

## ROCK TEAM REPORT TO PCC FOR MEETING ON 16 APRIL

### INTRODUCTION

1. This is a detailed and complex report at a key moment in the evolution of the ROCK Project and of the life of the church in general. It needs to be read alongside the other papers prepared for the meeting, namely:
  - The summary of the consultation carried out in March 2018
  - The complete set of written responses submitted by church members during that consultation
  - A breakdown of the estimated costs of different elements of the project
2. A substantial amount of information is provided in the report and towards the end, there are a number of recommendations which the PCC is asked to approve to enable the project to move into the next phase. The report follows this sequence:

#### **Part One Background Information**

- A) Summary of numerical responses to the consultation
- B) Key points from the written responses to the consultation together with abbreviated ROCK responses
- C) The responses and reactions of the Diocese and B&NES Planning Officers to the plans and proposals presented to the church in February 2018
- D) Notes on the costings for the three main elements of the project
- E) Notes on the merits and implications of phasing the project

#### **Part Two: Proposals and Recommendations for the period May – December 2018**

- F) Notes and recommendations on the Fundraising Strategy
- G) Notes and recommendations on the next stage of the design process
- H) Notes and recommendations on securing planning permission
- I) Notes on reporting back to church
- J) Summary of recommendations

### PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

#### **A: SUMMARY OF NUMERICAL RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION**

3. **The Profile of Respondents:**
  - a) The percentage of church members contributing to the consultation was 69% based on an estimated average membership of 280<sup>1</sup>
  - b) 50% of respondents have been a member of ASW for more than 20 years and 75% for more than 10 years
  - c) 90% of respondents are on the Electoral Roll
  - d) 95% of respondents attend at least 2 services per month
  - e) 70% of respondents live in the parish
  - f) 85% of respondents were aged 40 and over
  - g) 8% of respondents reported having a disability of one kind or another
4. **The numbers in favour of or opposed to the ROCK Proposals:**
  - a) 88% of respondents were positive or very positive about *Transforming the Interior*; 5% were negative or very negative
  - b) 70% of respondents were positive or very positive about *Expanding the Footprint*; 19% were negative or very negative

---

<sup>1</sup> There are 321 on the Electoral Roll; 268 was the number submitted to the Diocese as our membership; 250 was the number who put their names on the membership list in 2016. Average of these is 280

- c) 75% of respondents were positive or very positive about *Renewing the Landscape*; 8% were negative or very negative
- d) Roughly half of those who were negative or very negative about the Extension, were positive or very positive about the proposals for the Interior and the Landscape

5. **Intentions regarding future giving and support:**

- a) 58 people (30% of respondents) said they would now consider **starting** to give to the project
- b) 50 people (26% of respondents) said they would now consider **increasing** their existing giving to the project
- c) 90 people (46% of respondents) said they would like to be involved in other forms of support for the project besides giving

**B: WRITTEN RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION AND THE ROCK TEAM'S OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS TO THOSE RESPONSES**

6. Roughly 35 pages of comments were received. The ROCK Team has read carefully all the comments received and has reviewed them at a meeting. Many of the concerns and objections are not new, so this is not the first time they have been considered. The Team has tried to be both prayerful and objective in evaluating the comments. That means trying to balance **(a) paying attention to the large numerical majorities in favour of each of the three aspects of the project with (b) the discomfort and concerns of the minorities who are uncomfortable with or hostile to the some or all of the project.** The rest of this section lists the main issues raised together with an abbreviated ROCK response.

**Concerns of a More General Nature**

7. Clearly a number of people have strong concerns about the rationale and concept of the ROCK Project as a whole. Key concerns are:
- a) Whether it was right in principle to spent so much money on 'buildings' (see also section on costs)
  - b) The perception that there was no evidence to demonstrate that the proposals would enhance or complement the work on mission, evangelism and discipleship
  - c) The perception that there was no equivalent strategy for our work in mission, evangelism or discipleship and that the work on buildings would dominate to the detriment of the main purposes of a church community
  - d) The loss of the historical feel of the church inside and out (see also section on Transforming the Interior)
8. ***ROCK Comments:*** *The ROCK Project's existence and rationale stems from the work undertaken a number of years ago to identify the three key drivers for the next few years. Those were identified as (1) Engagement (Mission and Evangelism); (2) Discipleship; and (3) Reimagining our Buildings for the Future. The ROCK Team was appointed by the PCC to take the third driver forward always with the intention that the buildings should underpin and support the first two drivers. It would be fair to say that there has not been a corresponding focus on Engagement and Discipleship – at least not in the form of strategic planning. That will be remedied later this year when Mark Searle shares his vision for all areas of church life. As far as the ROCK agenda is concerned, we believe we have tried to stay faithful to our mandate and to put in place plans which would make our historic church building, more accessible and available, more comfortable and hospitable, more attractive, welcoming and inspirational. Having seen many medieval and nineteenth century churches which have gone through internal transformation, we believe that the proposed changes will enhance many of the historic features of the church building whilst bringing an appropriate modernity to those things that need to be modernized.*

