

### **Re All Saints, Cossington**

Leicester Consistory Court: Blakett-Ord Ch, 1 August 2012

*Extension to church*

A faculty was refused for the construction of a large, two-storey extension on the north side of the Grade II\* listed church. The proposed extension would be the same length, and almost the same width, as the nave, and the apex of its roof would be higher than the highest point of the aisle roofs. The intention was that the extension should provide two large meeting rooms, a vestry office, plant room, kitchen, WC and entrance lobby. English Heritage (EH) and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) were strongly opposed. In particular, EH raised concerns about the scale and quality of design of what was proposed and the manner in which it would dominate its setting. The chancellor had directed that the petitioners should serve a reply that addressed the particularised concerns of EH and SPAB as well as a number of issues that he had identified, which related primarily to the size and appearance of the proposed extension. The petitioners' reply failed to address those matters adequately. There was no explanation of why an extension of the proposed size was needed; and even if there were a case for such an extension, an architectural design of the very highest quality would be required. The petitioners had not proved a necessity for an extension of the size proposed and, in any event, it would damage the church aesthetically and architecturally in a manner that was not justified. The chancellor observed that, even though the courts frequently disagree with EH and the amenity societies, petitioners should treat opposition from them seriously and should take architectural advice accordingly. [Alexander McGregor]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X12001081

### **Re St Mary, Purton**

Bristol Consistory Court: Gau Ch, 14 August 2012

*Pews – necessity*

The petitioners sought a faculty for, inter alia, the permanent removal and disposal of two pews at the front of the nave to create a flexible space for the music group, performances and other liturgical uses. The pews had already been removed under an archdeacon's temporary licence and the petitioners wished to make the change permanent. Twelve parishioners raised objections to the removal on the basis that the change was unnecessary. The chancellor made a without notice site visit where he attended Sunday services and held discussions with the priest-in-charge and churchwardens. The chancellor refused to grant