



ROCK CONSULTATION MARCH 2018 – THE COMPLETE SET OF WRITTEN RESPONSES

This document contains the complete set of written answers provided by all 193 respondents, both those handwritten on forms and those typed onto the website. They have been roughly grouped into themes. Sometimes this has meant that a complete contribution by one person has been split up into different sections. In no cases has anything been edited out or cut (unless by an unintended oversight due to all the cutting, copying and pasting that has gone into the making of this document)

A: COMMENTS ABOUT THE SCHEME IN GENERAL

1. Ticking the above boxes doesn't represent my views because I have mixed feelings about the extension and the landscape -

some aspects are great, some I have concerns about. Firstly I want to acknowledge all the vision, hard work and prayer that has gone in to getting us this far with the ROCK project – thank you all. I recognise that our church building needs to evolve to meet the changing needs of the church family, and of the community we serve. And I also recognise that change, whilst unsettling, is vital to life lived in fullness. So before responding I have wrestled with and prayed about this project, knowing from experience that we have benefited from reordering and building projects in the past. Some of the things that I appreciate about the proposal are:

- An inclusive entrance that everyone

can use • New, up-to-date technology • Transforming the interior of the church – levelling the floor space and removing the pews • Well-lit, well maintained paths through the churchyard • Rethinking access to the parking area • More toilets • Replacing the existing vestry • Consideration for the crèche and youngest children

However I also have concerns and questions following the recent ROC presentation:

1. The churchyard provides a green lung for people and wildlife in the heart of Weston. There are owls living and breeding there as well as a myriad of smaller birds and animals. The sense of space and tranquillity it engenders is something I treasure and one of the main reasons why I have lived where I do for so long. The view of trees and the

peacefulness are an important part of my enjoyment and use of my home, including as a space where I offer formal and informal spiritual direction. I recognize this is a minority view but it matters to me and gives rise to a struggle in terms of my commitment to a project which significantly changes my immediate environment.

2. The size and appearance of the extension makes me question whether it needs to be so big. I know that you have considered this long and hard, but I still wonder whether we can't make better use of the large existing space in the church itself and reduce the footprint of the extension.
3. Parking - Residents, myself included, have to rely on on-street parking. The houses in this part of Lynfield Park don't have driveways or even roadway

outside the house. With an increase in activities in the church building as well as at the church centre, how can we provide sufficient parking? Have you considered using some of the back of the rectory garden to provide additional parking? Can we encourage people to think green (like the National Trust does at Prior Park) and to walk or cycle or use the bus where possible? 4. And so to the question of the money. £3 Million is an unimaginable sum to me, but I know our Father is able. I am unsure though about the idea of us taking on such a large sum at a time when we have a history of not raising enough to cover our on-going costs without an annual request for additional giving. If this were my personal finances I would want to sort out the on-going situation first before

committing to a large investment. 5. General comments: a. The new entrance is so important for inclusive access but it doesn't enable people to see into the church, an important factor in feeling comfortable about entering an unfamiliar space. This was one of the reasons for putting glass panels into the current main door into church. b. It seems a shame not to be able to have the baptistery in the main body of the church, although I understand the practical reasons for this. It has been so moving and faith-affirming over the years to witness baptisms together with the whole church family. My preference, and speaking from personal experience, is to use the birthing pool at the front of church – this is in itself a great metaphor! And I understand that not

putting the baptistery in would save around £50k plus on-going maintenance costs. c. The initial drawings show a large area of hard paving replacing green space. This gathering space is on the north-facing side of a large building – people are more typically drawn to gather on the south side of buildings where there is maximum light and warmth. d. In time, it would be good to make plans to sell/re-use the pews. Experience at other churches indicates that the church family and the local community will be interested and it could help to raise money for the project.

2. I think it's unnecessary.
3. We have been working towards this since at least 2013 with Patrick and two Curates following a long "Listening Process" from which we eventually mapped out a way

forward to meet the needs of the community. The Rock project was one of three strands of which we have perhaps forgotten two. The ROCK vision is set out in the many documents but Patrick wanted the Church to be Open during the week and not a fortress. It will need to be supervised. Our Curate Simon told us graphically of the effect of poor disabled access on the frustration experienced by Church users and this is addressed throughout the three elements of the project. Our sudden baby boom exposed our poor facilities for people bringing babies and toddlers to Church services. This is the biggest driver for the extension in which the Crèche is located. Our Mission is to look outwards and bring people to Jesus. In the past five years our membership has fallen significantly. This

means we need to do more to make our witness effective. We prayed for a new Rector and God led us to Mark and his family. We believe this and so if we trust God we should not doubt. The Vision for the Church re-imagining is not Mark's but ours under God's leading and with the expertise in the congregation and outside and with consultation along the way. It must have been a real challenge to faith when Moses stood on the edge of the Red Sea and the River Jordan.

4. Overall: the 3 aspects of the original vision - available, accessible, flexible - do not appear to have been fully addressed in the proposals. To me, available and accessible means the church is open and welcoming to casual visitors and passers-by. But if the building is “manned” by a couple of people

tucked away in the proposed extension, how do people from the village or passing on the Cotswold Way feel welcomed if they don't see anyone when they come in via the south door? Also how is security maintained if staff are tucked away at the back of the building? But above all, it has not been communicated how we see the outward looking mission of the church being developed by any of these proposals.

5. Presentation has addressed proposed layout but not necessarily the reasoning of how the new layout will improve mission in the parish. What new services/facilities are key to the plan?
6. Huge commitment, I do hope that it will bring people together and not drive them apart.

7. 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. Am more concerned with seeing a packed-out Tuesday prayer meeting.
8. A few weeks ago the vicar said the church has diminished over the decades. I know we have faith in our convictions, but the evidence of revival are scant. This building will not change people's hearts & a campus isn't the way forward. Materially, we have so much as a church & have done much with it, but 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.
9. Well done! See what the Planners make of it? Let's all pray for wisdom at this important moment and for the people God has already started to speak to in the community.
10. Thanks to everyone who has input precious time into this project.
11. The finance is scary, but God has never failed us yet! A lot of prayer has gone into getting us to where we are. If we keep praying and making sure we are listening to God, I am confident that He will not let us down.
12. I think this is a really good project, I have some reservations about some parts but generally good
13. I would like to support the ROCK project, personally and financially, but for a number of reasons I am struggling to get fully behind it. I'd therefore like to share some ideas with you which would help me (and

perhaps others) to feel more able to catch the vision and engage with the project. 1. People come to church for many reasons – to worship, to learn, for fellowship, to meet with God in community, for celebrations and to mark life events. But they also come to seek solace, to mourn, to wrestle with issues, to find peace, to reflect. I would love to see an area of the church dedicated to providing invitation and hospitality to those who need space for this aspect of faith and life. Can we include glassing in the remembrance chapel, just to the height of the wooden screen, to make an appropriate space available for quiet and private contemplation? 2. I'd love to see a Christian labyrinth either inside or outside the church. This is an ancient way of representing our faith journey. There's an

ancient one inside Chartres Cathedral for example which is often covered with chairs but regularly revealed and used. They have an open-air labyrinth too. Labyrinths are also often available in cathedrals, for example Wakefield and Guildford, as well as in retreat centres like Ammerdown, Sheldon, St Beuno's, and many others. Walking the labyrinth is a wonderful tool for experiencing different ways of contemplative worship, and can be used very successfully with people of all ages and abilities. It's an inclusive approach to exploring and expressing our relationship with God. (I have lots of information on this topic if you would like to know more. 3. Can we dedicate an area of the churchyard as a 'wild space', not perfectly ordered and organised but allowing more free rein for

wild plants to thrive, and for wildlife to share the area with us. The strip of land to the Northeast side of the path between Lynfield Park and Church Road could be a good space to dedicate for this. 4. Can you involve the residents around the churchyard in the plans for landscaping? I would like to understand which trees will be removed, what trees will replace them and where they will be sited. This could make a big difference to retaining the sense of greenness and tranquillity. Thank you for taking the time to read this – it hasn't been easy to write so honestly and I hope it is useful. I'd be happy to discuss my ideas and concerns in more detail. And if there is to be a working party looking at the landscape, I'd very much like to be involved.

