

**The Consistory Court
of
The Diocese of Exeter**

Date: 17th August 2010

Petition: St George, Dittisham

Chancellor's Judgment

1. The Church of St George at Dittisham was consecrated in 1333 having been reconstructed from an earlier Norman church. The building is listed as Grade I and has many interesting and attractive features including a beautifully carved stone wine-glass pulpit and a screen dating from the 15th century. In the 19th century the floor of the nave was lowered in order to establish seven separate steps up from the nave ascending towards the altar. Refurbishment to the windows and other parts was carried out in the style of Augustus Pugin and at around the same time, in about 1845, a stone altar in similar style was installed. Ninety years later, in 1933 to celebrate the 600th anniversary of the church's dedication, a reredos made by Herbert Read and Co of Exeter was installed behind the altar. The short history and

architectural notes published by the PCC states that the reredos 'was designed to be in harmony with the work of the 15th century'.

2. By a petition lodged on 5th November 2009 the then incumbent, Rev. Simon Wright, and the churchwarden, Penelope Mathews, seek a Faculty permitting the following works:
 - a. Remove and dispose of the wooden platform and curtain from the East End
 - b. Remove the Trestle Altar
 - c. Remove the Reredos
 - d. Relocate the existing Victorian altar to a position against the North Wall under the War Memorial
 - e. Install a Beer-stone altar with bronze plaque designed by Anthony Harrison and Bridget McCrum.

3. The aim of the proposed scheme is to establish a permanent altar, located to facilitate west facing celebration, created from local stone by the acclaimed sculptress Bridget McCrum, who is a resident of Dittisham and who has offered the proposed new altar as a gift to the church. The altar which is in three sections with a substantial central block sitting between the table top and a smaller base plinth carries on its face a bronze plaque depicting a pelican in her piety. The PCC do not favour having two altars in the chancel and therefore propose to

move the Victorian stone altar so that it will sit under the War Memorial on the North Wall. After much debate and revision of plans, it is now proposed to remove the reredos entirely from the church. The resulting effect of these changes will be to have the modern altar against the bare stone walls of the East End lit by light falling through the East window (which will no longer be partially blocked by the reredos) and by lighting incorporated into the recently installed lighting scheme.

4. The proposed plans have the support of the full PCC who have been assisted in preparing the scheme by Anthony Harrison, a respected local architect with substantial experience of church work. Like Bridget McCrum, Mr Harrison lives locally and has given his support freely to the church. Public Notices have been issued and there is no local opposition to what is proposed.

5. Despite the groundswell of support locally, the scheme has provoked controversy amongst the various heritage bodies and is opposed by the Church Buildings Council and English Heritage. Consultation with the Victorian Society has been less than adequate, but the implication is that it too would not favour the scheme. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings has made no substantial comment other than to describe the stone altar 'is a fine piece of work' whether

it is to a design by Pugin or not. Of the heritage bodies the only supporting voice comes from the 20th Century Society who are in favour of moving the reredos but, having been consulted on an earlier version of the scheme, stated that they were 'pleased to note that [the reredos] is still in the church'. The society regards the proposed new altar as 'bold and exciting' and is supportive of its introduction into the church.

6. The DAC certificate is dated 14th September 2009 and recommends (a), (b), and (e), namely removing the platform and curtains, removing the trestle altar and installing the McCrum altar. The DAC, however, does not recommend (c) and (d) namely the removal of the reredos from the church and the relocation of the Victorian altar. The following principal reasons are stated:

- i. The reredos is too important an historic piece of chancel furniture, designed by local craftsman Herbert Reed, to be disposed of.
- ii. To remove the reredos to storage without a specific long term plan for its use would not be appropriate.
- iii. Irrespective of its designer, the stone altar was in situ in 1845-6, a key year in the development of ecclesiology and it is one of very few stone altars of the period that survives in its

original setting. They were proscribed in 1846 and it is therefore of considerable importance.

7. The decision of a DAC is no more than an advisory recommendation and, as the DAC Certificate itself points out, the applicants are nevertheless entitled to petition for a faculty, notwithstanding the committee's negative decision. The petitioners have therefore sought to make their case to this court for a faculty to be granted permitting the reordering that they wish to achieve.

