

Re All Saints, Sharrington

Judgment

1. This is the determination of a petition dated 30 April 2014 for a faculty authorizing the installation of wireless broadband equipment in the tower of the church of All Saints, Sharrington.

Background

2. The petitioners seek permission for the installation of wireless broadband equipment in the tower of this Grade I listed church. It is intended that the installation is to be undertaken and funded by WiSpire Limited ('WiSpire'). WiSpire is a joint enterprise between the Diocese of Norwich and internet service provider, FreeClix and was established to deliver improved broadband internet services across the county of Norfolk, especially to rural areas where services can at times be poor.
3. On 4 March 2013 the PCC voted unanimously in support of the proposed works. In April of this year the works were recommended for approval by the Diocesan Advisory Committee. That recommendation was subject to a number of conditions pertaining to the safe execution of the electrical works and protection of the heritage value of the building. English Heritage and parish architect were also consulted and are content with the proposals.
4. Between 25 April and 25 May 2014 public notices were displayed at the church for a period slightly in excess of that required by Part 5 of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2013. The public notices invited anyone wishing to object to the works to write giving reasons for their objection such that their response reached the Diocesan Registrar by no later than 28 days after the notices were first displayed. Letters were received by the Registrar from three people; a parishioner (Miss Robinson), her mother (Mrs Robinson) and another parishioner (Mrs Rivett). All of these letters were received (and indeed dated) after the expiry of the period for objections to be received at the Registry.
5. Mrs Rivett's single letter was received approximately two and a half weeks late and as such the Registry Clerk simply wrote to Mrs Rivett

explaining that, although her correspondence was out of time, her letter would be forwarded to the Chancellor for her consideration when determining the petition. Mrs Rivett's letter states that although she is pleased that the proposed works would financially benefit the church, she remains concerned about the impact which the installation would have on the health of Miss Robinson. She asks that the health effects of the installation are considered and information about that provided to the PCC. She also hopes, if it can be shown that the installation would not be harmful to health, that appropriate reassurance can be provided to Miss Robinson. In determining this petition I take account of Mrs Rivett's letter.

6. The letters from the Robinsons were received only a few days late, and as such the Registrar effectively treated the letters as if they had been received within time. He wrote inviting the Robinsons to choose between becoming parties opponent to this petition or leaving the Chancellor to take their written representations into account. Given that correspondence objecting to the proposed works had been received by the Bishop of Norwich two months earlier from both of Miss Robinson's parents, the Registrar sensibly also included Miss Robinson's father (Dr Robinson) in this correspondence despite the fact that Dr Robinson had not personally written to the Registrar at that stage. Dr and Mrs Robinson do not live in the parish of Sharrington, but rather in Belfast.
7. I pause here to note that rule 9.2(4) of the FJR 2013 states that "[a] letter of objection must arrive at the Registry within the period of 28 days for the display of the public notice". Given the lateness of the letters received by the Registrar, the Court is not required to take account of the objections raised. Nevertheless, I cannot see that there is any prejudice to the petitioners in having to address these objections a few days later than they otherwise would have and in the interests of dealing with the case justly I would not seek to exclude the letters on the basis of their lateness.
8. Correspondence was entered into between the Registrar and the Robinsons which made clear that their letters to the Registrar were written not in response to the public notice placed at the church but rather as part of ongoing correspondence relating to the proposed works which had commenced with a letter from Miss Robinson to the Bishop of Norwich dated 12 August 2013. Further, it became clear that the Robinsons each contested the jurisdiction of this Court to determine the petition placed before it. I shall address the issue of jurisdiction later, but the outcome of this correspondence was that none of the Robinsons returned a properly completed Form 4A requesting to be joined as a party to the proceedings. Subject to the issue of Dr and Mrs Robinson's standing to object in this case, the effect of this is that although the Robinsons have not become formal

parties opponent to this petition, I am enjoined to take account of their representations as contained in their correspondence.

9. The correspondence submitted by the Robinsons stretches over a period of twelve months and has included the petitioners, the Registrar, residents of the parish of Sharrington, the local MP, the Bishop of Norwich, the Archbishop of Canterbury and myself. I have seen copies of all of the correspondence submitted to the Registry and take account of it in accordance with the paragraphs set out below.
10. In addition to the letters from the Robinsons and Mrs Rivett, I have seen nine forms apparently completed by residents of Sharrington village indicating that they “do not want WiSpire in Sharrington”. Those forms were returned to the incumbent of the parish, having been circulated to village residents by Miss Robinson. Given that I cannot identify the signatories and have cannot know the circumstances in which they signed those forms I must treat them with caution. Significantly, the signatories did not choose to write a letter of objection to the Registrar pursuant to the publication of the public notices at the church. In the circumstances, whereas I am prepared to accept that there are others within the village who may be unhappy about the erection of a WiFi mast on the church tower, I cannot attach any greater significance than that to those forms.

