

# Comments on the letters received from the CBC, DAC and HE re Plans dated Oct 2019

The letters with paragraph numbers are appended below the comments section.

## Re CBC letter of 17<sup>th</sup> October 2019 from David Knight

| Para             | Outline point being made   | SMFG response  |
|------------------|--|--|
| Para 1<br>Para 2 | Summary words  |  |
| Para 3           | Welcomed the proposal in general. Felt the vision of two churches with distinctive roles should be made clearer in the Statement of Need   | It was thought to be made clear, but the first two chapters will be revisited to see how they can be improved.   |
| Para 4           | The Business Plan is not recent.   | There was no incentive to update the Business Plan while the church and new build configuration was uncertain. The BP will be updated to reflect the more limited offering.  |
| Para 5           | CBC felt there may be a need to have more paid for support at the outset of the project.<br><br>They felt it would be problematic to close the church if public funds had been used to fund development.   | The inclusion of paid for support can be fed into the Business Plan. This has an impact on the Parish budget and would need approval of the PCC. At the moment no public funds have been used to fund the project. The question must be addressed if such funds are used.  |
| Para 6           | Statement of fact  |  |
| Para 7           | The Council is content for the removal of pews. The relocation of the font is entirely appropriate. Relocation of the organ should be accompanied by conservation and cleaning work.   | These statements are supportive of current plans.  |
| Para 8           | Liked the idea of clearing the nave. Asked if the existing underground cellars could be used for storage of retractable furniture.   | The cellars aka the boiler room and coal hole would need to be rebuilt. StMFG will look at extending the cellar towards the west end, with access from the north west corner.  |
| Para 9           | Statement of what is currently in mind to replace and extend the clergy vestry.<br>Statement of our desire to have a covered passageway on the north wall of the church with a new nave access. Also a new West door to the nave.  | This was the plan discussed.<br><br>The drawings available in December 2020 do not have a covered way to the north of the church and there is no new north nave access   |
| Para 10          | The Council was confident that the Parish appreciated the issues of excavation in the churchyard.  | This section of the Faculty application must be checked to show this is appreciated and investigative excavation in the churchyard have been carried out.  |
| Para 11          | The Council accepted that additional accommodation was required, noting with approval the strong desire of the Parish to keep open the axial east-west view through the church.<br>Asking that consideration be given to light structures in the aisles to form meeting rooms or other facilities. | This point is appreciated and is in line with our thoughts.<br><br>The parish consider that additional structures inside the church would need careful analysis, also that the uncluttered medieval interior is worth preserving.  |
| Para 12          | The size of the extension is based on there being an independent performance space and meeting activity happening at the same time. If this was not allowed then the extension could be smaller.   | We find this suggestion/conclusion not compelling. The new use envisaged as a performance space requires as a minimum the facilities envisaged. A single activity building would prevent regular use of the meeting room/ small function space. The existing Parish Rooms at St John's have many regular bookings that provide a steady income. Such regular use not only provides an income stream but is also a shop window for the performance and exhibition space. Single use also reduces the viability of office use by |

| Para    | Outline point being made   | SMFG response  |
|---------|--|--|
|         |  | more than one organisation.  |
| Para 13 | The enclosed passageway was to support independent use of the extension and access to toilets during an event. It is the most awkward element of the proposal due to the church buttressing and predicated on performance space facing east. | A passage way curved away from the north side of the church would overcome some of this objection. But we have abandoned the covered passageway and the new entry in the north wall in this application. The current plan envisages an entry at the east end of the north aisle i.e. behind the current position of the organ. In this location it works for a performance space facing east, west or south. It should be noted that any performance space must be supported, not only by the stage itself, but also by the associated lighting rigs, power sockets and cable runs, and the positioning of the stage control desk. |
| Para 14 | Opportunity for direct access from the east of the north aisle. Need a rethink of the kitchen servery, including size and location.  | A redesign of the clergy vestry extension has been carried out and is shown on the latest plan (December 2020).  |
| Para 15 | The CBC view of the construction material was that as it is "close to the street" a quiet design and finish was preferable to a modern design.   | The StMFG would be happy for the extension to be of modern, glass, brick or stone facing. The CBC letter provides some guidance and a great deal of latitude.  |
| Para 16 | The CBC would like to hear about further proposals   | The CBC will be kept informed  |