**Transforming the Interior Concerns**

9. Although only nine people were negative or very negative to the proposals, there were a number of concerns and questions from those who were positive overall. Those concerns were around:

- a) The loss of pews and the undesirability of chairs
- b) Uncertainty as to whether or not the South Porch Entrance would still be routinely used and open
- c) Whether a new north side door is needed
- d) Creating a self-contained room (with fold-back doors) under the balcony
- e) The arrangements for keeping the church open during the week
- f) Whether or not part of the Rood Screen was going to be reinstated

10. **ROCK Comments:**

- a) **Pews & Chairs:** *In the very first ROCK Consultation (2013), just over half of respondents wanted to move away from pews to chairs and flexible seating; roughly a quarter wanted to retain pews. The move of opinion since then has definitely been towards favouring chairs. No cathedrals have pews in the nave. Most church re-orderings opt for flexible and comfortable seating. It is true that for most services the configuration of chairs will stay the same but the options are there for a chair-less church or for different patterns of chairs. Obviously great care must be taken with the choice of chairs and we would hope to have several samples available for a few months for people to test out! We must also be aware of those who need back support or assistance in standing up from a chair (pews are good to lean on). The kind of chair we are thinking of is relatively light and stacks very neatly 30-40 high (unlike the church centre chairs or the upholstered chairs in church). We would probably go for a natural wood finish rather than a coloured upholstered finish. The seating capacity using chairs would be much the same as it is now with the present combination of pews and chairs. The seating in the balcony will remain. Two or three people have requested if some pews could be kept eg to line the south or north walls or in the Remembrance Chapel; that has happened at St Swithin's Church Walcot and could be possible here but it could just be a not very satisfactory compromise. Reference was made in the presentations to 600 WASPS pupils coming for services once or twice a term, which is a good thing. To be clear the pupils will sit on the floor as they do in assembly now and it will be much easier to accommodate them in a clear space than in the pews as at present.*
- b) **South Porch Entrance & Doors:** *The present proposals assume that the South Porch and Doors will remain open as an entrance. Ideally the external doors would be changed (or kept folded back) during daylight hours to reduce the fortress look.*
- c) **New North-West Door (at rear of church):** *There were a few comments in favour of this idea and a few more who could not see the purpose of it. In our current costings, we removed this item along with the other changes to the rear of church. Unless we phase the work (see later), it would seem that adding another entrance would be both costly and confusing.*
- d) **Creating a self-contained room (with fold-back doors) under the balcony:** *As with the North-West door, the proposals in the drawings for a fold-back glazed screen, WC and refreshment station were presented as 'nice to have' rather than essential as they would have pushed the costs significantly over £3M. It is unlikely that we would propose retaining these ideas. However, if the extension did not go ahead for some years or never, this proposal would probably have to be reinstated as the place for the crèche if nothing else. (See section on Phasing and Rationale for extension).*
- e) **The arrangements for keeping the church open during the week:** *Some questions were asked as to the practicalities of keeping the building open during the week. It would be fair to say that this has not been worked out in detail. Options include: a mix of passive supervision through the presence of staff or volunteers being present in the building; security cameras; no supervision (as is the case with the majority of open churches); some parts being open but not all parts. Clearly more thought needs to be given to this – and indeed opening the church does not have to wait until building work has been completed. We could trial it tomorrow!*

- f) **Whether or not part of the Rood Screen was going to be reinstated:** *Some eagle eyes spotted on the plans that there was a partial reinstatement of the Rood (Chancel) screen (now stored in the crypt) going across the south transept. This was an idea considered by the Team and then dropped for various reasons but by oversight it remained on the drawings presented to the church.*

**Concerns about Expanding the Footprint**

11. As with previous consultations, it is the question of the extension that has generated most concerns and comment; this is the one area where there is a significant minority (19% of respondents) who are unconvinced by this aspect of the project. In addition to concerns about the overall rationale for the extension, there were questions over details. So, the key issues are:
- a) Whether or not there is a need for an extension at all and/or the proposed size – especially given the facilities available in The Church Centre and now the Weston Hub
  - b) The location on the more shady and less public north side as opposed to the sunny south side
  - c) The apparent lack of a crèche room
  - d) The vicar having ‘another’ office in the Church
  - e) The location of the Baptistry – those commenting would prefer to see it in the main body of the church
  - f) Too many WC’s
12. **ROCK Comments**
- a) **The need for and/or scale of the extension:** *This has always been the most contentious part of the overall plan. Put simply and practically, ROCK believes that the church needs NOW the following additional facilities:*
    - i. *A warm and damp-proof vestry which serves as a room not only for preparation before services but which holds the safe, church registers and other essential items and which could be used as an interview space eg with a couple wanting to be married in church. The present one does not do this.*
    - ii. *At least one decent-sized room that can serve as a crèche during services and other events (see paragraph 13 c below) but there is an argument for a second room for toddlers.*
    - iii. *Better and more WC’s including baby change and disabled WC.*
    - iv. *A new entrance especially on the north side which is easier to access for those with mobility problems and which should become a main entrance; that in turn requires some kind of lobby or welcome area.*
    - v. *A modest kitchen ie less than the one in the Centre but more than the refreshment bar currently at the rear of church.*
    - vi. *Facilities for the flower arrangers*