8. Given the level of unease demonstrated by early correspondence with the heritage bodies, I gave directions in January 2010 providing for completion of consultation with EH and the CBC, followed by concluding documents being submitted by the parish. I also indicated that I would be prepared to visit the church in order to make better sense of what is proposed and the various options that have been considered.

9. The consultation with EH and CBC, together with the parish response, have now been completed. On the 8th April 2010 I undertook a visit to the church during which I had the benefit of seeing the layout and the current furniture in situ and hearing from a number of those who support the scheme describing the difficulties with the current set up

and the vision that they have for what is proposed. I am grateful to all who took time to facilitate that visit which enabled me to gain a very full and clear understanding of the petitioners' case and the good hearted but strong feeling there is in support of it.

10. I propose now to summarise the petitioners' case, the central point of which is that the current arrangement at the East end of the chancel is not fit for purpose. The top surface of the stone altar is said to be too small for sensible use and has had a wooden table top sitting on it providing a bigger space for as long as any of the current parishioners can recall. The altar, which has no back plate, sits snug against the East wall, and, consequently, there is no space for a celebrant to stand behind it and face West which is the position most favoured by the incumbent and the parishioners. No doubt in order to 'hide' the wooden table top, the altar has been hidden from view under an altar cloth for years beyond memory.

11. For the past 10 years the need to allow for west facing celebration has been facilitated by placing the wooden altar top on trestles and covering it with the altar cloth at a location some 3 or 4 feet in front of the stone altar. This arrangement was only ever considered to be a temporary stop gap, and has never been either particularly attractive or useful. It leaves two altars within a space of a few feet of each other

at the East end. The trestles are unstable and the altar, which should be the centrepiece of this part of the church, is in fact an insubstantial and transient structure.

12. So far as the reredos is concerned, the petitioners' case is basically twofold. Firstly the structure intrudes upwards above the bottom edge of the East window by some feet thereby interfering with the structural lines of that end of the building and blocking that proportion of the light. Secondly, if a new modern altar were to be installed and the stone altar moved, the reredos would be out of place. The petitioners see the modern altar standing without any surrounding furnishings in front of the stone surface of the East wall with only the East window featuring behind it.
13. As well as readily perceiving the need to rationalise the situation at the East end of the chancel, the church has received the generous offer from Bridget McCrum to create a new modern structure for the church. The petitioners see this as a once in a lifetime opportunity to enhance the church with a unique contribution from an extremely talented local resident.
14. So far as the Victorian altar is concerned, the plan to place it under the War Memorial is seen by the parishioners as a positive move. Rather

than being hidden by the temporary trestle altar, or shrouded in an altar cloth, it will be on full view on at all times. Its proportions are such that it will fit into its new position and complement the War Memorial above it.

15. The PCC have considered various locations for the reredos but the final proposal is described in the Statement of Needs thus:

‘The PCC feel that the reredos is what it is, a reredos, and wherever else it is placed it will still look like a reredos. The PCC have talked long and long about this and at different times have begun to think that a solution has been found. Each time, however, a sense of unease has emerged and a feeling that this is not the best they could do. They believe that the most honest and courageous course would be simply to remove it from the East wall. It could either be stored or made available to another church.’

16. The PCC commend the design produced by Bridget McCrum and consider that the pelican emblem is highly appropriate for an altar in that it symbolically represents the idea of self sacrifice.
17. Turning to the opposition mounted by the heritage bodies, their principal focus relates to the Victorian stone altar. Irrespective of the

fact (now established) that the altar was not designed by Pugin, it is regarded as being historically significant. English Heritage advise as follows:

‘The church of St George at Dittisham was restored in the C 19 by its aristocratic and well connected rector the Rev. Lord Henry Francis Kerr who held the living 1827-53. He was a prominent Tractarian and a friend of the locally active Archdeacon Froude who, more than any other person, was responsible for the extraordinary vigorous campaign of restoration and ‘correcting’ in the Diocese of Exeter. ... The work focused on the chancel which was ‘corrected’ to restore its medieval and symbolic character. The altar is in Beer- stone from the East Devon coast, like other, medieval, features of this church notably the south doorway and arcades. It is enriched with quatrefoils in roundels, a favourite motif, in the medieval decorated style for the reintroduction of stone altars into Anglican churches as part of the C 19 revival. [The altar’s] importance in the context of the ecclesiological revival in Exeter Diocese should be stressed. The altar forms part of a significant cultural ensemble which does not rise or fall on the Pugin autograph’.

