

ALL SAINTS ROCK PROJECT

QUESTIONS FROM THE CONGREGATION
&
RESPONSES FROM THE ROCK TEAM

AUTUMN 2018 – FAQ 2



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO FAQ 2.....	3
REMINDER OF THE OUTCOME OF THE CONSULTATION IN MARCH 2018.....	3
ROCK ACTIVITY: MARCH – SEPTEMBER 2018.....	4
CHANGES AND REVISIONS TO THE PLANS PRESENTED IN FEBRUARY.....	5
RESPONDING TO THE COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS.....	6
o QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROJECT AS A WHOLE.....	7
o TRANSFORMING THE INTERIOR.....	8
o EXPANDING THE FOOTPRINT.....	14
o RENEWING THE LANDSCAPE.....	18
o OVERALL COSTS INCLUDING PHASING AND TIMING.....	21
o DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT.....	25
MY QUESTION OR COMMENT HAS NOT BEEN ANSWERED!.....	26
ROCK DOCS FROM THE PAST AVAILABLE ON THE ALL SAINTS WEBSITE.....	27
ROCK DOCS FROM THE PAST AVAILABLE BUT NOT ON THE ALL SAINTS WEBSITE.....	28

INTRODUCTION TO FAQ 2

In 2016, we published a booklet called '*Frequently Asked Questions*' about the ROCK Project. It is still available for anyone who would like a copy.¹

In February 2018, we held the fourth consultation since we started talking about what to do with our church buildings for the long-term future. We showed proposed plans and costs. We invited people to make their views known through a consultation and 193 people submitted a response.

Every single word that was emailed or written as a result of the consultation was then made available in a booklet and online. The ROCK Team undertook to respond carefully to all the suggestions, questions and comments made. Our first response has been to consider if we should modify in any way the proposals; that has been done. Our second response has been to provide a carefully written response to those questions, comments – and indeed criticisms. This booklet (FAQ 2) is the fruit of second part of our response.

¹ See last page for full list of ROCK documents available

REMINDER OF THE OUTCOME OF THE CONSULTATION IN MARCH 2018

This is a reminder of the outcome of the responses to the plans and the consultation booklet provided to the church in February 2018. A summary of the responses was published along with all the written comments. These two booklets are available online or can be provided by the Church Office.

The statistical headlines were:

- 193 responses were received. This represents around two-thirds of the membership of the church (bearing in mind that there is no hard-and-fast measure of our membership)
- 167 (88%) responses were positive or very positive as regards the proposed internal transformation of the existing church; 9 (5%) responses were negative or very negative towards the interior changes
- 134 (71%) responses were positive or very positive as regards the proposed extension; 37 (19%) responses were negative or very negative towards the extension
- 143 (75%) responses were positive or very positive as regards the proposed **changes to the external landscape** – 15 (8%) responses were negative or very negative to the external changes

ROCK ACTIVITY MARCH – SEPTEMBER 2018

The following has happened since March 2018:

1. A detailed report summarising the responses to the March consultation was published and made available in April.
2. In April the PCC agreed that the process should move forward by getting everything ready for a formal planning application in the autumn of 2018 and by developing an external fundraising strategy.
3. Since April an immense amount of work has been done involving:
 - a. The ROCK Team
 - b. BHB architects (for the building)
 - c. LT Studio (Landscape Architects)
 - d. Greenwood (Quantity surveyors)
 - e. Nicholas Pearson Partnership (Arboricultural specialists)
 - f. Artemis (Heritage specialists)
 - g. Ethos Environmental Planning (Ecology specialists)
 - h. Chris Dance (Planning Consultant)
4. As a result of the comments made in March by the congregation, further thinking by the ROCK Teams and the reports and input of the specialists listed above, the plans shown in February have been further refined. (See next page).
5. Work on external fundraising has been started: a feasibility report has been completed by two external consultants; four people, including the Bishop of Bath & Wells and the Lord Lieutenant of Somerset have agreed to be patrons of the project; applications and approaches to Trusts and individuals have been made or will be made shortly; a brochure for external grant-givers has been produced.
6. Work has started on finding out more about the heritage contained in the more than 600 memorials and monuments in the church mainly dating from 1750 – 1870.
7. The necessary documentation is being put together with a view to submitting a planning application to B&NES and the Diocese by the end of November. Informal consultations with external stakeholders are also being put in place.
8. This second edition of questions and answers (FAQ 2) has been produced.

● CHANGES AND REVISIONS TO THE PLANS PRESENTED IN FEBRUARY

Below is a list of the changes that have been made to the scheme over the past few months. The revised plans and drawings will be made available by the end of October for all to see.

Transforming the Interior – Changes The revisions to the plan for the interior are very modest:

- New entrance (where the present drinks bar is) omitted
- WC at rear of church omitted
- No changes to the current main entrance doors and porch
- Pulpit to be removed
- One level floor for dais and chancel (not two levels as originally shown)
- The baptistry (if there is to be one) will be located in the dais area not the extension

Enlarging the Footprint – Changes The revisions to the plan for the extension are more significant, especially as regards the internal layout:

- Whilst the overall footprint of the extension has not changed, the internal arrangements have changed:
 - The entrance lobby/foyer area has been increased and made more regular
 - The main entrance doorway has been tweaked

- There is now only one meeting room (although it can be subdivided)
- There is one fewer WC
- The vestry will remain in its present position although it will be largely rebuilt
- The kitchen(ette) is in a new position

- The baptistry in extension is omitted
- The angles of the extension roof have been lowered slightly and mirror the angles of the transept roofs
- The outward form of the extension remains a mix of Bath stone, glass and metal roof but the detail of the design has been amended

Renewing the Landscape – Changes The changes to the external surroundings are the most significant – there has been a major scaling back of the proposals:

