

# **Diocese of Exeter**

## **Chancellor**

**Date:** 5<sup>th</sup> August 2015

**Parish:** St Andrew, Ashburton with Buckland in the Moor and Bickington

### **JUDGMENT**

1. By a Petition lodged on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2015 the Team Rector and Churchwardens [‘the Petitioners’] of St Andrew’s Church, Ashburton have applied for a Faculty to permit a range of interior works to the church, most of which arise from an acknowledged need for a complete relaying of the Nave floor. After full consultation with the community, the relevant heritage bodies and the DAC a large measure of agreement has been achieved as to the detail of the proposed works. Some controversy, however, remains over the question of the material and design of the surface of part of the re-laid Nave flooring.
2. St Andrew’s, Ashburton is a very fine Grade 1 church, which was built in the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century at a time when Ashburton was the prosperous centre of the local wool and tin trade. Indeed, although the financial high days funded by tin may be over, the town and St Andrew’s church continue to preserve an active link with, and pride in, the Protreeve and Town Courts. Much of the original fabric of the building, including the fine roofs, remains, although successive generations have added to or otherwise reordered the internal fittings.

3. The last major refurbishment was to a design by the celebrated Victorian architect G.E. Street and was completed some two years after his death in 1883. To the eyes of some commentators the extent of this reordering was unnecessarily radical and, in observations on the current plans, Historic England has commented that the church would be 'hugely improved' if consideration could be given to re-plastering the walls; the plaster having been removed during the 'Street' reordering.
4. The focus of this judgment is upon the Nave flooring. During the Street reordering the floor finishes then in place were removed throughout the church and replaced with chequerboard paving to the walkways, timber block under the newly installed pews and very fine patterned encaustic tiling (by Godwin of Herefordshire) in the Chancel and Sanctuary.
5. Some 130 years after the Victorian reordering it can be seen that the flooring work has in part survived so that its original glory can still be plainly seen; this is so particularly at the East end in the raised area of the Chancel and Sanctuary, with its high quality tiling, and at the West end at the base of the tower, which is also raised above the floor level of the nave.
6. The flooring in the main body of the church has not worn so well, in the main because of two separate features. Firstly, the flooring was laid straight on to compacted earth with the result that the timber blocking beneath the pews has become badly affected with damp and insect infestation. In places the blocking has been removed in recent times and replaced with plywood as a temporary measure.
7. Secondly the chequerboard pattern which decorates the walkways around the church and up the main aisle is comprised of squares of limestone from Beer in Devon alternating with similar sized squares (albeit made up of a dozen or so smaller tiles) of rust coloured basic tiling. The attractive colour and texture of the Beer stone as it will originally have been seen can still be detected on the floor in corners of the Bell Tower, where there will have been little wear over the years. The Beer stone in the main thoroughfares has, however, not fared nearly so well. It is not a hard-wearing

surface. In the main aisle roughly one half of the Beer stone blocks have had to be replaced with cement, which is out of place with the church interior and in contrast to the remaining Beer stone with the result that the original chequer effect is broken up. Where the Beer stone remains, it is worn and discoloured. In some areas the floor has simply been replaced (some years ago) with urban paving slabs.

8. The state of the flooring to the Nave is such that the need to undertake a major refurbishment is accepted by all. Early in the process of evaluating the options the PCC commissioned a report from the nationally respected firm of Odgers Conservation. The resulting report, dated May 2014, was neither enthusiastic about the quality of the original work to the Nave (both as to the poor quality of the rust coloured tiling and the workmanship with which the tiles had been cut and laid), nor the current state of repair. This evaluation of the walkways, coupled with the obvious need to address the decaying wood-block flooring under the pew areas that the walkways surround, led the parish to consider installing one universal floor covering for the whole of the nave, both walkway and under the pews. The supporters of the universal proposal considered that it had the added benefit of liberating the potential for flexibility as to the layout of seating within the church for the future by removing the blocks, or tramlines, that are a prominent feature of the current floor pattern.
9. The PCC has chosen Purbeck 'Grub' Limestone as the most suitable surface for the Nave flooring. Save for the two Objectors to the Petition, no agency or individual takes objection to this choice. Even on the Objectors' case, the principal the issue to which this Petition relates is the extent to which the new covering is laid out in the Nave to replace the pattern of the original Street design.
10. The primary consequence of the universal proposal was, obviously, that all trace of the Street floor pattern would be removed from the Nave, albeit that the original rust/Beer chequerboard would remain at the base of the West Tower together with the 'very fine example of G E Street design' (per Odgers) in the Chancel and Beer stone and wood in the Lady Chapel.