#### Re DAC letter of 7<sup>th</sup> October 2019

| Para     | Outline point being made  | SMFG response  |
|----------|---|--|
| Para 1-3 | Summary of the proposals made   |  |
| Para 4   | <p>Questions the need for so much space and for simultaneous use of meeting rooms and performance space.</p> <p>They ask for a record of simultaneous use of the current space.</p> <p>They ask for a business plan to support the new use envisaged to show how the scheme would pay for itself and the upkeep of the church.</p> <p>They ask who would pay for the use of the office space.</p> <p>They ask how the new use fits in with the mission of the church and clarification of the complementary use of St John's and St Mary's.</p> | <p>The new use envisaged as a performance space requires the facilities envisaged. Also a single activity building would prevent regular use of the meeting room/ small function space. Experience from the letting of the Parish Rooms suggests that there is a demand for regular i.e. weekly use. It could also reduce the viability of office use by more than one activity.</p> <p>As currently configured the church does not provide for or have facilities for anything but a performance or exhibition space. So no record can exist. Experience of the St John's parish room suggests usage of 50% of available sessions (am, pm, evening) is achievable. The business plan will be reworked with limited simultaneous use as a basis. We reiterate that maintenance of the building will be paid for by the St Mary Church and Poor Lands charity as it has done since 1902.</p> <p>As noted above the office space is itself already covered. The parish would pay for its use by office staff for a given number of hours a week.</p> <p>We believe that the plan already outlines the wider mission of all the resources of the parish. This point will be re-addressed in the next Statement of Need.</p> |
| Para 5   | <p>Questioned the long glazed link, does it have minimal impact on the fabric and appearance of the church.</p> <p>Could landscaping, lighting and cameras improve the safety of the access?</p> <p>They suggest that the height of the glazing would harm the appearance of the north side.</p> <p>The DAC question the cost of maintaining such a glazed link.</p>  | <p>As the DAC are unhappy with the concept of the glazed link, it will not be considered in the current plan.</p> <p>A new access/fire exit to the extension will be considered.</p> <p>A passage way curved away from the north side of the church would overcome some of this objection. The maintenance of any extension would, as noted above, be paid for by the St Mary's Church and Poor</p>  |

| Para    | Outline point being made   | SMFG response  |
|---------|--|--|
|         |  | Lands Charity.   |
| Para 6  | Noted the objections of Historic England to a glazed link and north aisle entry and claim that this does not support minimal harm.   | See answer to Para 5   |
| Para 7  | Discussion of the materials for the new extension.   | The parish has no fixed ideas on the material for the new extension and was seeking advice.  |
| Para 8  | The DAC are in favour of either re(de?)-cluttering the church and bringing the west door back into use.<br><br>They felt that improved landscaping to the north side would provide useful access.<br>They thought that the cellar access would be blocked up but that the basement would be retained.  | The StMFG believe the removal of the pews and the use of moveable seating would be fundamental to any successful new use. A weatherproof and attractive new west entrance is most desirable.<br>The StMFG believe that it is also fundamental to improve the access way to the new extension.<br>The location and method of entry to the cellar is being considered. One possibility is a new entrance inside the church in the north west corner of the aisle.  |
| Para 9  | A new glazed lobby at the West Door  | The StMFG is in favour of a new west entry with glazed doors.  |
| Para 10 | The DAC agreed that the pew back were poor and asked if the seating boards could be re-used.<br><br>The DAC asked about re-using the ledger stones.<br><br>The DAC raised the question of a demountable stage versus a raiseable stage set in the floor.<br><br>The DAC suggested a centrally placed stage rather than a chancel end stage.<br><br>The DAC raised the question of a fire lobby would be required at the extension entry point. | The StMFG will try to sell some pews to Devizes residents. If a use for the seating boards can be found then they will be used.<br>The SMFG intend that the ledger stones will be retained in the church or in the new extension.<br>The cube required to store a demountable or telescopic stage must be balanced against the restriction of a fixed raiseable stage. No firm decision has yet been made.<br>A fixed centrally placed stage would not be an option as it would only allow performances in the round. It would prevent the venue achieving one of its USPs – that of a performance space or lecture space for an audience of 200 to 250.<br>The issue of fire regulations will be addressed by the architects. |
| Para 11 | The DAC were in favour of a new glazed west end entrance.  | The StMFG agree that a much improved west entrance is highly desirable.  |
| Para 12 | The DAC suggested reworking the current application suite of documents.  | The current suite of documents has arrived in its current form in response to previous questions raised by the DAC, Historic England and other consultees. The StMFG will provide an executive summary and revise or re-issue the information required.  |
| Para 13 | The DAC were appreciative of the opportunity to be part of a constructive meeting.   | The StMFG appreciate the attendance of the DAC and CBC   |