14. 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? This is a huge project, it is worth putting in time and effort ensuring we get the details right when it comes to things like lighting, audio/visuals, the new landscape - involving a good cross-section of the church as we do so. We can save ourselves time and money in the future by making the right choices now.
15. I find myself concerned by the Rock project, its purpose and how it is proposed to fit in with the current development of All Saints Weston. Having attended the church only since August 2016, I appreciate that my

discomfort may stem from lack of continuous interaction with this project, but I do feel strongly enough to raise my worries. Undoubtedly, a lot of effort, time and sacrifice have already gone into the Rock project and the initial monetary commitments to date are also humbling. So the current stage and the feedback request feel like a pivotal decision point for all concerns to be aired. So it is with deep gratitude and respect to the project team and all involved I feel compelled to raise mine. I hear it mentioned that Rock is not a vanity project. It is also not simply a modernization, so as to pass on the church to future generation in the best possible state. It's been said the project team deliberations have judged the current church and ancillary buildings "not fit for

purpose", roughly being the growth of Christian family, congregation and discipleship in Weston/Bath. I take this in combination with the sermons preceding the latest Rock project presentation, where Mark Searle said that the current evangelical efforts are not working and must change from the comfy, settled, slow decline. Mark may well be right, although I found that particular talk counterproductive. This was particularly because I've heard so very little about what the actual renewal plan is, away from the Rock project – which is meant to merely enable the bigger picture. What is to replace the comfy slow decline and shake things up to such an extent that the congregation grows to 800 or 1000? I agree we should be ambitious and Christ will

indeed overflow and break our fishing nets, but prudence and good stewardship of resources are also key. So what is it that we are planning to do that is currently impossible, perhaps with a decent modernization program? I have heard a banquet being mentioned, I've been invited to imagine the possibilities of using flexible space unbound by pews. Apologies if I have missed a talk or a presentation, having rooted through past materials on the Rock project website. Logically I would expect that there would be an ambitious but no less concrete plan of how to grow the congregation from the current numbers to double or triple. This plan would contain a number of initiatives that would, with prayer and the help of God, bring in newcomers to witness church family

activities in a way that would convince folks to return, hear the message, wrestle with the Gospel and lovingly submit to Christ. A banquet may be one such initiative. Yet in the absence of concrete others, I am asking myself what is it the church buildings are so unfit to support? A banquet could well be hosted in the church centre and I see a smaller audience room in the plans for the enlargement of the church building, yet the church centre is already home to many such smaller rooms and flexible spaces. My unease is not centrally with the budget, although £3m is a vast sum of money and the opportunity cost of alternative uses is hard to overestimate. Neither am I a traditionalist defender of pews at all cost. I have seen a number of renewal projects in other churches, including as PCC Treasurer.

Some were so cramped that they simply had to have flexible spaces and so modernisation investment was effective, some failed to plan for what to actually do with the space once they got it and growth remains elusive. Yet other churches having grown strongly first, found their rented or temporary premises creaking and so the investment was a straightforward decision, funded with ease (especially in retrospect) and broad support. The new space then is important in the mix, but humbly pales into the background when the vibrant growth of the church is so front-and-centre that it becomes infectious. If I've simply missed such concrete plans and the Rock stems from these, then I'd be very eager to learn more and get involved. If these don't exist,

I am sure vanity is not the underlying driver for the project, but nor is prudence.

16. I really appreciate the work being done by the ROCK team. I do think that we are being led step-by-step towards a rebuilding project. I think that the lack of financial support from Our Almighty Father shows that we have not yet perfectly understood.
17. Exciting times ahead for everyone. Go for it!
18. The lack of responses suggests the Project needs a fundamental re-think. Was any survey carried out into the reaction to the original proposals, even if they were beyond the Church's means?
19. An exciting project! Very grateful to all the time, effort and expertise contributed by so many to get to this point.

20. Appreciate all the hard work put in by the ROCK team over the past few years. It must be an impossible task to address everyone's hopes and fears.
21. Thank you to everyone who has worked so hard on this project
22. It does seem very expensive! But I think the suggestions are basically good and I would be supportive.
23. it would have been useful to see the ideas for remodelling the church and to have been able to explore them before these were dismissed as unworkable.
24. 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 and that's something for every Church family member not just Mark. So it feels like we will overinvest in buildings and underinvest in people! Whatever goes ahead must have a parallel workstream to do both things together. For Proposal 1 and 3 - I can buy into that - its modernising and bring things up to date and disability / H&S compliant. The 2nd one isn't. The amount of funding worries me and should be reduced considerably. At a time when peoples future economic prosperity is not understood, the giving environment is hardening - particularly in Bath and the Church's main day to day finance is precarious there are too many risks. I think we should delay progressing the 2nd aspect for 3 years but continue with the others.

25. The church is the people not the building. We do not need an extension. We should not be ripping out perfectly good pews and spending thousands on chairs, all we need are some cushions. We have a beautiful, historic building that has been neglected over the last five years while we have been talking about rock, the money spent on architects could have been better spent on paint, a new heating system and repairs. I am very committed to prayer, giving and fund raising. But I strongly believe we do not need a flashy extension to grow as a church family and witness to our community in Weston. Our time, energy and resources could be better spent in a church plant in the school. Why are we wasting so much time and energy in a building? Let's fix what needs fixing and get

on with what really matters, mission here in Weston and in the world. Once the church is bursting at the seams and we have lots of new young people, then maybe then we can think about extensions!

26. I am deeply grateful to the team who have spent so many hours getting us to this stage.
27. I really appreciate all of the time and effort that the ROCK team have put in to this over the years. It must be a huge commitment and I'm really grateful for you all. Please hear my mixed feelings about the current proposals. While I think that we would all agree that it is vital that the interior of the building is done, I have huge reservations about an extension. Lighting, heating accessibility, audio/visual, toilets, painting etc all need doing and sooner rather than

later. But I am unsure why we need the extension. Tom said during the service that many people will have had extensions on their homes. This is true but is usually as a result of them outgrowing the space – something that we are not doing at All Saints. Also, we have the All Saints Centre and now The Weston Hub and once the inside of the church is done and pews are removed, we will have that space as well. Why do we need an extension? A few things were said at the service, which I would like to pick up on. First, the quote about the Church existing for its non-members. While I'd love this to be true, I don't think it is and I think that spending all this money on 'ourselves' sends that message out. In all honesty, it will probably just confirm to people outside of the

church what many of them already think – that we are more concerned about ourselves than those outside of the church. And maybe we are – however we 'sell' it. While this would make our church building look very grand, I feel it's very unlikely that the extension would do anything to grow the Kingdom. Also, the Great Commission was mentioned and the word 'Go'. I'm afraid that these grand plans talk more about trying to get people to 'come' to us. Times have changed since John Bond's days. 'Come to us' is a bit dated and we should probably be looking at Fresh Expressions outside of the church and investing financially there. It may be hundreds of years since anything major has been done in the church but I think that our part in the evolutionary story of All Saints

Weston should be the work on the interior. That in itself would be a great legacy of our generation. So point A – ‘Transforming the interior’ is VERY important’ Point B – ‘Expanding the footprint’ is not necessary I feel and we would not be good stewards of money if we were to do it – at least at this stage. Maybe if we do outgrow the building in the future, it could be revisited. This could be a ‘Phase 2’. Point C – Renewing the landscape is a really good idea. At the moment, the surrounding area is dark and full of gravestones and says ‘Death’! To have benches and nice plants and some paving stones with scripture in them maybe would be more likely to draw people to the church than the extension. It could be a real place of refuge, peace and tranquillity. My guess is that the interior work will come

to around £1 million and that the landscaping will not come to that figure. This means that the extension will be over £1 million. I don’t think it’s worth it. I don’t even think it’s that imaginative a space but I would feel very uneasy about having it. I just hope that with all the energy you’ve all put in to it that the breaks are able to be applied and that there isn’t already too much momentum that it has to continue regardless. Finally, Mark said “If God ordered it, He will pay for it”. I agree. But I hope we don’t end up paying for something that He didn’t order. I’m sorry this is so long and if this comes across as negative but I think that Mark has come here and talked about going out a lot and if that’s the case, maybe money should be spent elsewhere in the community rather than

increasing the footprint of our building. It will also take up so much of our energy and resources that any outreach will probably suffer. Thank you again for all you are putting in to this and I pray that God will give you real wisdom with regards to the way forward – whether that's with the thoughts I've put forward or not!

28. When discussing the project, please don't assume this is God's Will and the congregation need to get with the programme! Before stepping out in faith, we need to make sure this is God's will. Is it the best use of money?
29. Whilst positive overall, I do have some reservations
30. It is clear that we need to transform the interior of the church and have done for some years now. The landscape also clearly

needs transforming into a more welcoming and making more friendly and accessible for people with disabilities. However I am yet to be convinced on the need for type of extension being proposed. The needs I see are for a suitable crèche, better toilets. In the current plans there seems to be a lot of corridor/foyer space which I'm not sure is necessary, a meeting room which I don't think is necessary considering we have the Church Centre and now the Hub and we will be transforming the church interior for more space as it is. Don't quite see the need for an extra entrance at the back right of the church near the current kitchen area; it will mean we have a total of 7 entrances to the church! However, I do love the idea of a baptismal pool but think it may be

better placed in the main part of the church where a whole congregation can gather.

31. I am committed to ASW regardless of the ROCK proposals and will continue to support the church whatever the outcome. I believe our mission will carry on despite, not because of, any changes we make, however sensitivity and wisdom will be needed to avoid disunity and upset which is such an unhelpful witness.
32. Can't wait!
33. This will certainly enable the buildings properly to support the church's mission
34. I support the plans to improve lighting and have a common access and maintain the inside of the church. I don't understand the need to have an additional door where the refreshments area is now especially when the new door will be on the same side; it

seems a shame to amend the existing building and get rid of the window unless this is really necessary. I'm undecided about the need for an additional meeting room. Thank you for all the work on these proposals

35. I liked the initial very bold proposals. However clearly they turned out to be too expensive. While I think that the interior of the church, including heating and, as I recall electrics, clearly need attention, and I think removing the pews, replacing them with comfortable seats is a good idea, in the context of a lack of funds, I am unconvinced, of a need to build an extension. As far as the "landscape" is concerned. the connecting pathways do need attention, but I cannot see benefit in

the other items (Car Park Churchyard and Paved entrance).

36. I do not feel the questions [*in the consultation*] are helpful in enabling me to express my thoughts. It is correct that repair work and improvements are needed inside the church but we are being asked to consider only one version of how this may be achieved. How are we to express the view that the current proposals do not assist in making the church a more usable space, more accessible to the community and at a manageable cost? The side overlooking the village, with the most natural light and view is being neglected as a result of the focus on the one plan, which creates a whole new entrance. That proposed new entrance does not make use of the best features of either the interior or

exterior of the church. We have been repeatedly told this location is chosen because there is no other alternative-but is that a good enough reason to decide to proceed? Some extension to the toilets/crèche may be needed but a large room is a luxury we cannot afford and the foyer will be too restrictive in size as a welcome/refreshments area.