Standing

11. Under rule 9.2 of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2013, “[a]n interested person” may object to the grant of a faculty. The issue therefore arises whether Dr and Mrs Robinson are “interested persons” for these purposes. As a parishioner, Miss Robinson clearly had standing to object. Rule 9.1 defines an “interested person”. The only category within which could Dr and Mrs Robinson could fall is the category under rule 9.1(1)(a)(v) of “any other person or body appearing to the chancellor to have a sufficient interest in the subject matter of the petition”.
12. Dr and Mrs Robinson’s sole interest in this matter comes from the fact that their adult daughter is resident within the parish. It is argued by her and by them that the works will impact upon their daughter’s health. Although clearly unwell, there is nothing to suggest that their daughter lacks capacity or is any way incapable of representing her own interests in this matter. Indeed, Miss Robinson has (at times with the help of friends) written at least seven letters either to the petitioners, the Registrar, the Bishop of Norwich or to myself reflecting her views. That is in addition to a number of letters circulated to the local MP and residents of the parish. I am entirely satisfied that Miss Robinson is capable of representing her own interests in this matter.

13. As was made clear in the decision of Chancellor Tattersall in *Re St Michael and All Angels, Isel* (Carlisle Consistory Court, 25 October 2010) “it is for the Objectors to satisfy [the Chancellor] that at least one of them is an interested person”. I am not satisfied that family members, even close family members, of those resident in a parish would have sufficient interest in the subject matter of the petition by virtue of that fact alone. If, for some reason, the relative resident in parish was unable properly to represent his or her views or if, for example, there were some wider familial link to the proposed works (such as an impact upon the interred remains of a family member – see *e.g. Re Church of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield* (Wakefield Consistory Court, 6 November 2010)) then perhaps a sufficient interest would be found, but that is not the case here. Nevertheless, it is pertinent that the letters of Dr and Mrs Robinson are in large part expressed to be written or submitted “on behalf of” or, indeed, “by” Miss Robinson (as well as her parents). It is clear from the letters of Miss Robinson that she agrees with, relies upon and adopts the views set out in the letters of her parents. On that basis I am prepared to take account of the representations made within those letters. They stand as representations made by or on behalf of Miss Robinson as an interested person, rather than representations made by or on behalf of her parents.

Jurisdiction

14. Before I turn to the substance of this petition and the objections to it, I must address the argument raised as to the Court’s jurisdiction to deal with this case. In the letter dated 11 August 2014 Dr Robinson challenges whether the Diocese of Norwich “ha[s] the legal right to impose the [faculty procedure] in this instance”. He goes on to argue:

“It is our firm opinion that the 2013 Faculty Rules DO NOT allow for such matters which are external to the boundaries of a specific church property such as Sharrington and that, should the Church wish to have such powers it would be necessary to obtain the approval of Parliament.”

15. This letter reflects the jurisdictional argument raised elsewhere in the correspondence which may, I believe, be summarized thus: As the electromagnetic radiation produced by the proposed wireless broadband equipment would extend beyond the boundaries of the church and its curtilage, there can be no jurisdiction for the Consistory Court, which has jurisdiction only over that area, to grant a faculty permitting the installation.

16. The jurisdiction of the Consistory Court has existed for centuries and under Canon F13(3) of the Canons of the Church of England:

“[i]t shall be the duty of the minister and churchwardens, if any alterations, additions, removals, or repairs are proposed to be

made in the fabric, ornaments, or furniture of the church, to obtain the faculty or licence of the Ordinary before proceeding to execute the same.”

The Consistory Court’s jurisdiction was put on a statutory footing by the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963. Section 6(1)(b) of that Measure states that “the consistory court of a diocese has original jurisdiction to hear and determine a cause of faculty for authorising any act relating to land within the diocese, or to anything on or in such land, being an act for the doing of which the decree of a faculty is requisite”. Further, section 11(1) of the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991 declares “that the jurisdiction of the consistory court of a diocese applies to all parish churches in the diocese and the churchyards and articles appertaining thereto”. After the passing of a resolution in both Houses of Parliament and the granting of Royal Assent, these Measures (in common with all Measures) do, of course, have the full force and effect of an Act of Parliament.

