

Re St Mary the Virgin, Battle

Chichester Consistory Court: Hill Ch, December 2010

Extension – funding – parish share

Objectors had raised concerns as to the funding of an extension to the church, suggesting that the parish could not discharge its parish share and so ought not to spend large sums on a significant building project. Having addressed the *Bishopsgate* questions, the chancellor granted the faculty subject to conditions that the works should not commence until the registrar has certified in writing that the petitioners had satisfied him that sufficient funds were in place or pledged to cover the cost of the entire works; the Diocesan Board of Finance had certified that the parish was up to date in its payment of the parish share; and the court costs had been paid in full. The chancellor further directed that the Dean of Battle and the PCC should use their best endeavours to continue to discharge the parish share in future years. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X11000330

Re Bishop Hannington Memorial Church, Hove

Chichester Consistory Court: Hill Ch, January 2011

Illegal works – confirmatory faculty – conditions

In June 2010 the vicar and churchwardens petitioned for a retrospective faculty authorising works undertaken illegally during the course of 2010. In determining the petition the chancellor expressed regret at the ‘cursory and less than fulsome’ nature of the explanations which had been filed by the petitioners, the inspecting architect and the contractors, in accordance with the court’s directions. In reluctantly granting the retrospective faculty the chancellor attached conditions that the inspecting architect should make written representations as to why his name should not be removed from the list of approved inspecting architects; that the contractors should not be approved for any building works concerning churches in the diocese for a period of 12 months; and that even if they fell within the class of cases which might otherwise be put before the archdeacon, any faculty applications during that period are to be determined by the chancellor. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X11000342