18. In his most recent letter, dated 4 February 2010, Francis Kelly of English Heritage points to the juxtaposition of 1845, being the probable date of introduction of the altar at Dittisham, and 1846, which was the year in which the Court of Arches ruled against a similar altar being installed in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Cambridge.

19. Because of its historical importance, and artistic merit, English Heritage recommends that the altar should remain exactly in place in its current location, and does not approve of any movement on the basis of that once moved, any further relocation is easier to justify. English Heritage is however in favour of the positioning of a second altar in front of the Victorian altar and is not opposed to the relocation within the church of the reredos.

20. The English Heritage position is summed up as follows:

‘English Heritage does not wish to oppose positive development. Indeed we are delighted that this church has the opportunity thanks to a famous artist in its community of enhancing the church with one of her works. It is obviously right to remove the present trestle arrangement. There will probably be a need to review the levels. However if development is to continue our view is that it should be informed by, and where possible encapsulate and reflect, the

best of what our predecessors have handed down to us. The altar in question is in that class; it is of undoubted historic interest, irrespective of its authorship and an excellent example of decorative church furnishing in a style which remains wholly appropriate for the church and for its setting. As much as anything, its significance lies in its position which is both an intentional return to the pre-Reformation arrangement and a place of honour. Though veiled, this significance would not be lost even if it were no longer the focus of liturgy and worship.'

21. The position of the CBC is most fully described by a letter dated March 2008. The desirability of installing a further stone altar is questioned on the basis that 'their design dates quickly' and, unlike tables, they cannot be covered with any fashionable fabric. The council was also not in favour of moving the reredos. The CBC did however accept the practical limitations of the current set up, and recommended that the existing altar should be retained in the chancel, but brought forward to allow for west-facing celebration. The CBC position effectively remained unchanged and was confirmed by a short letter of 30th January 2009. The CBC further suggested that a new altar, or alternative work, by Bridget McCrum could be placed elsewhere in the church.

22. In addition to the DAC certificate the court has had sight of extracts from the DAC minutes relating to this project dating back as far as 2001. The minutes record the thoughtful oscillation that has been a feature of the development of this scheme over the years and I do not therefore propose to re-produce details here. A number of points, however, from the two meetings at which the DAC considered the parish's final proposal, are of relevance:
- a. The question of what thought had been given to modifying the current altar to make it more useful was raised. It was reported that the altar was not too small, but rather too short, but this was a problem that could be solved by moving it forward and putting it onto a plinth [31/7/09].
 - b. Hugh Harrison (DAC timber advisor) 'advised that the reredos is an important piece of Herbert Read woodwork of some distinction and that to store/remove it is not acceptable'. He commented that currently all of the furniture (including the altar) in the East End is perfectly acceptable [31/7/09].
 - c. The opinion of an architect member of the DAC to the effect that 'the reredos should be lowered, the Victorian altar moved forwards and placed on a plinth and the sculptor invited to produce something to go under the War Memorial' was seemingly influential in leading to the DAC's ultimate decision which was not to recommend items (c) and (d) in the application.

23. Following receipt of the DAC recommendation and the final contributions from EH and the CBC, the parish submitted letters from Anthony Harrison (11/10/09), Revd Simon Wright (19/10/09) and The Venerable John Rawlings, Archdeacon of Totnes (12/11/09). Those three letters, together with the earlier Statement of Needs and other documents argue the parish's case clearly and address the various points that have been raised. I have read them each of these documents on a number of occasions and set out the following extracts simply as examples of the principle arguments raised:

[Anthony Harrison]

'Against the east end of the chancel sits an earlier inadequately small stone Victorian altar, which is partly enveloped in a 1930's reredos and is totally obscured by the present trestle altar. It limits circulation and results in duality with the present free-standing altar.

...

The DAC appears to have given too much credence to specialist views and taken a very long time about it! Committee compromise solutions should not be an option and I hope the original vision can be achieved for St George's'

[Archdeacon of Totnes]

‘... it is abundantly clear that this is a much loved building in which the local people worship regularly and wish to enhance it in an appropriate way for Liturgy in the 21st century. Like all buildings it has metamorphosed over the centuries as the needs of the worshipping community have added or taken away different aspects of its construction. To move the stone altar to a new position so that it is not lost would seem to be a very sensible move as its provenance does not seem to be what some people would like and does not have the link with Pugin that some thought. Similarly the reredos seems somewhat overbearing and it is difficult to see where else in the building it might go. At present it cuts the view of the east window and hence diminishes the amount of light coming into the chancel. The proposed new altar would put something of beauty into that space which would be regularly used liturgically, provide a focus for the building and a new perspective for worshippers in the nave.’

