

## In the matter of St Andrew, Hove

### Judgment

1. This is a petition for the reordering of the significant grade II\* listed church of St Andrew Hove. Dating from the medieval period, the structure underwent a Victorian reordering under George Basevi and JT Chappel. The proposals include:
  - i. replacement of the pews with chairs
  - ii. provision of toilet and kitchen facilities
  - iii. improvement to the usability and accessibility of the chancel;
  - iv. provision of office space
  - v. changes to the heating system with installation of solar panels to the south facing roof
  - vi. various external works in the churchyard
2. Although the petition is formally unopposed, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, the Victorian Society, Historic England and the Church Buildings Council have each provided written observations in response to the consultative process, and they have requested that I take their professional opinions into account in the course of my determination, which of course I do.
3. I remind myself at the outset of the presumption against change where listed buildings are concerned, and the burden on the proponents of change to demonstrate that the benefits accruing from the proposals will outweigh any harm to the character and integrity of the building. I keep the *Duffield* framework in the forefront of my mind. I note the time and persistence of the parish in fully engaging with consultative bodies over a prolonged period.
4. It seems to be common ground that the facilities which these proposals will provide are likely to be transformative in the life and witness of this faithful Christian community, enhancing the practicable useability of the building for future generations. The DAC has been broadly supportive of this project through a series of iterations, each sensitively responding to the observations of consultees.
5. The inclusion of mezzanine features and their size have attracted adverse comment as has what is seen as the intrusive nature of so-called ‘pods’ and the introduction of upholstered chairs, notwithstanding that the current seating has soft fabric elements already.
6. These are all matters of judgment on which differing views may legitimately be held. I do not consider it helpful or proportionate to address in this judgment each and all of the matters touched on in the extensive documentation. I have read and considered all the comments and observation of consultees and the thoughtful replies of the parish and its various experts. There is more than sufficient material for an informed decision to be made.

7. Mindful that the harm to the fabric of this II\* building will be fairly significant, the justification for all that is proposed must be powerful, and I incline to the view that it is, save perhaps in one respect, namely the raised height of the chancel platform. On the evidence, I consider that the laudable objectives of the scheme (which include a significant reduction to the parish's carbon footprint) can sufficiently be achieved without increasing the height to the extent proposed.
8. Subject to that one consideration, upon which I require the proposal to be revised to the Court's satisfaction, I consider that the strict requirements of the *Duffield framework* are met and therefore a faculty may pass the seal.
9. The faculty is not to be issued until the costs of and occasioned by these proceedings have been settled by the petitioners.

The Worshipful Mark Hill KC  
Chancellor of the Diocese of Chichester

25 March 2026