lobby and a storage area, which is not identified as a need.
6. In terms of the proposed aesthetic, the DAC considered that the elevational design is quite characterful. Conversely, the very large roof would be highly impactful. A DAC architect member expressed that there are other ways of maintaining scale and character without being visually obtrusive.
7. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies cautioned that the tower is the most important part of the church visually, and the most significant element architecturally. As such, the view was expressed that it should not be added to, if at all possible, and otherwise for any addition to be recessed significantly behind the west wall of the tower, so that the integrity of that wall is compromised as little as possible.
8. The Committee resolved to suggest the reduction of the extension to just a good sized accessible toilet facility, and reconsider the elevational treatment accordingly, including the steep pitch of the roof, which was deemed to be out of character for the Georgian facade.
9. In addition, the DAC Archaeology Adviser 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.
10. Alongside the more developed tower proposal, it was determined that a fuller options appraisal should also be provided, to confirm the most beneficial, and least harmful, location for such a facility, inside and outside.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023 is applicable. The Committee suggested that the revised 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*)

Unlisted

7.2.2

OFS Application Ref:	2024-096317	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620534	Church Name:	Weston Rhyn: St John
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Weston Rhyn
Applicant Name:	Revd Stuart Jermy	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood [project architect: David Hughes]

Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	14-Sep-2022
Proposal:	Insertion of screen in former chancel, creation of upper and lower meeting rooms, introduction of new entrance stair, with associated new screens and doors, and insertion of glazed doors within porch (works in 2 phases)		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third (first as formal)	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 4th December 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, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice had been considered.

The Committee continued to support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric of the church building had been sufficiently identified and justified. 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 final development of the scheme, the DAC offered the following advice:

1. The Committee supports the proposed works within the two phases, incorporating the insertion of the screen in the former chancel, creation of upper and lower meeting rooms, introduction of a new entrance stair, with associated new screens and doors, and insertion of glazed doors within the porch.
2. In relation to the main chancel screen specifically, the DAC confirmed that the timber screen to the mezzanine (screen 2) is supported, although construction details are required to confirm section sizes.
3. The Committee understands the reasoning for the matching timber screen as secondary glazing across the traceried east window, at the same level within the proposed upper meeting room. Additional details were previously requested, and a 3D view of the upper tracery has been submitted by the project architect.
4. However, the DAC commented that this will have to cut across the tracery, and that, in timber, this is shown as a heavy section. No construction details are included, but which are required.
5. As this appears to be a fixed screen, it was queried how the window would be cleaned (including removal of cobwebs). Opening lights would make the framing even thicker. The Committee questioned again whether an aluminium screen might not have narrower sight lines and be capable of enabling cleaning.
6. In fact, it was identified that a faculty (no. [2022-070559](#)) was previously granted in 2022 for the installation of secondary glazing, in aluminium, to windows in the (liturgical) nave, vestry and porch. In view of which, the DAC proposes that it would be more beneficial to undertake the same with the east window, also to potentially enable cleaning.
7. Additional details of the timber staircase are required, or to be resubmitted (if unchanged) from the faculty (no. 4490, not on the OFS) previously granted in 2017 (expired in 2022).
8. In connection with the current porch proposals (constituting phase 2), it was noted that section details of the aluminium screen have been provided. These are acceptable, though the elevation needs updating to the frame sizes indicated. However, there are no details

in relation to the abutment with the ceiling or walls. It is assumed that this has been taken into consideration by the positioning of the screen.

9. Separately, a DAC architect member commented that there are some variations across the drawings, such as where drawing no. 4100 (Rev. P07) shows an open cooker and extract hood next to the coffee bar, and labels a 60 inch TV screen nearby, but which are either not shown or labelled on drawing no. 4102 (Rev. P08). These drawings should be clarified.
10. Lastly, and in relation to which, additional detail on the hob and food preparation area should be supplied, regarding extraction and fire separation.

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 indicated that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for final, formal DAC advice. However, the PCC should note that this does not remove the requirement for any other secular statutory regulations, where applicable.

