



# St Lawrence Church

LECHLADE-ON-THAMES

## Project Inspire



Project Inspire Working Group

Version 7

March 2022

## Comments log – Statutory Consultees

This document provides a written response to the comments raised by the statutory consultees in letters and emails, namely

- A. The Church Buildings Council (visited 22 October 2021) - letter 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021
- B. Historic England (visited 22 October 2021) - letter 5<sup>th</sup> November 2021
- C. Historic Buildings and Places (visited 22 October 2021) - letter 15<sup>th</sup> November 2021
- D. Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings (did not visit) – email 10<sup>th</sup> November 2021
- E. Victorian Society (did not visit) – email 4<sup>th</sup> February 2022

Colour key:

Agreed/ mindful to accept	
Further justification or explanation to be provided in the Statement of Need or Significance	

*The response to comments refers to the Statements of Need v15 dated February 2022 and the Statement of Significance Parts 1 and 2 V8 dated September 2021. The Statement of Significance was reviewed and updated for minor additions and has been reissued in March 2022.*

### A. Church Buildings Council

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
<b>1. Summary</b>							
CBC1	22 Dec 21	<p>The Council was broadly in agreement with the following elements of the proposal and was content to defer consideration of the following elements to the DAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• alterations to the floor and outer doors of the north porch and installation of glazed doors to the north porch</li> <li>• Relocation of the stained-glass window from the north wall to the south wall</li> </ul>	Noted	Agreed			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alterations to the vestry</li> <li>The increased floor level, including alterations to the pulpit. The Council noted that the floor was lowered during the Victorian reordering and this would bring it back to the original level. It also suggested that the stone for the floor should be carefully selected to provide texture and interest</li> <li>Removal of the pews and replacement with modern un-upholstered chairs in a light tone</li> <li>Relocation of the font</li> </ul>					
<b>2. Gallery</b>							
CBC2	22 Dec 21	The Council was content with the principle of reintroducing a west end gallery.	Gallery - noted	Agreed			
		However, it was concerned that the gallery and inner lobby, as presently proposed, would considerably foreshorten the nave and entirely alter the sense of space within the church. The Council was concerned that the proposed glazed inner lobby along the north aisle would be out of place with this building and would be difficult to keep clean. The Council also suggested that the parish consider whether a simple draught lobby would be enough to fulfil its needs.	Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery	Mindful to remove the glass lobby from the proposals			
	As such the Council suggested that the parish should look at how the other spaces it has access to, including the cottage can be used. The Council appreciated that some activities such as a Sunday school or youth work would be better	We explain in the Statement of Need the limitations of the cottage and the limited scope to	Agreed				

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		placed in the church and noted that these could be accommodated in a smaller gallery	modify for access by all abilities. We have explored options for the development of the cottage but advice from Cotswold District Council is that listed building consent for works is not likely to be approved. Agreed that Sunday school and youth work can be kept within the church. Space is limited under the current gallery proposals, and it is unclear what is meant by 'a smaller gallery?'				
CBC3	22 Dec 21	It also noted that 'multi-functional spaces' which open directly into each other and through which users of other facilities would have to travel could cause safeguarding concerns for some of the proposed users of these rooms and may not be practical because of the potential for interruptions. As such this aspect of the scheme may need to be considered.	We propose to manage this using agreed protocols between users.	?			
<b>3. Chancel</b>							

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
CBC4	22 Dec 21	The Council expressed concern with the cumulative impact of the proposals on the character and significance of the interior, particularly with respect to the furniture disposal in the chancel	Choir stalls	See CBC8. Mindful to accept			
<b>4. Screen</b>							
CBC5	22 Dec 21	It noted that it is proposed to remove most of the Victorian chancel screen to the west end thus removing its contextual significance.	We assume that this is a statement. We have explained the justification for removing the screen on liturgical, historic and architectural grounds in the Statements of Need and Significance	Further justification and explanation in Section 7.1 of the Statement of Need			
<b>5. Side chapel</b>							
CBC6	22 Dec 21	The Council felt that the proposed use of the south aisle chapel to house storage cupboards would be a lost opportunity for the parish and suggested that it would be the perfect space for quiet reflection and small meetings and to keep its liturgical focus. It may be appropriate to enclose the space to provide a meeting room	We have reviewed our plans and at this stage propose to retain the side chapel for quiet worship and communion. We have no plans for use as a meeting room.	Mindful to accept			
<b>6. Ledgerstones</b>							
CBC7	22 Dec 21	The Council accepted the principle of moving the ledgerstones noting that they had been previously located. However, they were concerned that if they were moved to the south aisle chapel they would likely to suffer from increased wear and tear, particularly if it is to be used for	We still propose to relocate two of the ledgerstones (those with brasses) within the south chapel as there will be	Addressed			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		storage. The Council also noted that if the chapel becomes a meeting room that the ledgerstones may take up valuable floor space and whilst they could have furniture placed on them, it may be best for the parish to consider another, less busy location within the building.	minimal footfall in the area. This will be a 'less busy' part of the church and therefore suitable.				
<b>7. Overall impact of the proposals</b>							
CBC8		The Council stressed the need for an assessment of the overall impact of the present proposals on the building and potential loss of the liturgical focus of the south aisle. The Council therefore would encourage the parish to rethink the proposals to create a scheme which embraces and celebrates its heritage whilst also allowing it to look forward in its mission and outwards to be welcoming to the community. The Council acknowledged recent parish thinking that the project is too large to carry out in one phase and suggested that the reordering could be carried out in phases. The first phase including the pew removal and other simple 'quick win' alterations as suggested above. This would allow the chancel furnishings to be assessed and to remain in situ for now. This would also give the parish time to ascertain what additional space it needs once the nave is fully flexible. The parish may find other spaces within the church building provide sufficient flexibility to avoid the proposed disposals. It also suggested that rather than disposing and commissioning new choir stalls that the existing choir stalls could be retained and made flexible to suit the flexible worship style of the parish. Phasing the reordering would allow the proposals to fulfil the 5 <sup>th</sup> key	Choir stalls  We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.	Mindful to accept			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		driver of the project which is to conserve heritage by carefully designed internal changes.					

## B: Historic England

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
<b>1. General</b>							
HE1	5 Nov 21	<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>We are very concerned over the proposed removal of the majority of the historic fabric that formed part of the 1880's re-ordering by F Waller and elements of the proposed changes to the church interior. This will result in the loss of a very significance phase of works, which very much defines much of the special interest and character of the church interior, as we experience it today. The chancel fittings, including the rood screen, are of very high quality and should be retained. There may be an opportunity for modification, including the creation of a gallery, at the western end of the church. However, more discussion is needed over the proposed removal of the nave pews and the raising of floor levels, including whether the existing pews could be adapted to make them moveable.</p>	<p>We comment on the nave pews and raising of floor levels in items HE6 and HE7 below.</p> <p>We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.</p>	The Statement of Need has been updated to provide further details in support of our proposals for pew removal and floor raising. See Section 8.			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
HE2	5 Nov 21	<p><b>Significance of Designated Heritage Assets</b></p> <p>Further to our initial advice of 6<sup>th</sup> April 2021, we have now undertaken a site visit and would like to thank the PCC for showing me around the church and giving a thorough explanation of their challenges, aspirations and clarification of their proposals. We summarised the significance of the Grade I Church in our previous letter, so does not require repeating here. Ascribing significance to various elements of the Church fabric needs supporting evidence and assessment, so simply ascribing a degree of significance to the pews, for example, but without reason or reference to their various heritage values, is insufficient, particularly when substantial amounts of loss is proposed. While much research has obviously gone into the Statement of Significance, it could be augmented further by a discussion of the heritage values, as outlined in Conservation Principles.</p>	To discuss with Chiz Harward, our archaeologist	To discuss			
HE3	5 Nov 21	<p><b>Impact of the Proposed Development</b></p> <p>The proposals include the removal of much of the Waller phase of works, including the bench pews. The overall/collective Waller phase is now ascribed as being of high significance in the Statement of Significance, following our previous questioning over the low to moderate significance purported in the previous document draft. although confirmed that these were designed by Waller. While they bench pews are relatively simple in design, they contribute to the ensemble of 19<sup>th</sup> century fittings in a positive manner. There may be scope to remove a</p>	The 1881 reordering was by Waller and Son. The proposal to mount the pews on castors is impractical. It is not a presumption that the pews are too heavy. The pews weigh about 80kg and the safe lifting weight for a man is 15kg.	Further explanation has been provided in Section 8.1 of the Statement of Need			



From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		<p>proportion of the pews towards the rear of the nave and aisles. However, since the existing pews were never fixed to pew platforms, we would encourage the PCC to consider making the pews more mobile with the adaption with castors or similar, so that they can be retained, but allow a more flexible arrangement of seating. We are yet to be persuaded that the justification discussed for the total loss of pews is clear and convincing and therefore does not fulfil the requirements of para 200 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Even if the pews could be moved, there is insufficient space to store them and provide a clear open area for church events.</p> <p>The proposal to place castors on the pews is impractical. This is because of the heavy weight of the pews, the high point loadings on the floor (clay tile or limestone) and the difficulty ensuring the locking of castors when pews are in place, A further constraint is that with 42 pews currently in the church we would need an area of 60m<sup>2</sup> just to store the pews, this would take up the whole of the available area in the north and south aisles and some space in the nave. This does not therefore meet</p>				