11. Consultation with the heritage bodies and the DAC produced a clear recommendation for the retention of part of the Street design in the Nave. Heritage England (as it is now known) recommended that ‘ideally a large section of Street’s red and cream chequer-work be retained as a cross feature in the body of the nave at the junction of the main alley with the cross aisle’.

12. The DAC Notice, issued on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2015, recommended the scheme but subject to a number of provisos including:

‘7. Provided that the Specification/Schedule of Works is amended to refer to relaying of the chequer board nave aisle floor, using reclaimed stone and tiles from areas to be removed.’

Although the wording of that proviso may be thought to be ambiguous and refer to the chequer board across each of the Nave aisles, the proviso arose out of detailed discussion between the Petitioners and the DAC and is taken to be limited to the track up the central aisle running from West Tower to Chancel steps as shown in drawing number SA/03 ‘B’ dated July 2014.

13. It is right to add at this point that another agreed feature of the final proposal is that at the head of the central Nave aisle, in line with the North and South Transepts, it is proposed that the floor pattern will include a slender cross formed of local Ashburton Marble.

14. In a letter of January 2015, Heritage England states: ‘we are pleased that you are able to retain Street’s chequer-work tile and stone paving in the main nave alley but disappointed to learn that you do not consider it feasible to retain it in the cross-aisle.’

15. In an email of February 2015 the Victorian Society endorsed the advice of the DAC but expressed particular concern as to the original proposal to remove the Street pattern from the aisles. It welcomed the Petitioners’ response to the DAC by agreeing to retain the chequer-work scheme in the central aisle but ‘like the DAC [the VS] would much prefer to see the cross aisle retained in addition to the nave

aisle, which would produce a more characterful result and play a helpful role in organising the volume of the space; however, we would not raise any objection to the granting of a faculty for the scheme in its current (ie revised) form.’

16. Alongside consultation with the DAC and heritage bodies, a number of those in the community who know the church well and are PCC members have expressed their opposition to some of the proposals. Mrs Rachel West and her son Mr William West sent formal letters setting out a number of detailed points to the Registrar in April 2015. Save for the issue over flooring, the matters raised in these letters have since been resolved by agreement with the Petitioners and it is only necessary to make brief reference to the outcome in this judgment:

- a. Suggested errors in the plans have been corrected where necessary;
- b. Concern that the new lighting design may be insufficient to eradicate current areas of significant shadow have been addressed in part by the reinstatement of existing floodlighting and by the acceptance on all sides that the effectiveness of the new installation cannot really be judged until it is in place. The Petitioners agree that, once in operation and suitably adjusted by trial and error, the result will be subject to further discussion and review;
- c. Work on the flooring will now proceed on the basis that that Petitioners will apply for a licence to lift the cremated remains of Harold Octavius Jones (organist at St Andrews for over 50 years) from their location immediately behind the organist’s bench during the work followed by their orderly return to that position in the new flooring once the work is complete;
- d. There is agreement over points of ambiguity that arose from the plans over the removal of some of the pews and location of a bookcase.

17. Mrs West and Mr West, whilst applauding the DAC stance of insisting upon reinstatement of the central aisle, ask that, ‘as a minimum’, the North-South axis should also be retained as recommended by Historic England. Beyond this minimum, Mrs West and Mr West sought the reinstatement of the whole of the GE Street flooring, including the replacement of timber under the pews. They also considered that the use of Purbeck ‘Grub’ stone paving was completely alien to the

context of the building, in contrast to their choice, Bearah Tor granite, which would fit in with the granite pillars in the church. Mrs West and Mr West considered the current revised proposal to be merely a token gesture to the past, and to result in a design that is ‘at odds with itself’ given that a mixture of timber and chequer-board is to be retained in the Lady Chapel.

