

the faculty as sought on the basis that the grounds of necessity had not been made out. Any flexibility needed could be achieved by making the pews removable in order that they could be moved when required. The chancellor was prepared to grant a faculty in those terms should the petitioners wish to pursue that course. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X12001093

### **Re Holy Trinity, Wandsworth**

Southwark Consistory Court: Petchey Ch, 4 September 2012

*Font – relocation – circumstances out of the ordinary*

The petitioners sought a faculty for the substantial re-ordering of the church, including the re-location of the font to the east end of the church. The font was currently located in a screened baptistery at the west end of the church, within which the petitioners sought to create a servery. The baptistery was unused and for the last 70 years baptisms had taken place with a portable font at the front of the church. The Diocesan Advisory Committee supported the petition but English Heritage, the Church Buildings Council and the Victorian Society raised objections, particularly in relation to the proposals for the font. None of those bodies chose to become parties opponent within the proceedings.

The chancellor reviewed in detail the historical and canonical background to the location of fonts. He reviewed much of the case law and the House of Bishops' Response of 1992 on the issue of fonts. The chancellor emphasised that he rejected the view that the qualified requirements of Canon F 1 – that the font shall stand as near to the principal entrance of the church as conveniently may be – were no longer of application. He further rejected the suggestion that the House of Bishops' Response altered the position in relation to Canon F 1, as the amendment of the Canons is vested in the General Synod rather than the House of Bishops. The chancellor held that the basic rule was that the font should be as near the principal entrance into the church as conveniently may be and for the authorising of an alternative location there needs to be shown circumstances out of the ordinary.

In determining the petition the chancellor first considered whether the requirements of Canon F 1 had been met, before going on to consider the *Bishopsgate* questions. He found that the font in its current position inside the baptistery was effectively redundant. The case for moving it was, thus, made out. He then considered whether the requirements of Canon F 1 meant that the font should be moved to another location nearer the principal entrance,

rather than at the east end as proposed. The chancellor found that the relative inconvenience of locating the font near the principal entrance, where it would limit the flexibility of the welcome area, did not amount to circumstances out of the ordinary. However, the fact that a tradition had developed within the church of baptisms taking place at the front of the church did amount to circumstances out of the ordinary justifying an alternative location. The faculty was granted. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X1200110X

### **Re St Paul, Herne Hill**

Southwark Consistory Court: Petchey Ch, 4 September 2012

#### *War memorial*

The petitioners sought a faculty for the creation of a welcome area at the west end of the church. The proposals involved the removal of the rood screen, on which had been included a First World War memorial, to the west end of the church, to be incorporated within the partition that separated the new welcome area from the main body of the church. The chancellor had sought the advice of the War Memorials Trust, who did not support the screen being moved. The chancellor stated that he had greater reservations about authorising the moving of a screen that was a war memorial than one that was not. In this case, the memorial would be moved further from the high altar, but the chancellor was satisfied that it would have greater prominence in its new position and that this outweighed any disadvantage in moving it. The faculty was granted. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X12001111