*The only difference between this list and the facilities shown in the plans is that there are two meeting rooms rather than the minimum of one. If this ‘brief’ is agreed then there is the question ‘can some or all of these facilities be fitted in the existing footprint of the church?’ The total area of the extension is roughly 167 m<sup>2</sup> of which roughly 137 m<sup>2</sup> is ‘new’ floor area. The main body of the nave and the usable floor area under the balcony (space must be left for access to balcony and probably to tower door) equals 220m<sup>2</sup> If you retained the present vestry (refurbished) and the present choir vestry as the (not very satisfactory) lobby/welcome area, then you would need to try to fit 90-137m<sup>2</sup> into the main body of the church. It can’t all (toilets, crèche, kitchen) go under the balcony and whatever we fit in will reduce seating/standing capacity at a time when we hope that we might start growing again numerically.*
  - b) **The location on the more shady and less public north side as opposed to the sunny south side:** *There is no doubt that the south side of the church is the sunny side of the church and probably the most attractive side of the church. Whether this is the most visible to the passerby is debatable. Very early on in this process the ROCK Team looked at proposals for*

expanding on this side but these were discounted for two main reasons. Firstly it was thought to be a lost cause to try to persuade the planning authorities that an extension on this side would be acceptable; we know that the planning officers are very, very conservative when it comes to additions to listed buildings and it is going to be hard enough to persuade them to approve an extension on the north east corner of the church. Secondly we think a main entrance close to the car park and disabled parking is better and more feasible than trying to do something on the south side. Although the extension will be more discreet on that side and therefore more acceptable, we do not believe it will be hidden.

- c) **The apparent lack of a crèche room:** It is generally accepted that the present provision for babies (and toddlers) during services is inappropriate and of poor quality. It was a mistake not to make clear in the presentations and booklet that in future the crèche would be located in the extension – probably in the larger of the two meeting rooms. It is clear we need a much better quality area for the crèche and possibly an area for toddlers who are not yet old enough to go to the groups in the Centre. Of course at the moment the crèche is only needed for one service on a Sunday morning ie 90 minutes per week but it would not make sense to say that the crèche room is only for the crèche. That is why the rooms are described as meeting room spaces – and of course the idea is that they would have fold-back walls so much of the extension could be a large open plan area when needed.
- d) **Another Office for the Rector (Vestry):** The present vestry is not only a place where service leaders, including visitors can gather before a service, it is also the place where the safe is kept, the church service registers are kept, money is counted. However it is not somewhere at present where anyone would want to spend any time, as it is damp, cold and the lead roof is prone to being stolen. If the extension does not go ahead some extensive repairs and improvements will have to be made to the vestry.
- e) **The location of the Baptistry:** The ROCK Team always felt that a baptistry (if there is to be one) should be in the church but was advised that this was not possible because of the crypt underneath the floor. However Pat Coley, who knows the building well, believes that it should be possible to put some kind of baptistry in the chancel or dais area and this will be followed up.
- f) **Too many WC's:** 2-3 people felt 6 WC's were too many. (There are 10 WC's and two urinals in the Centre.) The British Standards for Toilet Provision in places of entertainment and assembly or restaurants recommend 2 male WC's plus 4 urinals and 6-8 female WC's for a gathering of 150 men and 150 women. On that basis even with 6 WC's we would be under-provided for with WC's.

#### **Renewing the Landscape Concerns**

13. The three main areas of concern over the landscape were:

- a) Fears for loss of wildlife and trees
- b) Fears that the churchyard will become over-sanitized and urban, with too much hard paving
- c) Increased car traffic – especially along Lynfield Park

14. **ROCK Responses:**

- a) **Fears for loss of wildlife and trees:** It is true that the plans envisage the loss of some trees – just how many in the end has not been decided. The most important tree loss will be that of a large cedar close to the proposed extension. There are 16 yew trees that have not been properly managed over the years and which in the judgment of the ROCK Team do require pruning and in some cases removal. Some people (including the Conservation Officer for Bath) regard the present churchyard landscape as 'romantic' in the classical sense of the word; others see it as somewhat overgrown and at night somewhat foreboding. Ecological and wildlife studies have been carried out and more will be required before any work is carried out. We will work closely with those in the church and the community who feel strongly about the

green environment of the churchyard to come up with a plan that is protective of the natural environment whilst also making it a place that more people can enjoy and appreciate. Any proposals for removal of trees will have to secure planning permission; certain species of wildlife are protected and evidence will have to be produced by us to demonstrate that these species will not be harmed by any of the proposed works.