- The large gathering area of hard landscaping in front of the new main entrance has been greatly reduced
- There will be no seating or rectangular thin pool of water in the gathering area.
- Only one new pathway is proposed – one that leads directly to the new main entrance roughly from where the disabled parking bays are now; the existing pathway that wheelchair users use and which hugs the side of the building will be grassed over
- The number of trees to be removed has been reduced from around 20 to 10; all the trees to be removed are the lowest category trees. 15 replacement trees

will be planted to compensate for the loss of trees

- The pathways will not be resurfaced in resin-bound coloured materials
- The amount of night-time lighting is greatly reduced
- The number of headstones and monuments which will have to be moved as a result of the extension and other hard surfacing is greatly reduced (from about 85 to 28 headstones and 4 chest or table tombs)
- There will be no wooden 'pavilion' as you enter the churchyard from the car park
- The wall between car park and churchyard will be reduced in height
- Changes around the church centre have been reduced to two elements: (a) creating an all stepped area from Church St down to Church Centre main entrance (rather than the present uneven mix of steps and slope) (b) creating some steps up the short but steep slope from the High St to the Church Centre (by the entrance for cars)

RESPONDING TO THE COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

The rest of this booklet is a series of responses to the questions and comments raised in the consultation.

All of the 28 pages of responses have been read carefully and the key issues picked out. The actual words used by people in the consultation have been quoted with a representative sample

where there were lots of comments in the same area.

There were many expressions of support for the proposals as a whole and for individual elements. However, these supportive comments have not been included in this booklet, so it might appear as if the majority of comments were negative. This was not the case (see earlier section on the outcome of the consultation).

Although many of the comments challenged the ROCK Team's proposals and occasionally the way in which we have gone about our work, the vast majority of comments were '*gracious and seasoned with salt*' (as St Paul put it). We have responded in the same spirit by attempting to give '*a reasoned answer for the vision within us*' as St Peter put it.

Our hope and prayer is that all the members of All Saints will feel that the ROCK Team has done its best to weigh the comments and to respond with answers that make sense – even if some people still find it hard to agree!

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROJECT AS A WHOLE

'I worry that this will become such a time consuming and large commitment that we will miss the more important opportunity to get out into the community and get new people in! Too much emphasis is being placed on the building and not enough on discipleship.'

'Let's be careful not to invest in buildings without also investing in the rest of the church and its mission - people, staff, resources, the community etc. Should we draw up plans for these in the way we have drawn up plans for the building?'

'Over the last 15 years, numbers have dwindled so I don't understand the need for all this, though some work obviously has to be done.'

'This building will not change people's hearts & a campus isn't the way forward ... I've never heard of anyone who came to Jesus because of a building. We are the church, don't waste our time on stuff.'

The vision for transforming our buildings for the kingdom has always been based on three specific areas of work - mission, discipleship and the physical plant. For various reasons and over several years, the plans for the development of the

campus were more advanced than in the areas of mission and discipleship.

In September 2018 Mark Searle has addressed this directly with the launch of the vision to be a '*Church on the Way*'. The vision sets discipleship and mission right at the heart of all we are doing as well as seeking to ensure that we have the right resources in place to support the growing work.

A church on the way makes it clear that we are called to be witnesses to everyone in Weston and beyond. Jesus died once for all. In Weston alone there are about 7,000 people. A church on the way asks us to imagine a church of 750 people based at All Saints.

Living things grow and expand – they do not stay the same size or continue looking as they were today or yesterday. The vision for All Saints over the next decade and beyond is about growth – in all senses of the word. So we must get ready. Transforming our buildings in readiness is one part of that plan. To get there we now need to walk into the vision to be a church on the way, following Jesus and making disciples in the power of the Holy Spirit.

TRANSFORMING THE INTERIOR

'We do not want anything too modern.'

'I feel we will be losing the historic feel of the building and that this will be detrimental.'

We believe strongly that what we are proposing will retain and enhance the historic feel of the church. The pillars, arches, gallery, ceiling, stained glass windows, memorial plaques, stone screen at the far end of the chancel, Remembrance Chapel, Chancel, organ and the South Porch with its doors will remain. The random bits of furniture, the clutter and general bric-a-brac will go (and stay away we hope). Everywhere will be cleaned, repaired (where needed) and repainted. The new lighting will show off the building to its best. There will be a beautiful floor.

It is true that the pews will no longer be there and will be replaced by chairs – that will be the most obvious historical and visual change. But the loss of pews can actually enable the beauty and spaciousness of the building to be more visible. If you are not convinced, why not visit Holy Trinity at Bradford-on-Avon (right by the river in the Centre of town) which has had a major transformation of its interior? Or nearer home, look in on St Swithin's in Walcot St.

PEWS VERSUS CHAIRS

'Will the pews be sold?'

'Where will we store chairs?'

'I love the wonderful solidity of pews and regret plans to move them.'

'Pews are part of our heritage and should be passed on.'

'Chairs will be expensive, messy, untidy and a health and safety risk.'

'Even if most of the pews are going could we retain some to put for example around the walls or in the Remembrance Chapel?'

'Will we be losing capacity by replacing pews with chairs?'

'What about the seating in the balcony?'

'How can we seat 600 WASPS pupils plus the staff that come with them?'

Although most people either want to see the pews replaced with chairs or do not mind, we understand that for a few people, pews are very important and the thought of a church without pews is almost unthinkable. Here are some shorthand responses to the questions above:

- The original All Saints Weston would probably have had no pews – it might have had removable benches and

people might even have brought their own wooden stools.

- The current pews are the third set of pews in All Saints Weston.
- Although pews have been standard in parish churches, they do not appear to have been standard in cathedrals. Can anyone think of a cathedral that has pews in the main body of the church?
- Most pews in churches are of nineteenth century origin. Quite possibly at the time they may have been more comfortable than seating at home – but that is no longer the case. Who would choose to sit on a pew at home or in the office or in school?
- Most church re-orderings opt for flexible and comfortable seating. Bath Abbey is only the latest example of replacing pews with chairs. You may say that this is just the fashion of the day. That may be true but so were pews!
- For most services the configuration of chairs will stay the same but the options are there for a chair-less church or for different patterns of chairs.
- Obviously great care must be taken with the choice of chairs and we would hope to have several samples available for a few months for people to test out!
- We must also be aware of those who need back support or assistance in standing up from a chair (pews are good to lean on).
- The kind of chair we are thinking of is relatively light, but extremely hardwearing and stacks very neatly

into stacks 30-40 high (unlike the church centre chairs or the upholstered chairs in church).