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
			the objective of providing open flexible areas for use by the church.				
HE4		The proposals include the removal of the rood screen, designed and added by Waller and its relocation to the proposed balcony. The submitted Statement of Significance (part 2) concludes that this contributes 'greatly' to the Waller phase, but individually only of moderate significance. The workmanship, from our visit, appears to be of a high standard and a key decorative element of the interior. We are not persuaded that there is a cogent case for its removal, as its position is intrinsic to the hierarchy of space, and while the fabric would not be lost, its context would. The proposed new elevated location is non-contextual, would not be easily seen and would therefore be considered harmful to its significance as a piece of high-quality joinery.	We have explained the justification for relocating the screen on liturgical, historic and architectural grounds in the Statements of Need and Significance	Further justification and explanation has been provided in Section 7.1 of the Statement of Need.			
HE5	5 Nov 21	The choir stalls, also by Waller, are of high quality and set off against the elaborate tiled floor of the chancel. There is no justification for their proposed loss and replacement with modern, moveable choir stalls. It was explained that the PCC aspire for the choir to be used as a flexible stage for concerts. However, if the pews in the front of the nave are adapted so that they can be easily moved, an enlarged open area could provide a similar space or a temporary stage constructed for a music festival, for example.	Choir stalls  We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.	Mindful to accept			
HE6	5 Nov 21	The floor is to be raised and the 19th century tiled floor replaced with under-floor heating and a polished limestone finish. As we have indicated before, this raises some	We have information to show that the floor was lowered by about 250mm	Further explanation and details are			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		<p>concerns on a number of levels. Firstly, we understand that Waller reduced the floor level in 1882 by approximately 150mm in order to construct the limecrete floor. During the site visit we were able to see the bases of the columns and also the worn lower step into the church from the south porch, where the door has only recently been opened after being fixed shut for a significant amount of time. The worn step would tend to suggest that the floor was lower (perhaps similar to the existing level) for a much longer period of time. Also, the architectural mouldings on some (not all) of the column based are such that they indicate a previous lower floor level, although this view based on the aesthetics of the masonry and worn south porch step and not backed up by recorded evidence. It may very have been the case that the earlier 19<sup>th</sup> century phase of works raised the floor level from the previous and therefore Waller returned this to the former. While the existing tiled floor is a later addition, it contributes considerably to the Victorian phase and its removal would have a marked impact. Its loss would probably result in a degree of harm and that loss would need clear and convincing justification. The principle of the level change would also impact upon the aforementioned column bases and while we acknowledge the advantage of providing better level access into church and underfloor heating (which the raised level would deliver), we advocate those alternative approaches that retain the existing floor are considered</p>	<p>with the original intention to build up the level using timber supports and boarding to support the pews. During construction the 'Vestry' decided on a new design with pews located directly on clay tiles at a lower level. This lower floor is also confirmed by the unfinished stonework to the lower columns.</p> <p>It is important to note that the 6in thick limecrete floor laid by the Victorians provides a hard and robust floor to the church which we would not wish to disturb or cut channels in the concrete for cabling and heating pipes as this would significantly impact on the strength of the floor.</p> <p>There has been a series of repairs to the tiles over</p>	<p>included in the Section 8.2 of the Statement of Need.</p>			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
			<p>the last 100 years or so, as documented in the maintenance book which suggests that many of the tiles are not original. There is evidence of significant wear and fractures in the existing floor.</p> <p>Our access assumptions is to provide level access from the north door to the communion rail – not unreasonable and will allow people of all abilities to move around the church. The chancel steps place a significant obstacle to free access. The alternative to provide a ramp with a 1:15 slope as per Building Regulations would require a ramp length of 4m which in turn would reduce the available area for worship and events.</p>				
HE7	5 Nov 21	The new floor would also require the removal or covering of all the existing ledger stones, although we were advised	We have investigated the ledgerstones and assessed	Addressed. See Section 7.3 of the			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		during the site visit that these have been previously moved already. Even if this were the case, there is potential for damage, if these are to be lifted and re-located. This reinforces our view that the existing floor should be retained. In terms of a new limestone floor, the sample made available for viewing in the Church is over-engineered in its surface and edges, countering the quality and character of a stone flag floor, even if the principle of floor replacement were acceptable. Alternative methods of new heating should also be explored for further discussion.	<p>the feasibility of moving them. The options for relocating the ledgerstones were discussed with the Church Building Council. They confirmed that there is no objection to their removal and suggested remedial works be carried out. Documents PI17 and PI18 refer.</p> <p>Advice from our experienced stonemason confirmed that these could be moved safely,</p> <p>We still propose to relocate two of the ledgerstones (those with brasses) within the south chapel as there will be minimal footfall in the area. This will be a 'less busy' part of the church and therefore suitable.</p>	Statement of Need			
HE8	5 Nov 21	We previously indicated that we need to visit the Church to appreciate the impacts of the various proposed	The proposed gallery is on the line of the pre-1881	Mindful to remove the glass			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		reinstatement of the rear balcony with new rooms (w.c, kitchen and meeting rooms) below. While we acknowledge that a series of options have previously been tabled for discussion, the preferred option of the PCC would significantly alter the rear of the nave and aisles. The fully enclosed spaces to provide the kitchen, w.c's and meeting rooms/lobby would truncate the full length of the nave and side aisles and cause harm that we do not consider is justified. However, the reinstatement of a balcony on the line of the former and keeping the perpendicular lines of the church interior, may be acceptable in principle, if w.c and kitchen facilities can be accommodated underneath in a way that imposes less into the volume of the church.	gallery as confirmed by plans and photographs. Toilets and kitchen facilities are accommodated underneath the gallery. Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery	lobby from the proposals			
HE9	5 Nov 21	In terms of providing space for smaller meetings during the week and Sunday school groups during services, we note that these are presently held in the Cottage next to the Church and this appears to be a great asset for the church, albeit we recognise the restricted access to the upper floors. While we acknowledge that this is a separate Grade II listed building, there would be merit in exploring options for adaption, where this would not cause harm to significance. We are concerned that the PCC are looking to dispose of this property, where its accommodation would need to be relocated into the Church.	We explain in the Statement of Need the limitations of the cottage and the limited scope to modify for access by all abilities. We have explored options for the development of the cottage but advice from Cotswold District Council is that listed building consent for works is not likely to be approved.	Further explanation in Section 11 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
HE10	5 Nov 21	We support the principle of considering a more sustainable means of generating electricity for the Church and we discussed various options on site. The preferred option of an air-source heat pump would require a large exchange unit against the side of the south porch, presently the access to the boiler room. This would have an adverse impact upon the exterior of the church and we advise that either an alternative site is considered for this or even an alternative means of micro-generation, such as roof-mounted photo-voltaics, if these can be accommodated without harm. Full details of associated equipment, cable routes and impact on historic fabric will need to be considered as these proposals are developed. Further advice for the PCC in developing their ideas can be found in our standing guidance ( <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-heat-pumps">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-heat-pumps</a> ).	We have been advised by our professional heating consultants. We have evaluated alternative locations for the ASHP unit. The churchyard to the south of the church contains extensive listed tombs and gravestones which limit suitable locations. The proposed location adjacent to the south door causes least harm and can be shielded to reduce the visual impact as we have seen in another church. The feasibility study explains that even with the 'export' option for PV cells, the units would not provide sufficient power for the heating requirements, particularly in winter months.	Further explanation in Section 10 of the Statement of Need			
HE11	5 Nov 21	The proposed re-ordering and the cumulative impact of the various elements upon significance are of great concern. We applaud the PCC for the high ambition in their proposed changes but believe that the majority of their aspirations	We have read the comments from all the consultees and recognise the impact of the	Mindful to accept comments and defer some			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		can be delivered in a way that while being a compromise in some respects, could result in substantial less harm than the proposals before us at this time. We welcome the opportunity of working with the DAC and PCC in developing the proposals further.	proposals on the interior of the church. We are mindful to make some changes to the proposals. Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery Side chapel - we propose to retain the side chapel for quiet worship and communion. We have no plans for use as a meeting room. Chancel - We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.	elements of the project			
HE12	5 Nov 21	Central to our consultation advice is the requirement of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in Section 66(1) for the local authority to “have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of architectural or historic interest which it possesses”. Section 72 of the act refers to the council’s need to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area in the exercise of their duties. When	Noted. We are guided by the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2020 which takes account the future worship and mission needs of the church.	Please refer to the summary of the Statement of Need			



From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		considering the current proposals, in line with Para 194 of the NPPF, the significance of the asset's setting requires consideration. Para 199 states that in considering the impact of proposed development on significance great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and that the more important the asset the greater the weight should be. Para 200 goes on to say that clear and convincing justification is needed if there is loss or harm.					

