Neutral Citation Number [2026] ECC New 1

IN THE CONSISTORY COURT OF THE DIOCESE OF NEWCASTLE

His Honour Simon Wood, Chancellor

In the Matter of an Application in respect of St Helen, Whitley Chapel for the installation of 16 solar panels on the south-west facing roof using a rail fixing system and the introduction of a battery in the cellar; in the Matter of a Petition by Kate Gibson, Church Warden, David Wilson, PCC Treasurer, and the Reverend Andrew Patterson, Vicar

JUDGMENT

Introduction

1. This is a petition brought by Kate Gibson, churchwarden, David Wilson, PCC Treasurer, and the Rev. Andrew Patterson, Vicar, seeking permission to install solar panels and an associated battery, at the church of St Helen, Whitley Chapel in Hexhamshire, Northumberland.

2. The works proposed comprise the introduction of 16 solar panels to be affixed by a rail fixing system to the southwest facing slate covered roof and a battery in the cellar of the church. For ease of understanding, I will henceforth refer to this as "the south roof".

3. In anticipation of the petition, the petitioners have already secured planning permission from Northumberland County Council for the installation of photo-voltaic panels on the south facing roof of this simple rural stone church notwithstanding its status as a Grade II listed building.

4. However, each of the Church Buildings Council ("CBC") and the Georgian Group ("GG") have raised objections to the proposal, objections which have not been withdrawn albeit, whilst the court is asked to take their views into account, neither has sought party opponent status.

5. Given the controversy that has arisen, particularly as I am not familiar with the location, as is my usual practice, I took the opportunity to visit St Helen's on a fine, if overcast, afternoon on 1 August so better to understand the issues which have been raised. I did so without prior arrangement and did not meet with the petitioners. Despite being overcast, visibility was good and I took the opportunity to view each elevation of the church, with particular reference to the impact of the installation from what appears to be an unclassified rural road, running broadly east/west from the hamlet of Juniper to Whitley Chapel (from which the north and east elevations of the church are visible) and a second

unclassified road, known as Steel Lane, running at right angles from the former road in a southerly direction (from which the south elevation in question is visible). The location of the church and its churchyard is, effectively, a corner site bordered by the southeast corner of the junction of these two minor roads. Steel Lane is quiet rural lane leading to a number of scattered farmhouses and the edge of Hexhamshire Common where it becomes an unmetalled track. A Google Earth screenshot is attached which illustrates the location and to which further reference will be made.

The church

6. St Helen's church is described by the former longstanding DAC architect, Geoffrey Purves in his invaluable *Churches of Newcastle and Northumberland: A Sense of Place*, Tempus, 2006, as "a simple stone church…said to have been built in 1742". It is a modest building set in a large churchyard (with an extension) standing high above the east/west approach road on a bluff. The Statement of Significance reports a small weekly congregation but it is well supported at Christmas and Easter. The only utility from which the church benefits is electricity, having no potable water supply.

7. Pedestrian visitors to the church approach on Steel Lane via a gate in the western boundary wall, effectively, facing the west end of the church whose entrance is set in the main south elevation. There are a number of dwellings in old stone buildings opposite the western end of the church. The Google Earth picture shows a strikingly large number of photo-voltaic panels on them and other old properties close, disproportionately high, suggesting a community that, presumably lacking mains gas and heavily dependent on oil, in significant measure, has embraced this form of green, net zero energy.

8. The relevant part of the Statement of Significance describes a parish church on a medieval site, dating from 1742 with some C19 alterations. The construction is rubble with tooled dressings and a slate roof. Its form is a simple rectangular plan with C19 vestry built onto west end. The south wall comprises five bays the entrance being a flush-panelled door with fanlight, in chamfered round-headed arch with a moulded impost and raised keystone in bay 2, windows of two lights. There is a bellcote with cornice carried up over a round-arched opening.

9. The churchyard surrounds the church. The upper part contains four listed headstones, one of which is a war grave. The gates to the churchyard were listed in 1986 but have since been replaced in 2021 with similar gates made by a local craftsman. The lower extension to the churchyard, adjacent to the east/west road already mentioned is currently used for burial; the upper part is used for interment of ashes.