17. The proposed works in this case do amount to an alteration of or addition to the fabric of All Saints Church, Sharrington and thus the petitioners are obliged to seek a faculty before undertaking the works. They have done so. The works fall squarely within the jurisdiction of the Court as codified in the two Measures referred to. There can be no question of any person “impos[ing] the [faculty procedure] in this instance”. Rather, the petitioners are obliged by the law of the land to seek the permission sought from this Court before undertaking the proposed works.
18. It is argued that the fact that the electromagnetic radiation from the proposed installation extends beyond the churchyard boundary means that the Court has no jurisdiction here. This cannot be right. Consistory Courts, and indeed the Court of Arches (see *e.g. Re Emmanuel Church, Bentley* [2006] Fam 39), have been granting permission for similar installations throughout the Church of England for many years. The situation is akin to the repair or installation of floodlighting or bells within a church. In those cases light or sound from the installations may well spill over beyond the churchyard boundary (indeed, in the case of bells, it is presumably intended that it should do so) and thus affect local residents. This does not prevent the Consistory Court from determining those petitions. Instead, the Consistory Court will take account of the impact which the proposals are likely to have on those outside the churchyard boundaries in determining whether or not to grant the faculty. The legislation governing the faculty procedure does, of course, have built into it procedures specifically intended to safeguard the position of those with an interest in the proceedings by giving them a full opportunity to have their concerns heard and considered.

19. I am satisfied that this Court has jurisdiction to determine the petition before it. In determining it I take full and careful account of the concerns raised by and on behalf of Miss Robinson.

The law

20. In *Re St Alkmund, Duffield* [2013] Fam 158 the Court of Arches set down a framework or guidelines for the determination of petitions relating to alterations to listed churches. That framework took the form of a list of questions, the first of which was “[w]ould the proposals, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest?”. In this case, although the church is Grade I listed, there is no suggestion that the works would result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest. The proposed antenna is relatively modest and will be fixed to a non-penetrating mount on the tower roof. English Heritage have approved the proposals as have the DAC and the parish architect. All of this is subject to some uncontentious conditions aimed at ensuring the integrity of the building’s heritage. I am satisfied that the proposed works would not result in harm to the significance of the building.

21. The decision in *Re St Alkmund, Duffield* goes on to state:

“[i]f the answer to question (1) is “no”, the ordinary presumption in faculty proceedings “in favour of things as they stand” is applicable, and can be rebutted more or less readily, depending on the particular nature of the proposals (see *Peek v Trower* (1881) 7 PD 21, 26-8, and the review of the case-law by Chancellor Bursell QC in *In re St Mary’s, White Waltham (No 2)* [2010] PTSR 1689 at para 11). Questions 3, 4 and 5 do not arise.”

Thus, the burden of proof lies on the petitioners to establish on the balance of probabilities that there are good reasons why a faculty should issue in this case. In deciding whether that burden has been discharged I must and do carefully consider the objections put before me.

The objections

22. The objections made in the correspondence before the Court have a number of aspects. I trust that I do them no disservice in summarizing them thus: Firstly, there are procedural objections in relation to consultation and public notices; secondly, there are objections concerning the Diocese; thirdly, there are objections based upon the health risks from the proposed works; and fourthly there are practical objections based on a lack of need for the promised broadband service. I shall deal with these in turn.

Procedural objections

23. The Robinsons raise procedural objections in this case, arguing that the requirement under part 5 of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2013 to display public notices inside and outside the church for 28 days is inadequate to modern times given that only a minority of parishioners regularly attend church services. They further suggest an unacceptable lack of transparency arising from the fact that the public notice “suddenly appeared” without further additional publicity.
24. It is clear to me that the petitioners have complied with and exceeded the statutory requirements for public notice in this case. Those requirements are fixed by the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2013. The public notice requirements closely mirror the public notice requirements of the secular planning system. There is scope under rule 5.4 for directions to be given in any given case requiring an extended period of public notice, or indeed additional locations for public notices. No such directions were made in this case. I cannot see that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case. I note that in September 2013 Miss Robinson had circulated information about the proposals to a good number of properties within the parish, if not all of them. In addition, the parish held a public meeting to discuss this issue in March 2013, to no evident dissent from those present. Even if it was felt necessary, it is hard to see how an extended period of notice, or additional public notices, would have raised awareness of the proposals further within the village.