- b) Fears that the churchyard will become over-sanitized and urban, with too much hard paving:** There is a concern that the churchyard will become more like a municipal cemetery ie too regimented and groomed. This is not the intention. There are no plans to have neat rows of headstones, although it is true that some will have to be relocated to make way for the extension and the gathering place outside the new entrance. The landscape drawings did show extensive new pathways and a large paved area outside the new entrance. The plans will need revision, not least because external works are very expensive and this is one area where we can be much more flexible about what is included and when it is included. We need to balance ease of movement around the campus, clarity over where the main entrance is, space for occasional outside gatherings or services and retaining the character of the present churchyard.
- c) Increased car traffic especially along Lyngfield Park:** Some concerns have been expressed about the potential increase in the volume of traffic if the church is used more extensively than at present and if numbers increase. Everyone recognises the problem of car access caused by a moderately sized church car park, the problems of Lynfield Park and limited on-street parking in the close vicinity. However, if we want to grow numerically and spiritually as a church and to make the church more available, then inevitably that means more people walking, cycling and driving to church. That being the case, we should, as a church, consider what it means to 'love our neighbour' as far as Lynfield Park and our other immediate neighbours are concerned. That will mean encouraging people to walk much more to church, to park further afield, to come with friends etc. We will probably publish a travel plan. We might even station someone at the bottom of Lyngfield Park to say when the car park is full!

#### **Concerns about the cost**

15. Not surprisingly a number feel over-awed by the cost and how to raise the sums of money required. Other are concerned as to whether or not it could all be done for less money and/or whether it is morally right to spend so much on a building. The key concerns are:
- a) We are spending beyond our means now, so it would be foolish/wrong to take on this enormous commitment
  - b) Wrong to incur debt in the form of a loan or mortgage
  - c) Project should be phased in line with our resources
  - d) Immoral to spend huge sums on a building primarily for ourselves
16. **ROCK Response:**
- a) **We are spending beyond our means now so it would be foolish/wrong to take on this enormous commitment:** It is true that for a few years now our unrestricted income has not kept pace with our expenditure resulting in end of year appeals (or as in 2018, not paying £40,000 of the parish share). Most, if not all of the gap, between income and expenditure is attributable to the increases in parish share over recent years. There are on-going robust discussions with the Diocese about this. Reductions in staffing have been made. However, it is also true that when we embarked on the refurbishment of the All Saints Centre, there were no reserves and income only just matched expenditure (and in some years did not). Nevertheless we were able to fund a £1.1M development over a number of years. £1.1M is probably equivalent to £1.7M in 2018 prices.
  - b) **Wrong to incur debt in the form of a loan or mortgage:** A few people believe that it is plain wrong to take on a loan – some probably think it is unbiblical. The fact is that most homeowners borrow money to buy their homes and many do for other larger items. However

it should be remembered that the PCC agreed to taking out a loan of up to £400,000 from the CofE Central Board of Finance (of which we actually drew down £375,000). A loan of £400,000 in 2000 is equivalent to £640,000 in 2017 according to the Bank of England inflation calculator. Some have also suggested that it is wrong to take out a loan that will have to be paid off by our children. Well that depends on the period of the time we borrow and whether we pay it off more quickly than planned (as was the case with the church centre loan). Also postponing major works only loads more costs and burdens onto a future generation.

- c) **Project should be phased in line with our resources:** Yes indeed. The thing is that we do not know at this moment what our resources are or will be! We know that we have £600k pledged from the congregation, a large proportion of which will be spent upfront on fees. What we do not know is how much more we will be able to raise from within and without. We do know that more than 100 people in the consultation said they would consider starting to give to the project or increasing what they are already giving or have given. However the bottom line is that we will only be able to enter into a building contract for the amount of money we know that we have secured; so in that sense whatever we do will be in line with our resources.
- d) **Immoral to spend huge sums on a building primarily for ourselves:** This statement is often followed by 'when there are so many other more pressing needs in the world'. One response said we are 'over-investing in buildings and under-investing in people.' There is much that could be written about this. Some answers to those statements are: We have inherited an expensive historic building and we cannot just walk away from it; sooner or later buildings need major capital investment; very little capital investment has been spent on the church in the past 50 years; do we as individuals spend significant sums of money on our homes and ourselves that could be better spent in a needy world? the building project is not about building a comfortable space for the existing church family, it is about building a place where more people can come together for worship, celebration, healing, fellowship, learning and starting the Christian life.

The proposed spend on the ROCK Project also has to be seen in the context of what the church is also spending on other core activities and areas. See table below:

Area of Expenditure	Amount in 2017	2012 – 2021 ie ten years
Paying the costs of a Rector to lead the church with a parish wide responsibility and our proportion of central diocesan costs	£70,000	£700,000
Paying the costs of our paid staff who work with young people, older people, pastoral, church administration	£135,000	£1,350,000
Contribution from our parish share to provide clergy and associated costs for small rural churches and those in more deprived areas ie to support mission and the presence of the church elsewhere in Somerset	£80,000	£800,000
Giving to UK and Foreign Charities and Missions	£36,000	£360,000
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>£321,000</b>	<b>£3,210,000</b>

The figures for 2017 are accurate whereas the 2012 – 2021 figures are simply 2017 multiplied by 10 but the headline message is accurate. Over any ten year period, we will be spending more on people than we will on buildings and hopefully what we are proposing to spend on the building now will be good for at least another 25 years and most of it for another 50 years. In addition many members of All Saints who are giving both to our current expenditure and to the ROCK are also giving unknown amounts to other needs in the world. Lastly it is not as if we are sitting round wondering what to do with £3M and how to make the best use of it. The money for the