18. In addition to Mrs West and her son, the Registrar also received a formal letter of objection from Mr William Shapley. Mr Shapley is in a complicated position in this matter. As one of the two serving churchwardens, he signed the Petition and is therefore one of the Petitioners who has applied for the Faculty, yet, as his letter of April 2015 clearly shows, his true view is very much in line with that expressed by the Wests. He favours retention of a North-South axis in the Street chequered design and he questions the assumption that freshly laid timber flooring in the pew areas, using modern building techniques, would be prone to the same problems of damp and infestation.
  
19. All three objectors were given the option of becoming formal Objectors to the Petition, or simply allowing the court to take their views into account when determining the terms of the Faculty. In the event Mrs West and Mr West have issued formal Notices of Objection in similar terms to their earlier letters. Mr Shapley, however, in a telephone conversation with the Registry on 22<sup>nd</sup> May, firmly stated that he wished to withdraw his letter of objection. Despite Mr Shapley’s formal position being that he is not an ‘objector’ and that he has instructed that his letter be ‘withdrawn’, I have referred to its contents as it has apparently been copied to the other Petitioners and, at the Directions Hearing held in the church on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015, Mr Shapley once again explained that he really did not support the proposal insofar as it relates to flooring; he would very much prefer for as much of the Street design to be reinstated as is possible. He explained that although he had signed the Petition in hurried circumstances at the conclusion of a busy PCC meeting, once he had had time to consider the flooring proposal he was not in favour of it.

20. Pausing there, there is a need for this court to be very cautious in attributing any weight to Mr Shapley's views. He is not a formal 'objector' to the Petition. He no longer wishes his letter of objection to be considered by the court. He was only present in the church during the Directions hearing because he is one of the Petitioners, yet he took the opportunity to express his negative views on the flooring rather than supporting his Petition on this point. As I explained to all present at the Directions hearing, the issues in dispute will be determined on their merits and not by a headcount of those in favour or against. I regard the case against the current proposal as having been very fully and clearly put by Mr West, on his own behalf and on behalf of his mother, and, in correspondence by HE and the VS. The case in favour of the proposal has also been fully and clearly set out on paper and, at the hearing, was comprehensively explained by Mrs Lewis, the other Petitioner/Churchwarden and the church architect, Mr Lewis. Without meaning any disrespect to Mr Shapley, whose service to this church and the town is acknowledged by all, and on the basis that his views are really on all fours with those of Mrs West, I propose to disregard Mr Shapley's role in this matter in so far as it relates to the issue of flooring.

21. The arguments against any further extension of the Street floor pattern, beyond what is now proposed for the central aisle, have been set out on behalf of the Petitioners and the PCC, firstly in a document dated 20<sup>th</sup> April 2015 which makes the following points:

- a. The cruciform plan of the church fully reflects the 'cross' without the need for emphasis in the floor pattern;
- b. There may not be sufficient reusable, good quality, floor material to do more than the centre aisle;
- c. If the chequer-boarding were now to extend right up to and in to the South Transept, it would cover an area which was not tiled in the original design (being then under pews and so comprised of wooden block);
- d. The Beer stone wears badly and if the plan were to place it towards the back of the church on the North-South axis running from the main door, this would be the area of maximum footfall and hence erosion;

- e. The positive principle behind the PCC's design for the flooring was to move away from a rigid layout pattern in order to permit flexibility in seating arrangements for future generations. The DAC proposal regarding the centre aisle had been accepted with reluctance and the PCC were keen not to go further.
22. In a further document dated 14<sup>th</sup> May 2015 the views of the PCC in response to the objections of Mrs West and Mr West were set out in more detail. Regarding the flooring the point is firmly made that the proposal for the wholesale redesign of the flooring had been thoroughly debated by this small PCC and the relevant sub-committee, the membership of which includes both Mrs West and her son. The proposals, including the choice of Purbeck 'Grub, were passed unanimously at all meetings up to the decision to proceed to a DAC application in June 2014. Thereafter it is said that Mrs West or Mr West abstained on the vote about the DAC proposal for the centre aisle and there is no recollection of the suggestion of cross aisle tiling being raised by them at that meeting.
23. It is said that the present proposal meets the need to avoid repetition of damp and infestation from the sub soil. A stone floor with 'breathable' joints is the right solution. The use of any type of timber is not a practical long-term solution.
24. Purbeck 'Grub' was chosen after consultation with the DAC and following a visit to the relevant quarries. Mr West took a full part in this process. The suggestion of a granite floor throughout the non-Street areas was made, according to the Petitioners, for the first time in the letter of objection. Granite is almost double the cost of the Purbeck limestone.
25. The PCC consider that the church will continue to have ample evidence of, as opposed 'to a minimal gesture towards', the flooring in the original Street layout. The Bell Tower and the Lady Chapel are both fine examples and will remain untouched; the centre aisle will be refurbished and relaid.