Objections concerning the Diocese

25. The objectors argue that there is a lack of transparency in relation to the relationship between WiSpire and the Diocese of Norwich in the context of this application. It is noted that the officers of WiSpire Limited are senior diocesan staff and the parent company is the Diocesan Board of Finance. Further, it suggested that there may be some conflict of interest which impacts upon the determination of this case given the role of the Diocesan Registrar as a Director of WiSpire.
26. Given that the petitioners for this faculty are the parish and not WiSpire, I cannot see that there has been any lack of transparency about the relationship between the Diocese and WiSpire. I pause to note that the diocesan logo is prominently displayed at the foot of the home page of the WiSpire website and that the opening sentence of the ‘About Us’ page on that website starts “WiSpire is a joint venture between the Diocese of Norwich and FreeClix...”. The relationship between the Diocese and WiSpire would have been clear to anyone who was interested enough to make some very limited enquiries about WiSpire.
27. In any event, I am satisfied that these concerns do not impact on the making of the decision in this faculty petition. Certainly there can be

no suggestion that the Registrar's directorship of WiSpire impacts upon the decision. Apart from the fact that that position is a temporary and unpaid post, the Registrar is not the decision maker in this case. I am. As Chancellor of the Diocese, once appointed, I derive my authority not from the Bishop or from the Diocese but from the law. I exercise that authority independently. The Registrar's role in the determination of this petition has been essentially administrative and no more.

28. It is also argued that the church's motivations in seeking this installation is financial, it is "seeking to make money at the cost of human suffering". I do not accept that argument. Sharrington, through the generosity of worshippers and the hard work of fundraising events is a financially secure parish which has been able to meet the costs arising from its mission to its community and the maintenance of its building. Looking at the church more widely, the suggestion that the Diocese of Norwich's motivations are financial cannot be sustained – not least because, as has been emphasized by the Robinsons themselves, the low level of charging for the services rendered means that no profit is being made by the enterprise. Rather, I am satisfied that the motivation of the Diocese, and indeed the parish of Sharrington, centres around the desire to provide a service which will improve the lives of those in rural Norfolk, by improving communications and social opportunities, reducing isolation and supporting the rural economy.

29. The Robinsons also suggest that WiSpire Ltd is an inappropriate use of diocesan funds given its financial situation. I express no view on that matter. It is not for me as Chancellor to dictate financial policy for the Diocese of Norwich. Further, that financial policy can have no impact upon my decision about whether to permit this parish to install WiFi equipment within its church building.

Health risks

30. Both Mrs Rivett and the Robinsons express deep concern about the potential effect of the proposed installation on Miss Robinson's health. This is the core of the objections raised. The letters describe Miss Robinson's electrosensitivity and poor state of health, including her suffering with severe migraine and other debilitating symptoms which have, at times, rendered her bedbound. The letter dated 25 March 2013 also refers to a diagnosis of extreme ME.

31. Miss Robinson has provided the Court with two reports in relation to her health. The first is a letter from her GP, Dr Grove, dated 25 June 2014 and the second is a heavily edited report from Dr A Chaudhuri, Consultant Neurologist dated 4 February 2011. In his letter, Dr Grove acknowledges that there is a lot of debate about the issue of electrosensitivity and that Miss Robinson "believes that the

electromechanical waves associated with wifi cause her physical harm in the form of headache and neurological symptoms”. He confirms that Miss Robinson has in the past seen a neurologist who “made a note of the fact that Ms Robinson’s symptoms seem to be associated with electromechanical waves”.

32. The evidential value of the neurological report from Dr Chaudhuri is, I am afraid, very limited, principally because it is so very heavily edited. More than two thirds of the text of the report (which is only 27 lines long) has been blanked out and much of the remaining eight lines or so is in incomplete sentences. As a result it is extremely difficult to achieve any sense of what Dr Chaudhuri is saying. That which remains essentially seems to record the history of symptoms provided to Dr Chaudhuri by Miss Robinson (although this is not absolutely clear because, as stated, the sentences are incomplete). At no point in either of the medical reports is any diagnosis provided or any medical opinion expressed which evidences any link between Miss Robinson’s symptoms and the type and strength of electromagnetic radiation produced by WiFi masts.