37. My concern is that the Rock Project is primarily about buildings. Although it claims that the material investments are only one sphere of the Rock project, the plans include no spending on the other spheres. Yet, it feels as if it is in the other spheres that God's heart might be. And we put our treasures where our heart is. Strong arguments have been made for the need for the renewal of the interior. But to

spend so much more to increase the footprint seems to demand a stronger foundation and commitment to the other spheres and a clear connection to the kingdom. So maybe the footprint should be increased but only if we can also financially commit more to the rest of the Rock vision. Buildings seem to easily become our gods and all our hopes.

38. I assume the proposed changes are linked to a specific need that has been identified in the consultation work. Would it be possible to see how these link as it is not clear how all the proposed changes meet the objective of 'Consider how to ensure all our buildings help us in our goal of engaging with the contemporary world and encouraging worship, mission, community and closeness to God in them' 3) There are many other factors that should be

addressed to enable us to 'move out and others to move in'. I appreciate that this project is focussed on the building but there needs to be some connectivity to ensure that the changes in the building support the changes that could be made which cost a lot less (such as a better crèche and better children provision, service times, welcoming attitude). 4) How specifically does this layout support addressing the needs of the community and bringing them into the church? What are the proposed uses of the extra rooms, why do these need to be attached to the church as opposed to be in the church centre?

39. What are the "barriers" the current layout creates to church attendance, have views been canvassed from non-church members? How does the new layout

remove these barriers? What new activities and services would be supported; What is the envisioned service structure of the church. How will crèche facilities be improved, what can be done to tackle the segregation (especially when there might be only one parent in there)? How will other segregation issues be addressed (children's work etc.), What sustainability/efficiency elements are considered in the design (biomass, micro generation).

40. B: DISABILITY ISSUES

- 41. *I have a Hearing problem*– I like the inductive loop system
- 42. Being partially sighted, I find the plans impossible to read and look forward to

seeing the screens using white on black for all services. The large print hymn books are too heavy to hold with a magnifying glass.

- 43. I found writing on the booklet impossible to read even with a magnifying glass
- 44. Ease of access more important as I reach my late eighties.
- 45. The Interior is already accessible to wheelchairs
- 46. I have significant mobility problems that would require accessibility to all areas of the church (apart from the balcony!) to enable me to take part fully in the life of the church. Might it be helpful to consult people like myself to see what changes should be made?
- 47. I have mobility issues that can make the walk up to church hard on occasion.

48. I would like to increase disabled parking and bring cars as near as possible to the new entrance as the ageing population will increase greatly in coming years.
49. We desperately need to do something to improve the access for people with mobility problems. The current "disabled access" is grim and barely compliant with the law.
50. I think it is completely right to be changing the interior to ensure it is more accessible.
51. Need ramps at entrance and up steps to chancel
52. I hope that it will still be possible for blue badge holders to park near the Church as now
53. Has disability been considered not just physical access, but acoustics and lighting for people with sensory issues?
54. I was surprised to see that there was a question of re-instating the rood screen! We went through a lot of pain 30 years ago in order to remove it and so open up the chancel end of the church. This would seem to be a retrograde step.
- 55. C: TRANSFORMING THE INTERIOR**
56. I feel losing the historic feel of buildings is detrimental to future generations
57. I haven't been able to have a good look at the plans but making everything more user friendly is great as long as you don't destroy the beautiful look and feel of the church and surrounding graveyards. You don't want anything too modern or not in keeping with Bath. Replaced pews would be nice but I would hate the thought of the

church I got married in 1.5 yrs ago to disappear.

58. We have spent 36 happy years being part of All Saints Church and seen many changes during that time. We do realise that the Church Building needs to be done to make it more comfortable for today's house of Worship. It is looking rather tired in comparison to many other churches in the country!!!!

a. Comments on lighting, heating, sound, decoration

59. Heating, lighting and sound upgrades are essential if we are to make newcomers welcome. Similarly pew removal.
60. We fully support the intention of re-decorating, new heating, lighting, sound replacement and removal of

pews. Lighting: LEDs need to be dimmable stage lights rather than cheap spotlights

61. *We* really need an updated interior and rest can only help
62. I agree with repainting, under-floor heating, general refurbishment and better accessibility.
63. Redecoration is needed; painting, lighting and a new boiler, but not under floor heating which is very expensive.
64. The lighting, ramp access and acoustics are good proposed changes.
65. *We are in* desperate need of new seating, lightning, sound system, etc. This looks really good.
66. Yes to better lighting.
67. Have solar panels on lower roof (out of sight) for energy conservation.

68. Get the greenest, most efficient boiler possible.
69. I think the need for transforming the interior is overwhelming, for seating, access, audio/visual and lighting reasons among others
70. I love the idea of improving the lights and audio-visual system.
71. The sound system has served us quite well for decades but has never really delivered decent quality in every pew. The sound waves from the four speakers sort of cancel each other out in some areas and it is dead in the front pews. I support the view that the controls are in the balcony where the operators can see what is going on at the front and sides. It would be great if a new sound system was better and more controllable and versatile maybe.
72. I would like to see the ability to blackout the church in future - with blinds or similar - which would greatly assist in viewing screens, and give greater control of lighting for concerts and special church uses.
73. The interior is in need of updating with money required for decorating, new lighting and an improvement in the efficiency of the boiler. This is as a result of a lack of expenditure over the past 20 years. A new boiler is required – under floor heating will be costly – to what benefit? A long time to pay this money back! Should only be considered for new builds.
74. Include: hearing loop; Wi-Fi; security alarms / cameras; phone line(s) It is important to get the acoustics right. The centre's hall was designed to have soft

furnishings (i.e. curtains) to counteract sounds being reflected off all of the hard surfaces. It was later decided that curtains aren't appropriate in that setting and as a result the room is incredibly noisy and those with hearing difficulties find the space difficult to spend any time in. Sound absorbing solutions are expensive (& sometimes unsightly) to fit retrospectively.

75. QUESTION: What consideration has been given to the acoustics given all of the hard surfaces and the lack of any soft furnishings?
76. Would want more detail on what upgrades to AV in the Church means.
77. It would be really useful if, during the AV refurb, we could arrange for the service to be streamed to other parts of the church campus (and also for people who cannot

make it to church). I was at another church a month or so ago. Rather than have multiple tiny TVs all over the church, they had three projector screens (one for each section of the church). It might be nice to have a service mobile number, so that in some services, you could text in questions. Some of these could be addressed at the end of the sermon, with all online as an addendum to the service recording. Thought this might be of interest: <https://www.pro-teqsurfacing.co>

a. **Comments on pews versus chairs**

78. I love the wonderful solidity of the pews and regret plans to remove them. Now we have the Hub, perhaps we don't need to remove them as can have concerts there
79. I am against the removal of pews, as they are part of heritage and should be passed

on to future generations, like the memorial plaques. Chairs will be expensive, messy, untidy and a health and safety risk on handling. Am against removal of pews as safe, easy to clean and no moving required, and give more seating. Removal of pews yes.

80. I am glad we are getting rid of the pews.

81. I disagree with removal of pews - would like to retain these but make more comfortable with proper seat cushions.

82. Whilst the interior needs updating to increase the comfort of the congregation, I would prefer it if the pews were reinstated once a raised floor has been created.

83. I am pleased to see that the pews may be going. I feel that sitting in strict rows is not very inclusive and hope that the new

seating will be used in more imaginative ways.

84. I would be delighted if we were able to remove the pews to enable us to have a multipurpose space for church meetings/services, as well as numerous other uses.

85. I apologise if these matters have already been discussed. I support the removal of the pews but would like the north and south walls in the body of the church to be lined with pews for additional seating, especially as you can fit more people in the same length of seating. They could even be closed in under the seat to provide storage - a need that always exists! The illustration shows 188 seats. What is the maximum capacity, including those who may have to peep around the pillars?

86. Older people with back problem have difficulty sitting in pews and chairs may need a back cushion. The pink chair in church are useless as a cushion falls through, but the blue ones are ideal. The
91. pews, which are secure and safe, easy to clean, no trip hazards, no moving or stacking required! Pews provide a higher capacity of seating to that proposed. They have stood the test of time without looking shabby. I am saddened by the decision made by Bath Abbey – a beautiful listed building. The Abbey seems to be becoming more secular in its approach with colossal income from tourists.
92. Yes to comfortable seating.
93. Who is going to be responsible for setting up and storing chairs for services/ events?
- chairs illustrated for the Rock project do NOT look good.
87. Can you get removable pews?
88. Will there still be cushions for chairs?
89. Will the pews be retained on the balcony?
90. I am against the removal of the wonderful
94. Pews aren't very comfortable and make the space difficult for wheelchair and some disabled users. They may be a comfortable link with the past but a bit alien to people with no CofE background.
95. Although there is a lot that is good, I cannot stand the proposed use of stacking chairs. They're really terrible and the pews should be retained.
96. I did like the idea suggested originally – putting some pews down the side walls of the nave. This would give us more seating when needed. Is this out of the question?