Site visit, 1st August 2026

10. Since the visual impact of the introduction of solar panels is controversial, I was particularly interested to consider the sight lines and understand the extent to which the introduction of C21st apparatus would harm the appearance of this plain but pleasing C18th church. There is no scope to drive a vehicle on to the church site. There is no car park. Any parking would be on the road side on Steel Lane or in the hamlet itself. Any visitor to the church entering the church yard by the main gates on Steel Lane finds themselves faced with a straight tarmacadam path that rises on a moderate gradient up to the southwest corner of the church. The visitor's view of the church is impeded by a pair of large, pollarded yews on either side of the path such that one can see the south elevation walls but not the roof: see photograph 1. By the time the visitor has passed the yews, the proximity to the church and the height of the walls of the south elevation are such that the roof cannot be seen. That remains the position as one continues along the path to the entrance as the path is immediately adjacent to the southern elevation. The hamlet of Whitley Chapel is predominantly to the west and north of the church. Thus, any visitor to the church, entering via the main entrance on Steel Lane at its west end, would simply not see any apparatus on the roof. There is a footpath leading from the east/west road to the east end of the churchyard extension. Walking up it and round the east end of the church to join the footpath from the main gate, the south roof would similarly not impact at all on a pedestrian visitor.

11. I anticipate that most vehicular traffic will use the east/west road from which there would be no sight of the affected roof. Therefore, I paid particular attention to the views from the south, notably from Steel Lane. First, the upper churchyard, which, as mentioned, is used now solely for the interment of ashes, comprises mainly very old memorials, mainly C19 or earlier. By stepping off the entrance path a handful of metres in a southerly direction, the south roof becomes visible to any visitor. Likewise, should a pedestrian approach main entrance gates from the south on Steel Lane there is, in effect, a window whereby the roof is visible: photograph 2. However, it is a relatively narrow window because other than from within the churchyard itself, I calculated that only over a distance of about 30 metres is the roof visible, the presence of large trees and the rear of the only dwelling (which has Velux type windows set into the roof but no windows in its rear elevation), concealing the rear elevation of the church altogether, the bend in the road visible in the Google Earth screenshot contributing to the obstruction of the view of the church: see also photographs 3 and 4.

Proposal

12. The circumstances giving rise to the application are unusual but not unwelcome and I anticipate more will follow. As a designated "community building", St Helen's is eligible to apply for a Northumberland Community Energy Ltd,

"NCEL", photo-voltaic (PV) installation. NCEL is a not-for-profit co-operative, a Community Benefit Society, run by the charity, Community Action Northumberland, whose mission is to support resilience and reduce energy costs for community buildings across the county. It is funded by, amongst others, the North East Mayoral Strategic Authority, Durham and Northumberland County Councils and national government.

13. The Newcastle Diocesan Board of Finance and NCEL have been working on schemes for between ten and fifteen churches across the Diocese, of which St Helen's is one, bidding for funds for full structural roof surveys for churches seeking to install solar PV. This is a geographically large diocese with many churches serving small and often remote communities.

14. I have read extensive literature provided in support of the application from which it emerges that NCEL will cover the cost of obtaining planning permission, the purchase, installation and maintenance of equipment (including batteries) and any increase in insurance occasioned by the installation for the 20 year duration of the agreement. During its operation, the agreement enables the church to obtain its electricity at a price fixed for the duration of the lease at £0.15 per kwh with the value of any electricity exported to the grid inuring to the benefit of NCEL. Legal advice for the PCC will be obtained at NCEL's expense. There is an option to the PCC to purchase the equipment after three years. In the event of NCEL failing, the equipment will be removed. At the conclusion of the agreement, the equipment passes to the PCC or can be removed.

15. It is to be noted that, whereas PV applications in this court have tended to be particularly directed at heating buildings, this application is not made in association with an application to replace or change a heating system but to future proof the church's electricity supply, its sole source of power. As matters stand, there is no immediate proposal to replace the overhead heaters which are switched on to provide some heat when the church is in use. In making this application, the petitioners say:

    "The panels will reduce the cost of the electricity for the building and ensure that the church is more financially viable going forward, reducing the overheads and providing more funds for maintaining the building. In addition to this the panels provide are a significant contribution to the desire of the Parish to respond to the Net Zero proposals of the Church of England and the Diocese of Newcastle, as well as Northumberland County Council and the UK Government."

    The original proposal, which was for 32 PV panels, was estimated to give the church a 70% self-sufficiency based on its present energy consumption. Pro rata, I work on the basis of a 35% self sufficiency flowing from 16 panels, an indirect reduction on fossil fuel generated electricity of more than one third.