33. In September 2011, Chancellor Downes, my predecessor in this Diocese, held a hearing in open court to determine a petition for the installation by WiSpire of a WiFi mast in the tower of All Saints church in Postwick. Electro Sensitivity UK (ESUK) is a charity whose views are relied upon heavily by the Robinsons and whose mission statement is “[t]o work towards the recognition of ES by the general population and the medical profession and seek to find the best ways of ameliorating the condition of people so affected”. ESUK had made representations to the Chancellor in the *Postwick* case and at the hearing he heard oral evidence from two eminent scientists, Dr Azadeh Peyman and Dr James Rubin, on the issue of electrosensitivity and health risks from electromagnetic fields. Chancellor Downes concluded that the levels of emissions would be well within international guidelines (and significantly lower than the emissions created by the use of mobile telephones) and that “there was no robust evidence that electromagnetic radiation at the proposed levels would create a risk to health”.

34. As I said in my decision in *Re St Peter and St Paul, Barnham Broom* (11 January 2013), although Chancellor Downes’ decision is not binding upon me,

“I have due regard to the fact that in reaching his decision he had the benefit of hearing the evidence of prominent experts in this field whose evidence was tested in open court. It is unlikely that I would find myself taking a different approach to Chancellor Downes without significant additional evidence being produced.”

35. In the *Barnham Broom* case I also considered the Health Protection Agency report entitled *Health Effects from Radiofrequency*

Electromagnetic Fields which postdated the *Postwick* decision and concluded that:

“it’s conclusion that “[i]n summary, although a substantial amount of research has been conducted in this area, there is no convincing evidence that RF field exposure below guideline levels causes health effects in adults or children” is entirely consistent with the evidence given before Chancellor Downes in *Postwick*.”

Although I have had various fact sheets, mostly from unknown sources, placed before me, no more recent robust scientific evidence had been put before me in this case. I can only reach conclusions on the basis of the evidence before me and, to adopt the words of Chancellor Downes in *Postwick* “[t]he views of others, however genuinely held, which do not take the matter under consideration beyond the realms of anxious possibility only, can never be substituted for evidence and proof which is positive in nature and capable of evaluation”. I must consider whether, on the basis of the evidence before me, it is more likely than not that electromagnetic radiation at the levels to be emitted in this case causes harmful health effects in people, and in particular those who suffer in the same way as Miss Robinson. I am afraid that I must conclude that it is not. In his own letter of 30 July 2014 Dr Robinson acknowledges that “hard proof (of harmful health effects) has not yet been fully established”. I hope that it is of some comfort to Miss Robinson that not only are the levels of radiation caused by the proposed installation at a level well below that recommended by the Health Protection Agency, but it is also my practice to impose conditions on all faculties of this type requiring any advice or safety instructions from the World Health Organisation, the Health Protection Agency or any Government Body or Government Advisory Body as to the emissions limits or the use of such devices to be followed.

36. In concluding that the evidence available does not support the objectors’ contentions as to the harmful health effects of these WiFi masts, I am also bound by the decision of the Court of Arches in *Re Emmanuel Church, Bentley* [2006] Fam 39. In that case the Court of Arches allowed an appeal against the refusal of a faculty for the installation of mobile telephone aerials on the outside and the inside of the church tower. The Respondents in that case had argued that potential health risks were a reason to refuse the faculty. In its decision the Court of Arches reviewed the decision of *Re St. Margaret Hawes and Holy Trinity Knaresborough* [2003] 1 WLR 2568 in which Chancellor Grenfell undertook a comprehensive review of the scientific evidence then available in relation to the health issue. At paragraph 50 the Court of Arches stated:

“We agree with Grenfell Ch that “in the absence of compelling evidence of a real risk to human health as a result of transmitting radiowaves up to the levels set by the United Kingdom

Government in their adoption of the ICNIRP guidelines, it would be wrong to adopt lower guidelines for a base station just because it happens to come under the jurisdiction of the consistory court in addition to planning requirements”.

37. That decision has subsequently been applied by Chancellor Petchey in *Re St Paul, Woldingham* (Southwark Consistory Court, 6 July 2012) who stated:

“In terms of the law, I should follow *In re Emmanuel Church, Bentley* where the Court of Arches held that the ecclesiastical courts should not impose stricter guidelines than those of the Government and local planning authorities.”

Chancellor Petchey’s approach must be correct. It is clear from the evidence before me that in this case the radiation levels from the proposed equipment are well below the levels set in the ICNIRP guidelines which are endorsed in the planning guidelines contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Indeed, the levels are below the levels commonly found when mobile telephones are used. It would be wrong of me to impose stricter guidelines here without good reason.