24. The following significant points are made in Revd Simon Wright’s letter:

- this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to install a contemporary work of art in St George’s Church by an internationally known sculptor who lives in the village;

- the Victorian altar that has been the centre of so much discussion has not been used, or even seen, for many years. The early suggestion that it was designed by Pugin gave this altar far too great a significance in the discussions that followed;
- the historical significance of the stone altar in the life of the Oxford Movement is a fairly specialist matter. There is no known record of a visitor to the church seeking out the altar because of its significance. The historical background of one object should not govern the development and use of the building today and in the future. In any event the altar is proposed to remain in the building and on show in a place where its proportions fit well;
- two altars close together would be confusing and inappropriate;
- removing the reredos will allow the new altar to stand against the bare wall and allow more light to come in. The PCC has been advised by Hugh Harrison that the reredos is of one of many produced at the time and is of no particular artistic merit;
- the visual effect of the new stone altar standing on a stone floor with a stone wall behind it and space around it with

be a vast improvement on the present arrangement, which is both visually and practically unsatisfactory;

- the parish believe that the scheme will only work if it is undertaken in its entirety. The DAC has failed to look at it as a unit, with discussion being dominated by concern for preserving certain artefacts (altar and reredos), rather than addressing the liturgical and evangelistic needs of the Church today. The PCC takes its responsibilities very seriously as regards heritage and history, but their primary concern is with the mission of the Church now. They wish to make the building as appropriate and accessible as possible. They believe that this scheme will vastly improve the experience of entering the building, both for the regular and the visitor. It would speak to them of the living church community, whose central act of worship is the Eucharist.

25. Finally, from the documents submitted by the parish conclude with a final short letter from Penelope Mathews, which notes the EH and CBC positions and restates the Petitioner's case.

Discussion and decision

26. This application demonstrates all too clearly the classic balance that exists when a decision is called for that involves significant change in

the historic fabric of a living building. In the secular field, the heritage arguments, and the weight given to advice from English Heritage, are frequently determinative when the case involves a listed building. The Church of England enjoys an ‘ecclesiastical exemption’ from the secular system and is permitted to determine the development of its own buildings within the Faculty Jurisdiction; a scheme administered and determined by a judge who is a churchman and for whom the pastoral and liturgical arguments of the living congregation will have value and substance.

27. The Faculty jurisdiction must, however, be administered in a manner which gives real and appropriate regard to the importance of the secular listing scheme. The approach to be taken by a consistory court has been established by The Court of Arches¹ by approving the so called ‘*Bishopsgate Questions*’, by which the court must ask:

- i. Have the petitioners proved a necessity for some or all of the proposed works either because they are necessary for the pastoral well-being of the parish or for some other compelling reason?
- ii. Will some or all of the works adversely affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural and historical interest?

¹ *Re St Luke the Evangelist, Maidstone* [1995] Fam 1.

iii. If the answer to (ii) is yes, then is the necessity proved by the petitioners such that in the exercise of the court's discretion a faculty should be granted for some or all of the works?

28. In a later case² Chancellor George has suggested that 'necessary' and 'necessity' in the context of the Bishopsgate Questions mean 'something less than essential, but more than merely desirable or convenient; in other words something that is requisite or reasonably necessary'. Mark Hill QC (*Ecclesiastical Law* 3rd Edn para 7.72) states that, however the test is put, there is a presumption against change in the case of a listed building and a burden, not easily discharged, lies on those who advocate any alteration.

29. In the present Petition the change proposed is on any view a change which engages the Bishopsgate Questions and places the Petitioners under the substantial burden described in the previous paragraph. Given that St George's has a Grade I listing, full weight must be given to the special architectural or historical interest of the building within questions (ii) and (iii).

30. With the Bishopsgate Questions in mind I now turn to look at the issues raised in the present petition.

² *Re St John the Evangelist, Blackheath* (1998) 5 Ecc LJ 217.