- There is no reason why chairs should be messy or a health and safety risk but good quality chairs will be expensive. We would only want chairs that will still be in good condition and look good after 25 years.
- We would probably go for a natural wood finish rather than a coloured upholstered finish.
- The seating capacity using chairs would be much the same as it is now with the present combination of pews and chairs (except that we shall lose seating space in the north transept, next to the door that leads to the current two WC's). We should be able to seat around 200 in the main part of the nave – much the same as now.
- The pew benches in the balcony will remain.
- We will look again at whether we can retain any pews as 'features'. This has happened at St Swithin's Church Walcot and could be possible here but it might not be a very satisfactory compromise.
- WASPS children nearly all sit on the floor for assembly. It is getting a challenge now squeezing them all into the building along with adults. Having no chairs will help and will also make it easier for them to see.
- The plans presented in February showed a chair store at the rear of church for about 160 chairs. We do

not think we need chair storage for all 300-350 chairs.

- Any pews that are not being retained will be offered for sale.

UNDERFLOOR HEATING

'Won't underfloor heating be expensive to install and run – to what benefit?'

We have visited quite a few churches now that have had similar building projects and they all seem to be going for underfloor heating in both old and new parts of the building. It is expensive to install but having talked to a number of churches, we have been assured that the heating bill for keeping the church warmed throughout the week in the winter is only a little more than firing up the old boilers for Sundays and the occasional mid-week service. The benefit is that the church should always be at a comfortable temperature when people come in. We may need booster radiators for very cold spells. There are church members who know a lot about heating systems so we will want to draw on their experience when deciding on the specifications and systems. A full comparison of the costs and benefits will be done between an underfloor heating system and other systems.

BLINDS FOR BLACKOUT

'I would like to see the ability to blackout the church with blinds or similar. This would give greater control of lighting for concerts and special church uses.'

This is not something we have explored as yet but we can and will do. It is not factored into the present cost estimates.

ACOUSTICS AND AUDIO-VISUAL

'What consideration has been given to the acoustics, bearing in mind the hard surfaces and the lack of soft furnishings?'

'Can we have more information on what upgrades to the audio-visual system means?'

'Can we start to stream services to other parts of the campus or to people in their homes?'

As yet very little work has been done on the specification for a new sound system. However, we are very aware that this is a crucial matter. We will certainly be employing professional acoustic engineers. We know it will be a challenge (as it is now) to get the right system for the different activities – speaking, acting, and playing electric and acoustic instruments. The different numbers in the congregation or audience also makes a difference to the sound

projection. There will of course be an induction-hearing loop; and sound (and vision) will be relayed to rooms in the extension.

Likewise we have not yet looked at whether we are going to retain a large screen and small TV monitors around the church as we do at present. There is increasing sophistication about visual projection and this is yet one more item that we will have to look into carefully.

FUTURE OF SOUTH PORCH

'What is going to happen to the South Porch and Doors?'

The South Porch will remain as an entrance. We have wondered about replacing the main outer doors but think they will probably stay as they are. However, we would like to have them opened every day during the day so to make the church less forbidding.

THE REAR OF THE CHURCH

Can you explain more about the plans for the rear of church? I am not sure if the proposed changes are in or out.

The February plans showed: a new entrance where the present drinks bar is; a new refreshment counter on the opposite side to where it is now; a single accessible WC and a glazed folding screen so that the area under the balcony could become a more or less self-contained room.

As with many things in the plans, some people liked these ideas and others did not. The plans that will be submitted do not now include the additional entrance or a WC. Chair storage and a simple, discreet drinks station will be included. If we can afford it, we would like to keep the folding, glazed screen so as to give the option of a more or less self-contained room. If we are not able to proceed with the extension, the folding screen would be essential as we cannot think of any other places for a crèche or toddler group during the morning service (and other events where children are present). Even so it is not ideal because it will not be a soundproof area due to the open staircase leading to the balcony.

THE ORGAN

'If we removed the old organ, could the footprint expansion be smaller and the costs lower? By how much?'

'Will the renovation of the organ include tuning it so it can be played with other instruments?'

'Why are you maintaining the organ, it's a massive cost for no gain?'

We received a few comments proposing the removal of the organ. Although the organ is currently not used very much on Sundays (although it is still the main instrument for Sanctuary and Tuesday morning), it is often used and preferred on other occasions e.g. weddings and

funerals. Some reasons for keeping and overhauling it are:

- It is, of its kind, a particularly fine instrument (see specialist organ report)
- We think we can probably secure grant funding for its overhaul – money which would not be available for other elements of the project
- It's a matter of judgment as to how many 'items' from the past should be removed; we felt that to get rid of the organ altogether would be unnecessarily damaging or provocative
- Who knows what the pattern of worship will be in 25 years?

Tuning the organ to modern pitch may not be possible without incurring excessive costs. This will have to be explored with the organ specialists as we get nearer commissioning the work.

The organ occupies a space of about 11m². This is about the size of the Vestry, so theoretically we could reduce the size of the extension by about 11m² if we got rid of the organ but we would not necessarily save a lot of money, because making alterations to the empty organ chamber would be expensive.

REMEMBRANCE CHAPEL

'Why are you retaining the Remembrance Chapel?'

The Remembrance Chapel was added after World War 1. The names of those from Weston who were killed in both

World Wars and Korea are engraved there. We have considered various options but have decided that in terms of cost-benefit as well as the upset it would probably cause, the chapel should remain in place. One idea would be to partially or wholly glaze the decorative woodwork as to make it a more private place. This would be costly and we have not added that cost in. At the very least it should stop being a store and general dumping ground, so that it is a more appropriate space for prayer for those who may drop into church or for prayer ministry. A small group of people are working on how we might improve that space in the short term.