97. Could the remembrance chapel have pews and become more of a useable place of worship, rather than the rather untidy and little used area it seems to have become?
98. A gathering of 600 from Wasps will surely exceed fire safety regulations. The interior is already accessible for those with wheelchairs.
99. We have not looked at the myriad problems of stacking chairs, the obstacles that they are to many people particularly the old, infirm, elderly and tubby.
100. We have always wanted the pews to go, but Patrick always said he wouldn't do it in his time here, but he thought we would see it happen!!! Also to remove the pulpit. - no problem.
101. I note that there is a hope to seat all 600 pupils from WASPS. Will there be actual seating for 600 people ... or does flexible seating mean they will be able to sit on the floor?
102. There only looks to be storage for 80x4 (320) chairs. Given that we are anticipating having around 600 chairs for wasps, that's an awful lot of chairs to store.
103. What will happen to the pulpit and pews?
104. New storage areas will reduce the current footprint and therefore lose space.
105. Where has all the storage of what is currently kept in the main church been moved? For example - all of the communion wine stored in the unit opposite the welcome desk.
106. Why are there no tables, nor any storage for them? Surely if we want people to use it for receptions after life events then at the very least they'll need tables to put a buffet out on.

107. There is a suggestion about getting our own moveable display boards like the ones we've borrowed from WASPS but again there is nowhere obvious to store them (& the centre has no spare space for them).
108. WASP school size – [you need to] revise estimate
109. The proposition quotes 600+ pupils and staff. 21 classes of between 28-33 pupils + 2-3 staff per class = 630 to 735. Also at the end of year service parents of year 6 are invited (only one per pupil, so 90) plus parents of those receiving the boy/girl of the year award in each class (only one per pupil for 18 classes, so 36). This could be as many as 861. Although probably more likely to be 800+ (not 600+).
- b. Comments on rear entrances and the back of church**
110. The area at the back of church currently does very well as a welcoming and gathering space. It's the same size as provided in the proposed extension with the added benefit that folk 'expand' into the main body of the building if needed. The area under the balcony is well used by parents with small children. A bit of additional thought and provision in this area would be beneficial; is another entrance near drinks area really necessary?
111. I'm not sure about the proposal for the self-contained space at the back of church. Where would refreshments after the service be served, as now or in the extension?
112. Not sure about the new door at the back. Aren't 2 doors enough?

113. Not at all convinced by the need to have a new main entrance in that northeast corner of the church. It just doesn't make sense to me. It must be possible to improve the existing entrances, or prioritise the new proposed entrance where the existing coffee bar is, if we really need an entrance that is more accessible from the car park side. Keeping the south porch as the main entrance seems to have been disregarded. I would say at least 50% of those attending come to church from the village direction so the south entrance is their entrance point. But the plans appear not to have considered this at all.

114. Having a new door at the back of church on the North side will enable the project to be phased. I prefer to see brides and coffins come in the back of church and use the

central aisle (similar thoughts from another respondent). A baptistery could be fitted in the centre of the platform in front of the old screen position. Consider whether the front of platform should be level with sanctuary platform. This would mean 3 steps up – a disadvantage.

115. Would the existing entrance, which looks out onto the village, still be able to be used?

116. Will the existing main entrance still be used? Not convinced about the extra entrance at the back. It would dilute the welcome, cause confusion over which entrance to use. Latecomers can use the current main entrance to sneak in at the back.

117. I wonder if we need the new entrance at the back on the North Side? Keep the South door open on Sunday and in the extension.

The proposed toilet at the foot of the balcony staircase is in an embarrassing position because of toilet smells and sounds. Do we need it? Re-positioning the old rood screen in the South Transept. I don't like the idea but if it is popular then fine. What will happen to existing South entrance and lovely new door?

118. Please leave South door – it lets in light and warmth from sun and is convenient for many coming from local surround. Main entrance on North side would be bad, especially for weddings and visitors
119. Please do have a door open at the back of church during services ...I would rather not to come to church than arrive late and have to do the 'walk of shame' from the front! I assume if there is no glass screen then a toilet won't be put at the back of church ...

noises during the service may be embarrassing!

120. We certainly need to sort out the inside. A new entrance will be very good.
121. Is a new doorway at the back of the church really necessary?
122. With the main entrance moving round to the back of the church, how will we ensure walkers on the Cotswold Way feel invited to take a look round?
123. Adding one WC at the back is essential to creating a truly accessible inclusive environment, not everyone is comfortable announcing their incontinence by walking to the front of the congregation to access the main toilets. It is also a significant bonus when hiring out the space. If you only want to hire out the main church space (and not open up the whole

extension) then having a unisex toilet in that area is great. The upper room in the centre has a similar functionality with the disabled loo being their main use (rather than having to navigate to a separate part of the building that may be partially or fully 'closed' - no lights on; doors shut/locked).

c. Comments on the Organ

124. If we removed the old organ, could the footprint expansion be smaller and the costs lower? By how much? I understand the 'sentimental value' of the organ but to make an informed decision about it we ought to know the opportunity cost of keeping it.
125. I personally do not feel that the organ is an integral part of our church's worship, if we are to keep it, could we somehow raise

money via organ concerts? If this is neither viable, or will bring in income to cover the cost of refurbishing the organ, please could we scrap it completely and use the money we have saved for furthering God's kingdom in Weston and Bath. Organ. Don't renovate it, remove it.

126. I feel that the renovation of the organ (several thousands of pounds) is unnecessary, unless the church is going to be used for organ recitals/concerts etc that could generate significant revenue. How many minutes per week is it used compared to other instruments? Also, thinking ahead to future generations-organ music is unlikely to be part of their world or their spiritual heritage. It could be a very expensive historical reference!

127. Will the renovation of the organ include tuning it so it can be played with other instruments?
128. Why not spend the money [*on restoring the organ*] on a baptistry in the church whilst you're getting the floor done? Why are you maintaining the organ, it's a massive cost for no gain, and as the presentation points out it's not even an original feature of the church.

129.

d. Other comments

130. I feel that losing the historical look of the church would be a shame. I have no problem with necessary changes. I like the idea of making the back of the church, the gallery and the area by the toilets more usable spaces. But would like to keep the general feel of the actual church space as it is. I believe that many non-church goers

and those who chose to have a church wedding like the traditional look

131. I like there to be an area for cakes and drinks etc. inside.
132. I wish it all to remain as it is, especially inside the church!
133. Just a quick question apart from prayer prior to church services, what is the Remembrance Chapel for? I think the existing use of the area in the front of the church for the musicians is really good, please can we keep it the same. I think that the Baptistery pool is essential!
134. Interior: agree it would be nice to smarten things up, but we need to be absolutely sure as a membership that it supports our core mission focus and isn't just feathering our own nest. I'm not convinced that this has been at the forefront of the

considerations and formation of these proposals and would do away with the need for an extension to provide a crèche room.

135. We notice that you intend replacing the Victorian Rood Screen before the Holy Table (Altar). You may be aware that Rood Screens were put into a number of churches by the Oxford Society in the late Victorian era to separate the sanctuary, which included the robed Priest and choir from the congregation. At the last reordering we had to go through a Consistory Court with all that entails, to obtain permission to remove the screen, which was by far the biggest problem. At the same time we took out several front pews so that the dais could be built.
136. Is there a welcome point?

- 137.** I think a crèche area, that is sound proof & in the main body of the church should be a priority.
138. Current building and campus are suffering from neglect and are uninviting, but have the potential to offer much more
139. Refurbishment of interior would be good to make it more flexible and comfortable.
140. I like the plans for bringing the interior up to 21st century standards and improving access, but it is very expensive and we need a contingency plan to prioritise work and drop anything unnecessary
141. Transforming the interior - I don't think there is enough storage for all the different groups and resources (e.g.tables/chairs). All the other ideas make sense and would improve the building.

142. The interior definitely needs doing, the others would be a "nice to have" in order of preference above.
143. Memorials: Are they to be removed, and, if so, where? Please clarify what will happen to memorials and pulpit. They are part of our heritage. (Not averse to pulpit being moved, but not 'dumped' elsewhere.)
144. The worship team has now moved to the centre of church from the side, has this been considered in plans for storage etc?
145. Retain the existing Remembrance Chapel - Personal question - WHY?
- 146. D: EXPANDING THE FOOTPRINT – EXTENSION**
- a. **General comments**
147. This is a really exciting project! I am unsure how much extra space will be created for the congregation. Or whether both the meeting rooms are necessary. Especially with the costs being so high.
148. Do not like the look of the plans – could be better design! Not in keeping. We have received an amazing gift from God in providing the Hub – excellent timing. This provides lots of meeting rooms, large and small. I consider therefore we don't need an extension to the church.
149. The purpose of the extension is to provide a new Disabled access with everybody else, Crèche, toilet facilities and somewhere for someone to supervise the open building. Full stop. The South entrance remains available and will be used by people coming up the hill and for those wedding

pictures we all love. If those with a full immersion understanding of baptism want a baptistery then fine. When the Crèche is not needed then it is reasonable to use that room in a different way. I don't think the drawings reflected this adequately. The Crèche can be rented occasionally to generate funds for the Church. The Weston Hub will never generate funds for the Church. It is a Community asset run by us and we take a management fee and pay rent when we use it. Weston Hub is not the Crèche. It is not "Ours", it is owned by the Council. The burning question in my mind when I attend an old church these days is. "Where is the toilet"? We do fall down here with Weddings, Funerals and concerts. More needed. Please don't put anything too heavy over the Organ pump trap door

in the Choir Vestry. [Landscaping mainly happy, there may be some nice to have.]

