

## ALL SAINTS Childwall

### *Development proposals.*

Congregational meeting Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2010

At the start of the above, responses were given to questions that had been given in prior to the meeting. There then followed a time of 'open' questions. The following is a summary of these 'open' questions asked and the responses given.

*To begin with it was announced that a questionnaire had been placed in the box at the back of church when people had arrived and this would be dealt with first*

#### **Questionnaire**

Can the PCC confirm that there is no conflict of interest (financial or otherwise) with the people involved in the planning, planning application or the future building?

*Answer:* (given by the churchwarden) I have no knowledge whatsoever of any conflict of interest and would refute any suggestion that those involved have gained or will gain any financial benefit or recompense for the work they have been voluntarily involved in. If any one has any such information they should divulge it immediately.

#### **Question 1 (from the floor)**

Can you clarify which pews are being removed from the Plumbe Chapel and provide an update on the planning application?

*Answer:* The end of each pew in the plumb chapel will be removed in order to widen the aisle to make it about the same width as the main aisle in church. This will amount to removing approximately one seating space from the end of each pew on either side of the existing central aisle in the plumb chapel. The 2 pews at the front of the nave between the north aisle and the chancel will also be removed to provide a through access from the new entrance to the present chancel.

It was also pointed out that the new entrance would go UNDERNEATH the existing window in the Plumbe chapel which therefore would not need to be altered or removed.

As far as the planning application is concerned, this process is taking longer than envisaged due to the amount of information which has been requested, often in a piecemeal fashion, as the process has developed. We are unable to give a specific date by which the submission can be finalised and a decision made.

#### **Question 2**

You have stated that there is to be very little alteration to the interior of the church and yet there is going to be space for something like 50 additional seats. Where are they going to be placed?

*Answer:* Once the existing doorway can be taken out of use, the rear of the church can be cleared of a lot of cupboards, tables, bookcases and the like providing considerable space. There will also be no need to provide direct access to the present porch, so seating can be arranged right along the rear of the church. This seating would be in the form of removable chairs which can be stored when the present entrance may need opening for weddings or funerals and the like.

### **Question 3**

I am not a regular attendee at church, but have lived locally for over 40 years. It seems to me that this church is outstanding for both its age and beauty and, in a social sense, belongs to Childwall. How have we arrived at a circular rotunda which is so out of keeping with the rest of the church? If I did not speak up now I would feel guilty for the rest of my life.

*Answer:* There was a divergence of views within the DAC when consulted. Some members with an architectural interest wanted something 'bolder and bigger'. One considered the proposed building to be 'insignificant'. Our architects view, supported by the development area, considers that the proposals provide a 'discreet' building which provides an appropriate solution to the problems we face in providing the additional facilities we need. Whilst opposition to the building itself is perfectly fair, it is nevertheless subjective.

### **Question 4**

The fact remains that the proposal doesn't show any respect for the rest of the building which has abundant traditional style and it appears to me that the proposals have not been thought through.

*Answer:* A great deal of time, as well as consultation, has gone into where we are today. This project has been under consideration for years not months and we feel that what is proposed is appropriate.

It is felt that the proposals protect the integrity of our beautiful church building. It should be a matter of celebration that we need the facilities we are hoping to provide as it underlines the fact that we are a healthy and vibrant church community of people who want a living Christian community to flourish and to be open to all who may wish to come. It is not a museum.

### **Question 5**

This is just a statement. I would like to thank all those involved to date in progressing these plans up to now. There has obviously been a lot of hard work put in for which we should be grateful.

*Answer:* Thank you.

### **Question 6**

This is just an observation. Two other churches I have been involved in had similar problems regarding opposition to their proposals. In the event, when completed, the results were warmly embraced by all who used them.

*Answer:* Thank you for that.

### **Question 7**

Do you have any idea of the cost of these proposed developments?

*Answer:* Yes. We have obtained professionally prepared budgetary information. In round figures it is estimated that the cost will be in the order of eight hundred thousand pounds for the extension to the church and around 1.2 million pounds for the

church hall works. We consider the budgets to be robust, insofar as they have allowed for a reasonable element of unforeseen costs, such as those we have experienced throughout the planning process.