Decision: Defer

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

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

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

None this meeting

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

*Grade II**

7.5.1

OFS Application Ref:	2023-089254	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620577	Church Name:	Eyton: St Catherine
Archdeaconsry:	Salop	Parish:	Wellington with Eyton
Applicant Name:	Revd Tim Carter	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	02-Aug-2024
Proposal:	Creation of Garden of Remembrance, including retrospective creation of Area for the Burial of Cremated Remains (ABCR)		

No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£3,500
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A – Separate faculty (2023-091784) for the introduction of ramped access to churchyard extension (site of ABCR) previously granted on 19th July 2024. Note also item 7.6.1 below (churchyard policy)		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents. In relation to which, the Committee supported the principle of the proposal.

The DAC Archaeology Adviser indicated that the Garden of Remembrance, including an Area for the Burial of Cremated Remains (ABCR), is to be located in a modern extension to the churchyard, which is on the opposite side of, and separated by, a minor road. There will therefore be no archaeological impact from the proposal.

The DAC supported the proposed introduction of a collective memorial, in accordance with the Chancellor's Churchyard Regulations (2013). However, the Committee considered that the form and design of this particular memorial was not sufficiently in keeping with the setting and context of the churchyard extension, or the historic churchyard beyond.

It was recommended that the parish should give further consideration to the collective memorial, in order that its appearance is less heavy, and more inspiring in relation to the Christian message of hope that such a memorial is seeking to convey. Consideration should also be given as to whether there will be space on the memorial for enough plaques in relation to the number of burials that there may be.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 is not applicable. As such, the Committee indicated that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for final formal DAC advice.

Decision: Defer

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

7.5.2

OFS Application Ref:	2024-094301	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620608	Church Name:	Prees: St Chad
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Prees
Applicant Name:	Revd Deborah Walton	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	25-Mar-2022
Proposal:	Creation of a new Area for the Burial of Cremated Remains (ABCR), with bench, in the old churchyard		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£50
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents. In relation to which, the Committee supported the principle of the proposal.

The DAC Archaeology Adviser indicated that the churchyard is very nearly full and that the PCC is working towards closure. The DAC previously considered proposals from the parish to reuse parts of the old churchyard for new burials, but members had expressed significant concerns about the impact that this would have on existing burials.

Instead, the Adviser noted that the proposed ABCR would have a far lower impact, since ashes would be interred at a shallower depth and the excavation required would be far less intrusive. It was therefore considered that there would be no specific archaeological impact, albeit that the churchyard is archaeologically sensitive, with the parish church built on a pre-Conquest site.

The presence of substantial Yew trees confirms that the churchyard is ancient, and such tree roots should not be disturbed by this proposal.

Lastly, the DAC noted that the plots will be unmarked, so the ABCR would be visually unintrusive.

The Committee considered, however, that the bench the parish is proposing to incorporate, whilst made of recycled materials, is of limited design merit. The DAC resolved that a natural oak bench would be more suitable for this historic churchyard location.

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

Decision: Recommend with the following provisos:

- The DAC considers that a natural oak bench would be more suitable for this historic churchyard location than the proposed bench made of recycled materials. The PCC should bring forward proposals for such an introduction accordingly.

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

Unlisted

7.5.3

OFS Application Ref:	2024-104775	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620514	Church Name:	Gobowen: All Saints
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Hengoed with Gobowen
Applicant Name:	Revd Steve Nicholson	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	18-Jun-2021
Proposal:	Planting of a memorial tree, and permission for two additional trees, with memorial plaques, to be planted over the coming years to make a small memorial grove north-west of the church (three ornamental trees, one being a memorial tree, are already present in that location)		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£450
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2023		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents. In relation to which, the Committee supported the principle of the proposal.

It was confirmed that the DAC Tree Adviser (in absentia) had been consulted on the scheme, and had provided an internal consultation response for inclusion in the Committee's formal advice.

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

Decision: Recommend with the following provisos:

- The DAC Tree Adviser suggests that one of the three proposed trees should be a Field Maple or similar to give some longevity to the canopy cover of the area.