## C. Historic Buildings and Places

### C. Historic Buildings and Places

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
<b>1. Summary</b>							
HB1	15 Nov 21	<b>Summary</b> We well understand the wish of the parish to update its facilities and do not object to some radical aspects of the proposal, for example the ejection of the majority of the present pews and the introduction of a new western gallery, but we do fear that the cumulative effect of the many changes will be at the expense of the historic character of this nationally important listed building. The scheme is very extensive – and involves the loss of the present floor, both in	Noted support for some elements of the project.  We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.  The proposals are extensive and provide an integrated solution to	We refer to the summary of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		surface and level, and all of the Victorian seating, the introduction of a new western gallery running across the nave and both aisles, a new glass lobby to the north, the break-up of Waller’s East End, with the sole exception of the parclose screens and the incidental moving of monuments and a stained glass window.	the restoration and reordering for future worship and mission.				
HB2	15 Nov 21	This transformation of the present place of worship is dictated by the wish to accommodate all the facilities presently housed in Church Cottage – an ambition that may not be wholly realisable without some compromise. And consequently, to render an interior designed primarily if not exclusively to accommodate worship open to much more intense, multi-layered functions. This reinvention has been achieved in other cases without the degree of interventions envisaged in this case.	Yes, we consider it important to hold the Sunday School in the church, which is supported by the CBC and SPAB.	We explain in Section 11 of the Statement of Need why it is not possible or feasible to modify the church cottage			
HB3	15 Nov 21	We must fear that the ejection of so much that lends the present interior historic character and the introduction of so much new work in the nave, west end, and chancel will take away too much of what makes <b>St Mary’s</b> a Grade 1 listed building – with that sense of accretion, development and enrichment wrought over the centuries.	We have read the comments from all the consultees and recognise the impact of the proposals on the interior of the church. We are mindful to make some changes to the proposals. Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery	Mindful to accept comments and defer some elements of the project			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
			Side chapel - we propose to retain the side chapel for quiet worship and communion. We have no plans for use as a meeting room. Chancel - We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.				
2. Statement of Significance							
HB4	15 Nov 21	This, and the Statement of Need, provide the dual bedrocks in the documentation vital to ensure that proposals for a listed church, especially one which is the most important building in Lechlade, are justified and as benign as possible.  In the Statement, both Parts 1 and 2, we do feel that appropriate Significance is not properly claimed for the following:	Noted. In assessing significance, this statement uses the following terminology: <b>High</b> – important at national to international levels <b>Moderate-High</b> – important at a regional, sometimes higher level <b>Moderate</b> – usually of local value but classifiable as being of regional significance for its contribution to the building as a whole <b>Low-Moderate</b> – of local value <b>Low</b> – adds little or nothing to the value of a site or detracts from it	Significance has been applied based on guidance from the Church Buildings Council			
HB5	15 Nov 21	The tierceron-vault with shields on the main ribs and a large hole for the bell-ropes” (Pevsner) which commands the view within the tower arch	Add to Statement of Significance	Statement of Significance updated			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		(photo 1) and is an important element of the 15 <sup>th</sup> century tower ( see 2c below)					
HB6	15 Nov 21	b) The canopied niche on the southernmost column at the west end which is mentioned on page 21 but is, we would submit, underestimated. The feature is of the 1470s, dates from the original reconstruction and would indeed have contained a statue ( of St Lawrence or the Madonna ) probably against a painted backcloth. No doubt the base of the niche was hacked off during the iconoclastic attacks under either Henry V111 or Edward V1 but the subsidiary statue ( <b>see</b> photo 2 ) on the return has survived. Note how the small-scale tierceron vault has clear echoes of that in the tower ( see 1a above ).	Add to Statement of Significance	Statement of Significance updated			
HB7	15 Nov 21	c) The font needs to be understood with its 18 <sup>th</sup> century ogee top ( <b>photo 3</b> ) which is now relegated to the west end of the south aisle. Both are of importance, and they should be reunited.	Add to Statement of Significance	Statement of Significance updated			
HB8	15 Nov 21	d) The north porch is a slightly later addition of the early 16 <sup>th</sup> century but its present significance is more than that – its poetic character comes too from the ancient approach in stone pitching ( which I see is ascribed to c.1830 but could well be a much more ancient track ), the much-battered but medieval penance stone tight against the west corner, the fine late Georgian gates with swanneck profile and original hinges and, hanging up on the west wall inside, the coffin bier to the	Add to Statement of Significance	Statement of Significance updated			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		parish. The gates are almost certainly the work of Richard Pace c.1828 and are thus the only surviving element from his building campaign of that period otherwise ejected by Waller (Pace is buried in the churchyard). (photo 4)					
HB9	15 Nov 21	e) This may be an error but the fine and recently restored monument to George Coxeter in the south chapel is down at one point as “1871”. In fact, it is wholly of 1699 but was restored in 1876. The cherub nonchalantly resting his arm on the pile of books is an endearing way to indicate Coxeter’s learning.	Add to Statement of Significance	Statement of Significance updated			
HB10	15 Nov 21	f) Perhaps most concerning of the lot, because of the conclusions drawn from it, is the low significance accorded to Waller’s reworking of 1882-1887. I can find no visual evidence that Waller was providing second-rate work. The screen is a finely carved and contextual design. As Pevsner notes, the tracery heads are borrowed directly from the medieval windows. The stalls have the same tracery, albeit blinded. The brass light fittings are original and further confirm a determination to avoid the ordinary. Brass would have glistened in Winter light.	Noted. In assessing significance, this statement uses the following terminology: <b>High</b> – important at national to international levels <b>Moderate-High</b> – important at a regional, sometimes higher level <b>Moderate</b> – usually of local value but classifiable as being of regional significance for its contribution to the building as a whole <b>Low-Moderate</b> – of local value <b>Low</b> – adds little or nothing to the value of a site or detracts from it	The definitions of significance which we have used follows guidance from the Church Buildings Council			
		Waller went to Godwin of Lugwardine, the acknowledged experts, for the tiles of the chancel	Noted. No change proposed	No change proposed			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		floor which are consciously elaborate (and, we are delighted to see, are to be retained in the proposals). That firm worked for many of the leading Victorian architects and only closed down in 1998.					
		The pews, in deal or pitch pine (a durable wood much favoured by the Victorians and often imported from the Baltic) are Waller's homage to Pugin who used the Y or upsilon shape a great deal. There may be practical and theological arguments against Waller's work, but it does seem misguided to undervalue its intrinsic aesthetic interest. <b>Photo 5</b>	Noted with later comment in HB20 below that <i>we do not oppose the removal of the majority of the nave pews</i>	Noted and add to the Statement of Significance			
3. Shelley' Walk							
HB11	15 Nov 21	The reworking of the ancient path, that section of Shelley's Walk, leading to the north porch. <b>Photo 6</b> . We can appreciate why there would need to be changes if this is to become the main entrance, but the use of stone pitching is both evocative and precious. The country has many listed examples and there is a growing revival in the conservation skills needed to safeguard them and reduce trip hazards. The extensive survivals in Merton Street, Oxford is rightly celebrated. Their conservation is often taught alongside the repair of drystone walls. The principle of keeping margins in pitch stone (instead of the present gravel) but relaying the central "aisle" in new flagstones is accepted but the drawing (photo <b>6a</b> )	Comment addressed in separate faculty.  Recycled limestone flags with straight edges and random sizes to be used.  Ducts to be included for future cabling	Agreed			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		<p>shows regularly sized slabs regularly laid. Natural stone only must be used, and they must be informally set to avoid too neat, too suburban an appearance. But how is this to work in the first stretch immediately adjacent to Church Cottage? There are no margins in gravel at this point. Is it really not possible to retain and relay the stone pitching in this section at least?</p> <p>We also suggest that as Internet and other wiring is often relayed under footpaths that any ducting is introduced now before any surface might have to be disrupted afresh. Either that or, even better, a line adjacent to the path is preserved for that future purpose.</p>					
4. The Gallery							
HB12	15 Nov 21	<p>We don't quarrel with the principle of a new western gallery</p> <p>but are very concerned by:</p> <p>a) The asymmetric effect of the glazed flat-roofed box which will greet those arriving through the north door. The tripartite form of gallery, at the end of each aisle and the nave, introduces a certain balance but the lobby porch or box on the north side creates a discordant note which runs counter to that balance. A wholly glazed feature, no doubt with "manifestations" would draw attention to itself and strikes a markedly utilitarian tone.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Mindful to remove the glass lobby from the proposals</p>			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		Has the need for this lobby been clearly established? Doors, any doors, create barriers, even if mechanically operated (and such mechanisms will, invariably, break down over time). A further door is something else for the elderly and a mother with a buggy to have to negotiate. It follows that if the lobby isn't built then the War Memorial (and its flags) would not have to be moved.					
HB13	15 Nov 21	b) The internal elevations to the gallery show a utilitarian frontage to the south in what looks like white render with timber trim on the north side. This is more at home in a works canteen than an ancient church. Quality of finish and materials is vital in a Grade 1 interior.	Noted and will be addressed at detailed design	To address at detailed design and in specification			
HB14	15 Nov 21	c) Promises are made about the niche (see 1b above) but I cannot yet understand either how it is to be incorporated into the new space or indeed done so with dignity.	Noted and to be included within the central meeting room	Addressed			
HB15	15 Nov 21	d) The presumption seems to be that the fine A.K. Nicholson Harker window (Photo 7 shows one of the lower lights) is to be cut in two.	We are revisiting the design of the balcony and stairs so that the full window can be seen	Revisiting the design			
HB16	15 Nov 21	e) How is the new gallery to permit views, open from the body of the church, of the tierceron vault in the tower? (See 1a and Photo 1).	The tierceron vault in the tower can be viewed more closely from the gallery than is currently the case	Further explanation to be provided in the Statement of Significance			



