

notice, deserting their spouses, causing a public scandal and forming an inappropriate relationship meant that he could never again be able to recommend them for ministry. The tribunal found that there was a realistic possibility that the second respondent could, at some point in the future, take up ministerial functions again. She was prohibited for twelve years and the first respondent for life. Both were removed from office and placed on the Archbishops' List. [WA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X09002221

### **Re St Nicholas, Nuneaton**

Coventry Consistory Court: Gage Ch, January 2009

*Reordering – new room – removal of organ*

The petition before the court was in two parts. The first concerned the construction in the churchyard of a community hall to be connected to the Grade I listed church and the neighbouring Grade II listed former grammar school. There were no objections and the scheme had received the necessary planning permission and listed building consent. The faculty for this was granted subject to conditions about the recording and reburial of any remains disturbed. The second part attracted three objections and concerned the removal of pews, the installation of a new heating system, the installation of a dais at the chancel end of the nave, the construction of meeting rooms within the south-west corner of the church, the removal of the pipe organ to make way for a new vestry and other sundry matters. The hearing was principally about the removal of the organ and its replacement with a digital instrument. The chancellor reviewed the law set down principally in the *Bishopsgate* questions. He was satisfied that the petitioners had shown the necessity for the proposed works. He also considered that the works would adversely affect the character of the church as a building of significant historical and architectural interest. He was satisfied that the necessity outweighed the adverse effect in respect of the majority of the proposed works. However, the organ (which he considered to be a fixture, rather than a chattel) was of local and historic interest. He found that the removal and possible re-use of the organ elsewhere had not been considered and that proper consideration had not been given to the siting of the vestry in one of the proposed new rooms in the south-west of the church. A faculty was granted for the second part of the petition, save for the removal of the organ. [WA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X09002233