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

7.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

Churchyard policy – Formal advice

*Grade II**

7.6.1

OFS Application Ref:	N/A – see papers on OneDrive	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620577	Church Name:	Eyton: St Catherine
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Wellington with Eyton
Applicant Name:	Revd Tim Carter	Quin. Inspector:	Mark Newall
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	02-Aug-2024
Proposal:	Creation of a parish churchyard policy, relating to headstones and the interment of cremated remains		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Nil
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A – Formal DAC advice required to be issued to the Registry, for the Diocesan Chancellor, in accordance with the Chancellor's Churchyard Regulations , p. 7–8 and specifically schedule 2 (para ii on p. 13). Note also item 7.5.1 above (ABCR)		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents. In relation to which, the Committee supported the principle of the proposal.

The DAC recognised that the first objective of the churchyard policy is to regularise previous, and thereby to harmonise future, headstones in non-conforming stone and lettering types, in order to create a consistent aesthetic and practice within the modern churchyard extension. It was noted that this policy would not have an impact on memorials within the historic churchyard.

The DAC observed that the second objective of the policy is to regularise interments of cremated remains, including upholding the introduction of previous, but ceasing the addition of new, individual grave markers. Similarly, whilst the DAC noted that burial in a proposed environmentally-friendly 'biocasket' falls outside the Chancellor's Churchyard Regulations (2013), the Committee would support the PCC's preference for its use in this context as part of the wider regularising of an irregular situation within the churchyard extension.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 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.

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the Diocesan Registry Assistant

8. Lichfield 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

Case Reference No.:	2022-069439	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620037	Church Name:	Lichfield: St Michael
Archdeaconry:	Lichfield	Parish:	Lichfield St Michael and St Mary
Applicant Name:	Alan Toplis	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	02-Jul-2024
Proposal:	Extension to south side of church, to provide rooms to replace church hall and office facilities (now demolished, on another site)		
No. of Times to DAC:	Fourth	Cost Est:	£1,055,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at 12th February 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 proposal for an extension to the south side of the church, and confirmed that the matters previously raised by the DAC's informal advice had been considered.

The DAC Chair informed the Committee that a letter had been received from the PCC, requesting clarification on some aspects of the DAC's previous informal advice, specifically with regard to the aesthetic considerations of the scheme. The Committee had this in mind when seeking to provide the PCC with additional, clear advice on this aspect of the proposal particularly.

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

1. The Archdeacon of Lichfield (in absentia) reaffirmed the parish's need for such a facility.
2. The DAC carefully considered the additional documentation from the QI architect and their practice. The Committee observed that no design changes had been made, but that the resubmission included reworked elevations, photorealistic visuals, and images of stone

samples positioned against the current fabric. The Committee was grateful for this extra detail, in response to its previous advice.

3. Additional comments on the aesthetics and materials were put forward by DAC architects and nominated members, which views were upheld by the Committee corporately. Such opinions sought to provide clarification on the previous characterisation of the building as being 'somewhat austere', and other terms such as 'ponderous and heavy'.
4. In fact, seeking to expand on these views, it was commented that the proposal is not a particularly joyful design, and is almost industrial in feel.
5. An alternative cautionary view was expressed against the regimented fenestration, largely blank, on the south elevation. These slits were considered to look like a conventional 'modernist' gesture.
6. A related view did not support the proposed choice of natural sandstone, on the reasoning that this material and its jointing are more indicative of a traditional building, which is not reflected in the contemporary design of the proposed extension. Instead, the stonework over large windows would look artificial, as actual stone could not bridge those gaps.
7. A DAC architect affirmed this opinion, and commented that apart from a tendency to visual heaviness, natural sandstone will not accomplish the wide spans over the larger openings without steel behind, and where it would tend to look like cladding (which, in fact, it would be).
8. The separate opinion was expressed that the west elevation looks funereal, manifested by the deep 'lintel' over the windows.
9. These comments confirmed the general view of the DAC that the building design has not been achieved yet. The Committee did recognise the QI architect's explanation of the development of the design, and that the general form has been put forward consistently.
10. Indeed, in relation to the supplied evolution of the design ('A1 Panel – Design Evolution .pdf'), the Committee resolved that the 'Feasibility Level' version continues to be the most supportable, although it has the same general massing. It was proposed that this may be due to its less regimented window proportions on the south, and perhaps because it is a white card virtual model, thereby not shown with darkish sandstone.
11. With this in mind, the DAC recommended that the QI architect should look again at the window proportions, and reconsider whether natural sandstone is the correct material. By way of an alternative option, the Committee queried whether the building could have render instead, perhaps over a low masonry plinth. Overall, however, it was concluded that the design needs to reflect a strong idea, carried through with conviction.
12. Lastly, it was strongly restated that the parish should undertake consultation with external statutory bodies on the scheme to inform the broader discussion (in addition to the DAC).