THE ROOD SCREEN

'On the plans in the exhibition it looked as if part of the old Rood Screen was going to be put back in the musicians' 'corner'. Is this correct?'

Some eagle eyes spotted on the February plans that there was a partial reinstatement of the Rood (Chancel) screen (now stored in the crypt) going across the south transept. This was an idea considered by the Team and then dropped for various reasons but by oversight it remained on the drawings presented to the church. So, no, the screen or even a bit of it won't be going back!

WELCOME AREA

'Is there a welcome point?'

The main welcome point will be by the new main entrance in the new extension. However those who come into church via the South Porch will also be welcomed. We recognise that this will create some problems with 'manning' these two points but we think these can be overcome.

MEMORIALS & PULPIT

'Please clarify what will happen to memorials and pulpit.'

We are not proposing the removal of any of the memorials (although there are those who find them distinctly off-putting). In fact it would be good if we could afford to repair and clean at least some of them (this is being done to very good effect at St Swithin's by a volunteer). We are thinking about moving some of the smaller tablets in the nave to less visible places in the church.

There are nearly 700 hundred memorials and monuments in the church and in the churchyard. Some of the people buried or commemorated were famous in their day and have stories to tell. Some are already known: Admiral Bayntun who fought with Nelson at Trafalgar; Christiana Penn-Gaskell, great-granddaughter of William Penn, founder of Pennsylvania; Dr. Oliver, famous Bath physician and inventor of Bath Oliver Biscuits; Sir Charles Henry

Frankland, buried alive in the Lisbon earthquake of 1755; James Smithson, founding benefactor of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.

Their stories would be a great interest to a great many people and we are working out how to do more research and then to tell their stories. It may be too that people and organisations with an interest in or with connections to some of those people, may be willing to help fund the repair of memorials and other elements of our ROCK Project.

A specialist in the conservation of monuments has just been added to the team of consultants.

As far as the pulpit is concerned, it has suffered damage to its decorative elements over the years. It not been used for its original purpose of preaching for many years. Its current position is where we would like to put a ramp to make better access to the chancel area. We have looked at the possibility of putting it somewhere else in the church but at the moment we do not see the point of that. It may have to be stored in the crypt. We will need to consult more with the diocesan authorities about this.

MUSICIANS' AREA

'Now that the worship band has moved to the centre of the church, has this been considered in the plans for storage?'

We are working on the assumption that musical instruments and equipment will need to be stored securely, especially if the church is to be open more for more activities and passers-by. The best place for storage seems to be in the south transept (the current area). We may also block up the little side door, as it is not really needed.

EXPANDING THE FOOTPRINT

THE NEED FOR AN EXTENSION OR THE PROPOSED SIZE OF IT

'What uses are there for the extension that couldn't also be accommodated in the main church by moving the seats?'

'I do not see any need for the footprint of the church to be extended. Congregation numbers have been falling for years.'

'Just what are the thoughts around use of new meeting rooms given the other rooms that are available in Church Centre and Weston Hub.'

'The Scout Hall can also provide meeting spaces as it is owned by

All Saints. I am sure the Scouts will not object to money being spent in return for use of space.'

The questions and comments above are typical of the 30+ comments received querying the need for the extension – or one as big as proposed. As a ROCK Team we understand that we have not made the case for the extension as well as we would have hoped.

As with any building project, we started with questions like: *'What does not work at present?'* and *'What do we need now or would like to have?'* and *'Can we anticipate future needs and usages?'* In wrestling with those questions we came up with a list of some things that we would regard as 'essential' and others as 'nice-to-have'. We have pared that list down to more or less what we regard as essential. This list is:

- i. *A new entrance especially on the north side which is easier to access for those with mobility problems and which should become a main entrance; doing that requires some kind of lobby or welcome area.*
- ii. *At least one decent-sized multi-purpose room that can serve as a crèche during services and be used for other events.*
- iii. *A damp-proof vestry which serves as a room not only for preparation before services but which holds the safe, church registers and other essential items and which could be used as a private meeting or*

counselling space interview space e.g. with a couple wanting to be married in church. The present one does not do this.

- iv. *4-5 WC's including baby change and disabled WC.*
- v. *A modest kitchen i.e. less than the one in the Centre but more than the refreshment bar currently at the rear of church.*
- vi. *Facilities for the flower arrangers, storage and plant.*

In our plans, the extension housing these spaces totals 167m². But this includes the floor area of the existing vestry and former choir vestry (where the two existing WC's are) and which need renovation. So actually the total 'new' floor area is 137m², representing one quarter of the total floor area of the church and extension.

A number of you have asked 'But if we do need these facilities, why can we not put them inside the existing church?' This is a question the ROCK Team has asked itself and the architects several times.

This is how we have thought about it: We would not want to put new rooms in the main part of the nave or in the chancel area. That means the only spaces for installing new facilities are the spaces in the gallery and below it, plus the current musicians' store area. We cannot use the north transept – opposite the musicians' side – because we need to keep that free for people to enter church from the fully

accessible new entrance. We do not think it right to use the Remembrance Chapel as a room.

The gallery (above and below) plus musicians area is about 120 m², which is nearly the extent of the new floor area of the extension. However we would need to level the floor in the gallery and install a glazed screen from the front of the gallery to the ceiling. In addition we would need a folding glazed screen underneath the gallery. We might be required to install an additional staircase and/or a lift if we did this because of fire and disability regulations.

It is often assumed that making internal alterations is cheaper than new build; actually this is not the case, especially when it comes to an historic, listed building. Roughly speaking, to make the changes above and below the gallery would cost around £500-600,000. We would still need to overhaul the existing vestry and make improvements to the new main entrance and entrance into the church. By the time you had done all these changes, the cost would be getting very close to the cost of the proposed extension but at the expense of reduced capacity inside the church and with the risk that we had spoiled the overall interior appearance.