*ROCK project will only come from those who believe in the value of the project. Those who do not will hopefully be as generous in giving to other causes.*

#### **Concerns about the Decision-Making and Consultation Processes**

17. There are a few comments regarding who makes the final decision and on the consultation/engagement processes followed so far, ie:
- a) The final decision as to whether to proceed or not should be made by a formal vote of the church membership not by a PCC decision
  - b) Previous consultations flawed and/or deliberately skewed
18. **ROCK Response:**
- a) ***The final decision as to whether to proceed or not should be made by a formal vote of the church membership not by the PCC:*** *This was the view of a few people, some of whom believed that an undertaking had been given that nothing would go ahead until church members had formally voted on it. It is quite true that the go-ahead for the Church Centre Project was only taken after two formal votes of the church membership with a minimum turnout and majority required for approval. However it has never been agreed or stated that the ROCK project would be put to a formal vote – for a number of reasons. **Apart from the fact that the PCC is in law the only body that can make the decision, even if it agreed to a binding vote, there are problems over the nature of the questions to be raised.** Would it be a single question ie ‘Are you in favour of the ROCK project going ahead’ or would it be a three headed-question relating to each of the three elements. Would you ask detailed questions about borrowing or about phasing or about pews or chairs? Then there is the question of who gets to vote. Everyone on the Electoral Roll? (some of whom have moved away or no longer come); those who have identified themselves as Members? Only those who are able or willing to support the project financially? The ROCK Project is a complex project with very many different strands as with many large decisions in life. That is a good reason why the decision should be taken by those who have been elected as the representatives of the congregation to make decisions about the life of the church but those representatives must have the fullest possible information, including the feelings and views of the congregation.*
  - b) ***Previous consultations flawed and/or deliberately skewed:*** *There have now been four public consultations about the future of the church (2013, 2015, 2016 and 2018). In each case people have been given full opportunities to record their opinions both in terms of ‘votes’ and comments. The ROCK Team would strongly contest the idea that there have been any deliberate (or unintended) flaws in these consultations, much less that the consultations have been deliberately skewed to give a favourable view of future change options.*

#### **C: REACTION OF THE DIOCESE AND B&NES PLANNING OFFICERS**

19. Whatever changes inside or outside to the building are proposed will have to be agreed by the planning authorities. The Diocese in the form of the DAC (Diocesan Advisory Committee) will have to approve any changes to both the interior of the existing church and any external changes ie extension and changes to the churchyard area; this is known as obtaining a faculty. B&NES has no say over changes to the interior but has to give approval to any changes to the exterior and to the churchyard. Both bodies have been sent details of the proposed changes; site meetings have been held with representatives from both bodies and both have responded in writing to the proposals. This is the second time this has been done because they were both sounded out in 2016, when the extension, which ran the full length of the north side, was still an option.
20. **Diocesan Response:** The response from the DAC was very positive and can be summed up in this paragraph from its follow-up letter:
21. *The delegation was very sympathetic and in support of the overall aims of the project. The church and their architect have taken careful note of the previous comments by the DAC and BANES on*

*their 2015 proposal. The delegation generally considered this to be a far more acceptable and appropriate plan. The church reps gave the delegation an excellent presentation and the delegation commended the church on the well-researched and extensive Statement of Significance. The delegation reminded the church that the higher the listing of the church, the higher the requirement for showing that the need to change outweighs the significance of the status quo. The delegation wanted to enthusiastically encourage the church to push forward with this mission-focused plan.'*

22. As well as being supportive overall, the DAC asked us to consider a number of specific points but none of these would be difficult to comply with.
23. **B&NES Response:** The response of the planners was very different (as it was last time). The B&NES response is coordinated and led by the Senior Conservation Officer. The essence of their report is in this paragraph:
24. *'The scheme has clearly moved forward since 2015 and the positive efforts made to address some of the issues raised at that time is welcomed. However the submitted documentation makes it clear that there is an ambition to create a venue for events and theatre<sup>2</sup> which is driving many of the changes proposed. There continues to be considerable concern that overall the still intensive nature of the scheme will have a harmful impact on the church and its cemetery which cannot be reconciled with the statutory duty to preserve the listed building and its setting. It is considered that the degree of harm caused to the significance of the designated heritage assets would not be decisively outweighed by the public benefits afforded by the scheme.... There is still significant concern regarding the impact of these proposals on the setting and character of the listed building, historic churchyard, and medieval tower. It is therefore recommended that the proposals are not acceptable in their current form.'*
25. The B&NES response is clearly very disappointing and concerning, not least because the implication of their 2016 response was that a much-reduced extension would be acceptable. It would appear that in the minds of the planning officers conservation trumps all other considerations. The difficulties of dealing with Bath planners are well known but they can be won round, or at least the members of the Development Control (Planning) Committee can be. Nevertheless the PCC should be fully aware that gaining the approval of planning officers for any scheme that alters the existing external appearance of the church and churchyard will be very difficult. See later section on this matter.