150. I do not see any need for the footprint of the church to be extended. Congregation numbers have been falling for years. Why reduce the seating capacity within church and is there a need to put up an extension?
151. When we have Centre 69, the Church centre and flexible seating in the main part of the church, what is the purpose of the extension? Will it be hired out? Are we going corporate?
152. Needs simplifying. Too many doors and separate areas
153. Now we have the Hub, do we really need more office space? Are 6 toilets necessary?
154. I'm not convinced that such a grand extension is needed. It seems to be too extensive and expensive.

155. Building an Extension - this is a great idea and the best design yet.
156. Design: suggest that the timber lattice truss ceilings in the extension are possibly not great value and very much a 'nice-to-have'. Not hugely supportive of extensive landscaping other than forming a larger gathering space, improving surfaces, and strengthening key, but not all linkages.
157. The extension is OK. My objection to it is the very plain wall facing east. It would be improved with a window...perhaps reflecting/complimenting the shape of the East window.
158. Don't like the shed-like angles of frontage.
159. I assume there is a reason for the angle of the west wall of the extension? It seems like lost floor space. I would like the west wall to include a Gothic arch in some form, even if it is etched in the glass. At present there seems to me to be no connection between the old and the new as you approach the building.
160. I like the idea of the new entrance (and baptistery) as I think that improving access for all is important, however I'm not sure of the purpose and need for the extension meeting room.
161. Disturbing gravestones for an extension is rotten and cruel and not a Christian thing to do. How would relatives feel?
162. *The extension* Is impractical as heating and lighting costs would go up.
163. It is obvious that the church and ASW needs to move forward into the 21st Century and beyond... I like the ideas proposed. However do take care with the physical positions of a new build. Especially

when considering the movement of the sun and the placing of patios/outdoor seating and the entry/exit of the church. It would be a shame to not be able to use the present entrance especially when it is considered that it faces south and benefits from direct sun etc rather than as proposed having an entrance that faces North ... I understand the location... near car park...New build etc....a dilemma! However I do feel that 'blocking' off the South entrance and turning it into a pray/meeting room could well see the space underutilized and become a storage area. Which would be a shame given the view and it's aspect.

164. Concerned about impact of the extension on the environment of the churchyard and the costs associated with it. However, I like the idea of having a single point of entry to

the church for everyone and for this to be a welcoming space.

165. Do not think we can justify the enormous cost of this extension. Do not like the juxtaposition of the modern/glass building on the side of the nineteenth century church. Do not think a kitchen is needed as feel it is inappropriate to eat meals in the church. Worship and meetings are fine and a good tea/coffee/cold drinks station is needed for these.

166. Very happy with the proposal to change the access to the church and make it more accessible to disabled visitors. I am not in favour of the proposed major extension. Thought that was dealt with by the major redevelopment works to the church centre several years ago. As I recall part of the rationale for redeveloping the church

centre was to create a major space to support church activities including provision for catering. Why do we now need a substantial kitchen and extra meeting rooms in an extension to the church?

- 167. I do not feel an extension is fully necessary.
- 168. On a personal basis the biggest problem we have is that we simply cannot understand what the new build is for! We have one of the best church centres in Bath, albeit not attached, but your proposal to build steps to the side of the path is excellent. We have puzzled over this for months, and there can be little doubt that if you start messing about with the church yard and taking down trees and moving graves, which will have to be done, could upset a number of people which might lead

to another Consistory Court. Likewise we also think removing the pews could well be a challenge but at least they are in-house. Thanks again for all you are doing, we do realise that a tremendous amount of work has gone into this.

- 169. I don't really see the need to expand the size of the church by building an extension. I'm sure most of the facilities proposed could be accommodated in a modernised interior with rooms partitioned with glass as they have done at St Luke's. I suspect the cost of this would be much lower.
- 170. Extension: this is a very expensive way to achieve not a lot really. If we're saying we need more space because the centre isn't available for church meetings then we should reserve more of the centre's space and time for the church's needs. We can

afford to lose quite a lot of bookings before it costs the church £1.3m. Decent renovation of the vestries and loos would be so much cheaper than new build.

171. What uses are there for the extension that couldn't also be accommodated in the main chairs by moving the seats?
172. The proposed extension is on the north side - the shady side - of the church and might have a tendency towards seeming gloomy. It would be good if every opportunity could be taken to capture natural light, e.g, skylight in roof to be as large as possible, large windows in east-facing and south-facing walls. A large south-facing window in the larger meeting room might be better than the proposed door, especially as there is another door just three or four steps away. Also, could

the south-facing section of the new roof have a large skylight as well as the flat section?

173. What on-going costs are predicted for maintaining/equipping the new extension? Whilst we raised funds for the centre refurbishment, there is a substantial amount needed for its upkeep year on year.
174. I am a flower arranger and see there is an area for this shared with cleaning. Will we be able to use the kitchen area to work with the flowers?
175. Latecomers would be conspicuous and potentially disruptive, entering at the front of the church.
176. The proposals include a lot of glass in the design, which is certain to make the new space unusable in the future summers, we

have not explored these problems yet We have not yet explored the use of a step-wise development approach, so that changes can come as parts of a planned greater whole, but in contained steps. We have not yet fully resolved if we require a single-story or double story extension. Remember we can build a double story outside first and construct the upper floors later on at need.

177. Any glass ceilings on the extension would be costly to maintain - especially if flat, as they'd get dirtier quicker.
178. The plans provide a new entrance. This will provide a large level entrance incorporating a refreshment area and toilet facilities. However what consideration has been made regarding the following:
 - a. as it is understood that the south entrance will still be in use, the

- disadvantages of having to provide an equal welcome in two areas of the church will be perpetuated,
- b. 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,
 - c. the reception area in the new entrance is not large and will need to accommodate movement of people through to the church and to the toilet area, as well as functioning as a welcome/refreshments area,
 - d. an earlier idea was to create an area extending along the north side and although the original idea was rejected on cost, what thought has been given to a moderated version which would support the structure of access at the west end, provide a larger welcome

area and ensure usage of the north aspect is within the warmth of an indoor space,

- e. concepts of operation and use of the new facilities, and practicalities of the new layouts for church services in the first instance, but also for other potential uses.

179. A stated aim of this project was to enable the building to be open much more frequently and to lose the day-to-day impression of a locked building. How will the current proposals support this aim, taking into account the following:
- a. development is focused on the north east wing, remote from the key features of the village and the setting overlooking the hills,
 - b. unless doors are open on the south side outside of service times, or are changed

to something which looks less foreboding, the church is likely to continue to give the appearance of being locked and closed,

- c. enabling the church to stand open requires a minimum of two people and their safety and oversight of the church could be compromised by needing to divide personnel between the worship space and the new extension,
- d. hot desking at the welcome desk and a counselling area in the south transept and chapel would be a simple way of locating personnel in the building, however the lack of focus on the landscape and entrances on the south diminishes these options.

b. Comments on the two proposed meeting rooms

180. I am not convinced of the importance of the extra meeting room for up to 40 people.
- 181.** We have Centre 69 and Church Centre and will have big space in church which has seats which can be moved about. Why do we need another room? Vicar in separate room in church? Surely he should be with staff in centre. This feel like an unnecessary white elephant. Feels a bit corporate too!
- 182.** Why does the Vicar have an office in the extension? -
183. Given the Hub and Centre, why do we need an additional 40-seat room? How much money would be saved by not including this? Want new entrance and new vestry/crèche, but not 40-seat room and 6 toilets.
184. No need identified for extra meeting space as we have plenty of rooms within the Church Centre and Hub.
185. It would be helpful to have the need for an extra room for meeting space for 40 to be explained now we now have the Hub.
186. Could also use Scout Hall in return for spending money on the building.
187. 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.
188. Where is the crèche going? (x2) Current provision unsatisfactory. I'd really like to put in a plea for better facilities for young children during services. It makes a huge difference for parents to have meaningful and workable spaces/provisions for them.
189. Need improved area for crèche.

190. Please explain the need for the extra meeting room in the 'expanding the footprint' section. The chancel and sanctuary have very similar amount of space and is largely underused.
191. We don't need an extension. Plenty of space in Centre and Hub. Why move the main entrance? Current entrance is an asset and a wonderful witness to residents.
192. Just what are the thoughts around use of new meeting rooms and the other rooms that are available in church, church centre and Hub.
193. Do we need extra meeting rooms in church?
194. Why do we need meeting rooms? What do you see as their primary function? Are they going to be linked to the main service so two crèches can operate out of them?
195. The theory of the extension is fine, I just hoped it was more about worship space and less meeting rooms. Or maybe you could explain the workings of those meeting rooms so we can see them more as crèches and prayer rooms and associate them less with meetings!! The baptistery is much more inspiring!! I would love to develop that before the meeting rooms! Or, could these meeting rooms have sliding doors/walls so it is feasible to open up the space to make an alternative worship area (maybe perfect for SALT or mid-week prayer or youth events) and a big space to gather around the baptistery as a congregation. I could see us needing a modern, smaller area to worship-a kind of side chapel, an alternative to the vast church interior, for smaller, more intimate

services and gatherings....but not just solely meeting rooms. That bigger space could be subdivided into little meeting rooms if needed but more flexible the rest of the time? We could even have a small community cafe operating out of a more flexible space (I'll run it!).

196. I am not quite sure of the need for the new meeting rooms etc but if felt important happy to go with it. I suppose if we have the use of the hub as well now, could some of the meetings happen there?
197. I question the need for such a large extension, with the added Hub now and with the church being more flexible with seating in the future I question the need for another room. I agree the damp part of church needs to be sorted and the entrance there is a good idea. It seems the extension

is more than we need considering you'll be able to use the church for different sized meetings in future..