16. The panels would be mounted via a reversible system on the existing slate roof. They will be, so near as is possible, a similar colour to the slate to minimise the impact, laid out centrally on the roof in two parallel, conjoined rows of eight in portrait configuration. The battery will be installed in a cellar beneath the church to which there is already no public access.

Statement of Need

17. The petitioners note that the current electric heaters are old, inefficient and will need to be replaced at some indeterminate point in the future with more efficient and economical models. Their continued use, at a time of very high electricity prices, simply adds to the burden on a church with a very small congregation (average 15 to 20 people) and limited resources. By becoming part of the NCEL project, they will not only have the opportunity to save on cost but to benefit the community from exporting surplus energy. By having the resources to heat the church more often, it will enhance the church as a community resource by making it warmer and more comfortable for wider community use.

18. By reference to the Church of England "Net Zero by 2030" ("Net Zero") ambition, the church will not only make a meaningful contribution to that aim but enhance its financial position and make the building a more attractive proposition for community activities.

Planning permission

19. With the assistance of Community Action Northumberland, a planning application was made to Northumberland County Council supported by a design report prepared by the Sustainable Design Studio, submitted as part of this application, and, notwithstanding its status as a Grade II listed building, planning permission has been granted.

The Amenity Societies

20. Prior to the lodging of the Petition, the petitioners consulted, amongst others, the CBC and the GG and, notwithstanding detailed responses to their objection to the plans, have maintained their position and asked for their views to be taken into account before a decision is made.

21. Historic Buildings and Places deferred to the DAC in respect of the issue as to whether the proposal met the proposed net zero goals but did not object on visual grounds. They continued:

    "The [panels] will clearly be visible but we can accept that the Church can take credit for being seen to meet the challenge of Climate Change and that the panels will sit symmetrically within the slope."

The Church Buildings Council

22. In its initial response of 11 March 2026, the CBC, whilst supporting the deployment of solar PV "where this has been carefully considered" but concluded that this threshold had not been met when assessed against the heritage issue and the balance of benefit over harm. In support of its position, it made these points:

    (i) installation of PV panels on a south facing roof did not align with Historic England's guidance in respect of the primary viewing point of a church. Whilst the petitioners argued that this roof was not in fact thus characterised, the CBC considered the roof to be "a significant and prominent visual aspect";
    (ii) there being very low on-site energy, the scheme provided limited direct carbon benefit, no asset ownership, no export income and limited financial savings;

23. It concluded that:

    (i) the justification of a community-owned PV system on a prominent roof of a Grade II listed church was weak;
    (ii) the heritage harm was high to an architecturally significant roof plane;
    (iii) a 20 year roof lease introduced long-term constraints and liabilities for the PCC
    (iv) more appropriate and less harmful options had not been fully explored such as ground-mounting, solar slates or a PCC owned installation.

24. In their response, the petitioners challenge the asserted detrimental impact caused by the scheme, pointing out that they propose glare reducing and colour matching measures. In rejecting the characterisation of the south roof as a prominent visual aspect of the building, they note that the author of the original design had asserted – and they agree – that the visual impact would be minimal.

25. In terms of the lack of benefit asserted, the petitioners struggle to understand why the ability to cover its own energy needs and export for community benefit, is objectionable, especially since this is to be achieved at no capital cost to the church. Having no desire to own the assets which they could not afford in any event, they will benefit from legal advice as well as a full roof survey at NCEL's expense. The whole scheme is reversible and any accidental damage will be covered by insurance, the church's insurers having raised no objections to the proposals. Quite apart from cost, a ground-based scheme is neither feasible nor permissible in the churchyard. The petitioners note that the CBC's objection makes no reference at all to their obligation to adhere to Net Zero.

26. The CBC remained unmoved albeit welcomed the intention to support wider community use and contribute to Net Zero. However:

"The Council also recognises the wider role that community energy schemes can play in supporting grid decarbonisation and enabling community participation in the transition to net zero. However, such models necessarily distribute benefits across the wider scheme, and while these are realised at the level of the host building, they are not always proportionate to its context or level of use. The Council has therefore given particular consideration to the extent and proportionality of the direct and lasting benefit to the church in this instance.

The Council wishes to emphasise that this conclusion has not been reached lightly. It recognises the proposal is intended to support…net zero…. However, having regard to the current level and pattern of energy use at the church, the Council considers that the likely carbon and community benefit arising from the scheme would, in practice, be limited, and does not materially alter the overall balance of benefit and harm."