26. As I have already recorded, the process of exchange of letters and more formally structured documents through the Registry has enabled the Petitioners and the Objectors to have a constructive dialogue which has led to a number of issues that were originally in contention being resolved. Mrs West and Mr West's final letter (26<sup>th</sup> May) by implication indicates that the matter can now be resolved by the Court without a formal hearing; that understanding was confirmed and agreed to by all parties at the Directions hearing in July.

27. The Directions hearing took place inside the church on Friday 31<sup>st</sup> July. I am very grateful to the Registrar and his staff for making the necessary arrangements and for each of those present for taking the time to assist the court in gaining an understanding of the issues relating to the flooring. Before turning to matters of substance, it is, however, necessary to record who was, and who was not, present and to give a brief explanation of my decisions on these procedural matters:

- a. Mrs Judith Lewis was present in her capacity as Petitioner and Churchwarden;
- b. Mr William Shapley was present in his capacity as Petitioner and Churchwarden. I have already explained my approach to the difficult position relating to Mr Shapley's twin role as both Petitioner and an objector (at least with a small 'o'). I took the view that, as he had not stepped down from being a Petitioner, he was a full party to the proceedings and was therefore entitled to be there;
- c. Unfortunately the third Petitioner, the Revd David Sherwood, was away on sabbatical leave. Rather than delay matters further, all parties were content to proceed in his absence;
- d. Fortunately, the clergy were represented in the absence of Revd Sherwood by the Archdeacon of Totnes, the Revd Douglas Detmer;
- e. Mrs Rachel West and Mr William West attended;
- f. Mr Brian Lewis, who is the church architect and also a member of the PCC, attended. Mr West was initially not agreeable to Mr Lewis being present, but my clear view was that it was essential that we had the architect present to assist my understanding of the details of the project. In the event, and as I

apprehended might be the case, in view of Mr Shapley's exquisitely difficult position, Mr Lewis and Mrs Lewis were able to present the Petitioner's arguments and Mrs West and Mr West were able to present the arguments to the contrary. Had Mr Lewis not been present, and in the absence of the Revd David Sherwood, Mrs Lewis might well have been the only voice in favour of the project, which would have created an unhelpful imbalance in the process;

g. Mr Martin Follett, Diocesan Registrar attended.

28. In addition to those in attendance, in advance of the meeting I was invited to approve the attendance of Mr Parffrey, a PCC member who is a retired solicitor. Mr West strongly objected to Mr Parffrey's attendance on the basis that the PCC had not approved him as a representative at any PCC meeting and that if the PCC were to have legal representation then the Wests would also wish to be represented. On the basis that I hoped for the hearing to be as informal as possible, with the emphasis on light, rather than heat, so that I could hear an account from both sides of the argument without one or other feeling any more unsettled than the circumstances themselves might generate, I ruled that Mr Parffrey should not attend.

29. On arrival at the church, despite the careful discussions that had been undertaken as to attendance, I was informed that three other members of the PCC were in the church and wished to remain for the hearing. Mrs West and Mr West were not in agreement with anyone attending other than those previously agreed. As I was intent on conducting an informal process, encouraging all in attendance to 'have their say', I was keen to limit the numbers taking part in order to maintain some balance between the two sides and also to retain the structure of a hearing rather than an open meeting. I met the three PCC members and explained the position to them. I am very grateful to each of them for agreeing to leave the church, despite the obvious interest that they have in this project and their understandable desire to support Mrs Lewis in her role as Petitioner on their behalf.

30. So far as the issues concerning the project were concerned, I found the hearing itself to be a most useful and informative occasion. All parties conducted themselves throughout in the most civilised manner, focussing on the issues and, to a large part, avoiding the undoubted undercurrent that must have been in each of their minds as to what had been, or had not been, said at PCC meetings at which all were present during the development of this scheme. This structured encounter, which lasted for an hour and a half, cannot have been easy for those involved. It is not for this court to enquire as to the reasons, but it was impossible not to be struck by the palpable strong feelings, possibly principally of hurt on all sides, that were present throughout. As I observed during the hearing, whatever the court's decision on this point, for the future each of the key protagonists is likely to continue to be a neighbour, PCC member and attender at this magnificent and much loved church. There may well be a need for some bridge building, reconciliation and mutual understanding of how this unfortunate falling out has arisen once the dust has settled so that, in time, relationships may be restored to a more positive configuration.