Some people, with good reason, have wondered why we need more accommodation when we have the Church Centre and now the Weston Hub.

As with nearly all these good points the ROCK Team has wrestled with them.

If the Church Centre sat right next to the church, we would probably not be thinking of an extension, but the Centre is down a steepish hill. Having lots of toilets in the Centre is not that much use for services and events in church. Even if there were space for the crèche in the Centre during morning service, parents do not want to be 'down the hill'. A vestry is needed in the church.

As for the Hub, similar arguments apply. Also, we do not 'own' the Hub. We are managing it on behalf of the community. A fee is paid to the church for our costs in managing the Hub, but if we rent space in it for church activities, we have to pay rent.

Although the Scout Hall 'belongs' to the Church, it is leased to the Scouts for another 50 years. Discussions were held with the Scouts to see if Enrich could also use the Hall but this did not prove to be practical.

These are some of the reasons why in the end, after many hours of discussion, we have opted for an extension. There is also an element of faith in that we are building for growth and building for the long-term.

DESIGN OF THE EXTENSION

'Building an Extension - this is a great idea and the best design yet.'

'I do not like the look of the plans – could be better design! Not in keeping.'

We think the current extension is a simple and modest single-storey construction placed in the least obtrusive part of the site. It is not attempting to make a grand statement or compete with the existing church, but there are echoes of the church in the design. The external appearance will predominantly be Bath stone and glass – i.e. the same as the church exterior (although new Bath stone will not have the weathered look of the church). Since February some of the details of the exterior have been changed, partly to accommodate the changes we have made to the rooms inside and partly to 'improve' the look.

LOCATION OF THE EXTENSION

'The site of the new entrance is on the north side of the building which is in shadow and consequently a cold area in which to spend any time.'

'Having a new entrance on the NE corner is out of sight of the village and passers-by. It is not a witness.'

There is no doubt that the south, sunnier side of the church is the most attractive

side of the church. Very early on in this process the ROCK Team looked at proposals for expanding on the south side but these were discounted for two main reasons.

Firstly, we knew it would be impossible to persuade the planning authorities that an extension on this side would be acceptable; we know that the planning officers are very, very conservative when it comes to additions to listed buildings and it is going to be hard enough to persuade them to approve an extension on the north east corner of the church.

Secondly, we think a main entrance, which is close to the car park, and disabled parking is better and more feasible than trying to do something on the south side. Although the extension will be more discreet on that side and therefore more acceptable, we do not believe it will be hidden.

We do not believe it will be a cold and gloomy space, nor as someone suggested will it be too hot in summer because of the glass in the building.

CRÈCHE PROVISION

'Is there a provision for a crèche? I think this is a huge difficulty for families to attend church and does not appear in the plans for this project. How is this being addressed?'

It is generally accepted that the present provision for babies (and toddlers) during services is inappropriate and of poor quality. It was a mistake not to make clear in the presentations and booklet that in future the crèche would be located in the extension. It is clear we need a much better quality area for the crèche and possibly an area for toddlers who are not yet old enough to go to the groups in the Centre. Of course at the moment the crèche is only needed for one service on a Sunday morning i.e. 90 minutes per week but it would not make sense to say that the crèche room is only for the crèche. That is why the rooms were described as meeting room spaces. Since February we have removed the smaller of the two rooms but put a folding screen/wall into the larger room and slightly increased the size and shape of the foyer/gathering space.

THE VESTRY

'Vicar in separate room in church? Surely he should be with staff in Centre?'

The room labelled 'office' in the plan meant vestry which is not only a place for the vicar, where service leaders, including visiting speakers, can gather before a service, it is also the place where the safe is kept, the church service registers are kept and money is counted. It could also be used as an interview/counselling room. The latest plan has the vestry office

remaining in its present location but 'rebuilt'.

THE BAPTISTRY

'If there is to be a baptistry, would it be possible to put it in the church?'

'I am not convinced that a baptistry in the new extension would be worthwhile or easy to maintain.'

The ROCK Team always felt that a baptistry (if there is to be one) should be in the church but was advised that this was not possible because of the crypt underneath the floor. However, we now believe that it should be possible to put some kind of baptistry in the chancel or dais area and this will be followed up. More investigation needs to be done on the plumbing practicalities as well as the covering of the baptistry when not in use.

WC'S

'Toilet provision is adequate for current numbers.'

'Are as many as 6 toilets required?'

The British Standards for Toilet Provision in places of entertainment and assembly or restaurants recommend 2 male WC's plus 4 urinals and 6-8 female WC's for a gathering of 150 men and 150 women. On that basis even with 5-6 WC's, we would be under-provided for with WC's (by way of comparison, there are 10 WC's and two urinals in the Centre).

When there are larger gatherings i.e. weddings, funerals or a concert and people have travelled distances, there are often queues for the loos.

RENEWING THE LANDSCAPE

There were far fewer comments about this aspect of the project than the two other areas. However, this is where the greatest change will be seen because the scale of works has been significantly reduced. There will be no new wooden fence between churchyard and car park; the amount of hard paving is greatly reduced; the lighting has been reduced; fewer trees will be removed; fewer monuments will be moved; probably tarmac will be retained for most pathways.

PRESERVING THE ENVIRONMENT

'The churchyard provides a green lung for people and wildlife in the heart of Weston.'

'I am strongly against the cutting down of beautiful mature trees to be replaced by concrete and brick.'

The overall feel of the churchyard will remain pretty much as it is now. The current plans envisage the loss of 10 of the current 58 trees (but 15 new trees will be planted). The largest tree to go will be that of a large cedar which stands within the proposed extension; it is already damaged from storms and branch pruning. Most of the other 9 trees are yew trees

(there are 16 yews in all at present); these Irish yews have not been properly managed over the years they do require pruning and in some cases removal. Any proposals for removal of trees will have to secure planning permission.