From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
HB17	15 Nov 21	f) I am afraid that I didn't inspect them during the site visit, but I note that the 4 ledger stones at the base of tower are to be buried under the new floor. We thank the church for proposing to resite the two brass matrices and the Brudenell ledger stone but cannot see why the same cannot apply to these 4	The ledgerstones in the west porch are less significant than those in the Nave. They were moved in the 1881 reordering to use as a floor to the porch. They will be covered with a removable timber floor.	Further explanation in SoS			
HB18	15 Nov 21	g) We note that several monuments will need to be resited, but I am not clear from the paperwork where they are to go (and whether, as we hope will be the case, that the opportunity will be taken to conserve them, and if necessary, take out any cramps).	There are a small number of monuments to be relocated. Details to be include in the SoS	Further explanation in the Statement of Need			
HB19	15 Nov 21	h) On the placing of the Waller screen into the gallery see 4 below.	See HB28 below	See HB28 below			
<b>5. The Nave</b>							
HB20	15 Nov 21	3. On the treatment of the nave we note from the Statement of Need that there is at present frequent moving of the pews, and we accept that this must be a chore and prevents the broader use of the interior. And we do appreciate that the present pews are not exceptional. We appreciate too that pew clearance will of itself transform the useability of the space. For that reason, we do not oppose the removal of the majority of the nave pews but:	Noted	Agreed			
HB21	15 Nov 21	a) we do ask that consideration goes to keeping some (on castors? ) so that there is permanent if limited evidence of Waller's work in the nave.	The proposal to mount the pews on castors is impractical. It is not a presumption that the pews are too	Explained in Section 8.1 of the			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
			<p>heavy. The pews weigh about 80kg and the safe lifting weight for a man is 15kg.</p> <p>Even if the pews could be moved, there is insufficient space to store them and provide a clear open area for church events.</p> <p>The proposal to place castors on the pews is impractical. This is because of the heavy weight of the pews, the high point loadings on the floor (clay tile or limestone) and the difficulty ensuring the locking of castors when pews are in place,</p> <p>A further constraint is that with 42 pews currently in the church we would need an area of 60m<sup>2</sup> just to store the pews, this would take up the whole of the available area in the north and south aisles and some space in the nave. This does not therefore meet the objective of providing open flexible areas for use by the church.</p>	Statement of Need			
HB22	15 Nov 21	b) We do not oppose the raising of the floor level and are prepared to defer to the DAC on the	Noted	Agreed			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		design of the new floor, the chairs and the location of any chair store.					
HB23	15 Nov 21	c) We note that both brasses are to be resited within the new floor of the south chapel – but that one drawing shows a table and chairs placed directly over one. How is likely damage to be prevented ?	A misunderstanding. Yes, the ledgerstones are to be laid in the south chapel. The area will still be a chapel for private prayer and communion with no tables and chairs	Explained			
HB24	15 Nov 21	d) What happens to the brass plaque to the memory of those whose family paid for the Waller work on the upstand of the single step into the chancel ?	This plaque will be relocated to a suitable location near the screen	Explained			
HB25	15 Nov 21	e) As is stated, the pulpit is Waller work set on a 15 <sup>th</sup> century base. As we read the proposals it is to be resited in its entirety onto the new floor. We do ask that that is the case and that it is not “sunk” into the new floor.	The proposal is to raise the base of the pulpit at the same location. It is not proposed to ‘sink’ this.	Explained – add note in SoS			
HB26	15 Nov 21	f) We note that the present south chapel was dedicated as such as recently as 1954 but it must be a very strong suspicion that there was a side altar there from the 1470s. A medieval church would have had several altars, not all them based on chantries. To retain that memory might not the Mowbray altar be retained where it is? The Statement of Significance calls the reredos catalogue work but Mowbrays (now united with Wippells and the Wareham Guild) did commission architects and designers to prepare some of their designs. The present example is a vigorously	Yes, there is historical record of a chantry in the south chapel location although both the Pace and Waller & Son re-orderings filled the area with pews.  We do not consider that the Mowbray Reredos reflects the new design of a ‘simple’ chapel and propose a new home to be found.	We have reviewed our plans and are minded to retain the side chapel for quiet worship and communion.			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		coloured piece set within a Classical frame. It does deserve better than to be ejected, let alone sold off.					
HB27	15 Nov 21	g) we would in any case be very concerned by the proposal that it should be replaced by cupboards. This is too prominent location for such a workday function.	The side chapel will remain as such with some furnishings but no cupboards				
6. The Screen							
HB28	15 Nov 21	4. We oppose the removal of the chancel screen. We appreciate that the objection to it is as much theological as visual – that it symbolises the hierarchy of division between the clergy and the laity which is now discredited within the churchmanship of the present congregation. However, the screen has played a key part in Christian practice for the last Millennium. It was mandated by canon law in the Middle Ages and although Puritan theology was not comfortable with it, it is noticeable how many screens survived the iconoclasts of the 16 <sup>th</sup> and 17 <sup>th</sup> centuries and how many churches of the 17 <sup>th</sup> and 18 <sup>th</sup> centuries were built with them. Those designed by Christopher Wren are an obvious example. Its role was to create a sense that the holiest part of the building (the chancel) was special and should be demarcated as such. It was never there, except in a small minority of cases, to block views through,	We have explained the justification for removing the screen on liturgical, historic and architectural grounds in the Statements of Need and Significance	Further justification and explanation is provided in Section 7.1 of the Statement of Need.			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		rather to filter them with a sense of reverence and mystery. The choir is on the eastern side but the effect on acoustical performance is surely neutral not least as the screen is so open.					
HB29	15 Nov 21	The paperwork seems to be ambivalent over whether one or both of the parclose (or side) screens are to stay. We trust that both will stay but it has to be said that without the mother screen sitting within the chancel arch they will appear orphaned. We fully accept that theologies change (and it has to be said also enjoy revivals) but it is now accepted that historic buildings, churches included, are governed by <i>The Conservation Principles</i> , issued after widespread consultation by Historic England (and subject to regular reviews). A key plank of those <i>Principles</i> , which are in turn based on international Charters, is that we don't eradicate whole swathes of a building's history (in this case Waller's reworking) without compelling reasons.	We propose to remove the side screens	Further justification and explanation is provided in the Statement of Need			
HB30	15 Nov 21	Our misgivings are the greater because: a) We feel that the screen would look very uncomfortable in its new elevated position within the tower. We thank the church for exploring this option rather than wholesale ejection, but this skying of the feature would relocate it to an area where it has no meaning, where it can hardly be seen and where it might well work against the effective operating of the new space.	The proposals are to relocate rather than remove the screen allowing any reversibility in future decades, This is also to reflect and display the workmanship rather than for any liturgical reasons,	Further explanation is provided in Section 7.1 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
HB31	15 Nov 21	b) The screen and choirstalls provide a stylistic and visual unity – of quality and with a strong sense of repose. Of course, the present intention is to clear all of that away but then the choirstalls themselves are to be replaced by new flexible moveable seating. Without the screen these would be extraordinarily prominent, the more so because they would sit between the congregation in the nave and the High Altar beyond. Is this prominence appropriate?	Choir stalls  We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.	Mindful to defer this element of the proposals			
HB32	15 Nov 21	c) Is there not room for compromise? I noted that a third, maybe a half, of the chancel was occupied by very banal, functional post-war stalls (sitting between the end of Waller’s stalls and the altar). These are of no interest and if dispensed with might the space released allow some of the greater flexibility being sought?	Choir stalls  We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.	Mindful to defer this element of the proposals			
<b>7. Conclusion</b>							
HB33	15 Nov 21	I am sorry that this is such a lengthy critique – but the far-ranging and serious nature of the proposal, and the quality of St Lawrence, demands that.  As you will see we are not challenging the broad principles behind the scheme, but our misgivings are considerable and multi-layered.  Our greatest concerns remain the break-up of the Tractarian East End and the asymmetrically placed glass lobby to the north. ( <i>Tractarian – attributable to the Oxford Movement NJ</i> )	We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date. However, removal of the screen is fundamental to the proposals for liturgical, historic and archaeological reasons. The screen will foreshorten the length of the church	Further justification and explanation to be proposals are set out in the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		We are very willing to talk further with the parish and other consultees to see whether these very real concerns might be met.					

**D. Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) – did not visit the church**

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
<b>1. Summary</b>							
SP1	15 Nov 21	We agree that the church would benefit from accessible toilets, improved kitchen facilities and some additional flexible space, but we have very strong reservations over the way in which the parish are proposing to accommodate these requirements within the extremely significant interior of this Grade I listed church. It is very likely that the parish are going to have to accept a degree of compromise for a mutually acceptable solution to be found.	Noted	We explain in Section 9 the proposals for toilets and kitchen facilities			
SP2	15 Nov 21	We also wish to note that the Statement of Significance, while a useful document, does not contain a detailed assessment of significance, particularly in relation to the items that the parish are proposing to remove / re-position. The Waller re-ordering was a major phase in the churches development and is of high significance, and therefore a comprehensive appraisal of it is necessary. To support the importance of the	Noted. In assessing significance, this statement uses the following terminology: <b>High</b> – important at national to international levels <b>Moderate-High</b> – important at a regional, sometimes higher level <b>Moderate</b> – usually of local value but classifiable as being of regional	The Statement of Need has applied the Church Buildings Council definitions for significance			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		church the Statement of Significance notes: 'Perhaps due to budgetary restrictions, the Waller and Son restoration has left us with a fine Perpendicular church, largely unencumbered by later alterations or over- endowed with Gothic revival additions: the beauty of the church is in its simplicity of form and dear lines.'	significance for its contribution to the building as a whole <b>Low-Moderate</b> – of local value <b>Low</b> – adds little or nothing to the value of a site or detracts from it				
<b>2. Proposals</b>							
SP3	15 Nov 21	St Lawrence was completely rebuilt in the 15th century with some later additions such as the North Porch dating from the 16th century. It was partially re-ordered in 1828 by Richard Pace, then in 1882 it was extensively re-ordered by Frederick Sandham Waller. This almost complete Victorian interior is now considered to be of very high significance as it provides the overwhelming character of the churches interior. The current proposals are very extensive and would remove the majority of the Waller scheme, effectively obliterating the Victorian phase of the churches history and returning at least parts of the building to how it would have been pre-1880. This would have a very significant and detrimental impact on the interior of this church, and this level of intervention would require exceptionally robust clear and convincing justification. In terms of the impact the proposals would have on the on the fixtures and fittings within the Victorian interior, we do not intend to comment	See comment in SP2 on the CBC definitions of significance which we have applied.	The Statement of Need has applied the Church Buildings Council definitions for significance			



