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Notes on Statistics

1. In calculating population figures, Output Areas (OA) were allocated to parishes based on the population centroid. The 2001 census population figure was then multiplied up such that OA populations summed to mid-2009 lower super output area (LSOA) populations. Whilst this figure will inevitably contain some errors at the parish level – since OAs are allocated as a single unit and not apportioned where they straddle parishes and population growth cannot be considered below the LSOA level – estimates can be considered as robust at the deanery level.

2. Data on clergy come from two sources. Stipendiary clergy data come from payroll information and non-stipendiary clergy data from Crockfords. Both sets of figures are correct as at 31 December 2009.

Foreword

It has been a privilege to chair the new Dioceses Commission in this important review of the Yorkshire dioceses. In its work the Commission is required to ‘have regard to the furtherance of the mission of the Church of England’,¹ and it was for the sake of the Church of England’s mission to the people who live in the four dioceses concerned that the Commission embarked upon its task. The review and its conclusions are mission-led and not finance-driven (though mission needs to be financed, so financial considerations cannot be ignored). We have asked which structures will best enable the Church of England to relate to the communities of Yorkshire (not just in the parishes but also at city, borough, district and county levels), which will be most intelligible to non-churchgoers, which would eliminate wasteful duplication, and which are likely to prove resilient and sustainable into the medium term.

I wish to express my thanks to all who have contributed to the report: the other members of the Review Team and of the Commission, each of whom has contributed important expertise; the Commission’s staff, in particular its able Secretary; and other staff in Church House – especially in the Legal Office, the Research and Statistics Department and the Church Commissioners’ Mapping Department.

Our work has offered fascinating insights into the interface of church structures not only with history and ecclesiology but also with geography, sociology and local government issues. For the Review Team it has been a privilege to hold conversations with bishops and their senior staff, council leaders and chief executives, and leaders of other churches, and to meet many of the rural deans and deanery lay chairs of the dioceses concerned, as well as significant numbers of parish clergy and lay representatives – around 250 people in all. We are grateful for their time and their frankness, as well as to those who wrote to us with reflections and suggestions.

Some of the aspirations that were expressed to us might at first sight appear to be in conflict – for a mix of urban and rural areas within a diocese and yet for focused attention to rural or urban issues, for example; or for episcopacy that is close to the parishes and yet for structures that offer economies of scale. We hope that in each case our recommendations will fulfil both aspirations.

Our report plays back much that was said to us – sometimes, perhaps, things that many have been thinking but which may not always have been articulated in local discussions. It is the fruit of a year’s work. We hope that it will be read, digested, reflected upon prayerfully, and debated thoroughly. We look forward to considered responses in the light of prayer, reflection and debate – continuing a two-way conversation between the Commission and the people of the dioceses concerned.

PRISCILLA CHADWICK
Dr Priscilla Chadwick
Chair of the Dioceses Commission 18 November 2010

¹ Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007, s. 1: General Duty.
The Dioceses Commission and its Yorkshire Review

Introduction

The Dioceses Commission is an independent statutory body established in September 2008 under the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007. One of its principal duties is ‘to keep under review... the size, boundaries and number of dioceses and their distribution between the provinces’.

During 2010 the Commission’s membership and staff have been as follows:

Chair: Dr Priscilla Chadwick
Vice-Chair: The Ven. Richard Seed, Archdeacon of York (to October 2010)
           Canon Professor Michael Clarke (from Nov. 2010)
Elected members: The Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford
                 The Revd Paul Benfield
                 Canon Professor Michael Clarke (to November 2010)
                 Mr Michael Streeter (to October 2010)

Appointed members: Mrs Lucinda Herklots
                   The Revd Sarah Mullally, DBE
                   Canon Professor Hilary Russell
                   The Rt Revd Nigel Stock,
                   Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich

Secretary: Dr Colin Podmore
Assistant Secretary: Mrs Jo Winn-Smith (to September 2010)
                   Mr Sion Hughes Carew (from September 2010)

The Archdeacon of York did not participate in deliberations leading to recommendations regarding the Diocese of York.