Practical objections

38. The Robinsons have raised in correspondence the suggestion that there is, in any event, no need for the proposed WiFi mast as BT have confirmed their intention to bring underground fibre-optic high speed broadband provision to Sharrington starting this month. Underground fibre-optic cables produce none of the concerns which have been raised about WiFi broadband provision. Bearing in mind the (albeit more or less easily rebutted) presumption against the granting of a faculty (see paragraph 21 above), if the petitioners cannot show that there is a need for WiFi provision in Sharrington then they will not have discharged the burden of showing that a faculty should be granted in this case.

39. In response to this point the petitioners have argued that there is such a need. Currently, broadband speed in the parish is slow and can be at least as low as 1MB/Sec, far below the superfast broadband speed which is defined as 24+MB/Sec by BT. There are those who reside in Sharrington who work from home, are self-employed, or students or have family members living some distance away. Access to fast broadband services is an increasingly important aspect of modern life. The question remains, however, whether this need has been fulfilled by the imminent arrival of fibre-optic broadband provision in the village.

40. The Programme Director of the BT/Norfolk County Council initiative called Better Broadband for Norfolk (BBfN) attended a public meeting

in Binham in January of this year where she provided an “indicative view” that the upgrades to the service for Sharrington were timetabled for between October 2014 and March 2015. This is consistent with the BT Openreach website’s information that the relevant exchange is to be upgraded within the next six months. Correspondence from BBfN subsequent to the public meeting has provided further details. The pertinent facts are as follow:

- a. There is a small chance that the survey which precedes the upgrade will reveal something unexpected which would cause delay or, in extreme cases, prevent implementation;
- b. The broadband speed provided by the new fibre-optic service will depend upon the distance of each property from the relevant cabinet. This can only be checked once the cabinet is ‘live’; and
- c. Each broadband cabinet “serves homes and businesses in a very localised area such as part of a village or town.” In some villages (although we do not know whether this applies to Sharrington) not all properties are connected to the cabinet which is to be upgraded and as such not every property will always benefit from an upgrade.

41. What this suggests is that there is, at present, a need for improved broadband provision in Sharrington, but that there are a number of unknown factors which may (or may not) mean that that need is met through fibre-optic provision at some point in the future. Given the relative ease with which the proposed equipment can be removed from the church tower (the mast is attached to a free standing mount), and given the fact that any reduction in need will result in a commercial imperative to turn off and remove the mast as a result of falling numbers of subscriptions to the service, I am satisfied that even if the need in Sharrington is short lived (which it may not be), it is still, nevertheless, a real need.

Determination

42. It will be evident from the above that I am satisfied that the petitioners have discharged to burden of showing that, on the balance of probabilities, a faculty should be granted in this case. The faculty will be subject to a number of conditions directed at ensuring long term compliance with national and international guidance about emissions and securing the integrity of the building. As is usual, the petitioners shall bear the costs of this application.

I order that a faculty shall pass the seal on condition that:

1. The electrical works shall be executed by an NICEIC approved/ECA registered contractor;
2. The positioning of the cable routes and equipment must be agreed in writing with the inspecting architect before any works commence;
3. The sheath of the new MICC cables is to be coloured or painted to blend in with the background to which they are fixed;
4. Any wall fixings shall be of stainless steel or brass to prevent future rust spots appearing;
5. Any hole made in the lead shall be carefully sealed to ensure that water does not seep into the church;
6. The new 13A spur for the cabinets should either be connected to the existing distribution board or spurred off an existing socket or fuse spur;
7. All damaged decoration and holes in fabric shall be made good;
8. On completion of the works, test certificates should be issued and the existing circuit charts updated and the works shall be checked by the church architect;
9. The contractors shall be instructed to cease work immediately and notify the architect if any traces of wall painting are discovered;
10. Should there be any advice and/or directions from any Government Body or Government Advisory Body, that the limits of emissions require reduction, that advice and/or directions must be followed;

11. In addition, should the World Health Organisation or the Health Protection Agency issue safety instructions as to the use of such devices, these instructions must be followed as a condition of this faculty;

12. The works shall be executed under the direction of the church architect; and

13. The works shall be completed within 12 months of the issue of the Faculty or within such extended time as may be allowed.

Ruth Arlow
Chancellor

8 October 2014