#### **D: SCHEDULE OF COSTS**

26. A separate schedule of the costs is provided in a separate document. Very early on the process, Geoff Evans, one of the most experienced Quantity Surveyors in the country when it comes to work on churches and cathedrals, produced some cost estimates in 2015 and 2016. In 2017 we appointed Greenwood Quantity Surveyors, who have also worked on a number of historic building projects, including churches. There is broadly speaking a high degree of convergence between the two sets of estimates. Clearly both are dealing in estimates at this stage, sometimes using industry standard average costs per unit eg 400 m<sup>2</sup> of underfloor heating and other times making a reasonable judgment. The prices given are estimated 2018 prices. Obviously they will increase year on year in relation to building costs inflation.
27. The schedule of costs provided to the PCC shows estimated construction costs for different elements of the project to which are added all the other costs eg consultants' fees, an allowance for VAT, furniture etc. These have then been aggregated into the three main elements of the project ie:

---

<sup>2</sup> The officer report refers to 'theatre'. This is not a word that has ever been used by the ROCK Team or the architects in presenting proposals.

- a) Transforming the interior: **£1,427,548**
- b) Expanding the Footprint: **£996,499**
- c) Renewing the Landscape: **£575,536**

28. The cost plan prepared by Greenwood actually came to £3,700,000. This has been reduced to around £3M by taking out the works under the balcony, the baptistery and reducing the scope of works in the landscape (which is the easiest area to 'flex').
29. It is hard not to be taken aback at what everything costs, but the quality standards used are typically average for church refurbishments. PCC members must remember that these are estimated costs based on current information. They will change as more and more elements are detailed; they will also change due to inflation. Furthermore these are costs based on the project being a single contract; if the work is phased into two or more contracts taking place at different times, this will also add to costs. Finally, PCC members should note the exclusions from costs, which are set out in the Greenwood summary.

#### **E: THE MERITS AND IMPLICATIONS OF PHASING THE PROJECT**

30. Both the ROCK Team and some of the responses have considered the merits of or necessity for phasing the project. Reasons for phasing the project are two fold:
- a) Firstly, if we do not have sufficient funds to do whatever is proposed in one go
  - b) Secondly because it would be better to wait until we are really, really sure that we need an extension either because of increasing numbers attending services and/or increasing activities taking place in the church.
31. Clearly the idea of phasing has to be given serious thought. That said it is not as simple as saying *'let's do everything that is listed in the interior, then the extension and lastly the external landscape'*. There has to be a decision about what the priority of the work. The most obvious option is to do the work on the main body of the church first, followed by (at some stage) the work on the extension; however there are arguments for doing the extension first and then the main work on the church. But so as not to overcomplicate things and because there is such a large majority in favour of tackling the main body of the church first, we would need to think through what that would mean.
32. If we started with transforming the interior (say £1.43M as above) there are things we should consider adding on to that base cost such as:
- a) Refurbishing and making damp-proof the 'Vestry' which even if refurbished ought not to remain as the vestry; [NB: if/when the extension goes ahead the vestry will be demolished]
  - b) Creating a proper space for the crèche – the only space for that would seem to be possible is under the gallery, so that would mean reinstating the glazed screen and WC etc as well as making improvements to the refreshment area
  - c) Making a temporary improvement to the entrance into the choir vestry;
  - d) Making a temporary improvement to the choir vestry itself and the two WC's
  - e) Making the permanent improvement of the entrance from the choir vestry into the main body of the church
  - f) Improving the access route to the new entrance and undertaking whatever paving is agreed leading up to the new entrance
33. All these items would add considerably to the £1.43M. We hope to have cost projections for different phasing models in time for the meeting.

## PART TWO – RECOMMENDATIONS TO PCC FOR THE NEXT PHASE APRIL – DECEMBER 2018

34. Taking into account all the work that has been done to date and the results of the consultation process, the ROCK Team recommends that over the next 9 months the following priorities or work-streams are pursued:
- a) **Developing the fund-raising strategy - including seeking to secure external funds**
  - b) **Moving to the next stage of the design process ie developing the plans so that a detailed planning application is submitted**
  - c) **Developing and implementing a strategy so that planning permission is highly likely to be granted**