31. In terms of 'necessity' the petitioners have no difficulty in establishing that it is necessary to undertake a significant degree of re-ordering at the East end of the chancel. The current arrangement, both before the erection of the trestle altar and after, is unsatisfactory and requires re-ordering. The desire of the parish to have the facility for West facing celebration at the East end of the chancel, rather than by using a nave altar is entirely understandable. The wish for the parish to maintain the chancel as the focus of worship, rather than to introduce a nave altar as many other churches have done, is fully justified and, indeed, in keeping with the seven step structure of the building created by their forebears.

32. The trestle altar was only ever intended to be a temporary measure, it is not satisfactory and, I suspect, it has never been satisfactory. It has been in place for ten years. Its presence has not been licensed by Faculty or any other licence that is still in force. The weight of the evidence produced by all sides in this case, and for that matter the court's own view, is to the effect that having two altars so close together is itself confusing and theologically questionable.

33. In short, therefore, some action needs to be taken to resolve this muddled and unsatisfactory set up.

34. The second proposition which the petitioners have no difficulty in establishing is that the court must pay full regard to the needs of the current, living, worshipping community in Dittisham and to the pastoral need for that community to develop and worship as it wishes to do. If the issue raised in this case did not involve a listed building, then the desires of the petitioners would be afforded considerable weight and where, as here, there is unanimity, their wishes would be likely to carry the day in the absence of some other compelling reason. The fact that this is a listed building alters the balance, but it does not remove the weight that must be given to the strong and consistently expressed wishes of this active church community.

35. Some of the petitioners may well think, and they would be entitled to do so, that their church has been saddled with the Victorian stone altar precisely because the worshipping congregation, or more particularly its rich patron, 150 years ago was an enthusiast for one particular and fashionable mode of worship. The stone altar was introduced at a time, as the Holy Sepulchre decision shows, when to do so will have been highly controversial. Yet it was introduced, no doubt to the great pleasure of those who supported the Tractarian movement at that time. Similarly, those who introduced the reredos to celebrate the 600th anniversary of the church will have done so because they wanted to and they thought that it was a splendid thing at that time.

Why, the petitioners may well say, can not we now, in our day, rearrange the East end and introduce an altar which we believe would be both workable and, importantly, create a tone for the holiest part of our church which we think would be entirely appropriate and indeed splendid.

36. In coming to my decision I keep the summary of the petitioners' position described in the foregoing paragraphs, and the arguments that underpin it, very much in mind but I have to do so, as a matter of law, within the structure of the Bishopsgate Questions which require the petitioners to satisfy the court that the necessity for the particular change they wish to make is such that it overrides any adverse effect on the character of the church as a building of special architectural and historical interest.

37. Turning to that issue the evidence clearly establishes that (a) this is a building of special architectural and historical interest; in coming to that conclusion, the court need not look any further than the Grade I listing status. Secondly, (b) the evidence from the heritage bodies, principally EH, CBC and the DAC, all describe the historical interest that surrounds the altar, and its position as principal altar in the church, and, to a lesser extent, the reredos. The contributions made by these various bodies and made by those who are expert in their field.

The petitioners are not in a position to challenge what is said about the historical importance of these two items and, as a matter of law and evidence, the court too must accept this unanimous professional opinion.

38. Following on from that, I am satisfied that the changes proposed will adversely affect the character of this church as being a building of special architectural and or historical interest. The word 'adversely' has a narrow reference with respect to this question. The petitioner's opinion is that the changes that they are proposing, rather than adversely affecting the character of the building, will be an improvement to it. That is not, however, the point raised by the second Bishopsgate question which does not focus in on the overall look of the building, but whether the changes adversely effect the architectural and/or historical character of the building as it stands at present. Again, the heritage evidence from the experts is all of one voice and I have no difficulty in concluding that the second Bishopsgate question must be answered in the affirmative.

39. In the course of this short analysis I have not yet directly addressed the first Bishopsgate question. Whilst I have readily held that there is a 'necessity' for some re-ordering at the East end of the chancel, I have not addressed the question of whether the particular re-ordering

proposed by the petitioners is necessary. And it is on this point, that I consider the decision in this case turns.