The Georgian Group

27. In its objection, whilst the GG indicated that it had been unable to make a site visit but recognised that the south roof was only visible from Steel Lane and from within the churchyard. It continues: "the roof slope is above the church's principal access door and is accordingly the one which was intended to be seen by visitors and the congregation". The installation of "an assertively modern addition" in the form of PV panels would be "unavoidably [sic] incongruous" for the church's "modest character and bucolic setting". Praying in aid the Historic England Guidance already referenced by the CBC, it urges alternative sitings.

The DAC

28. The DAC unanimously recommended that the proposals be approved subject to the following conditions:
i) a suitable structural survey should be carried out before the panels are installed;
ii) battery storage must adhere to suitable fire safety measures and liaison with the church's insurer;
iii) a suitable lease/licence is arranged with the third-party provider for the installation of the solar panels and associated equipment and is approved by the Diocesan Registrar.

29. The DAC considered the objections received from the CBC and the GG but maintained its recommendation on the following bases:

    i) it supported the wider Net Zero aims and was convinced that the public and social benefit was sufficient to balance the visual and heritage impact;

ii) it was reinforced in that view by virtue of the fact that the installation was reversible;
iii) the planning application had received no objections suggesting strong local support;
iv) the PCC had reduced the number of proposed panels at the suggestion of the planners;
v) the life of the installation is such that there will likely be less impactful alternatives available when it comes to be replaced.

The Diocesan Net Zero Team

30. For completeness, I note that this team works in partnership with NCEL. Together with the Newcastle Diocesan Board of Finance, NCEL has successfully bid for GB Energy Funds to provide full structural roof surveys for 10 churches seeking to install solar PV of which St Helen's is one.

Discussion

31. By reference to the Historic England record, St Helen's Grade II status arises from:

> "Parish church on medieval site, 1742 with some C19 alterations. Rubble with tooled dressings; slate roof. Simple rectangular plan with C19 vestry built onto west end. South wall 5 bays; flush-panelled door with plain fanlight, in chamfered round-headed arch with moulded impost and raised keystone in bay 2; windows of 2 lights with basket-arched heads. Coped gables with moulded kneelers. To left, lower vestry with boarded door, in possibly re-set block surround, and coped gable with corniced end stack. West end has 2 single-light windows with basket arches, that to right re-set in projecting vestry. Bellcote with cornice carried up over round-arched opening; North wall has 3 C19 windows each of 2 cinquefoil-headed lights. East end has re-set medieval window of 3 stepped lancets under chamfered pointed arch, and C19 foliate gable cross. Interior. C18 font with moulded circular bowl and shaft. Pater board with pointed head, dated 1858; similar but undated creed and commandments boards."

32. This description fairly represents what is a later church on a medieval site, preserving regional Northumbrian ecclesiastical heritage with traditional stone masonry and its local historical significance.

33. Both the CBC and the GG point to the Historic England Guidance which stress the special importance of southern elevations. In this regard, St Helen's does not fit into the generally perceived experience of the southern elevation being its principal viewpoint: as seen by photograph 1, it is blocked to visitors entering via the main gate and the roof is only visible to a visitor who strays from the path on to the grassed graveyard itself. Save as just described, it is not possible to see the roof from the churchyard itself. The position is different for someone

standing on Steel Lane assuming they are on the approximately 30 metre section of road (there is no pavement) that permits a view of the south elevation. It might fairly be observed that the most significant elevations are the eastern and northern which are visible from some distance on the Juniper to Whitley Chapel road by reason of their standing proud and exposed on the bluff or mound on which the church stands. In so observing, I do not seek to diminish the attractiveness of the southern elevation but highlight that it is one that gives a more limited experience than one might have anticipated, given the trees and the presence of a house that backs directly on to it.

34. Having visited the church and spent time considering it from as many angles as I could, I agree with the petitioners that the importance of the southern elevation and its completely plain slate roof has been exaggerated when considering the question of harm. The listing simply mentions "slate roof". It is difficult to see how that is any more than a factual description as opposed to a significant characteristic. The windows beneath the roof are described in more detail: "windows of two lights with basket-arched heads" albeit there is a significant gap between the windows and the roof. It is striking, in my view, that the local planning authority has approved planning permission as is the absence of any objection by a parishioner, local resident or anyone else who might have a legitimate interest. Indeed, looking at the sheer volume of solar panels on the buildings, mostly old ones, visible in the Google Earth screen shot, this would appear to be a community that has very much embraced this form of energy.