198. Not sure of the need of the extension with the church centre available, though I can see the sense in making a new entrance at the back.
199. Planned extension fine but cost excessive.
200. Extension - do not see the need for an area for gatherings or a room for 40 people. Meetings can be held in Church Centre or church. - why do we need more rooms?
201. I still think careful thought needs to go into the extension - are we sure we need all those extra rooms, particularly with the All Saints Centre just down the hill and having just acquired Weston Hub? Is it possible to get the essential extras like a nice entrance and more toilets with a smaller extension,

or would this not actually save much money? The extent of this aspect of the plans seems far less essential than the rest and perhaps more of a luxury - could a much more modest extension be built initially but in a way that allows a further extension in the future if we need it?

202. I would love to see the inside of the church transformed and the outside landscape better suited to all people. I think it would be wise to scale down the extension to what is required; at present I think we have plans that are slightly too much than what we need and the space and allocation of rooms needs revision. For example, keep the toilets as planned, and kitchen area with neighbouring foyer looks great; but do we need another office, and two further meeting rooms considering the wealth of

meeting rooms we have just down the road at the Centre and now at the hub? Our church is by no means full on Sundays, we're building an extension, who is it for, the current members or the members we believe will come through because of a new extension? My concern is that we focus too much on building more before we have focused on gaining people to fill it. I would like to see the church spending money on evangelism and projects that reach people in the community as well as spending money on this exciting project. But as with any project that expands a home, usually it is done because of the need for more space; a growing family for example. Are we growing as a family? If not, let's get on with growing the family before we expand the house.

203. I also feel it is a shame that if an extension does go ahead, that it is on the side of the building that doesn't get much sunlight, so the plans for the big glass doors and skylight won't get the sun shining through them.
204. Very little cupboard/storage space allocated in the larger meeting room. Presumably this area will be used as a crèche for the services? The cupboard space required for storing toys for that age is significant (even if just for mats/cushions/bouncers). The area immediately outside that room (behind the sanctuary external wall) should ideally have a fence around it. That way the little ones can run around outside without wandering off into the graveyard. It needn't be high or obtrusive - but creating an enclosed safe-

space is a great resource. There is also no storage allocated for the chairs in that space. If everyone is milling around after a service then lots of the chairs will need to be removed from the space, & leaving big stacks out (to be knocked/leant against) in the open is dangerous. To rent out that space to other groups at other times then there needs to be storage for the groups using it. There is a phenomenal amount of storage space in the centre (including the loft) and it still isn't enough. I know that there is the crypt but it is cold, damp and not easily accessible from that room. Add a screen relay from the church to the back meeting room (for parents to watch). Again there is virtually no space to store things or for surfaces to put say a printer; or possibly floor space for a photocopier.

Importantly there should be lockable storage (especially for a key cabinet). It may even be nice to have some lockers for the personal belongings of those performing at concerts or for church staff on duty. Don't have a wall of glass in that room (adjacent to the entrance doors). It reduces the potential for putting shelves, cupboards, tables etc against it - i.e. reduces storage space. BUT a (small) window so that you can see who is approaching might be nice. Very little cupboard/storage space allocated in the clergy office replacing the current vestry. No space allocated for a safe (for the communion wine & collection). Again there is virtually no space to store things or for surfaces to put things (depending on what's

in the smaller work/meeting room) or to lock personal items away.

c. Comments on Children and Babies and Creche

205. I see that the baby change station is sited on way in to main loos I hope there will be another in the disabled loo. For privacy and practicality. Thanks for all your hard work.
206. We also need to make better provision for the youngest members of our congregation. The current vestry is completely unsuitable for a crèche - it is cold, dingy and much too small. There is no access or space for buggies. We do have a lot of little people at some of our services and a warm and convenient space, with an AV link to the service, for them is necessary. However, at times other than

services, this may not be needed, so a room that could double up as a meeting room seems like a sensible idea. It is hard to see how these provisions could be made within the existing building without renewing any of the landscape or building an extra bit. A door at the North West corner (where the current servery is) would need steps, a steep ramp or a bridge, due to ground levels. A room under the balcony would be very difficult to soundproof due to sound going up the stairwell, and babies can be very loud! The current vestry is damp and the roof leaks. The foyer that used to be the choir vestry (where the loos are) is also very cold and has a problem with repeated lead theft, making the roof leak. It seems that the obvious solution is to knock the vestries down and build a crèche, some

extra loos, somewhere to put the safe, and somewhere for people to work if they are there to supervise the building when it is open during the week. I love trees, and I'm always sad to see one go, but I think babies and people with mobility problems are even more important, and trees, even beautiful ones, can be replaced.

207. Firstly, thank you to the ROCK team for their efforts in getting the plans to this stage, and the handling of it should be commended. I agree that the time is now for investment in the building. Concerned at the new building removing the crèche facility in favour of a 40 person meeting room. I would feel a more flexible seating arrangement in the church would allow for any 40 person meetings to happen, and thereby don't understand the requirement

- what groups are we failing to house currently or planned ones in the future? However, I'd like to see the extension include the foyer, smaller offices and meeting rooms and better toilets - and perhaps the removing of the 40 person meeting room won't be that much of a cost saving, so is worth having.

208. My concerns are around the changes to the 'additional' areas (meeting rooms, lack of crèche).

209. 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. From talking to current and past members of the church one of the main issues is children provision, how is this being addressed?

210. Where is the crèche though? Surely this should be a priority. Building an Extension: do not understand why we need this.

211. Mention was made of a buggy park in the space leading from the church into the extension. Would this not be hazardous and a not particularly welcoming sight as one would now enter by this doorway?

212. Surprised there is no specific mention of crèche. Having had toddlers, I see this as a difficult time for Mums when it is easy not to bother coming to church because so much time spent out of service.

213. Where will the crèche be? –

214. Where is the crèche going to be? Can the extension and new plans for the crèche also provide an area for crawling - 2 years where parents can still listen to the

service/feel included (i.e. a bigger crèche area)?

d. Comments on Baptistery

215. I am not convinced that a baptistery in the new extension would be worthwhile or easy to maintain.
216. I am not sure the cost of installing a baptistery especially as it cannot be installed in the main part of the church is justified. 2 disabled toilets out of 6 would be preferable. They can be used by abled-bodied people if they are not needed by disabled.
- 217.** If there is to be a baptistery, would it be possible to put it in the church (perhaps under the raised platform in front of the chancel) rather than in a smaller area in the extension where fewer people could

participate? I do realise that there is a crypt under the floor.

218. Love the idea of the baptismal pool. How are you going to remove and store what I am assuming will be large heavy glass (?) panels, when in use?
219. Could we have baptismal pool inside main church building rather than foyer of extension? Do we need all those entrances?
220. I understand the idea of the baptistery being placed where proposed, but it doesn't feel very intimate or "cosy".... rather than being in the body of the church, baptismal candidates will feel as if they are in the porch... alongside the entrance to the loos, stored buggies, wellington boots, milk bottles... and a few people who can find room to stand round. Having the event relayed on screens just detaches the

congregation from what can be an uplifting and emotional event. We might as well watch on a live stream through our computers at home... all hail the age of the technology bubble.

- 221. I love the idea of a baptistery.
- 222. I would love to see running water under the floor at the entrance symbolising the waters of baptism.
- 223. Where will the 'floor' be put/stored when it is removed to use the baptistery? Add a screen relay from the baptistery area to the main church

e. Comments on Toilets

- 224. *Can we have* separate girls and boys toilets?
- 225. 6 loos are too many.
- 226. Toilet provision is adequate for current numbers.

- 227. Extra wcs definitely needed. When our church family is bigger they will be needed!
- 228. I also think that the toilets need to be made perhaps more "welcoming" and definitely not so cold!
- 229. Toilet provision is adequate for current numbers.
- 230. Is it necessary for the entire project to be carried out? Are as many as 6 toilets required?
- 231. Please ensure that these are WIDE enough to comfortably fit sanitary boxes in each cubicle.

232. E: RENEWING THE LANDSCAPE

- 233. Renewing the Landscape: difficult to understand what this would look like,

having heard presentation. Quite pricey for what we are getting? Is this the best use of the money?

234. We should be aware of the poor access road leading to the North side of the Church via Lynfield Park, thus the need for as much extra car parking as possible to cope with any uplift in traffic. Also 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. Have we thought of how to work with or combat either of these two potential problems?
235. Would love to see the outside space more available for outside activities. E.g. church services outside.
236. I like the car park extension but am not sure about the need to remove two Bath

Stone walls and replace them with wooden fencing and a little shelter? It ain't broke and needs little maintenance.

237. I am unsure about landscaping becoming paving slabs all the way round the church (maybe I've misinterpreted the sketches). However, opening up the area around the church to more sunlight would increase use, and certainly I'm in favour of increasing accessibility.
238. 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.
239. Most landscape changes are now taking place around new entrance rather than around the old entrance that I think is more

photogenic, so I don't feel strongly about renewing the landscape

- 240. Fixing the garden and pathways would be appreciated
- 241. Apart from size of car park and ease of access, I consider cosmetics as being of second order importance.
- 242. I am strongly against the cutting down of beautiful mature trees to be replaced by concrete and brick.
- 243. Renewing the landscape - the car park and the pathways are a must as this can be very dangerous especially at night. I haven't seen anything about security lighting for walkers but I hope this will be done. I don't like the idea of the pond (?) outside the church, as it seems a lot to maintain and not great H&S wise. The garden outside of the Centre doesn't work for its need. The

trees mean you couldn't have bouncy castles or food tents set up. What would be better is a new hedge by the road wall to give privacy and some pretty border flowers for when people have their event and take photos.