It was reaffirmed that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. The Committee reiterated its previous suggestion that the scheme should next be resubmitted for external informal consultation (pre-application advice) with Historic England, the Victorian Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer). Such consultation is separate from planning permission, through the Local Planning Authority, which matter is in addition to, 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

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

None this meeting

8.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

None this meeting

9. Walsall Archdeaconry

9.1 DAC site visit reports for approval

None this meeting

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

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

Grade II*

9.2.1

OFS Application Ref:	2022-076400	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620122	Church Name:	Pattingham: St Chad
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Pattingham and Patshull
Applicant Name:	Geoffrey Dann	Quin. Inspector:	Simon Smith
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	21-Apr-2022
Proposal:	Reordering and internal alternations to nave north aisle		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£100,000 [original scheme]
DAC Comments to Date:	Last considered as DAC site visit report approved at 5th April 2023 DAC meeting (report uploaded to application on OFS). Previously considered for informal advice at 28th September 2022 DAC meeting (parish response to DAC advice uploaded as supporting document to application on OFS, 9th March 2023)		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022		

The Committee last considered the proposal as a DAC site visit report approved at 5th April 2023 DAC meeting. 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 Acting Archdeacon of Walsall expressed their support for the proposal. The view was given that the proposal would make the church more accessible to the local community, in addition to the large amount of outreach work already being undertaken by the parish.
2. The DAC affirmed both this view and that the church building is Grade II* listed. In relation to which, it is considered that in order to best understand, and be able to appraise, the proposal, additional information is required regarding the specifics of the scheme. As such, the Committee would pose a series of questions to the parish and QI architect, as follows.
3. The proposed Caspian fan heaters might not be appropriate for installation within the church, as they have a very strong industrial appearance. Have visual alternatives been considered?
4. Will there be any inspection points to access the covered service trenches? The floor will be covered in timber boards, and so it is assumed that all the quarry tiles will be lifted and disposed of. As such, is the whole area going to be excavated to allow for a new substrate and the thickness of the boards? This aspect should be expanded on.
5. Is it necessary to have two new trenches to accommodate the heating pipes? It seems that this portion of floor will be heavily impacted on by this (would one suffice?).
6. Can any of the pews be retained and positioned along the north wall?
7. What kind of faucet is specified, and is it a folding one? Has an invisible kitchen sink been considered?
8. It is assumed that the catering point will be used for coffee mornings and light lunches. As it is not a commercial kitchen, will the Sanispeed Plus macerator pump be necessary? What kind of extractor has been specified (a vented induction hob perhaps?).
9. Has an assessment of the effect of steam and vapours on the adjacent stained glass been carried out by a stained glass specialist?
10. Can it be confirmed that the 'gate' into the kitchen area will be of the same design as the adapted vestry's screen panels? This would conceal the new modern base units from view.

It was determined that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 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 Victorian Society, and the Local Planning Authority (Conservation Officer).

Action: The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

Grade II

9.2.2

OFS Application Ref:	2024-101640	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620163	Church Name:	Walsall: St Paul
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	St Paul Walsall
Applicant Name:	Revd Canon Robert Hall	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Hayward
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	27-Jun-2024

Proposal:	Works to Day Chapel to enable disability and buggy access [within The Crossing at St Paul's]		
No. of Times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£85,000
DAC Comments to Date:	N/A		
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 the accessibility imperative for the works, but considered that the impact of the proposed works on the fabric and contents of the chapel, within the listed church building, had not yet been fully identified and justified.