35. It is, of course, for the petitioners to demonstrate that their proposal is desirable and falls within the Court of Arches guidelines set out in *Re St Alkmund, Duffield* [2013] Fam 158:

    i) Would the proposals, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest?
    ii) If not, have the petitioner shown a sufficiently good reason for change to overcome the ordinary presumption that the absence of a good reason for change should not be permitted?
    iii) If the answer to i) is "yes", how serious would the harm be?
    iv) How clear and convincing is the justification for carrying out the proposals?
    v) Bearing in mind that there is a strong presumption against proposals which will adversely affect the character of a listed building, will any resulting benefit (including matters such as liturgical freedom, pastoral well being, opportunities for mission, and putting the church to viable uses that are consistent with its role as a place of worship outweigh the harm. In answering this question, the more serious the harm, the greater will be the level of benefit needed before the proposal should be permitted. This will particularly be the case if the harm to a building which is listed Grade I or II*, where serious harm should only exceptionally be allowed.

36. I have concluded that the proposal to introduce solar PV panels will result in some harm to the significance of St Helen's as a building recognised to be a building of special architectural or historic interest, albeit not one which has a Grade I or II* status. It is beyond argument that installing PV panels on the slate roof of the south elevation will result in a change to the church's appearance changing it from one which currently has a simple, unadorned slate roof. To that extent the GGs description of "incongruous" is not an unfair one.

37. Passing over the second question which no longer applies, it falls to the court to determine the extent of the harm to the significance of St Helen's if the proposal were to be approved. In my judgment, the harm does not reach the threshold of serious or substantial and is more properly characterised as moderate.

38. I have considered the views of the DAC, the CBC, the GG and Historic Buildings and Places. Although the lack of objection is far from a guarantee of success, I also take into account the grant of planning permission by Northumberland County Council and the complete absence of challenge from the community St Helen's serves.

39. Whilst the GG and the CBC stress the apparent inconsistency with the Historic England guidance in relation to avoidance of the use of principal roof slopes, that is qualified by "if they would be visible and would detract from the building's special interest". That qualification is particularly important in this instance for the reasons I have identified in describing the relatively limited opportunity for visitors and others to see panels on this roof. The aspect from Steel Lane, limited as it is to those passing by on the road adjacent to the churchyard wall, is not to be ignored but it is not one visible from any significant distance and, importantly in my judgment, the panels would not be readily visible to a visitor or worshipper entering via the main gates to the church. That is in direct contradiction to the observation of the GG that the roof "was intended to be seen by visitors and congregants".

40. The lack of any description of the roof in the listing, other than the fact that is slate, also points to this roof not being a significant feature of the listing.

41. The plan to install the panels centrally in the roof will maintain symmetry and configuring them in portrait style will minimise any jarring of lines as they will, to that extent, mirror the portrait positioning of the windows on the western elevation.

42. Finally on this question, the fact that the proposed installation is wholly reversible is, in my judgment, highly relevant to the question of the seriousness of the harm and places it lower, rather than higher, on the scale.

43. So I turn to question iv), namely how clear and convincing is the justification for the proposal. Despite the strongly held views of the CBC and GG, I am satisfied

that the petitioners have made out a persuasive case for identified benefits that will inure to parishioners, the community where they live and others beyond by embracing solar power to light and heat their church.

44. This is a small, remote, rural church with a very small congregation. The petitioners are only in a position to contemplate this scheme because there is an external agency and external funds available to make it possible. The petitioners make it clear that they could not begin to afford to install solar PV panels as they have neither the necessary funds nor the ability to generate them. It is, in my judgment, entirely appropriate for the Diocesan Board of Finance to have engaged with NCEL for a geographically large but relatively sparsely populated diocese with over 250 churches and to assist and encourage those most in need and at risk not just to engage with Net Zero but to use it as a vehicle to encourage wider and greater use of these remarkable buildings.

45. These petitioners have, in the court's judgment, demonstrated, that they can reduce their reliance on fossil fuel generated electricity by over a third, bringing them closer to net zero, reducing their impact on the environment but simultaneously creating wider opportunities to their own communities by making the church a more comfortable, welcoming but more economically viable place. Their consumption may objectively be modest but the reduction is proportionately significant. It is presently difficult to conceive of any arrangement that would in pure economic terms be advantageous given the high cost of converting to carbon net zero scheme. The benefit to the environment cannot be measured in such terms but, since the church is spared that substantial capital outlay by this arrangement, the benefit in both economic and environmental terms is significant.