- 244. I think the little patio area, although facing south, will be very overshadowed by the trees along the perimeter of Church Road. The entrance to the new extension will be in shade most of the day... just a point to bear in mind (It will get a blast of sunshine in the late afternoon/early evening... depending on the time of year) I hope the churchyard won't be "sanitised" by straightening the gravestones into regimental rows - their haphazardness provide a charming country churchyard atmosphere. The souls buried there are just

as much a part of the history of the church as we are. There is wildlife in the churchyard - owls and three pairs of squirrels. Their home, too. The proposed deciduous trees near the memorial garden to replace the yews will look bare in winter (at least 5 months of the year) and someone will have the job of sweeping up the leaves so they don't become a slip hazard (yew trees are very obliging in this respect). Yews also provide food for birds and squirrels. Deciduous trees do not. I don't object to dogs exercising, but I'm not over-enthusiastic about their being allowed to use the churchyard as a dog bog. Not all owners clean up! *I hope there is not going to be as much hard standing as depicted in the plans. It is a) rather ugly and not a

country churchyard look, and b) will turn the hill into Niagara Falls when it rains.

- 245. Landscape - agree with better provision for access, car parking, memorial garden etc.
- 246.** The 'landscape' is also clearly in need of work, for safety, accessibility and general enjoyment.
- 247.** Landscape: car park improvement looks great. Path improvements are essential but we don't need the piazza. We need to be able instead to gather outside the south door in the lovely sunshine where our visual focus is on the village - our mission area, and where we can be seen by the village. Having a new entrance on the NE corner is out of sight of the village and passers-by. It is not a witness.
- 248.** Greatly concerned about moving grave, headstones and memorials and old

beautiful yew trees. Why move the entrance? The current entrance is an asset to the Church in showing it is open and a wonderful witness being provided to residents with no further effort other than walking into church.

249. How will parking be increased to support increased usage of the church building, as well as existing use of the church centre? Will you encourage a green approach transport for those using the church and church centre, like the National Trust does at Prior Park - walk, cycle, bus, etc? At what stage will local residents be made aware of the plans? Will you involve residents in the immediate vicinity of the churchyard in the landscaping plans? Can an area of the churchyard be dedicated as a 'wild space' for plants, animals and birds to thrive? Can the remembrance chapel be glassed in to

provide a quiet and more private prayer space? Can we include a Christian labyrinth as an aid to prayer, either inside the church building or in the grounds?

250. Having a pond (if that's what the rectangle between the seats is) would be a huge maintenance overhead - both cost and time. It is also a parent's nightmare that their child will fall in (both for the congregation and the local community). Having a non-transparent wall or opening on the covered area immediately adjacent to the car park (for bikes?) would completely block the line of sight to the church. Pillars or perspex would be better.
251. It is suggested that as many as 600 people (if fire regulations allow) could be accommodated in the nave and balcony for a concert if these plans go ahead. That is a huge number of people making their way

by cars or minibuses through Trafalgar Rd and Lynfield Park, a narrow, 'dog's hind leg' journey, meandering to the car park, in some parts single passage only. 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? The only other access road leading up to the front of the church is narrower than Lynfield and unsuitable for heavy traffic. As we know the car park only appeared in the last century in the advent of the motorcar and before that time, most worshippers walked to church when the pace of life was much slower. So with the passage of time, we have chosen to drive to church, requiring the width of a car to make out journey for one or more people. Laudably, our congregations are much larger now and

we have outgrown the car park and this increase is surely going to require better access to a larger car park. When the houses in Lynfield Park were built in the 1950's/60's there clearly was no planning for 50 years on and no concern at the time for worshippers' journey to church by car. The developers or council planners could not have envisaged this. At that time only the wealthy had cars and congregations were small, again most walked to church because they lived in the parish. Many of our congregation today live outside of the parish and need a car. AS I see our ROK project objectively, with respect to the wonderful work, hours, creativity and money invested in the project, with the present plans, we could expect residents to complain of the increased traffic volume and congestion that will ensue for them as

well as the church visitors if we intend to use our church for large events to the outside world. I understand the economics of large events. It would be advantageous to us as the revenue will increase to offset costs, and I worry that the event managers seeking to make bookings will not consider All Saints as first choice because of the poor access. In my view we could reduce the plan of vision with large numbers in mind, reduce costs and plan for church needs only. I don't see that concert events, or business events, will justify extra spend to boost revenue needed to cover it. Are we a church or a business? We are a church first and foremost and nothing can be done to improve Lynfield Park access.

252. I dislike the idea of steps leading down to the Church Centre. My view is that the sloping path is more accommodating for

the blind people, those with walking frames, the infirm, wheelchair and pushchair users.

253. F: DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

254. I am concerned that PCC [*not church members*] will make the next decision where a significant amount of money will be committed. The next steps and way forward should be based on the members' responses, with a requirement for a minimum "turnout" (number of responses) and a decision to proceed only if appropriate pre-defined majority in favour. Therefore the PCC would endorse the membership's feelings and there would be an audit trail and transparency in the process.

255. I am happy to go along with the majority decision after considered consultation and would trust in a favourable outcome.
256. I don't agree with the like it or lump it attitude of the church leaders.
- 257.** Decision should be taken by congregation, not PCC/Rock team.
258. I trust the ROCK team to organise the project on behalf of all church members.
259. I don't envy your task! I totally understand that you are never going to please everyone and almost certainly disappoint some. I trust that positive comments that I have made are helpful in further discussions....however understand if not convenient! Wishing you all every success.
260. Consultation Process: The original proposals were to be supported by a significant number of the church

membership. 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. Certain individuals within the Rock team have a lot of power and the project itself has had a lot of time, focus, energy and finance detracting from mission and discipleship. I have seen some disgusting behaviour towards congregation members through some of the presentations including a poor illustration of access by a disabled person. This problem had nothing to do with the disabled person but more to do with service organisation. Please return to the original terms of engagement with the

church including listening to views presenting the consultation results accurately and honestly- not skewed figures or adding numbers together as has happened before. The production of the consultation questionnaires have been biased to try to direct the project in one direction.

261. A budget of £3m is estimated, consequently the congregation / membership needs to be empowered and supported in making an informed decision concerning this project. To what extent has the process ensured proper access to information and a role in decisions taking into account:
- a. the lack of definition of the needs and priorities for the Christian community in Weston, now and in the foreseeable

- future, which should influence any decisions about development of the All Saints church building,
- b. the lack of evidence and record that the proposed plans will achieve whatever needs and priorities have been identified,
 - c. assuming the early plan to build along the north side had merit, what has been done to justify the significant change of approach, particularly taking into account the altered location of the church's main entrance,
 - d. the benefits of being able to consider a range of options, for example the alternative of landscaping and developing around the south west aspect, drawing on the obvious attractions of view and sunlight and

including an additional door on the north side within the same welcome space,

- e. the 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.

262. The Rock Team have done a fantastic job in bringing us this far on our journey. Thanks for the sacrifices you have made in time and for the gifts you have deployed in seeing through this project and for your obedience for God's call on your lives

263. Is there a plan to tell residents about the proposals? It would be a courtesy to tell them and it would be an opportunity to

invite them to church with all that we have to offer spiritually as well as functionally.

264. As a long-time member of ASW I wish that I could be involved in the project.

265. Is this God's vision or the vision of a few privileged powerful members of the church on the Rock team?

266. I will support whatever the congregation decide as promised NOT a decision by the PCC (rock committee)

267. Much of the detail of the plans is still to be decided - will the church membership be involved in those future decisions? For example, choice of material for frontage of the extension, choice of internal furnishings etc

268. It is difficult to put questions when we are being told there is only one answer.

269. Each time we have been briefed on the Rock proposal it has looked slightly

different and I don't feel I have much visibility of the decision making process which led to the changes.

270. Will you please consult with an acoustic engineer to ensure both spoken word and music played will be in as good an acoustic environment as possible? 2. Please could you ensure there is minimal carrying around of instruments and sound equipment? This reduces damage to people, material and equipment
271. I would be willing to be involved in cleaning and redecoration of the building interior
272. Consultation should be with relevant professionals as well as the congregation (see below)
273. As an electrical engineer, am happy to help with any technical aspects of the new sound system

274. Suggest involving church members with project management experience

275. G: OVERALL COSTS INCLUDING PHASING AND TIMING

276. Phasing this huge project would be my choice

277. In Luke 14v28, Jesus' teaching is recorded: "For which of you when he wants to build a tower does not sit down and calculate the cost to see if he has enough to complete it? Otherwise when he has laid the foundation and he is not able to finish, all who observe it begin to ridicule him saying 'This man began to build and was not able to finish'. WAS does not have £3m to undertake this whole project. As a society, we currently spend beyond our mean and incur debt. This is not a wise, biblical practice, however tempting it is.

278. Concerned about finance and our ability to meet everyday budget of church and our parish share and our giving to mission.
279. I believe most, if not all of church members, agree our church building needs urgent maintenance and updating with modern technology, to be in line with current-day basic safety and legal requirements for public buildings both inside and outside. Personally I can't wait to see this done. The plans look beautiful and desirable. However in my humble opinion, we must be objective as we would with our own homes when costing what is affordable and feasible and considerate in living peaceably with our neighbours.
280. £3m is too much to spend
281. I fully support any investment in improving the inside of the church and doing all repairs and improvements that are needed to update the church.
282. Investment in the building is needed, and if not now, soon
283. 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? The building extension should not be done.
284. I hear rumours that church architects are very expensive and I'm concerned some over designing has gone on. Otherwise very much in favour.
285. There is a big question also of the morality of spending £3m on the building when we have so many blessings to be thankful for. There is great need locally, nationally and worldwide please let's focus on these needs not on the building and being greedy

for ourselves. This project will detract from any local witness.