### F: FUND-RAISING STRATEGY

35. Throughout the five years that ROCK has been going, thought has been given as to how the works could be funded. Assumptions have been made and some of these assumptions were presented to the congregation in 2016 before almost any money had been raised by the project. These assumptions were based on:
- a) Our own experience of raising the £1.1M for the Church Centre
  - b) Talking to and visiting other churches eg St Michael's Stoke Gifford (£4-6M project); St Michael Waitrose (£1M); St Andrew's Oxford (£2.5M); Bath Abbey (now £19M)
  - c) Talking to Diocesan Parish Resources Officer
36. The assumption has always been that for a project of this sort, the majority of funding will have to come from church members. As far as the Church Centre project was concerned about 85% came from church members over a period of 8 years. Other sources of income are expected to come from the following sources:
- a) Individuals not necessarily connected with the church but who would be sympathetic to our mission and vision
  - b) Grant-Making Trusts
  - c) Heritage Lottery Fund (but see later)
  - d) Option for Sale of Chandler Close house but that would mean the loss of an annual income of £10k
  - e) Loan – but of course that would have to be paid off over the period of the loan primarily by church members.
37. **Heritage Lottery:** Whilst the PCC and church members are unlikely to have serious qualms about approaching individuals for donations and also grant-making and public bodies, there will be questions and reservations or even objections to approaching the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for a grant because the money has come from gambling. HLF is now the largest provider of funds for heritage projects. HLF will only pay for repair items to churches or for work, which enables the wider public to have more access to the heritage 'stored' in a church; it will not fund better facilities. Even so, we do not know if a church like All Saints would be considered important enough in heritage terms to merit a grant. The PCC will need to decide in due course whether it is willing to apply for grants to HLF not just for the church but also for repair works to the Centre.
38. So far we have not had our fund-raising strategy or assumptions externally tested by those who have much more experience in this field than we do. We do believe that others should critically review the feasibility of what we are attempting to do and that work should start on trying to secure external funds. The ROCK Team has the following time-scale in mind as regard fund-raising:
- a) Spring to Autumn 2018 behind-the-scenes work, probably supported by a professional fundraiser to identify sources of funding outside of the church and then to secure commitments.

- b) Late in 2018 or early 2019 to go back to the church with the results of this phase of the funding strategy known. There would then be a second Gift/Pledge Sunday. After that we would know how much money we are likely to have and what therefore we can commission. We should also know then whether or not we have secured planning permission. (See later). Obviously if church members want to increase or start their giving now, we would not wish to dissuade them but we think it is probably not right to go out now with a church-wide appeal until we know what is the 'gap'.
39. A rule of thumb for many charities is that the budget for fund-raising needs to be 10 - 20% of the sum needed. So, for example, the Genesis Trust had a budget for fund-raising activities of around £100,00 for their Walcot St Centre, which has a build cost of £1,000,000. We do not expect to spend anything like 10% or even 5% on fund-raising activities. However at this stage of the project we do believe it would be right to pay for a feasibility study that would examine what we have done so far, stress test our funding assumptions and undertake some preliminary work on identifying some external sources of funding. Over the past year three potential consultants have been met with and we now want to proceed with a two-man enterprise called 'Mission-Focused Fundraising' which has wide experience of supporting churches and charities in raising funds for capital projects.
  40. A proposal from Mission Focused Fundraising for a feasibility study is being prepared. It is very likely that we will wish to accept all or some of what is proposed by MFF. Depending on the outcome of that work, we might wish at a later stage to commission more work from them or we might decide that what is recommended can be done by ourselves at little or no cost.
  41. **RECOMMENDATION: The PCC is asked to authorize the appointment of Mission-Focused Fundraising to carry out an initial feasibility study in accordance with the proposal that has been submitted to the ROCK Team.**

#### **G: THE NEXT STAGE OF THE DESIGN PROCESS**

42. Throughout this long process, we have proceeded step-by-step, never committing ourselves too far ahead or beyond our known financial resources. As far as the architects are concerned, we have so far contracted with them for the first 3 phases of the complete design process, namely:
  - 1) Preparation and Brief
  - 2) Concept design
  - 3) Developed Design

These three phases account for 40% of the final fee and we have paid 80% of that 40%.
43. We now want to instruct the architects to submit planning applications to the Diocese and B&NES. That will probably take a few months. However that additional work is included within Phase 3, which we have more or less paid for. Therefore to get to planning application stage involves no new commitment of finance to the architects.
44. The key question is whether we wish them to work up the present design for planning application or a design that shows a reduced extension or non-existent extension. It is the considered view of the ROCK Team that we should ask them to take the present proposals forward subject to some final revisions, including a softening and reduction of the external landscape proposals and some possible adjustments to the internal layout of the extension. We recognise that this may seem like ignoring the concerns of the 19% who are unconvinced about the extension, but this is not a final-final decision. This is because we cannot and will not make the final decision as a PCC as to what works to authorize until we know:
  - a) What exactly we will get planning permission for
  - b) The funds available to us

45. It is possible that we will not obtain permission for an extension (or only for an even more reduced extension) and/or that we have not been able to get much beyond £2,000,000 by way of promised funds. In which case we will have to revisit phasing the project or scrapping the extension altogether. But at this stage we think we should go for the whole scheme.
46. As far as the design process is concerned, we should also be moving to make the appointment over the next few months of a structural engineer and a mechanical and electrical engineer.<sup>3</sup> The amount of work required from these two consultants as part of the planning application process is not likely to be very great but there will be some. In due course we may also want to appoint an acoustics engineer and a Project Manager but those are not necessary at this stage.
47. **RECOMMENDATION: The PCC is asked to:**
- a) **Agree that the architects should be asked to complete the current contracted phase of their appointment, namely the formal submission of plans to the Diocese and the local authority in order to secure planning permission; and furthermore that the plans should be based on the proposed changes to the interior of the church, than appropriate outline form of the proposed extension, and a reduction in the scale of changes to the landscape**
  - b) **Authorise the appointment via a competitive tendering process of a Structural Engineer and an M&E Engineer, with ratification for the appointment to be sought (by email) if necessary from the PCC.**