46. The petitioners are criticised for their failure to have considered alternative routes to Net Zero. Principally, ground panels appear to be recommended, a proposal that can be rejected out of hand for the want of suitable land to support such panels. Incidentally, whilst no one suggests otherwise, for the avoidance of doubt, there is no other part of the church roof that would be suitable or as beneficial an alternative. Nor is there any other reasonably affordable alternative available to the petitioners.

47. Reminding myself of the strong presumption against change which will affect the character of a listed building adversely, have the petitioners made out a sufficient case that the harm I have identified is outweighed by granting them permission to carry out the changes requested?

48. The petitioners have been in significant measure been drawn to this proposal by the opportunity presented to them to support the Church of England's Net Zero aims notwithstanding their relatively modest contribution to carbon production. That is to their credit and a missional priority, a factor that is properly taken into account in answering this question.

49. The proposal is clearly and readily reversible. Were it not the case, the harm to the church's significance would inevitably be greater. The duration of the proposed lease is 20 years whereupon the petitioners may either keep the PV panels or ask NCEL to remove them. There is certainly no justification for keeping the panels and, thus, the harm, beyond their expected working life and I am attracted to Fry-Spedding Ch's approach in *In the matter of St Anne's Church, Ing* [2024] ECC Car 2 in which he imposed a condition that the panels be completely removed at the end of their anticipated lifespan (in that case, 25 years), affording extra time to allow for installation and pointing to the ability of the successors to the current petitioners to seek extra time in the event that they exceed their expected lifespan by applying with supportive evidence.

50. The petitioners are criticised for joining a scheme that will result in the possibility of energy being exported without any financial benefit to the church, a point which completely ignores the fact that, having had the benefit of this system being installed and maintained at no cost to the petitioners, this is a proposal that involves no capital outlay, either upfront or on a rolling basis, on the part of the church.

51. Concern is expressed about the contractual arrangements, the state of the roof, the risk flowing from a 20 year lease, outage responsibilities, conflict with insurance conditions, the failure of the supplier and so on. These points, while validly raised, can be addressed other than by the CBC's suggestion of a self-funded and fully owned system which is simply not an option for this parish. The petitioners will have to seek legal advice in any event and it is already agreed that this will be acted upon and funded. A full roof survey will also take place and be funded. The petitioners are already in discussion with their insurers who are supportive. If NCEL becomes insolvent, ultimately, the equipment can be removed. If it fails, the church will still be connected to the grid.

Conclusion

52. For the reasons I have set out, I direct that a faculty issue on the petitioners discharging the burden of proof.

53. The following conditions will apply:

    i) there shall be full compliance with the terms and conditions of the planning permission granted by Northumberland County Council dated 10 July 2025;
    ii) no works shall be carried out pending the completion of a full structural survey of the roof, to be lodged with the Registry before works begin, designed to determine:
        a) that the condition of the roof is such that it will not reasonably be anticipated that major works necessitating the temporary removal of the solar PV panels within the duration of the lease and no later than

21 years from the date of this faculty, making good any resultant damage to the Archdeacon's satisfaction;

b) that there is no structural impediment to the roof structure caused by the installation of 16 solar PV panels;

iii) no works shall be carried out until the petitioners have sought comprehensive legal advice in relation to the proposed leasing arrangements between the parish and NCEL and lodged the same with the Registry for the approval by the Diocesan Registrar;

iv) fire resistance, reduction, detection and alarm work shall be carried out in respect of location of the battery and lodged with the Registry prior to work commencing;

v) All wiring is installed in as unobtrusive a manner as is reasonably practicable with wiring being of a colour to blend in to the background or so painted or sheathed;

vi) So far as is reasonably practicable all fixings are made into joints not stonework, using stainless steel or non-ferrous screws;

vii) compliance with the requirements of Ecclesiastical set out in their letter of 18 June 2026;

viii) any material variation must be reported to the DAC and, in the absence of agreement, referred to the court.

54. Having imposed the foregoing terms absent any representation from the petitioners, they are at liberty to apply in writing by 16.00 hrs on Friday 25 September 2026.

Simon Wood
Chancellor
2 September 2026



Photograph 1: view from entrance gates



Photograph 2: pedestrian view from boundary wall just south of entrance gates



Photograph 3: rear elevation of dwelling to south border of churchyard



Photograph 4: view from Steel Lane to south west of site



Screenshot from Google Earth