The DAC encouraged the parish to continue to develop its Statements of Significance, and specifically 'Section 2: The significance of the area affected by the proposal' and 'Section 3: Assessment of the impact of the proposals' in the submitted Statement of Significance. The Statement should address in more detail each element of the fabric or contents affected by the proposal, to enable an assessment against the needs demonstrated by the parish. 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 Acting Archdeacon of Walsall expressed their support for the proposal for increasing accessibility. The view was given that the chapel is frequently visited and attended each day, and that as such there is a clear need for making the chapel more accessible.
2. The DAC identified that the PCC had considered, in 2023, an options appraisal prepared by its QI architect, constituting 4 possible proposals for increasing access into and within the chapel. These options constitute, in general terms, the introduction of an internal ramp within the chapel, a lift in the adjoining entrance foyer, a new side entrance to the chapel, and a new chapel floor respectively.
3. The PCC has put forward its own alternative version of the fourth option, constituting the replacement of the floor, still to provide level access, but with the existing furniture to be returned as it is currently. The proposal would include a rail and step for communion, as currently, level with the altar.
4. The DAC supported the principle of this alternative proposal, noting also that the current Statement of Significance specifically identifies that 'People often comment on liking the traditional nature and environment of the chapel such as the pews, altar, and reredos'.
5. In relation to which, the DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies observed that the contents of this chapel represent the remaining fittings of the original late-Victorian church, prior to the more recent major reordering of the wider church building as The Crossing, and as such should indeed be retained in situ within the chapel.
6. Separately, but in addition, the Committee concurred with the identified constraints for this fourth (albeit modified) option within the QI architect's options appraisal. As such, the DAC determined that the existing floor would need to be investigated to confirm whether it is a raised or solid floor, and whether it is possible for it to be removed to create a level surface. Similarly, if services are contained within the floor void, the potential impact on the existing building would need to be appraised.
7. In addition to which, the DAC indicated that the impact on existing architectural features should also be considered, including alterations required to the column bases and dado panelling. This should be presented in both written and drawn form, by the QI architect.

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.

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

None this meeting

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

None this meeting

9.5 Landscaping in relation to a listed or unlisted church building

None this meeting

9.6 Casework from Diocesan Registry

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:	2024-107546	Church Name:	Lilleshall: St Michael & All Angels
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Refurbishment of the bell installation		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Woollam	Date NoA Issued:	21st March 2025

10.1.2

OFS Application Ref:	2025-108747	Church Name:	Penn Fields: St Philip
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	Ramp improvements, and tile and downpipe replacements		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	21st March 2025

10.1.3

OFS Application Ref:	N/A – private faculty no. 5310	Site Name:	Ellesmere: Swan Hill Cemetery
Listing:	N/A	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Memorial safety testing within the consecrated areas of the council cemetery managed by Ellesmere Town Council		
DAC Consultees:	Revd Preb Mary Thomas† (lead) (Archdeacons corpora-	Date NoA Issued:	21st March 2025

10.1.4

OFS Application Ref:	N/A – private faculty no. 5342	Church Name:	Burton-on-Trent: St Modwen
Listing:	Grade I (NB churchyard case)	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	The local authority, East Staffordshire Borough Council, to erect scaffold to Burton Market Hall over the churchyard of the adjoining St Modwen's Church		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	21st March 2025

10.1.5

OFS Application Ref:	2024-100919	Church Name:	West Felton: St Michael
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Emergency repair of water pipe in churchyard (granted under interim faculty no. 5270)		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	21st March 2025

10.1.6

OFS Application Ref:	2025-108630	Church Name:	Tittensor: St Luke
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	To uphold the relocation of a beech sapling previously planted without authorisation, too close to St Luke's church hall, to the wildlife area, clear of buildings, within the churchyard		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	21st March 2025

10.1.7

OFS Application Ref:	2024-096029	Church Name:	Whitchurch: St Alkmund
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Installation of accessible toilet in north lobby (flower vestry), and automation of inner doors to north and south lobbies [confirmation of final details under delegated authority]		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	21st March 2025

10.1.8

OFS Application Ref:	2024-097513	Church Name:	Knutton: St Mary
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Temporary repair to roof of church where there are loose and missing tiles following storm, causing safety issue and water ingress (granted under interim faculty no. 5237)		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	22nd March 2025

