

September by him and the Administrator of the Diocese were a bar on proceedings before the tribunal. [Garth Blake]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X1200049X

### **Re St John the Evangelist, Filey**

York Consistory Court: Collier Ch, May 2011

*Re-ordering*

In the diocese unopposed petition fees were paid by the Diocesan Board of Finance, although the fees for opposed petitions were met by the petitioners. A faculty was granted for the re-ordering of the church, including the plastering of a brick wall, subject to no objection being received after display of the Public Notice. One parishioner made an informal objection to the plastering of the wall. In finding that there was no substance in the objection raised and therefore granting the faculty, the chancellor observed that the single objection had caused significant additional delay and cost for the petitioners and commented that it might be appropriate for petitioners when explaining re-ordering plans also to explain the process involved and the consequences of any objections received. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X12000506

### **Re St Nicholas, Radford Semele**

Coventry Consistory Court: Eyre Ch, February 2012

*Organ – moveable font*

The church having been destroyed by fire in 2008, a faculty had been granted for its reconstruction and those works were ready to commence. Two outstanding matters remained: proposals to install a digital organ and a moveable font. As to the organ, the chancellor referred to his judgment in *Re St Nicholas, Warwick* (2010) 12 Ecc LJ 407, in which he had held that those seeking to replace an existing pipe organ with something other than a pipe organ had to discharge a heavy burden, there being a presumption in favour of replacing pipe organs with pipe organs. This was still the case even where, as in the present case, the previous pipe organ had been destroyed, as the presumption in favour of pipe organs resulted from the musical quality and longevity of such instruments. The petitioners' argument that a digital organ would cost less in terms of both capital outlay and maintenance carried little weight. Over time pipe organs were better value for money than organs with a more limited lifespan and the court would not be sympathetic to arguments that it