From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		in great detail and will defer to the Victorian Society and Historic England. However, we felt it was important to provide comments on the various aspects of the scheme.					
<b>3. Pews and chancel fittings</b>							
SP4	15 Nov 21	The photographs provided show that the interior of the church is already a well-used, flexible space as the un-fixed pews are regularly moved. We appreciate that they are heavy and cumbersome, but has an experienced carpenter been consulted to see if they could be made easier to move by the addition of locking castors? A presumption has been made in the Statement of Significance that this would not be possible and that they would be too heavy, but it needs to be looked at carefully by someone who is suitably experienced. No justification has been provided to show that this is not possible and that the only alternative is therefore to remove all the pews, which is unacceptable. However, there may be some scope to slightly reduce their number to create additional space at the western end of the Nave and Aisles.	<p>The proposal to mount the pews on castors is impractical. It is not a presumption that the pews are too heavy. The pews weigh about 80kg and the safe lifting weight for a man is 15kg.</p> <p>Even if the pews could be moved, there is insufficient space to store them and provide a clear open area for church events.</p> <p>The proposal to place castors on the pews is impractical. This is because of the heavy weight of the pews, the high point loadings on the floor (clay tile or limestone) and the difficulty ensuring the locking of castors when pews are in place, A further constraint is that with 42 pews currently in the church we would need an area of 60m<sup>2</sup> just to store the pews, this would take up</p>	A detailed justification is set out in Sections 7 and 8 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
			the whole of the available area in the north and south aisles and some space in the nave. This does not therefore meet the objective of providing open flexible areas for use by the church.				
SP5	15 Nov 21	The Chancel contains the choir stalls designed by Waller along with a beautiful Gibson tiled floor, all complemented by the adjacent screens. The choir stalls are of a good quality and again, no justification has been made for their removal. If the pews within the Nave can be adapted and made moveable, then additional space can easily be created, so they should all be retained in-situ.	Choir stalls  We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.	Mindful to accept/ defer			
<b>4. The Rood Screen</b>							
SP6	15 Nov 21	This was added as a memorial in 1885 and is a good quality piece which is designed to be viewed with its side screens. The proposals are to reposition it on the first floor at the west end of the new gallery, whilst leaving the side screens in their current positions. Although this would retain the rood screen's physical structure, it would take it entirely out of its intended context leaving it lost and prone to being removed entirely. It would also partially block the west window. The justification provided for its removal is weak and the adjacent spaces will function perfectly well with it remaining in its current location.	We have explained the justification for removing the screen on liturgical, historic and architectural grounds in the Statements of Need and Significance	Further justification and explanation is provided in Section 7.1 of the Statements of Need			
<b>5. Raising and replacing the floor in the nave and aisles</b>							

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
SP7	15 Nov 21	Whilst we fully appreciate the desire to provide level access throughout, the existing Victorian tiled floor is a significant part of the Waller re-ordering. The Statement of Need indicates that the current tiled floor is breaking up and is a trip hazard, but no evidence to this effect has been provided and it should be possible to have it professionally repaired. There is a strong desire to install underfloor heating throughout the Nave and Aisles which is likely to be the driving force for this aspect of the proposals rather than the condition of the floor. Further consideration needs to be given to alternative and less invasive forms of heating (please also see section on Heating) that will allow the tiles floor to be retained in-situ.	The comment gives little weight to the need to provide level access for less able people, either walking or in wheelchairs. The tile floor is in poor condition in many parts and there are historic records of tile replacements over the last 100 years.	Details on the condition of and repairs to the tile floor are included in Section 8 of the Statement of Need			
SP8	15 Nov 21	Changing the floor from tiles to limestone would considerably change the internal character of the church, removing the warm colouring and tones that the terracotta tiles provide, although we are pleased to see that the Gibson tiles in the Chancel and Sanctuary would be unaffected. The change from terracotta tiles to a pale limestone can leave churches feeling cold and rather bland rather than welcoming	There are good examples in many churches where limestone flags are used to provide a light and welcoming space, for example St Lawrence Bourton -on-the-water and St Philip and St James, Leckhampton. The current terracotta tiles give a dark and unwelcoming appearance which is inconsistent with the project objectives.	The reasons for a new limestone floor are set out in Section 8 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
SP9	15 Nov 21	There are also ledger stones in the existing floor, and these would need to be relocated again with the chance of damage occurring.	An archaeological investigation has been carried out to assess the condition of the ledgerstones and the feasibility of moving. See document PI17. We have consulted with the conservation team at the Church Buildings Council who have supported the proposals. We have also consulted with an experienced stonemason who confirmed that the ledgerstones can be safely moved.	Refer to Section 7.3 of the Statement of Need			
SP10	15 Nov 21	We understand that there is already level access throughout the church as far as the Chancel step from the existing entrance (the West Door), so we do not understand the desire to change the entrance. We would therefore ask that alternative options to address the height difference at the Chancel step are fully explored, allowing the retention of the existing floor and entrance.	Our access assumptions is to provide level access from the north door to the communion rail – not unreasonable and will allow people of all abilities to move around the church. The chancel steps place a significant obstacle to free access. The alternative to provide a ramp with a 1:15 slope as per building regulations would require a ramp length of 4m which in turn would reduce the available area for worship and events.	We provide further explanation in Section 8 of the Statement of Need as to why other options are not feasible or provide undue discrimination against those who are less able.			
<b>6. Heating</b>							
SP11	15 Nov 21	We are pleased that the parish have undertaken a Feasibility Study of the M & E Services and have given the matter a great deal of consideration in	We engaged Martin Thomas Associates (MTA) who have significant professional experience	The justification for the proposed heating system is			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		terms of the congregation's comfort, but less thought seems to have been given to the impact on the churches historic interior and character. As a result, the current proposals are to install underfloor heating with an Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP), which would be positioned externally to the east side of the south door above the existing boiler room. However, the Feasibility Study and parish have assumed that there will not be any objections to the entire floor of the Nave and Aisles being lifted and replaced or the pews being removed — two things that we are unable to support.	in the design of mechanical and electrical services in churches. They have completed a comprehensive study of the heating requirements and proposed options for an effective heating system. There are several good reasons to raise the floor which we have set out in the Statement of Need.	set out in Section 10 of the Statement of Need			
SP12	15 Nov 21	The Study explains clearly why underfloor heating in certain circumstances would be a viable option (see pgs 24-26), and we might agree if there was a robust reason for the floor to be lifted / replaced, but in this case there is not. Therefore, the lifting and replacement of the floor just to install underfloor heating and insulation is not considered to be robust enough justification as it would cause a significant degree of harm to the church's interior and the Waller re-ordering. Alternatives such as under pew heating were not considered as the proposals are to remove all the pews, something we are also uncomfortable with.	There are several good reasons to raise the floor which we have set out in the Statement of Need.  Pew heating was not considered feasible because of the need to move pews. This would require cabling to be placed in the existing floor which would weaken the existing floor structure	The justification for the proposed heating system is set out in Section 10 of the Statement of Need			
SP13	15 Nov 21	Underfloor heating ideally needs to be left on constantly or the parish will need to bear in mind that it has a long 'heat-up time' — 2.5 to 3 hours	We have been advised by our professional heating consultants and have already shared the report	The justification for the proposed heating system is			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		generally, roughly double that of correctly sized radiators. It is also very expensive to install. We would therefore suggest that the parish revisit the Feasibility Study and seek further advice and guidance from Gloucester DAC's Heating Adviser. They will be able to take a fresh look at all possible options/ combinations of options that would have the least impact on the historic fabric, do not require the floor to be lifted, and will provide the flexibility that the church wants.	and proposals with the DAC heating advisor.	set out in Section 10 of the Statement of Need			
SP14	15 Nov 21	Although we support the churches desire to look at more sustainable forms of heating, ASHP consists of a large external unit which can be quite noisy, and this would have a considerable visual impact on the south side of the church. Have alternative locations for the unit been considered slightly further away from the church building? ASHP's are also expensive to install, need annual servicing and generally have a relatively short lifespan of approximately 10-15 years.	We have been advised by our professional heating consultants. We have evaluated alternative locations for the ASHP unit. If you visit the churchyard, you will see the extensive listed tombs and gravestones south of the church. The proposed location adjacent to the south door causes least harm and can be shielded to reduce the visual impact as we have seen in another church.	The justification for the proposed heating system is set out in Section 10 of the Statement of Need			
SP15	15 Nov 21	Given that the south side of the Nave and Aisle roofs look to be reasonably well hidden, photovoltaic panels could be a viable option here, subject to further details. They have been discussed briefly in the Feasibility Study but should be given further consideration along with installing additional insulation where possible.	The feasibility study explains that even with the 'export' option for PV cells, the units would not provide sufficient power for the heating requirements, particularly in winter months.	The justification for the proposed heating system is set out in Section 10 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
SP16	15 Nov 21	In light of the drive to achieve net zero, the Church of England have recently revised their guidance on heating, which the parish may find helpful: <a href="https://www.churchofengland.org/resources/churchcare/advice-and-guidance-church-buildings/heating">https://www.churchofengland.org/resources/churchcare/advice-and-guidance-church-buildings/heating</a>	We are aware of this. We have attended all the relevant Church Building Council webinars and are up to date with their views.	No further action			
7. Proposed West Gallery							
SP17	15 Nov 21	Whilst it may be possible to reinstate some form of small gallery in the position of the previous one, which was removed in 1882, it needs to be fully justified in terms of why the additional space is required. It would also have to be on a considerably smaller scale than what is currently being proposed, with the kitchen and accessible toilets ideally being accommodated entirely beneath it so the full length of both Aisles could still be read. It is also unclear how the proposed gallery would work with the windows as those at the west end along with the Tower Arch will be significantly obscured. The preferred option shows a large gallery which extends the full width of the church, significantly reducing the proportions of the Nave and Aisles and is visually very intrusive — the glass will be reflective rather than transparent. The design of the proposed folding screens and the kitchen would also require significant reconsideration.	The position and extent of the gallery is unchanged from that in place up to 1881. This continued across the north and south aisles. This is confirmed from plans and photographs at that time. This is explained in the Statement of Need.	The justification for the proposed gallery is set out in Section 9 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
SP18	15 Nov 21	We note in the section on the North Porch (below) that the 'Glazed Inner Lobby' area inside the North Door is not needed, so removing this would immediately reduce the 'bulk' at the west end of the North Aisle.	Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery	Minded to remove the proposed glass lobby			
SP19	15 Nov 21	On the plans shown in the 'Presentation of Design Proposal' part 1, (pgs 6-7) there appears to be four areas marked as 'multifunctional space', numbered 3, 8, 9 and 18, but it is not clear why so much additional space is required. If two meeting areas could be retained within the adjacent cottage (see Section on Church Cottage), then only two meeting areas would be required within the church, potentially removing the need for the gallery entirely. Far greater consideration needs to be given to this aspect of the proposals considering the harmful impact that a gallery would have on the church's interior.	The Statement of Need sets out the justification for a small kitchen, disabled toilets, and meeting rooms within the church and under the balcony. In effect the balcony acts as a ceiling to these facilities. The area numbered 18 is an open area for gallery seating and not a meeting room. We have one large meeting area and two small ones – one being shared with the bell ringers.	The justification for the proposed heating system is set out in Section 10 of the Statement of Need			
<b>8. Kitchen area</b>							
SP20	15 Nov 21	The intention appears to be to have a fully functioning semi-commercial kitchen where food preparation and cooking will be undertaken. We support the desire for an improved kitchen, but it will be important to consider how the space (and toilets) will be ventilated and where any external vents would be positioned to minimise their impact. These should be kept to an absolute minimum in terms of size and number. We would advise the church to discuss their kitchen	The proposed kitchen, as described in the Statement of Need is for serving light meals and refreshments and is not a semi-commercial kitchen as assumed in the letter.  We have consulted with a local commercial kitchen designer to confirm needs and space	The justification for the proposed kitchen is set out in Section 9 of the Statement of Need			