#### **H: OBTAINING PLANNING PERMISSION**

48. Section C above noted the different responses of the two legal bodies who must give their approval to any plans to the church and campus. Securing a faculty (ie planning permission) from the Diocese is unlikely to be problematic. On the other hand securing B&NES planning permission is likely to be difficult, given the present attitude of the officers. The PCC should know that the preliminary view of an experienced Planning Consultant (see next paragraph) was that our chances of gaining a recommendation for approval from the planning officers was slim, although the chances were significantly greater if the application is considered by councilors (which it will be). Therefore it is ROCK's view that a strategy needs to be developed and implemented for reducing or eliminating the risk of not obtaining local authority planning permission. Such a strategy will include:
- a) Ensuring that our application is as professional as possible and is compliant in all the essential elements
  - b) Modifying the proposals where we can to accommodate the officers' objections – but not at the expense of compromising our core objectives
  - c) Mobilising local community support and reducing any opposition through a careful process of engagement
  - d) Mobilising more senior officer support and where we can the support of members of the planning committee
  - e) Engaging with such bodies as Historic England (a statutory consultee) and the Victorian and Georgian Societies (none of these bodies are likely to be sympathetic to internal and external changes)
49. In order to develop that strategy, the ROCK Team believes it is advisable to engage a Planning Consultant ie someone experienced in assisting clients to obtain planning permission. Such a person has been identified but not via a competitive tendering process. The person in question has been recommended by Peter Heywood because Genesis Trust used him to assist them in gaining

---

<sup>3</sup> The four main consultancies in a design project are the Architect; Quantity Surveyor; Structural Engineer and Mechanical and Electrical Engineer

planning permission for their new centre in Walcot St. His name is Chris Dance. As well as being a Planning Consultant he is also the worship leader at St Saviour's Church Larkhall; he has wide experience of planning applications in B&NES. A preliminary interview has been held with him and his first piece of advice was that we needed to engage local councilors as soon as possible. Accordingly a meeting has been set up for 16 April involved Cllr Matthew Davies (one of the two Weston Councillors and a Member of the Planning Committee), Mark Searle, Rosie Coates and Tom Peryer. There will be no cost to the church for this meeting. However it is very likely that we will wish to ask Chris Dance to assist us – but very much on a 'Pay-As-You-Go' basis.

50. **RECOMMENDATION: The PCC is asked to agree to the appointment of Chris Dance as the Planning Consultant for this project on terms and for such services as are agreed between him and members of the ROCK Team.**

**I: REPORTING BACK TO CHURCH MEMBERSHIP AND ON-GOING ENGAGEMENT**

51. Clearly it is important to keep the congregation fully informed of the results of the consultation and the decisions of the PCC. So it is intended to make the following documents available to them (on the website and in hard copy):

- a) All results of the consultation exercise to be made available (ie both summary and complete set of comments)
- b) This report to the PCC
- c) A letter from Rector and churchwardens (on behalf of PCC)<sup>4</sup> to the congregation outlining the decisions made by PCC and explaining what will happen over the next few months

52. In addition, active engagement should continue and include:

- a) The offer to meet with anyone or any group who wishes to talk over their concerns or ideas (some of that has already been happening both before and since the consultation)
- b) The setting up of meetings with interest groups eg parents of babies and toddlers, flower arrangers, those with a disability
- c) Possible one-off meeting just for those who have concerns about the extension and funding

**RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION POINTS**

53. **The PCC is asked to:**

- a) **Approve the three main work-streams of the ROCK Committee during 2018, namely:**
  - i. **Developing the fund-raising strategy including seeking to secure external funds, prior to any second appeal to the congregation**
  - ii. **Moving to the next stage of the design process ie developing the plans so that a detailed planning application is submitted**
  - iii. **Developing and implementing a strategy so that planning permission is highly likely to be granted**
- b) **The PCC is asked to authorize the appointment of Mission-Focused Fundraising to carry out an initial feasibility study in accordance with the proposal that has been submitted to the ROCK Team.**
- c) **Agree that the architects should be asked to complete the current contracted phase of their appointment, namely the formal submission of plans to the Diocese and the local authority in order to secure planning permission; and furthermore that the plans should be based on**

---

<sup>4</sup> Not discussed with them!

the proposed changes to the interior of the church, an appropriate<sup>5</sup> outline form of the proposed extension, and a reduction in the scale of changes to the landscape

- d) Authorise the appointment via a competitive tendering process of a Structural Engineer and an M&E Engineer; with ratification for the appointment to be sought (by email) if necessary from the PCC.
- e) Authorise the appointment of Chris Dance as the Planning Consultant for this project on terms and for such services as are agreed between him and members of the ROCK Team. *(NB: TP to clarify CD's connection with LPC Trull)*<sup>6</sup>
- f) Note the communication that will be shared with the church after the PCC meeting and the intentions regarding further engagement

---

<sup>5</sup> 'Present' changed to 'appropriate' by an amendment at PCC meeting

<sup>6</sup> Amendment about relationship with LCP Trull approved at PCC meeting