#### Re Historic England letter dated 2/10/19 Jacqueline Smith

| Para   | Outline point being made   | SMFG response   |
|--------|--|---|
| Para 1 | Comment  | Proposal had been changed but obviously by not enough. More changes have now been made. |
| Para 2 | Comment  | Proposal had been changed but obviously by not enough. More changes have now been made  |
| Para 3 | Harm caused by two doorways and a glazed corridor  | The north wall doorway and glazed link have been deleted in the new proposal.           |
| Para 4 | HE suggested removal of north aisle door and glazed link. Allow new entry on the north east corner         | This is in line with current proposal   |
| Para 5 | HE suggested a new landscaping scheme to the north of the church would allow safe access to the extension. | This is in line with the current proposal   |

|         |  |   |
|---------|--|---|
| Para 6  | HE question the justification for the proposed extension. HE questions the assessment carried out for the new uses envisaged | SMFG have carried out a lot of work on assessing the physical building needs to support the new uses envisaged. This is not just to make it “more active” for the church, but the changes and facilities provided must ensure it has a financially viable and expanded use. |
| Para 7  | Requirement for a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment.   | This information is already contained in the Conservation Management Plan and the Statements of Significance. These include a report on the pews.   |
| Para 8  | HE require views of the extension from different parts of the churchyard   | These are in the architect’s December 2020 submission.  |
| Para 9  | HE require details of the options appraisal that has been undertaken for the proposed scheme                                 | These documents exist in both full and abbreviated form.  |
| Para 10 | HE require a statement on the impact of adjustable staging.  | Detailed work on the exact form of the staging has not yet been done. The staging detail will be part of the DAC faculty application once the external build concept has been agreed.   |
| Para 11 | HE require more information on the placement of the ledger stones.   | The placement of the external ledger stones will be part of the external build detail. The internal ledger stone placement will be part of the DAC faculty application once the external build concept has been agreed.   |
| Para 12 | HE require information on the organ history and placement within the church  | This information is contained within the existing CMP.  |
| Para 13 | HE raise safety concerns over the new roof and possible damage to the old fabric   | There is already an active control room monitored camera on the rooves of the church. This could be extended to cover the new build.  |

## Conclusion.

There is wide support for a solution that prevents redundancy. There is support for a new main entrance at the west end, involving a new glass door and foyer to allow the church to be seen as an inviting space to visit and use.

There is support for new construction around the site of the present Clergy Vestry. However there is no specific requirement for the materials to be used in the exterior, only that it be subtle.

There is support for the Parish’s view that the interior must remain a “wonderful uncluttered medieval space”.

The Parish has agreed that this application will not include a glazed link on the north side of the church, but will seek to improve safe access by other means.

The Parish is concerned that suggestions of reducing the facilities in the new build will be detrimental to a successful future.

A new executive summary document is to be prepared outlining the Parish’s view on how St Mary’s fits into the Church’s mission in the Devizes area; the communities view on what it wants to see and support in a re-vitalised church and the business plan or plans that show how this vision could be sustained. There are already supporting documents that give more detail on the building itself, the consultations carried out and research into the site.

New versions of the business plan will be produced to reflect the facilities envisaged in the new application.

A new access to the cellar will be investigated.

Letters Concerned are given below

Tom Welch  
Chedburn Dudley  
Email: tomw@chedburn.com

Dr David Knight  
Senior Church Buildings Officer  
Church Building Council  
Our Ref: CARE 34/533  
Your Ref:  
17 October 2019

Dear Tom

**Devizes, St Mary (Diocese of Salisbury)  
Proposed extension and reordering**

P1 Thank you for seeking the advice of the Council over the proposed extension and reordering of this church. The Council considered this at its recent meeting following a visit to the church on 1 October. Its advice is set out below.