From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		requirements with the local authority's Environmental Health team to ensure that all the necessary regulations in terms of food storage, hygiene etc are met. Bin storage for waste food will also need to be a consideration.	requirements. The reference to the Environmental Health team is spurious. Our M&E consultants have identified ventilation needs.				
<b>9. North porch</b>							
SP21	15 Nov 21	This is an Elizabethan addition to the church and was the main entrance until the re-ordering of 1882. It is no longer the main entrance due to the uneven cobbled path to access it and the change in levels internally. At present the porch is open to the elements with Georgian wooden gates externally and a heavy wooden internal door to the North Aisle. The proposals are to make this the main entrance again by significantly changing the path and internal floor levels in the church, removing the wooden gates and replacing them with solid wooden doors, leaving the internal wooden door fixed open and installing new glazed doors inside the North Door to access the North Aisle via a large glazed internal lobby.	The uneven cobbled path is being improved under a separate Faculty.	Comments addressed			
SP22	15 Nov 21	The existing entrance via the West Door already provides level access throughout the majority of the church. The internal floor levels only become an issue if the North and / or South Door are used as there is a step down to the Aisles, but this could be simply overcome with permanent, purpose made ramps. It is not clear why the	The uneven cobbled path (AKA Shelley's Walk) is being improved under a separate Faculty. This is a busy public right of way and improvements are to be carried out by and paid for mainly by Gloucestershire County Council	Comments addressed			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		parish wish to go to all this expense — what is the benefit of spending a large amount of money re-opening the North Porch and reconstructing the path? It would be simpler to retain the existing entrance and simply re-open the South Door as an emergency exit with a small, permanent ramp in place.	with grants from Lechlade Town Council and the Lechlade Heritage and Development Trust. This will enable the North Porch to be used as a main entrance. The used of ramps is impractical – with a 1:15 design slope (as building regulations, this would lead to a ramp length of nearly 4m and an area of up to 8m <sup>2</sup> . A similar ramp would be required at the chancel. These would have a significant impact on the seating area and flexibility of the space.				
SP23	15 Nov 21	At this stage not enough detail or justification has been provided to assess the full extent of these proposals. Traditionally porches were open, providing a degree of shelter from the weather, so closing this one in with new doors would change its character and appearance and therefore requires careful consideration. We would want to see details of the existing external gates, the wooden door into the North Aisle and how this would be fixed open, the existing floor and exactly what the proposed new external wooden doors and internal glazed doors would look like.	The proposals would allow church community to enjoy the north porch where currently the area is locked and unused. External doors are proposed mainly for security and weatherproofing to allow greater use to be made of the area. We explained the door arrangements to the visitors who came on 22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2021.	Comments addressed			
SP24	15 Nov 21	If there are to be new internal glazed doors from the porch into the North Aisle, there seems little justification for an additional large, glazed internal	Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and	Minded to remove the			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		lobby area. This will not form part of the proposed gallery and should be removed from the scheme. If draughts are still a concern, the M8LE Services Feasibility Study suggests that a hot air curtain could be positioned above the internal glazed doors. By removing this lobby there would no longer be a need to re-position the War Memorial to the South Aisle.	keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery	proposed glass lobby			
<b>10. Shelley's Walk</b>							
SP25	15 Nov 21	Altering this path is vital if the North Porch is to be re-opened. At present it is an attractive stone cobbled path immediately adjacent to Church House (Grade II) and St Lawrence's (Grade I) and within the Conservation Area. The path itself is not separately protected, but it clearly contributes to the character of the immediate area. It is not clear what the proposals are to make it more accessible, but as many of the cobbles should remain as possible. We would suggest looking at carefully removing the central section of cobbles and replacing them with a level but slightly cambered (to aid rainwater run off) nonslip natural stone / slate surface and then retaining the cobbles either side to aid drainage and retain the character of the path. We would be happy to comment on these proposals separately if required.	This is addressed in separate Faculty application.  A drawing was submitted with the faculty application.	Separate faculty application			
<b>11. South Door</b>							

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
SP26	15 Nov 21	We welcome the South Door, which is not currently in use, being carefully and sympathetically repaired, draught proofed and brought back into use as an emergency exit. We would be very interested to know how old it is. Altering this door to accommodate the proposed change in floor levels would not be supported at present, but we would be happy to discuss a well detailed permanent ramp.	Noted. We are planning to carry out a dendrochronological survey when the expert is available. The used of ramps is impractical – with a 1:15 design slope (as building regulations, this would lead to a ramp length of nearly 4m and an area of up to 8m <sup>2</sup> . A similar ramp would be required at the chancel. These would have a significant impact on the seating area and flexibility of the space.	Comments addressed			
<b>12. West Porch</b>							
SP27	15 Nov 21	This is currently the primary access to the church, facing directly on to the Market Place. The door is reached externally via a flat, level path which does not suffer from the same issues as the adjacent cobbled path. Once inside this door, there is level access up to the Chancel step. There is a step down into the church inside both the North and South Doors, so it appears easier to retain this as the main access into the church (see North Door section above). To compensate for losing the proposed meeting area at the base of the Tower, the North porch could be turned into a small meeting room - there are many examples of redundant but beautiful porches being sensitively re-purposed as meeting spaces, storage and even as small kitchens or toilets!	There is regular flooding of the path to the west door. We propose, in due course, to raise the path to reduce the risk of flooding and meet the new floor level in the church. The Chancel steps are currently a barrier to safe access by the less able, particularly when descending after communion. The project objectives are to provide level access for all abilities without any discrimination. We explain earlier why ramps are impractical.	Comments addressed			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
<b>13. Vestry and parish office</b>							
SP28	15 Nov 21	It is proposed that the Vestry will also serve as the Parish Office. We feel that the Parish Office could easily remain within Church Cottage if it was brought to the ground floor to make it accessible. However, if it does move into the Vestry then details of the alterations to the Vestry door, the proposed external ramp arrangement and the rooflights would need to be provided.	The DAC asked us to consider including all the facilities currently within the cottage in the church. The office within the vestry makes best use of space and provides flexibility. We explain in the Statement of Need why it is not feasible to continue to use the cottage.	Comments addressed We explain in Section 11 of the Statement of Need why use of the cottage is not feasible			
<b>14. Bowley Window</b>							
SP29	15 Nov 21	No justification is given for the proposed moving of this window (dating from 1920) from the north to the south side of the church. More robust justification is required as to why this is considered necessary.	The was a Faculty previously granted for moving this window but this expired. The reason is that the window cannot be viewed because of the lack of light on the north side. This is obscured by an ancient yew tree in the churchyard.	Comment addressed. Check that this is included in the Statement of Need			
<b>15. Church Cottage</b>							