Ecological and wildlife studies have been carried out. We know where the bats are! Certain species of wildlife are protected and evidence will have to be produced by us to demonstrate that these species will not be harmed. We will work closely with those in the church and the community who feel strongly about the green environment of the churchyard to come up with a plan that is protective of the natural environment whilst also making it a place that more people can enjoy and appreciate.

EXTENT OF PAVING AND HARD SURFACES

'I am unsure about landscaping becoming paving slabs all the way round the church.'

'I hope the churchyard won't be "sanitised" by straightening the gravestones into regimental rows - their haphazardness provides a charming country churchyard atmosphere.'

Since the February plans were shown we have greatly reduced the extent of hard landscaping. This is partly in response to comments received, including from the

planners and partly to reduce costs. There was some concern that the churchyard will become more like a municipal cemetery i.e. too regimented and groomed. This was never the intention nor the plan.

The plan submitted for planning permission will have only one new pathway and the paved area outside the new main entrance has been greatly reduced.

THE WATER FEATURE

'Having a pond or whatever it was would be a huge maintenance overhead and a parent's nightmare'

It wasn't a pond but a very shallow reflective 'pool'. It is no longer in the plans!

INCREASED TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

'Will you encourage a green approach transport for those using the church and church centre?'

'Am I in the minority who has concerns about our access roads with their parked cars and the slalom journey to reach the car park for those minibuses and large vehicles?'

Some concerns were expressed about the potential increase in the volume of traffic if the church is used more extensively than at present and if numbers increase. Everyone recognises the problem of car access

caused by a moderately sized church car park, the problems of Lynfield Park and limited on-street parking in the close vicinity.

However, if we want to grow numerically and spiritually as a church and to make the church more available, then inevitably that means more people walking, cycling and driving to church. That being the case, we should, as a church, consider what it means to 'love our neighbour' as far as Lynfield Park and our other immediate neighbours are concerned. That will mean encouraging people to walk more to church, to park further afield, to come with friends etc. We will probably publish a (green) travel plan. We might even station someone at the bottom of Lynfield Park to say when the car park is full! The plans do envisage a new entrance into the car park plus 3-4 more spaces, making a total of 34 parking bays plus 3 disabled parking bays next to the Rectory.

ATTRACTING TROUBLE

'I worry the hard standing area at the North side of the church could become a meeting place for youngsters in the evening, unofficial skate park or whatever, thereby affecting the local community.'

'I'm concerned about the outside spaces around the church becoming a place where people gather at night and the consequences of that on the local neighbourhood, e.g. littering, noise, safety etc.'

If we make the church and the campus more attractive and more accessible, then, we would hope more people would enjoy both. That does mean we run a risk that the church and environment becomes damaged or spoiled and the neighbours experience some nuisance or feel unsafe.

We will have to manage that both in terms of lighting and security systems but also in talking to and getting to know any who are loitering with not such good intent. The safest way of avoiding risk is to lock the building most of the time and make the area unpleasant to be in. Who wants that??

DISTURBING GRAVES

'Disturbing gravestones for an extension is rotten and cruel and not a Christian thing to do. How would relatives feel?'

There are no plans to destroy gravestones, ledgers or memorials. However, moving gravestones and monument is not uncommon and has happened before with previous rebuildings of All Saints church. Previous generations at ASW put tarmac over ledger stones. However, 32 stone memorials (out of the 536 stone memorials in the churchyard) will be moved to a different place because of the extension and the paving. We hope (funds permitting) to be able to repair some of the damaged tombstones – both those that are moved and perhaps some of the most important other ones (there are

16 Grade 2 or 2* listed memorials in the churchyard).

The last person to be buried in the churchyard was in the 1860's so there are no immediate family. Nevertheless, we are legally required to try to make contact with any descendants before relocating memorials. It is likely that if any descendants were concerned about the relocation of headstones, they would hopefully be reassured by knowing that those headstones will be retained and probably repaired.

If human remains are discovered during any excavation (which is likely because 15-20,000 bodies have been buried in the churchyard over the centuries), they will be sensitively reburied. It is not unusual to rebury human remains during the course of building works. An archaeologist will be on hand to monitor and record any findings.

STEPS DOWN TO CHURCH CENTRE

'I dislike the idea of steps leading down to Church Centre – the sloping path is better for wheelchairs and buggies.'

Many people are uncomfortable with the steepness of the slope especially in wet or icy conditions. The proposal is to have steps on one side and to retain the slope on the other side. That should make it safe and easier for everyone.

OVERALL COSTS INCLUDING PHASING AND TIMING

'The cost at £3m+ seems excessive, particularly as the church seems to be running at year-by-year loss and only £600k is committed so far.'

'I'm concerned about finance and our ability to meet everyday budget of church and our parish share and our giving to mission.'

These comments neatly sum up the views of a number of comments received. Let's deal with them one by one.

£3M+ is an excessive amount

There is no denying that it is a very large amount. In terms of what is proposed and in comparison with other churches we have visited and studied, our costs are very similar. Making changes to listed, historic buildings is extremely expensive. If we were doing tomorrow what we did to the Church Centre 18 years ago it would cost around £1.7M. Here are some other quick points:

- Nothing substantial has been done to the church or campus for nearly 30 years. There is a backlog of maintenance work on the church irrespective of the ROCK project such as new heating, lighting, AV system, redecoration, insulation in the roof space, safety lines on the roof, overhaul of the organ etc all of which are picked up in the ROCK project.

- We will be making the building good for another 25-30 years (a great gift to the church of tomorrow) and the cost of £3M should more fairly be viewed over a 50-year period and any comparisons with what we spend on mission etc. should be looked at over that period of time.
- In the past 10 years we have spent roughly £4M on maintaining the life of the church (not building). Most of that has been to pay for the cost of our clergy and staff, to support other ministry and clergy costs in the diocese and to support mission outside of the parish.
- We will spend £5M over the next 10 years on our church life – regardless of any ROCK based expenditure.