31. The quality of the paperwork produced by both the Petitioners and the Objectors has been such that the key arguments, as summarised above, were well known to both sides, and to the court, prior to the start of the hearing. A primary purpose in attending the church was to understand the physical dimensions more readily than can be gained from plans and photographs and, importantly, to understand the detail of the alternative plan being put forward by the Objectors. In this regard it was impossible not to observe that Mr West had not come to the hearing with a fully formed alternative proposal in mind, let alone on paper. In reply to my request for detail, he was required to spend time in discussion with Mrs West before sketching out his concept using a copy of the church plan in the Church Guide Book. The proposal was for two cross aisles. On the ground he demonstrated one as being in the rectangle immediately in front of the steps up to the Chancel extending to the line between the first two pillars on either side of the central Nave (although his sketch stops a foot or two short of these two pillars). The second cross aisle that he proposed would run from the North Porch across the Nave to the South wall immediately opposite. On the drawing this second aisle was shown as the full width

of the doorway opening, but Mr West explained that this was an error and it should only be the width of the area currently unoccupied by pews.

32. On further discussion one potential reason for the previous lack of clarity regarding the Objectors alternative proposal is that, as she candidly stated, in principle Mrs West would much rather the Street design were reinstated in its entirety throughout the church, both as to tiling and wooden flooring; she therefore finds it difficult to contemplate any compromise. Mr West, who acknowledges the practical limits on replacing all the tiling that arises from the lack of sound Beer stone blocks and tiles, was in the difficult position of representing his mother's principled view whilst at the same time offering a pragmatic solution. Be that as it may, a lack of clarity as to proposals for a cross aisle or aisles is also a feature of the responses from HE and the VS. HE speaks of a 'cross feature' at the juncture of the cross aisle, and the VS would much prefer to see the 'cross aisle retained'; both seem to be describing just one cross aisle, rather than two. Although it is possible to make an assumption, it is not entirely clear whether the cross aisle being considered by HE and the VS is at East end of the Nave or in line with the North door, neither is it possible to discern quite what the extent of any chequer-boarding might be as part of a 'cross feature'.

33. I have made the observations that I have set out in the above paragraph not in any manner to be critical of either the Objectors or the heritage bodies. Up until now any discussion of maintaining a cross feature in the tiling design has been at a 'high level', as a general idea, without descending to detail. We now have some detail provided by Mr West on the spot during the hearing, but it is, by definition, detail that he will not have had a great deal of time to consider (and indeed was revised by him in the two respects that I have mentioned very soon after he had drawn it out). More importantly, the PCC, DAC, HE or the VS have never considered this proposal from Mr West.

34. There is also, I am afraid, a lack of precision as to a central premise in the PCC's case. Having seen the state of the current floor, I well understand and accept the point that a good many of the Beer stone blocks have either not survived or are

unlikely to be fit for re-use. The same is true of some of the tiling. There is no suitable source from which to introduce like-for-like replacement in modern times. Despite understanding and respecting Mrs West's principled stance in favour of re-laying a full replica of the original street floor plan, my conclusion is that that is simply not possible. Going further, the PCC rightly state that there will be a limit on just how much further the available resources will stretch to provide stones and tiling for any cross aisle. I accept, as part of the same point, that the PCC will wish to be prudent in laying the new floor by keeping in reserve a stock of useable stones and tiles to provide a replacement in the years to come if some of the newly laid materials fail in due course. The precision that is missing from this strong argument made by the PCC is the ability to identify just where the tipping point lies. Again, in making that observation I am not being critical of the PCC and the architect. They know that they have sufficient stones and tiles to make good the centre aisle and they have not hitherto had to consider any more detailed proposal. But, I am afraid (because it will obviously be a tedious task) the time has come when there needs to be a detailed audit of the Beer stone blocks and tiles to identify just how many seem likely to be available for re-use or storage as stock for future use.