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
SP30	15 Nov 21	The church owns a separate Grade II listed cottage adjacent to the church on its north side, facing directly on to the Market Place. It currently contains meeting and office spaces and two toilets (not fully accessible), although access to one of the rooms is difficult. Various options to retain and use the cottage are briefly discussed in the Statement of Need, but the parish appear to want to get rid of this property and use the proceeds to undertake the re-ordering. If sold, all the additional accommodation that it currently provides would need to be incorporated into the church, putting more strain on its sensitive Grade I listed interior. Although we appreciate that the listed cottage will have restrictions on what can be altered, we feel that the parish needs to put every effort into utilising the space within this building in the best way possible rather than trying to cram everything into the church.	We explain in the Statement of Need why it is not feasible to modify the Grade 2 cottage.	We explain in Section 11 of the Statement of Need why use of the cottage is not feasible			
SP31	15 Nov 21	The cottage needs to be considered as an integral part of this scheme and the buildings should support each other. It seems that the parish are assuming that the cottage cannot be altered but has a formal pre- application with the local authority been undertaken with a view to discussing how it could be utilised, for example, by changing the uses of the spaces and possibly making some fairly low-key alterations / small rear extension? Without seeing plans it is hard to	As we explain in the Statement of Need we have consulted with the Cotswold District Council conservation officer about the feasibility of making improvements to the cottage to meet current building and access standards. Their response is included in the Statement of Need.	We explain in Section 11 of the Statement of Need why use of the cottage is not feasible modify the cottage			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		comment but could the parish office be moved to the ground floor so that it can be more accessible, which would make sense given its position facing the Market Place. The upper floor could also be used as a meeting room, possibly with the inclusion of a stairlift if required, and could the existing toilets be amalgamated to become a single accessible one? It would be better to have at least one or two of the meeting rooms retained within this building plus an additional accessible WC to reduce the pressure on the church and the costs.1	We were also advised by the DAC Senior Church Buildings Officer that development of the cottage was not feasible, and we should look to include the facilities within the cottage in the church.				
SP32	15 Nov 21	However, it makes sense for the Sunday School space to be accommodated within the church to allow children to remain close to their parents.	Agreed. Moving the Sunday School meeting areas to within the church leaves few other facilities which are needed in the cottage and makes justification for its retention unviable.	Agreed			
SP33	15 Nov 21	It would be helpful for plans and sections showing the cottage's internal layout to be provided and we would be happy to work with the parish to find a way to put this mid-18th century property to better use supporting the church.	Thank you for the offer but we have consulted with the DAC Senior Church Buildings Officer on this matter.	Noted with thanks			
<b>16. Summary</b>							
SP33	15 Nov 21	Whilst we appreciate the needs of the parish and the lengths they have gone to so far, it is a great shame that the amenity societies were not been consulted at a much earlier stage. We feel that	We have read the comments from all the consultees and recognise the impact of the proposals on the interior of the church. We are	Mindful to accept comments and defer some			

From	Date	Comment	Response/ Action	Current position	Status	by	Date
		the proposed scheme is un-necessarily harmful to the highly significant interior of this Grade I listed church, and creating a photographic record is not considered to be sufficient mitigation for the removal of many of the fixtures and fittings. This level of substantial harm is simply not justified. By including the cottage within the proposals and looking at the two buildings holistically and with a degree of compromise, we are confident that a more sensitive solution can be found. We would be very happy to work with the parish regarding their proposals, and we can also take the scheme to our Casework Committee if it was felt this would be beneficial.	mindful to make some changes to the proposals. Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery Side chapel - we propose to retain the side chapel for quiet worship and communion. We have no plans for use as a meeting room. Chancel - We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.	elements of the project			



## E. Victorian Society – did not visit the church

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
<b>1. Summary</b>							
VS1	5 Feb 22	Conscious as we are that this scheme remains very much a work in progress, we must nonetheless raise serious concern with a number of aspects of what is envisaged, in the process echoing much of the advice already offered by the SPAB, HBAP, HE and the CBC. The scope of works is wide-ranging, to say the least, and its cumulative impact on the special historic and architectural interest of what is a building of the very highest designation would be profound and detrimental. I'm afraid it is hard to see how all of what is proposed could ever be justified, particularly when much of what the parish aim to achieve could surely be realised by far less sweeping and damaging means.	We have spent the last four years in developing detailed proposals to meet the worship and mission needs while seeking to respect the heritage of the building minimising harm and proposing mitigating measures.	The statement of Need clearly sets out the worship and mission needs. We explain why the Need is greater than any harm which in any case is mitigated by measures explained in the Statement of Significance.			
<b>Statement of Significance</b>							
VS2	5 Feb 22	In the first instance we recommend that the Statement of Significance will need to be revised to properly reflect the significance of what is undoubtedly high quality nineteenth-century work. The Statement's dismissal of Waller's work as somehow mediocre is inexplicable and unjustified. In fact, as Matthew Saunders highlights, much of Waller's fixtures and fittings possess a high level of artistic and aesthetic quality, and, taken holistically, his work defines	Noted. In assessing significance, this statement uses the following terminology: <b>High</b> – important at national to international levels <b>Moderate-High</b> – important at a regional, sometimes higher level <b>Moderate</b> – usually of local value but classifiable as being of regional	The Statement of Need has applied the Church Buildings Council definitions for significance			

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
		and characterises the present interior. The Statement should acknowledge this, and, in turn, the scheme celebrate it. With these thoughts in mind I turn to the proposals themselves, beginning with...	significance for its contribution to the building as a whole <b>Low-Moderate</b> – of local value <b>Low</b> – adds little or nothing to the value of a site or detracts from it				
<b>The Chancel</b>							
VS3	5 Feb 22	This is the climax of Waller’s work, and of the church as a whole. It brings together materials, design and workmanship of high quality, and constitutes an ensemble of great interest and dignity. The chancel screen and accompanying parclose screens are fine, and the form of their tracery appears closely related to that elsewhere in the church, in the choir stall frontals, in the pulpit and in the windows (for instance, the striking paired octofoiled lozenges above the primary ogee arches in the screen are mirrored in the aisle windows), reflecting the scholarly, holistic and consistent nature of the 1882 restoration. The Godwin tiled floor is dazzling and, like the floor in the nave, is notable for the way in which it continues beneath the furnishings. The choir stalls are also fine examples of their type.	We have considered the suggestion from the CBC to defer proposals for the chancel furnishings to a later date.  We have explained the justification for removing the screen on liturgical, historic and architectural grounds in the Statements of Need and Significance	Mindful to accept the CBC suggestion for the choir pews.  Further justification and explanation to be provided in the Statements			
VS4	5 Feb 22	The loss of the screen (by its relocation) would remove the chancel’s single-most important fixture, would divest the screen of its architectural context, function and effect, and would separate it from its accompanying parclose screens, one of	We have explained the justification for removing the screen on liturgical, historic and architectural grounds in the Statements of Need and Significance	Further justification and explanation to be provided in Section 7 of the			

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
		which – the southern – would actually be disposed of altogether. Placing the chancel screen, as is proposed, high up astride a new western gallery (particularly one adopting the design proposed) is nonsensical and would look frankly absurd. But the proposals go even further, removing the choir stalls and their frontals also, potentially retaining some in adapted, moveable form. What is proposed to the chancel would fundamentally erode its integrity and undermine its architectural an aesthetic primacy, in the process causing serious harm to the significance of the building. We strongly oppose it.		Statement of Need			
<b>The Floor</b>							
VS5	5 Feb 22	The present floor in the nave and aisles forms an integral part of Waller’s comprehensive and high quality restoration of the building, and in many ways, as floors often do, draws and holds the interior together. This is evident in all the photos included in the documents, but is demonstrated particularly well in the image that shows the nave and aisles entirely cleared of benches. It appears to formed of three different colours of tile, arranged in an inherently unremarkable but nonetheless pleasing pattern. The decorative walkways respond rationally to the inherent axiality of the building and its plan, and the central walkway in particular draws the eye	We have information to show that the floor was lowered by about 250mm with the original intention to build up the level using timber supports and boarding to support the pews. During construction the ‘Vestry’ decided on a new design with pews located directly on clay tiles at a lower level. This lower floor is also confirmed by the unfinished stonework to the lower columns.  It is important to note that the 6in thick limecrete floor laid by the	Refer to Section 8 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
		toward the east end, where, in the chancel, the tiled floors become even richer.	<p>Victorians provides a hard and robust floor to the church which we would not wish to disturb or cut channels in the concrete for cabling and heating pipes as this would significantly impact on the strength of the floor.</p> <p>There has been a series of repairs to the tiles over the last 100 years or so, as documented in the maintenance book which suggests that many of the tiles are not original. There is evidence of significant wear and fractures in the existing floor.</p> <p>Our access assumptions is to provide level access from the north door to the communion rail – not unreasonable and will allow people of all abilities to move around the church. The chancel steps place a significant obstacle to free access. The alternative to provide a ramp with a 1:15 slope as per Building Regulations would require a ramp length of 4m which in turn would reduce the available area for worship and events.</p>				