Our giving to Mission

We have long had a commendable policy of giving 10% of our unrestricted income to agencies and individuals working in this country and abroad in the field of mission and evangelism. That policy is continuing. In 2017, £38,000 was given to external agencies and individuals. This does not include the contribution we make to the funding of clergy in the rest of the Diocese (about £80,000 in 2018). In addition, we have undertaken to contribute up to £20k to pay for the building of a new HQ and Training Centre for Eagles Relief in Malawi and £20k to support the accommodation costs of the Enrich work. We need to multiply these figures by 10 or 20 to make a true comparison between money spent

on building and money spent on mission at home and further afield.

The church seems to be running at year-by-year loss

Fortunately that is not the case in 2018 where we expect to have a modest surplus at the year-end. It is true that in the past 5 years we have had to have a couple of end-of-year appeals to balance the books.

An important piece of information is that the increase in our parish share (what we pay to the Diocese) has gone up much more than our own expenditure (which has actually decreased slightly) in recent years. Our current parish share in 2018 is enough to fund 2.8 full-time clergy in the Diocese plus our share of other central diocesan costs. But we only have one full-time clergy post for the three churches. We are in active and robust discussion with the Diocese about this.

Finally, and as has been said many times, when we undertook the project to completely renovate the Church Centre, the finances of the church were no different. The Church Centre Appeal in 1999 was launched at a time when the church general budget had been 'in the red' for a couple of years. We sorted that out AND people gave to the Church Centre Appeal.

Only £600,000 has been committed to the ROCK Project so far

There are two ways of looking at the above statement. One is to say that

£600K is only 20% of what we need; the other is to say that £600k was a fantastic launchpad for the project, coming on top of the already generous giving by All Saints members. It has enabled us to crack on with the design work and do all that is needed for the time being.

BUDGET BREAKDOWN

'A budget breakdown of the different parts of the project would be useful.'

'Do the architects have an interest in the amount of the development? That is the more is paid - the more they should get in commission?'

There is a very detailed breakdown of estimated costs provided by the appointed Quantity Surveyors. It is 45 pages long but it, or a summary, can be provided to anyone who would like one.

At present, the construction costs are estimated at £2,100,000; and fees, VAT and other elements add a further £790,000. The current headline costs then come out to:

Church Interior:	£1,544,000
Extension:	£1,001,000
External Works:	£344,000
Total	£2,890,000

The total is lower than that given in February because of the reduced landscaping costs but we shall continue to use the figure of £3,000,000. The figures above are estimated prices if we started

building in 2018. Every year that we do not make a start will add around £100,000 to the overall costs because of inflation. There are also a number of unknowns, which may have to be included later.

A project of this scale needs a number of technical advisers or consultants. The Big Four are: architect; quantity surveyor; structural engineer; mechanical and electrical engineer. In addition, a number of other consultants are required for specialist areas such as: planning; heritage; conservation; arboricultural and ecology; archaeology. The fees of the 'Big Four' are usually based on a percentage of the construction cost, so it is true that the bigger the build the bigger the fees. The budget includes a provision for fees of 17.5% of the construction cost. For specialist, one-off work to buildings such as churches, this is a standard allowance.

PHASING

'Phasing this huge project would be my choice.'

'I suspect that donations may not cover all the work and would be in favour of taking one step at a time, proceeding to the next phase when the first phase is funded.'

We can and will only undertake what we have the money for. That is what we have done all along with the ROCK Project. But

none of us knows how much or how little will be committed and given in the future. We are working to secure external funding from various sources. We now have some high profile Patrons who we hope will help us in that work. When that stage is complete and when we have secured planning permission, we will come back to the church for the second stage of our appeal. Only then will we know what we can go forward with. If that means the work has to be phased in stages, that is what we will have to do.

But it is not as simple as saying *'let's do the church first and then do the extension and the external works if we can later on'*. If we do not do the extension, we will have to look seriously at putting in the self-contained room under the balcony. Also, we have to make a better entrance and pathway into the north side of the church and create the entrance into the main body of the church from the choir vestry. Furthermore, the toilets and vestry cannot be left for years and years – they would need to be done as well. But if we have to phase it in line with the funds available and promised, that is what we will do.

If we do not have all the money in the bank to do what we would like to do, it seems only sensible to spread the very large cost over a number of years via a loan, rather than trying to 'save up' and get all the money before starting. Most homeowners borrow money to buy their homes and to improve and extend them.

TO BORROW OR NOT TO BORROW?

'The proposals for funding include a mortgage. What is being proposed as collateral? Are we safeguarding the church for those not yet in it or jeopardising it with the mortgage borrowing?'

'I don't want an enormous debt for the younger members of the church'

That is exactly what we did with the Church Centre Project. Because not all the money had been given upfront, the PCC agreed to taking out a loan of up to £400,000 from the CofE Central Board of Finance (of which we actually drew down £375,000). A loan of £400,000 in 2000 is equivalent to £640,000 in 2017 according to the Bank of England inflation calculator.

Some think it is wrong to take out a loan that will have to be paid off by people who may not yet be in the church. Well that depends on the period of the time we borrow and whether we pay it off more quickly than planned (as was the case with the church centre loan). Also, postponing major works does not relieve a future generation of expenditure; it simply postpones it to another day and a future generation – and it will cost even more then. As pointed out earlier, if you assume inflation of around 3-4%, you can add £30-40,000 onto the costs for every year's delay for every £1,000,000 of expenditure.

We have done some preliminary work on what we could borrow and on what terms, so we are confident that we would be able to raise £1,000,000 in loans if we needed to. But we hope any loan would be lower than that. It is quite likely that the annual interest charges would be less than the higher costs due to inflation if work has to be delayed.

As for collateral, loans that were negotiated through the Diocese would probably not need collateral. Also, we own a house which is currently rented out. Ideally we will keep that rather than sell it to fund the project but it would be security against at least part of the loan.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

'I don't agree with the 'like it or lump it' attitude of the church leaders.'

