

that the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the building. The chancellor refused the faculty on the basis that the justification provided by the parish for the proposed works was not clear and convincing. The works would undoubtedly produce a real public benefit in this community but, given the expressed needs of the parish for space to host meetings, concerts, exhibitions and Messy Church services, that benefit could readily be met by the removal of all but the front four or five rows of pews with the remaining pews being made moveable. The chancellor stayed the proceedings for six months to give the parish the opportunity to present amended proposals in the light of her findings, in default of which the proceedings would stand dismissed. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X16000727

Re All Saints, Ockbrook

Derby Consistory Court: Bullimore Ch, 22 January 2016

[2016] ECC Der 1

Removal of pews – justification

The chancellor dismissed a petition to remove and sell pews from the north and south aisles of a Grade II* listed church. The petitioners' statement of needs said that there was a need to create flexible space to enable various styles of services to be conducted and, in particular, to allow the church to meet more flexibly the needs of families with young children; and that there was a further need for space for persons with impaired mobility, and for church and community groups to meet in the church during the week. It was not explained by the petitioners what types of services were contemplated that could not be accommodated by the present seating arrangements, how the removal of the pews would aid the needs of families with young children or those with impaired mobility (unless such persons were to be relegated to the aisles), or what church or community groups that did not currently use the church would use it if the pews were removed. As the removal of the pews would cause moderate harm to the listed building, the absence of clear and convincing justification for what was proposed meant that the petitioners could not demonstrate that the proposals would result in public benefit which would outweigh that harm. [Alexander McGregor]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X16000739