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
		The floor in the main body of the church is unusual in that it is all on a single level, without pew platforms, and it thereby doesn't present the trip hazards that many, even most, churches have to either live with or somehow address. As we understand it, level access is already provided both into the church and around the vast majority of it, excluding the chancel.	We strongly believe that all in our church community of all ages and abilities should be welcome. <i>'A Church without disabled people is a disabled Church'</i> We consider level access from the north door to the communion rail to be an essential need for people of all abilities. The two steps from the nave to the chancel presents a serious barrier to access by less able people. To state that level access is possible across the church completely disregards the need for the less able people to ascend and descend the steps to the altar rail.	Explained in Section 8 of the Statement of Need			
VS6	5 Feb 22	What is proposed would effectively erase the historic floor, concealing it from view and removing the positive contribution that it makes to the character and appearance of the interior, and profoundly undermining the integrity of Waller's high quality restoration.	We set out the need for raising the floor in our Statement of Need which is an integral solution for floor surface, level access across the church and the provision of underfloor heating without the need to disturb the lime concrete floor.	Explained in Section 8 of the Statement of Need			
VS7	5 Feb 22	The effect of this single aspect of the proposals would be extremely harmful. It would also conceal from view the plaque (on the upstand to the chancel step) commemorating the family who paid	The plaque will be relocated	Plaque to be relocated			

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
		for Waller's restoration, which is itself a significant historical record.					
VS8	5 Feb 22	Part of the justification for the loss of the historic floor and the creation of a raised one is the claim that Waller lowered the floor as part of his restoration. We are unconvinced by this argument, for which limited evidence has been offered, although we would gladly consider any evidence that might be produced. Even if true, however, it would not affect the significance of the present floor, the contribution it makes to the church, and the impact of its loss.	We have drawings (from GCC archives) by Waller to show that the floor level was reduced when the original design was to place pews on oak supports. See the Statement of Need	Explained in Section 8 of the Statement of Need			
VS9	5 Feb 22	Another argument is the stated aim to provide level access into and around the whole of the interior, including into the chancel. This argument is undermined by the fact that, for all that work, level access would not be provided to the sanctuary and the office on the north side of the chancel, and, more glaringly, by the fact that the proposed gallery at the west end would not itself be accessible other than by a staircase on the north side.	A new all-ability access is proposed to the external door of the office/ vestry as shown on the drawings.  The facilities provided on the gallery are the same as present in the nave. See the architect's report.	Comment addressed			
VS10	5 Feb 22	We would also echo the SPAB's concern on proposals for underfloor heating: we are not convinced of its appropriateness as a form of heating here, especially given the scale of intervention required to realise it.	We engaged Martin Thomas Associates (MTA) who have significant professional experience in the design of mechanical and electrical services in churches. They have completed a comprehensive study of the heating requirements	Explained in Section 10 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
			and proposed options for an effective heating system. There are several good reasons to raise the floor which we have set out in the Statement of Need.				
VS11	5 Feb 22	It is also claimed that the floor is in a poor state of repair. May we ask the parish to produce evidence to support this claim? Even so, surely it could be repaired, and its contribution to the interior is such that that should surely be the expectation.	We explain the reasons in the Statement of Need including evidence from the maintenance records and the reasons why the tiles are not appropriate for regular movement of pews and chairs.	Explained in Section 8 of the Statement of Need			
<b>Lobby</b>							
VS12	5 Feb 22	We strongly oppose the proposed inner glazed lobby on the north side, which would hugely intrude on the historic interior. We do not consider that a compelling need for this structure has been articulated, and, given its enormous visual intrusion and the high and detrimental impact it would have on the historic interior, we feel it should be omitted from any revised scheme. Quite apart from its visual inappropriateness and the lack of practical necessity for it, it would require the relocation of historic memorials (including the war memorial), would be very difficult to keep clean (particularly its roof, which would quickly gather dust), and it would completely destroy the experience of and drama inherent in entering this magnificent interior.	Lobby – we now propose to remove the proposed lobby and keep rooms within the line of the proposed gallery	Mindful to remove the glass lobby from the proposals			
<b>Gallery</b>							

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
VS13	5 Feb 22	The principle of a gallery may be acceptable, in the event that there was significant compromise on several other elements of the scheme. However, as it stands, we do find the justification for it to be lacking. As we point out above, the gallery would not be accessible, and the CGIs [?] indicate that it would likely create a rather awkward first-floor space, the usefulness of which is unclear. Moreover, by its form and scale and precise disposition, it would hugely obscure views into the tower and of the tower arch itself, and greatly detract from the spatial qualities of the west end. Photographs of the west end prior to Waller's restoration demonstrate just how transformative and beneficial Waller's decluttering of the west end was (by the removal of the gallery and organ). It would be unfortunate to undertake work now that would effectively revert to that historic arrangement, and which would have a similarly harmful (and probably far more harmful) impact on the west end, and the interior more generally.	The proposals will return the west end of the church to the pre-1882 reordering with the line of the gallery generally following the previous galleries. The gallery provides a ceiling to the toilets and kitchen and makes room for additional seating and storage. The facility on the gallery is no different to those on the ground floor as such does not require access for less able. See the architect's report.	Explained in Section 9 of the Statement of Need			
VS14	5 Feb 22	The nature of the design and the materials of the gallery and the fenestration, screens and doors below it would greatly compound the harm caused by the scale and imposition of its form. The openings with roller shutters to the kitchen on the south side (with what are presumably skimmed partitions between the openings), the extensive bi-	These issues are subject to detailed design. We aim to have a high quality of design and workmanship.	Detailed design will show the quality of design proposed.			



From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
		fold doors to the central section, and the lengthy glazed gallery balustrade, all appear disappointingly utilitarian. The impression it gives is of an intervention that is not fit for any historic church, let alone one of the highest significance.					
<b>Pews</b>							
VS15	5 Feb 22	We do not by any means consider that the pews here are of such significance that no reduction of them can be contemplated. However, they are good quality pieces of historic joinery, treated with respect and care in their design and detailing, and they form an intrinsic part of Waller’s comprehensive and holistic restoration. As a significant part of Waller’s restoration, and as historic furnishings that contribute positively to the character, appearance and an understanding of the interior, there is a presumption against any loss unless there is clear, compelling justification presented for it. The Statement of Needs outlines an ambitious vision, as well as a great many activities that either happen or could happen in the church (although the specific demands of several of these uses remains unclear). However, we do not think this amounts to a clear and compelling articulation of need for <i>wholesale</i> removal of the historic benches. Surely a compromise could be found, which would see a significant number of benches retained, perhaps in shortened form, and/or adapted to be	We explain in our Statement of Need the reasons why we propose to remove all the pews  Both the Church Buildings Council and the Historic Buildings and Places supported the removal of the pews.	Explained in Section 8 of the Statement of Need			

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
		made moveable without the aid of a trolley. Moveable choir pews are envisaged, so why could not the historic benches be modified to make them relatively easily reconfigured? Given their significance, this option at least deserves consideration. The retention of a significant number of benches would also reduce the need for storage, of which much is proposed, including in the south chapel.					
<b>Cottage</b>							
VS16	5 Feb 22	We wish to echo SPABs comments on the neighbouring cottage. This is a valuable resource and has great potential to serve a number of functions that could in turn reduce the burden on the Grade I-listed church. We acknowledge the concerns that have been expressed by Council officers and others at the possibility of adapting this building, but it seems wrongheaded to avoid altering the Grade II-listed cottage – even substantially so – on the basis of avoiding harm to its significance, when the significance of the Grade I-listed church would be so profoundly undermined what is proposed. We recognise that the cottage could only ever accommodate a small portion of the uses envisaged for the church, but it could surely perform an important role in the context of the activity of the church community as a whole.	We explain in the Statement of Need why it is not feasible to modify the Grade 2 cottage.	We explain in Section 11 of the Statement of Need the reasons why it is not allowable or feasible to modify the cottage			
<b>Summary</b>							

From	Date	Comment	Gs	Current position	Status	by	Date
VS17	5 Feb 22	Having said all this, and conscious that our advice is striking a critical tone, we wish to state that the very broad principle of what the parish is aiming to achieve here is acceptable to us. Moreover, we by no means consider this building, despite its exceptional significance, to be beyond adaptation, and there are elements of the scheme that are justified: the principle of providing lavatories and a servery, for instance; of providing additional storage; of creating additional areas of flexible space; of providing an efficient heating system; of M&E works; of redecoration; and the principle of some degree of pew removal from the nave and/or aisles. However, we do consider that the scheme as it is presented is both seriously damaging and specifically unjustified.	We understand the concern but explain in the Statement of Need how the needs for worship and mission outweigh any harm. Mitigation measures are explained	The Need for the proposals is clearly explained in the Statement of Need. Mitigation measures are set out in the Statement of Significance			
VS18	5 Feb 22	On the loss of the C18 gates from the north porch – which is surely a most contentious proposal – we defer to the Georgian Group, which ought to be consulted on this (would the C18 chandelier remain also? And the font cover?). And on the proposed disposal of the handsome altar from the south chapel, and the impact of the proposed works on the Hawker and Bowley windows in the north aisle, we defer to the Twentieth Century Society.	There are no proposals to remove the C18 chandelier which is the only feature of the Georgian period left after the Victorian reordering in 1882	We refer to the Statement of Significance for these topics			