286. 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.
287. 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.
288. The proposals for funding include a mortgage. What is being proposed as collateral? Will they take a charge on the church or church centre? what happens if for whatever reason it comes to that charge being enforced - are we safeguarding the church for those not yet in it or jeopardising it with the mortgage borrowing?

289. Overall - £3,000,000 is a huge amount to spend on the fabric of the church, with little resulting benefits. We have a wonderful Church Centre for meetings, functions, staff etc plus The Hub. Can think of better uses for a sum of this kind in the Weston community or in Bath.
290. Finally All Saints is already living above its means and has been for some time necessitating periodic appeals. The proposed level of expenditure seems difficult to justify particularly if it necessitates taking out a mortgage!
291. As finance will be difficult, the exterior seems less worth doing
292. It's quite a large sum for the project which needs careful consideration for future generations

293. A budget breakdown of the different parts of the project would be useful.
294. No mention has yet been made of the planned giving to local work with Enrich or to Eagles in Malawi.
295. Why haven't the congregation been asked if they want to take out such a vast loan?
296. Please see my mortgage related questions and also questions on what the purpose means within "not fit-for-purpose"
297. How are we doing with seeking Heritage lottery funding?
298. Could we see a breakdown of the proposed costs
299. What is the time scale for this? This is for the whole community. What are the plans to raise money from those who are not members of the congregation?
300. Please can we have a breakdown of costs for the three elements of the project so that everyone is clear as to the cost of the extension compared with the other elements.
301. When will work begin? What disruption will the work cause and for how long?
302. How long will it take?
303. What proportion of the £3 million does the extension represent? Knowing this figure would be helpful in determining value for money.
304. Will you be looking to sell anything that's removed (e.g. pews) rather than just disposing of?
305. Where will the congregation meet whilst they are unable to meet in the church building (& how long will that be for)? The children currently use the centre so either they will need to be relocated (to say, the hub) or the congregation will need to go elsewhere. What are the practical & cost

implications of meeting elsewhere? Both through displacing other users and loss of income, or additional hire costs.

306. H: PERSONAL GIVING & COMMITMENT

- 307. Decreasing income means an increase in giving is not practical
- 308. Maybe a legacy
- 309. Block donations easier than regular giving for me (x2)
- 310. Establish priority of work as finance comes in
- 311. I will NOT consider giving to the project as it is greedy when we already have the Hub and Centre. So many people are in need so why spend so much money on the church, which is fine as it is. We should be doing the Christian thing by helping those in need.

- 312. I will not be giving to ROCK . We have money pledged (£600,000) so let us live within our means and not spend £3m. Don't want an enormous debt for the younger members of the church (under 16s don't get a voice). £3m is too much to spend on a building.
- 313. Can't increase giving at present but will support in prayer.
- 314. I would like to help by organising a fundraising concert in the church
- 315. I already give regularly and always being told to give more because the church has overspent
- 316. I will consider additional giving once the PCC decides to move to the next stage.
- 317. Can't give any more at present.
- 318. Would like to give money towards the Remembrance garden if you can give me an

idea what the costs might look like. Some people may like to give to a specific part of the project or to find a way of honouring previous members of the church. A name in a book that no one sees doesn't do it for me

319. I feel I need more clarity about the project before increasing giving. I think it's unlikely I will be paying more in the future; I would prefer my money to go to e.g. disadvantaged Christians rather than a plush building.
320. Can't remember what if anything we pledged, can you let us all know?
321. I have already commented on phasing the project into three parts starting with the church interior. At the start I did not give a pledge but gave a donation to the project and will continue this way. It may be

helpful to recognise that others may be like me. Giving a pledge implies that you can remember what you have pledged which may be a problem for some.

322. We've lost track of what our pledge was last time. Can anyone tell us the situation?
323. I have already pledged what I can to the project
324. My giving to ROCK will continue as before. I was already fully behind the project.
325. I will give to improve and repair the church but do not agree that we need to spend 3 million pounds
326. I will continue with my pledge
327. I cannot consider supporting this project.
328. I cannot commit to anything extra at the moment, but will give it thought
329. I will see what the final decision is before deciding about increased giving.

330. We will try, but since we about to have our second child, funds will be tight for a while.
331. The project is over budget and I don't feel comfortable in contributing financially
332. But we are unable to do this in the immediate future
333. I have already pledged a sizeable bit over the next few years. I would be willing to try to increase this but maybe need to be over some years rather than a single sum.
334. I am committed to honouring my existing pledge and will consider extending it on completion of its term.
335. We have given a chunk of money to the project and will consider giving further over a course of time.
336. Have already given amount pledged
337. Do not have a 'shed full of money but what I can give I will.
338. I've already increased giving, please be wise and don't do things unnecessarily
339. I will not support this if the extension goes ahead and also consider my existing giving and possible withdraw it.
340. I'm committed to trying to fulfil my existing pledge but am not in a position to increase it at present.
341. I am currently supporting ROCK but at the moment cannot consider increasing my pledge, but may be able to do so at a later date.
342. I will see what I can afford as I had to lower my contributions a few years ago due to a change in job.
343. I think I would want to see what was proposed before deciding.
344. Not sure at present because I have only just heard of this!

345. I am still not in a position to be able to give to the ROCK project. I will not support the introduction of stacking chairs.
346. As previous £3m seems excessive. I'd like to see the project broken down into 3 stages or perhaps £1m each and each stage taken one at a time as funds become available.
347. I need more information before being able to decide on financial support for the Rock
348. In many respects, giving or increased giving for the normal running costs of the Church are extremely important, because of the deficit we always seem to have, and these should not should not suffer from the financing of the ROCK project.
349. I am already giving but any future donating will depend on what is finally planned.
350. I will make a decision on additional giving based on the scope of the project finally decided by the PCC. It is unlikely I will support a project necessitating borrowing by the church.
351. We are already giving to the project and will continue, perhaps increasing funds permitting.
352. I have already increased my giving to the church generally and have already pledged money to rock. I don't feel able to add more at the moment but would be happy to be involved in fundraising activities.
353. Not really a high-income earner. Have made an initial contribution
354. Ok with current giving
355. I will seek to fulfil current pledge and continue it.
356. We committed to giving a sum each year for 5 years and will honour this commitment.

357. We pledged an amount each year for 5 years and will honour that pledge. At the moment we do not feel in a position to increase our giving to church. We plan to continue our monthly donations by standing order and to continue our small annual additional contribution to the ROCK project.
358. I have already given to the project and will give more when it gets started.
359. I would be prepared to support the modernisation of the church interior and landscape, but I am reluctant to spend significant amounts of money on an extension. I would like to know what each of the three elements will cost.
360. It is frustrating to see needed improvement work delayed but I cannot commit to a project, which does not address our needs

and play to the strengths of our current building. We know from the plans that we can add an accessible entrance on the North West corner. This would work well with our current welcome space. We need to think more about our weekday access. The south entrances are the most visible and should be open, with the church manned by two people. The extension would spread manpower and incur additional running cost. The south transept and chapel could be given independent heating and used for meeting/counselling. The welcome desk could become a hot desk work space. These areas benefit from natural sunlight. Landscaping should be focused on the south side overlooking the village to draw passers-by into the vicinity of the church. "Travel light" should be our

way forward. We are blessed with a beautiful, large, space to meet with God. We have so many other options for meeting rooms around Weston. Lighten the burden for future generations by handing on a well maintained, easy to manage space, but do not pass on debt and yet more building to run and maintain.

- 361. I have been giving since the first appeal. I cannot increase my giving.
- 362. I would happily help fund the needed up keep and renovations
- 363. I have been and continue to consider what my financial contribution should be but don't feel ready to make a commitment yet.
- 364. I do not want to support any plans which include an extension

365. Qualification: once I am in a financial position to do so

366. I shall not be able to continue giving until the completion of the project as I have moved away

367. I am already giving to the ROCK project. When my pledge runs out I will look at renewing it. If my financial circumstances improve in any way, I will certainly consider giving more to ROCK.

368. I: OTHER COMMENTS NOT NECESSARILY ROCK RELATED

369. I want there to be a birthday slot (2).

370. Now I have retired I hope to be able to attend the church more, I didn't know I had to register, maybe you could put me in the right direction for doing that, I also love singing if the choir needs backup, I prefer

to blend in; the other thing is that I was actually confirmed as a Roman Catholic and so I don't receive communion in any All Saints services

371. I would like the services to be more interesting to teenagers, not like puppet shows
372. I have been a member of both the church and the local community for the past 25 years or more – one of a small number of people who are members of All Saints and also live in its immediate environs, so with strong vested interests in both church and community. I haven't spoken with my neighbours about plans for the extension and the churchyard but in due time I am sure this will be a hot topic of conversation. I appreciate this opportunity to be open about my concerns as well as my support,

in part because I feel that I owe it to my neighbours.

373. I have now moved a long way away from Bath but am still contributing to the ROCK Project
374. No mention has been made of repairs needed to the church roof.
375. Attendance at church is limited because of young children, otherwise we would be there weekly