P2 The Council noted that its previous engagement with this church was in 2006 when it was being considered for closure. The church is part of a multi-parish benefice with St John's. A major fire at St John's stayed proposals for closure of St Mary's. There is now a vision in the parish to see each church with a distinctive role with the main worship function being at St John's. The proposals for St Mary's are to adapt it for wider performance and community uses to complement the ministry at the other church.

P3 The Council welcomed this development that has found the building a future in parish use and was pleased to hear that there is a strong vision for the relationship between the two places as part of the mission of one parish. The Council felt that this could be made much clearer in the statement of need, and that to do so would greatly strengthen the case for the proposals.

P4 It is proposed to reorder the church so that it can function effectively as a performance space and support some small meetings in separate spaces. Provision of toilet and catering facilities to support this is part of the proposals. The Council was told that the church is already used for some performances that have attracted full audiences. This indicates that the proposals build in part on activities already in place. The project has had a long development stage and the original work in the business plan is not recent. Where there is more recent relevant information to replace earlier material it would be useful and add strength to the case for the proposals, especially at there were many other public spaces available in the town.

P5 Although not a buildings matter the Council felt that a there may be more need for paid support for volunteers at the outset of the project. It also noted that the proposal to close the church if the project failed was problematic if public funds had been used to fund the development, as these would have conditions over public access for a given number of years.

P6 The proposals essentially contain two elements: clearing the pews from the nave and providing a new extension to the north east. The chancel will remain as the focal point for worship.

P7 The Council was content with the proposal to remove the pews. This will provide the freedom needed to develop performance and other community events in the church. The Council was told that there will be consequential changes to the heating, lighting and the locations of the organ and font. The relocation of the font near the south entrance is entirely appropriate. The organ is freestanding and its relocation should not offer particular challenges for an experienced accredited organ builder. While it is dismantled for relocation it would be sensible to undertake necessary conservation work and cleaning.

P8 The proposals as drawn show a strong eastward focus for activities. The Council felt that the cleared nave would give freedom for uses in a wider variety of configurations. It is proposed to put a retractable platform in the floor at the east of the nave. There are cellars under the church – the Council asked if the location of these existing underground spaces would make a more logical place for retractable furniture – if these were justified by the business case.

P9 The extension is proposed to accommodate a kitchen/servery, toilets, meeting rooms and office. One meeting room could serve for a green room for performances. Although there is already a modest vestry extension to the north east the proposed new extension has a larger footprint and will be set into the bank of the raised churchyard. In addition it is proposed to provide an enclosed passageway along the exterior of the north wall to link the extension to a proposed new door into the nave and a door that opens at the west end of the aisle.

P10 The Council noted that any excavation work, in the church or churchyard, would have significant requirements for working, with potentially significant archaeology including burials. The Council was confident that this is appreciated by the parish and noted that making sure this is clearly seen in the faculty petition will assist all involved.

P11 The Council accepted that there is a need for some additional accommodation to support the community use of the building. It also accepted that the obvious location for any extension was that chosen, to the north east. It noted that there was a strong desire from the parish to keep the nave as unencumbered as possible. The Council would strongly encourage keeping open the axial east-west view through the church. It felt less strongly about discounting entirely

providing some of the additional facilities in the church – maybe by using a light structure in the north or south aisle. It also noted that portable screens could be used to form meeting spaces when some division was needed.

P12 The size of the extension is based on there being independent performance and meeting activity happening at the same time. The Council felt that this aspect of the business case could be usefully revisited. If the parish could find a way of not offering a small meeting space at the same time as the church was in use for a well-attended performance, there would be less need for so much meeting space in the extension.

P13 The Council noted that the proposed enclosed passageway was to support independent use of the extension and access to the toilets during events. It is the most awkward element of the proposals. The buttressing of the north wall will make the design fussy and its need during performances is predicated on the building being used facing east.

P14 There is an opportunity for direct access to an extension from the east of the north aisle. The Council felt that this was a far less interventive solution that would remove the need for the exterior passageway. It would strongly encourage development of this. One consequence of this would be a need to rethink the kitchen and servery facility. A modest reduction in the amount of meeting space in the extension should enable this to be achieved. The preparation and serving of food may not need to be linked, and this could offer scope to keep the scale of the actual kitchen quite modest.

