

and overseas. The chancellor considered the decisions of *Re St Gregory, Tredington* [1972] Fam 236 and *Re St Peter, Draycott* (2009) 11 Ecc LJ 365. The chancellor considered that the burden of proof on the petitioners to show a good and sufficient reason for the sale of the bible was towards the lower end of the scale but nevertheless he refused the petition. The chancellor expressed concern that if such a reason were readily found then parishes would come under great pressure to part with valuable items. There was no financial emergency and the PCC's laudable desire to support missionary work could not amount to a good and sufficient reason in the circumstances. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X10000232

### **Re St Margaret, Halliwell**

Manchester Consistory Court: Tattersall Ch, October 2009

*Confirmatory faculty – unauthorised works – costs*

The priest-in-charge and a churchwarden petitioned for a faculty for roof repairs. After an oral hearing the chancellor made findings that the petitioners had authorised the undertaking of the proposed works without a faculty despite knowing that one was required and that the DAC did not support their proposal. He further found that the petitioners had completed the petition in a misleading manner and had attempted to conceal the fact that works had already been completed. He ordered that the petitioners should each personally make a contribution of £100 towards the cost of the petition to mark the gravity of their behaviour. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X10000244

### **Re All Saints, Dulverton**

Bath and Wells Consistory Court: Briden Ch, October 2009

*Churchyard paths – disabled access*

The first part of the petition concerned the alteration of paths in the churchyard, which slopes steeply upwards from the road to the church. The chancellor granted the faculty noting that the court will normally allow reasonable alterations to improve disabled access in line with section 21 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. He noted that where decisions (on traffic issues, for example) had been taken by the local planning authority they would not normally be re-examined by the consistory court. However, he noted that the treatment of interred remains that may be disturbed during works in the churchyard was the proper concern of the court and he made the faculty for these works conditional upon the reburial