35. The present floor design has endured for more than a century and it is no doubt hoped that what is established after the current reordering will last for a similar period. It is plainly not in any way satisfactory for a final decision to be made on the question of tiling in the cross aisle or aisles without the detail on this point being the subject of further considered thought by all those who have previously been consulted.

36. The PCC and those who support the present scheme will undoubtedly receive the news that there must inevitably be a short further delay in coming to a final decision with dismay. I fully understand that that will be the case and I have over the past few days considered if it is nevertheless possible to proceed on the modest level of detail provided by the Objectors, the heritage bodies and the PCC, but it is simply not possible to do so. I hope that all will agree, to use the old phrase, that a further short time spent in recognisance will not be wasted.

37. Before turning to detail, I appreciate that much of the burden of the early requests that I have set out below will fall personally and professionally upon Mr Lewis. Whilst I apologise for that, I anticipate that he will see the need for these steps and that I can rely upon his good will to engage with the Objectors and also to provide the necessary information as to the resources that will be needed and those which are available.

38. What I propose is that the following steps should be undertaken against a very tight timetable:

i. Mrs West and Mr West are to liaise with the architect, Mr Lewis, so that he can draw up a precise depiction of the Objectors final considered proposal using the same template for the plans that have hitherto been used [‘the Objectors’ proposal’]. This should be a short task and I would ask that it be completed by Friday 14<sup>th</sup> August;

ii. Mr Lewis is to calculate (if possible by the same date):

a. how many sound Beer stone blocks and sound tiles will be available for re-use in the new floor.

If possible, he is also to calculate:

b. how many stone blocks and tiles will be taken up in the present plan for a single central aisle;

c. how many additional stone blocks and tiles would be needed to achieve the layout depicted in the Objectors’ proposal; and

d. how many stone blocks and tiles he estimates should prudently be kept back for future repair work;

iii. The Objectors’ proposal and the data provided by Mr Lewis under (ii) above should then be circulated (by no later than Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> August) for consideration by:

a. The PCC;

b. The DAC (or a sub-committee of the DAC);

c. Heritage England; and

- d. The Victorian Society;
- iv. If, as may be the case, HE or the VS wish the court to consider an alternative to the Objectors proposal they are to send a marked plan setting out their proposal to the Registry so that it is received no later than Friday 28<sup>th</sup> August;
- v. In the event that HE and/or the VS do submit an alternative proposal then that must also be circulated to the Objectors and the others set out in (iii) for consideration;
- vi. If no alternative proposals (other than that of the Objectors) are submitted by Friday 28<sup>th</sup> August, then all responses to this additional consultation must be sent to the Registry by Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> September;
- vii. If there is a need to consider any further alternatives, the time for responses from all will be extended to Friday 11<sup>th</sup> September;
- viii. The Registry is asked to keep the parties informed by email as to receipt of alternatives from HE or VS and, therefore, which response date is to be met;
- ix. Thereafter (ie after either 28<sup>th</sup> August or 11<sup>th</sup> September) the papers are to be returned by the Registry to me and I will prepare my final decision if at all possible within the following five days.

39. Before concluding this preliminary judgment, it may be helpful if I indicate a number of final conclusions that I have been able to determine as a result of all that I have read and heard. I will provide reasons for these conclusions in my final judgment:

- a. Wooden flooring beneath the pews: the PCC argument in favour of stone flooring throughout the Nave (subject to any areas of ‘Street’ chequer-work) succeeds both on the ground that wooden flooring is unlikely to be sound over time and also because I accept that this is an opportunity to introduce greater flexibility into the floor design for the benefit of this generation and those to come – the opportunity to do so is unlikely to arise again in this manner;

- b. Purbeck 'Grub': I approve of the choice of Purbeck 'Grub' limestone for use in all areas of the Nave other than those where it is determined the Street design should be replaced;
- c. All other elements of the Petition: I shall in due course grant a Faculty for all of the other elements of the Petition (including that in relation to the remains of the late Harold Octavius Jones). The Faculty with respect to these uncontroversial matters will be on condition that each of the relevant provisos in the DAC Notice is satisfied. If it is helpful in this short additional period for the Faculty formally to be granted with respect to these matters, then let this be done.

The Rt Hon. Sir Andrew McFarlane  
Chancellor of the Diocese of Exeter

5<sup>th</sup> August 2015