P15 The Council was asked about a view on the appearance of the extension. While it is essentially for the parish to make the case for what it wants, the Council felt that in this sensitive location quite close to the street a quiet design and finish that sat comfortably alongside the church was probably more likely to work than one that was self-consciously modern.

I hope that this advice is helpful. The Council would be happy to hear further about these proposals if that would assist the parish or DAC.

Yours sincerely



David Knight  
cc. Salisbury DAC Secretary

DRAFT DAC site visit on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2019 to St Marys, Devizes

Archdeaconry Wilts

**Present.** DAC members: Jill Channer, John Turnbull, Stephen Ponder, Archdeacon Sue, Sarah Baines. **Parish representatives:** Tony Scorer, Jane Scorer. **Architects:** George Chedburn, Tom Welch., **Historic England representative** Jacquie Smith, **CBC representatives** – David Knight, David Thackray.

**Proposals.**

1. New single storey extension on the NE side of the church to provide new toilet, kitchen and office accommodation and community meeting/venue space for recitals, events and catering for 250 people.
2. New access arrangements to the new extension include forming a new door way beneath a window in the north wall of the north aisle to create an off-set cross aisle and forming a new doorway below the east window of the north aisle
3. Re-ordering associated with the new extension including removing pews, relocating church organ and font, creating two new links from the church to the new extension at the north end of the church, declutter the church, locate a stage platform and introduce under floor heating.  
Re-open the West door and formation of new glazed lobby.

**Extension proposal**

P1 The DAC commended the church for the new drainage improvements on the north side of the church. The parish architect explained the proposed scheme will enable the church to remain a place of worship in Devizes and a large venue for the community which will provide income to provide for the upkeep of the building. He explained the proposed scheme has been designed to deliver the needs of the church and community. The Chancel would remain the focal point for worship.

P3 He explained the restrictions on the space to the north side of the church including tree roots, impact upon the setting of the Chancel and archaeology. The existing small C19th vestry to the north of the Chancel will be replaced with this larger multifunctional extension. The large glazed corridor to the north side of the church will provide a safe route into the new

extension on the north side of the building. Internal alterations to access the new extension will be achieved by creating a new door in the N nave aisle and adapting existing openings behind the organ and through the Chancel. The proposed scheme will help declutter the church. As part of the proposed scheme a new retractable stage platform beneath the floor was discussed, to avoid the need to find somewhere to store it when not required. A new underfloor heating scheme is also proposed together with relocating the existing boiler into the new extension. The site for the new stage will be considered once the final scheme has been worked through and any archaeology considered. It was noted that it was perfectly feasible for the toilet facilities to be accessed discretely if necessary during performances - as was the case in many theatres and concert halls with central stages.

P4 CBC explained that the Statement of Needs for the proposed extension should be robust and should review whether it was necessary to provide so much space for meeting rooms and catering facilities on the assumption that there would be a requirement for independent and simultaneous events. It would be useful to know more about the track record of recent performances and a business plan for future performances. This will help to demonstrate how the proposed scheme will pay for itself and the upkeep of the church building. The plan should outline who will pay to use the office space. Most importantly, the plan should outline the wider mission of the church and how it combines with other churches in Devizes, especially clarifying the complementary relationship between St Johns and St Marys.

#### **Glazed link:**

---

P5 The DAC delegation questioned if the long glazed link demonstrated minimal impact on the fabric and appearance of the church and asked if improved landscaping, including new sinuous pathways, lighting, signage and cameras would provide a safe route on the north side of the church. Serious concerns were raised by all present that the height of the glazed roof would harm the character and appearance of large perpendicular windows and tall buttresses along the north side of the church. The DAC delegation also questioned the cost involved in maintaining the guttering and glazing of the glazed link on the north side of the church.

P6 Historic England raised serious concerns with the proposed glazed link and alterations to the aisle window required to form a new doorway through to the glazed link. They concluded the alteration do not demonstrate minimal harm in all aspects and would not support the loss of significant historic fabric. This concern was raised previously by Historic England and should be addressed.

P7 The parish suggested the new extension could be built using modern materials or using more traditional ashlar stone. The DAC delegation suggested the design could take inspiration from the idea of an enclosing courtyard wall. The proposed glazing on the north side could be omitted, with some top lighting in the roof provided to overcome overlooking and security concerns. An ashlar wall of the extension could be continued as the retaining wall to the churchyard alongside the north aisle.