10.1.9

OFS Application Ref:	2025-108478	Church Name:	Knutton: St Mary
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	To strip out lath and plaster ceiling panels due to rot and to allow for drying out – to be replaced like for like (granted under interim faculty no. 5338)		
DAC Consultee:	Adrian Mathias	Date NoA Issued:	22nd March 2025

10.1.10

OFS Application Ref:	2024-104629	Church Name:	Hatherton: St Saviour
Listing:	Unlisted	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Upgrading of the church hall (unlisted) by improving roof/wall insulation		
DAC Consultee:	Mark Stewart	Date NoA Issued:	22nd March 2025

10.1.11

OFS Application Ref:	2025-110532	Church Name:	Cheadle: St Giles
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Installation of three autowind units to the turret clock for automatic winding, and to strip and clean the clock on installation		
DAC Consultee:	Robert Ovens ^{††}	Date NoA Issued:	22nd March 2025

10.1.12

OFS Application Ref:	2023-091163	Church Name:	Salt: St James the Great
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Restoring and rehanging the bells for swing chiming		
DAC Consultee:	Peter Woollam	Date NoA Issued:	22nd March 2025

10.1.13

OFS Application Ref:	2024-095109	Church Name:	Bentley: Emmanuel
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Walsall
Proposal:	New electrical works to replace old electrics (new MCB board and removal of asbestos)		
DAC Consultee:	Tim Bowdent ^{††}	Date NoA Issued:	22nd March 2025

10.1.14

OFS Application Ref:	2022-076298	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Listing:	Grade I	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Conserve 6 historical monuments [confirmation of final details under delegated authority]		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Wigley	Date NoA Issued:	24th March 2025

10.1.15

OFS Application Ref:	2024-106874	Church Name:	Hanford: St Matthias
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent

Proposal:	Disposal of obsolete metalwork that formed part of choir stalls prior to 2007/08 reordering		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Foster	Date NoA Issued:	24th March 2025

10.1.16

OFS Application Ref:	2024-104821	Church Name:	Whittington: St Giles
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Installation of up to 6 overhead infrared heating panels in the social space, under the gallery, created by the recent reordering of the west end of the nave		
DAC Consultee:	Malcolm Price	Date NoA Issued:	24th March 2025

10.1.17

OFS Application Ref:	2023-092113	Church Name:	Stoke-on-Trent: St Peter ad Vincula (Stoke Minster)
Listing:	Grade II	Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent
Proposal:	Removal of 2 dangerous trees (granted under interim faculty no. 5183)		
DAC Consultee:	Andy Smith	Date NoA Issued:	24th March 2025

10.1.18

OFS Application Ref:	2024-095946	Church Name:	Wem: St Peter & St Paul
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Salop
Proposal:	Repair of 7 nave windows on the north and south elevations		
DAC Consultee:	Candida Pino	Date NoA Issued:	24th March 2025

10.1.19

OFS Application Ref:	2024-099656	Church Name:	Cannock: St Luke
Listing:	Grade II*	Archdeaconry:	Lichfield
Proposal:	Internal plasterwork repairs, including bed joint reinforcement using stainless steel helical bars, to south and north clerestories of nave (south side confirmatory works), extending beyond plasterwork repairs approved under List B 2023-092009		
DAC Consultee:	Candida Pino	Date NoA Issued:	24th March 2025

† Acting Archdeacon †† 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 Lyneal-cum-Colemere, St John the Evangelist (Grade II*), Candida Pino proposed inspector

10.2.2 Dunston, St Leonard (Grade II), Adrian Mathias proposed inspector

10.2.3 Wednesbury, St Bartholomew (Grade II), Simon Smith proposed inspector

10.2.4 Stoke-on-Trent, St Peter ad Vincula (Stoke Minster) (Grade II), Simon Smith proposed inspector

10.2.5 Stoke-on-Trent, St Paul (Mount Pleasant) (unlisted), Simon Smith proposed inspector

10.2.6 Oxley, The Epiphany (unlisted), David Powell proposed inspector

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

Action: None

11. Any other business

None this meeting

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 4th June 2025 at 2.00 pm**

to be held ***in person (not by online conferencing)***

Location in Lichfield Cathedral Close to be confirmed

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary

giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 221152

Helen Cook, Assistant DAC Secretary

helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org 01543 221155