40. Standing back and assuming for a moment that Dittisham did not have the benefit of an artist of the calibre of Bridget McCrum who was willing to donate a new piece of work to the church, one can then ask what sort of proposals would 'be necessary' to re-order the East end to ensure the pastoral wellbeing of the parish or meet some other compelling reason.
41. On that basis, it seems to the court that what would be necessary would be a series of changes of a much less radical character utilising the furniture that is currently available. The suggestion by the DAC of moving the altar forward, raising it to a more acceptable height on a plinth and reducing the height of the reredos would be the sort of changes that might be 'necessary' in that context.
42. The matter might be put the other way around by asking the question why is it 'a necessity' to install a modern altar in this church. Much of the justification put forward by the petitioners, which I accept, relates to the practical inconveniences of the current set up. Those difficulties do not, as night follows day, indicate that clearing all the current

furniture out and replacing it with a single modern altar is the necessary solution.

43. The logic that runs clearly through the documents submitted by the petitioners starts from the assumption that the modern altar is to be installed. If that is the case, then I accept much of the logic which is so well presented by the Rev. Wright and others. It would follow that only one altar should be at the East end, and the stone altar would have to be moved. Further, a strong case is made for this modern piece to stand alone on the stone floor against the stone wall with the unobstructed light from the East window behind it. Thus, if the church was to have the Bridget McCrum altar then the removal of the Victorian altar and the reredos would be likely to be justified as a consequence of that radical change and therefore, in that context, 'necessary'.

44. The line of thought adopted by the petitioners, and summarised in the previous paragraph, is not, however, a line of thought that it is open to this court to follow. In order to succeed in this petition the petitioners have, in effect, to satisfy the court that introducing the Bridget McCrum altar itself is necessary for the pastoral wellbeing of the parish or for some other 'compelling reason'. The evidence in the case simply does not come anywhere near establishing that degree of

necessity. Some re-ordering at the East end is necessary for the pastoral wellbeing of the parish, but it is not 'necessary' to introduce the modern altar in order for those pastoral needs to be met.

45. My conclusion, therefore, is that the petition fails on the first Bishopsgate question. However, even if that conclusion were erroneous, the same reasoning would apply to the ultimate third Bishopsgate question which involves the court balancing the necessity for making the proposed change against the adverse effect on the architectural and historical character of the building. If, therefore, contrary to the decision that I have already just stated, the first Bishopsgate question had been answered in the parish's favour and there was, on some basis, a necessity for this congregation to have a modern stone altar, would the need for the introduction of that altar be such as to outweigh the removal of the reredos from the building and the movement of the stone altar to the War Memorial. I put the question in that way because I largely accept the parish's case that this is an 'all or nothing' project. The issue would not arise if a piece created by Bridget McCrum were to be introduced elsewhere in the church and did not trigger the consequential movement of significant furnishings which are already in place. In relation to this third question, therefore, the answer can only be that the arguments raised in favour of its introduction, namely, that the church has a once in a

generation opportunity to accept a gift from an internationally renowned artist in their community cannot justify the adverse consequences to the current fabric of the building that would follow. The loss of the stone altar and the reredos from their current historically significant places in this church is simply too high a price to pay for the introduction of a new altar.

Conclusion

46. It follows that the petitioners have failed to satisfy the court that the Faculty that they seek should be granted and the Petition therefore is dismissed.

47. The decision to which I have come will be of enormous disappointment to those in the parish and the wider community who support the proposed re-ordering. The decision comes at the end of a period measured in years when they have determinedly pursued their aim, notwithstanding the unified opposition of the heritage bodies. Their stance has rightly been described as courageous and their determination to do what they think is right for their church is a matter which commands the court's respect. I have laboured to explain my understanding of the evidence and the process of analysis which, as a matter of law, the court must apply in determining this

issue in the hope that the parish will understand why it is that the court has felt it necessary to refuse the application.

48. For the future the need remains for there to be a re-ordering of the East end of this church. The current unauthorised trestle altar cannot remain permanently, or even for much longer. I would therefore urge the parish to consider the lesser options for re-ordering that have been discussed down the years, and, in part, are summarised in this judgment in the hope that a resolution can be achieved relatively quickly.

49. Finally the wish of Bridget McCrum and the parish to introduce a significant piece by her into St George's Church may, I hope, come to fruition in the form of an alternative proposal that does not require radical consequential change and is therefore likely to command the approval of this court.

Andrew McFarlane

Chancellor of the Diocese of Exeter