#### **Re-ordering:**

P8 All present supported plans to re-clutter the church and bring the West door back into use which is visible from the street. It was felt that access improvements to existing pathways to the West door could be combined with landscape improvements on the north side of the church and access to the new extension. The DAC delegation noted landscaping plans would involve blocking up existing external basement steps to the boiler house but noted internal basement access would be retained.

P9 The delegation discuss the need for a new glazed lobby at the West door to allow light into the church, improve security and prevent heat loss.

P10 The DAC delegation noted that the quality of existing pew backs was poor but felt seating elements could be salvaged and used in the new scheme. The delegation also asked if existing Ledger stones could be reused in the new scheme. The delegation agreed a demountable stage would give more flexibility of use but would create a storage problem which would need to be solved. This was offered as an alternative to the fixed stage popping up from below the floor which would only allow a traditional performance. It was suggested the stage could be placed centrally rather than at the Chancel end to free up circulation space to the new extension, subject to archaeology. The delegation asked if a new fire lobby would be required in the church to access the new kitchen and toilets?

#### **Conclusions:**

---

P11 The parish agreed to defer plans for the glazed link and omit plans to alter the aisle window to create a new door as part of this scheme to extend to the north side in favour of improving landscape arrangements on the north side to the new extension and utilising the existing West Door. This would immediately reveal the impressive interior view of the east end which will greatly enhance the welcome offered to the community and communicants.

P12 Refine paperwork, cut out unnecessary detail and convey the relationship with sister church of St John and St Marys in Devizes. This should include an executive summary, consultation summary, feasibility study including future proposals for a glazed link if required and up to date QI report.

The DAC delegation was grateful to the parish representatives and their architects for the opportunity to participate in such an open, constructive and positive discussion of these most welcome proposals.

SB 7.10.19

Mr Tom Welch  
Chedburn Dudley  
Limley Mill  
Limley Stoke  
Bath  
BA2 7FJ

Direct Dial: 0117 975 0667

Our ref: PA01018765

2 October 2019

Dear Mr Welch

### Pre-application Advice

#### CHURCH OF ST MARY, NEW PARK STREET, DEVIZES

Thank you for inviting me to attend the DAC visit to St Mary's Church in Devizes. It was disappointing to not see that that being proposed has not progressed since our last meeting, however I am pleased that today's discussions with DAC colleagues were constructive.

Historic England continues to hold the view that the current proposals will cause significant harm to the overall heritage significance of this important church without appropriate justification for their need.

In particular the harm being caused by the proposed two new doorways (north and east end of north aisle) and the proposed glazed corridor along the northern elevation is considered to be excessive and unjustified. These changes will remove historic fabric, interrupt architectural features and obscure and interrupt the aesthetics of the north elevation of the church but will provide limited benefit to the scheme overall.

It is our view that a more limited scheme is possible; achieving the majority of the aims of the applicant whilst limiting the overall harm caused. This option would see the removal of the glazed link and the north door and instead limit change to the proposed new extension at the north east corner with access where the current organ sits. This solution would retain independent access to the extension but limit the overall size and impact.

Concerns have been raised with regards to safe access to the external door to the new extension; however, it is our view that these could be overcome with an appropriate landscaping scheme. Indeed, it is our opinion that a more open approach to this aspect of the churchyard would actually better facilitate the aim to create a positive connection between the churchyard the church itself.

### Next Steps



29 QUEEN SQUARE BRISTOL BS1 4ND  
Telephone 0117 975 1308  
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full privacy policy for more information <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/terms/privacy-cookies/>

**Subsequent 22/1/20 email** from Isla Macneal, Wiltshire Conservation / Economic Development and Planning, gives encouragement for the December 2020 plan:

*The internal works will have impact on the significance and the overall assessment of Significance, Need etc would need to be articulated in any scheme going forward. The extension is an improvement in terms of siting, footprint, height than previous proposals. It will extend substantially into the churchyard requiring some excavation. I am not qualified to comment on the archaeological impact, as that is more for Rachel Foster to assess. I am of the view that from the information provided the scheme is getting closer to something we could support. We would need to consider it as a whole project and with worked up drawings. I am of the view that a key aspect will be the materials and suggest the curved wall should be stone. Perhaps some of the stone from the dismantled vestry could be reused. As with previous schemes we were not convinced that render is appropriate in this context.*