'The current plans seem to be drawn up by the ROCK team and rubber-stamped. This is a very concerning change in the terms of engagement with the church membership. The congregation should be making the decision not the ROCK team/PCC.'

'There is a need for the membership to approve by a formal vote, with a specified turnout & majority requirement, for the project to proceed, as opposed to the PCC acting merely on feedback from consultations.'

Clearly a small number of church members are unhappy with the process of developing the project and who makes the final decision as to what exactly goes ahead. But it is hard to see how this 5/6 year process could fairly be described as a 'like-it-or-lump-it' process. There have been four formal consultations. On each occasion the results have been fully reported back to the church and the contributions made in writing and in meetings have been fed back into the work that has gone on. A lot has changed

as a result of those consultations. That process continues.

It is quite true that the go-ahead for the Church Centre Project was only taken after two formal votes of the church membership with a minimum turnout and majority required for approval. However, it has never been agreed or stated that the ROCK project would be put to a formal vote. This is for a number of reasons.

Apart from the fact that the PCC is in law the only body that can make the decision, even if it agreed to a binding vote by 'the members', there are problems over the nature of the questions to be raised. Would it be a single question i.e. 'Are you in favour of the ROCK project going ahead?' or would it be a three headed-question relating to each of the three elements? Would we ask detailed questions about whether or not to borrow or about phasing or about pews or chairs?

Then there is the question of who gets to vote-

- Everyone on the Electoral Roll? (some of whom have moved away or no longer come);
- Those who have identified themselves as Members but are not on the Electoral Roll?
- Only those who are able or willing to support the project financially?

The ROCK Project is a complex project with very many different strands requiring a lot of detailed consideration. The PCC is

made up of around 20 people who are there to make key decisions about the future life of the church. Each member of the PCC has had and will continue to have the fullest information about the ROCK Project and that includes having a detailed understanding of the views of the congregation as a whole. The PCC is proceeding step-by-step to advance the project but doing so cautiously and prudently and informed by what the congregation has said over the years.

MY QUESTION OR COMMENT HAS NOT BEEN ANSWERED!

We have done our best to respond to all the key points raised in the comments but apologies if you feel that your question or comments have not been answered in this FAQ 2 booklet. We did our best! Please do submit it again. The same goes for if something else has occurred to you or if you want to follow up anything in this booklet. In all those cases, please speak directly to any member of the ROCK Team or email Tom Peryer at tom.peryer@edpro.co.uk with your question and comment.

THANK YOU, ALL SAINTS FOR YOUR PATIENCE, COMMITMENT, AND GENEROSITY OF SPIRIT

ROCK DOCS FROM THE PAST AVAILABLE ON THE ALL SAINTS WEBSITE

The docs listed below are previous booklets and documents which are available on the All Saints website. There are many other documents and reports held by the ROCK Team which are not on the web. Some of those documents are listed on the next page and can be emailed or given to anyone who would like them.

2013 A Vision for Reimagining Our Buildings: The first ROCK booklet setting out basic ideas and principles about a redevelopment of the buildings; includes results of the first consultation with the church

2015 All Saints Church & Campus – Exploring the Way Ahead: A ROCK booklet making some specific and general proposals for the future development of the church building and campus as well as the first cost estimates £3-4,000,000; includes the results of a second consultation based on the exhibition in church

2016 A Vision for 2020: A ROCK booklet putting forward concrete proposals for transforming the interior of the present church, extending the footprint and renewing the landscape

ROCK Report to PCC March 2016: A ROCK report summarising the results of the third consultation with the church based on the Vision 2020 proposals

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ 1)

A ROCK Booklet containing 62 Frequently Asked Questions and ROCK Responses

2018 The Shape of Things To Come: A ROCK booklet showing detailed drawings for consultation

Powerpoint Presentation to the Church – February: As above with more detail and illustrations

Summary of Responses to the Plans and Proposals + Complete Written Responses – March : Two ROCK booklets containing (a) the results of the fourth consultation in numbers and (b) all written comments received from the 193 respondents

ROCK Report to PCC and Letter from Rector and Churchwardens – April: The ROCK report which went to the PCC as a result and the letter sent out by Rector and Churchwardens to the Church following the PCC decision to keep going with the project

Responses to the Questions and Comments (FAQ 2) – October: A ROCK booklet (FAQ 2) responding to the key questions and comments voiced by church members during the March 2018 consultation (ie this one!)

Drawings and Plans October 2018

The latest set of drawings and plans and ones which will be used as part of the planning application to do to Bath & North East Somerset Council and the Diocese of Bath & Wells (Available by end of October)

ROCK DOCS FROM THE PAST AVAILABLE BUT NOT ON THE ALL SAINTS WEBSITE

These are some of the additional documents held by the ROCK Team

1. **Drawings & Plans:** Copies of the various versions of the plans that have been produced over the past three years by the architects and landscape architects
2. **Cost Estimates:** Various cost estimates of the proposals produced by Geoff Evans (Deputy Churchwarden and QS) and the external QS consultants
3. **Specialist Reports:** Covering church organ; archaeology, ecology and trees
4. **Preliminary Responses from Planners & Diocese:** Initial responses from the B&NES Conservation Officers and the Diocese in response to initial ideas presented in 2016 and 2018
5. **Various ROCK Reports to PCC and PCC decisions**
6. **Historical Documents relating to the Church**
 - (a) 'A Guide to All Saints Church' by Joan Hargood-Ash in 1947
 - (b) 'The story of the rebuilding of All Saints Church in 1832' by Michael Messer
 - (c) 'A Time To Build' An account of the last major extension of the church in 1892 as recorded month by month in the All Saints Parish Magazines
 - (d) **Statement of Significance** A detailed report with photographs produced by external consultations describing all the heritage features of the church and the churchyard
 - (e) A listing of all the memorials in the church and in the churchyard (includes all the inscriptions from the churchyard memorials)