Further information about the Commission and its work may be found at www.diocom.org

At its first meeting the Commission received from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York a paper offering some reflections on how it might undertake its duty to review the size, boundaries and number of dioceses. It agreed with them that it would be best to begin exploring specifically what will best serve the future mission of the Church in one or more areas where boundaries appeared to be problematic, rather than seeking to arrive at a theoretical view of the optimum size and distribution of dioceses and then attempting to apply that to the country as a whole.

The Commission’s work therefore began with an analysis of diocesan boundaries which compared them with the local government regions and the boundaries of ceremonial counties and unitary authorities and identified anomalies which might merit closer investigation.
1.1.6  The Commission sent its paper on boundary anomalies to all diocesan bishops and invited them to comment on which region of the country should be priority for the Commission’s first review. The largest number of bishops suggested that the Commission should begin by reviewing the dioceses of Yorkshire, but it was also suggested that the boundary between the Diocese of Peterborough and the Diocese of Ely merited examination.

1.1.7  On 29 January 2009 the Commission announced that it would begin by examining the Peterborough-Ely boundary and then commence a review of the boundaries of the five Yorkshire dioceses. During 2009 it worked on its initial report on the Dioceses of Peterborough and Ely and also undertook preparatory work for its review of the Yorkshire dioceses. The review then began in the first week of January 2010.

1.1.8  So that this report could be published before the end of 2010, the Commission decided to limit its scope to the Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon & Leeds, Sheffield and Wakefield. Consideration of the western and southern boundaries of the Diocese of York is included, but substantive examination of the Diocese of York (including its northern boundary) has been reserved for a subsequent report, which is expected to be published during 2011.

1.2  Aim of the Review

1.2.1  In the initial announcement of the Commission’s review programme, its aim was stated as follows:

‘The aim will be to establish whether the shape and boundaries of the existing dioceses tend to facilitate the Church’s mission to the people and communities of Yorkshire or whether different boundaries would enable the Church to relate to them more effectively. The Commission has no agenda to reduce or increase the number of dioceses, but rather to ensure the best configuration to the communities that the dioceses serve, which could involve merging existing dioceses and/or creating new ones.’

A note added:

‘In identifying the local communities to which the Church needs to relate, the Commission will look at how diocesan boundaries correlate with the boundaries of counties and unitary/metropolitan authorities and which configurations might best further the Church’s mission. It will also have in mind other factors. Among these are:

• the sense of local identity resulting from history and shared culture,
• contemporary communities reflecting the places between which people travel for work, shopping, leisure, education and health services,
• road and rail communication routes, and
• the accessibility and distance of cathedral cities by car and public transport from all parts of the diocese.’
The Chair of the Commission, Dr Chadwick, commented:

‘The Commission is embarking on its review work with an open mind and a willingness to think radically, as well as an awareness of the need to be realistic. We have every confidence that the bishops and dioceses concerned will engage with the process in the same spirit.’

1.2.2 The context for the Church’s mission in Yorkshire has changed since the present diocesan boundaries were fixed, and it continues to do so. Population has grown and demography has changed, overall church attendance has declined, some old industries have declined and new industries have grown up, with consequences for patterns of employment and unemployment. Services and leisure facilities, communications and transport systems have all changed greatly since 1919, when the newest Yorkshire diocese was created. Many of these changes have also had consequences for people’s sense of identity and community.

1.2.3 The Commission has been concerned to stress that its Yorkshire review should be mission-led, not finance-driven. In times of financial stringency it is important that any change does not increase the cost of running the Church’s structures in Yorkshire. Indeed, it is desirable that the cost should be reduced. This is not the aim with which the review has been undertaken, but the cost of bringing change about must at least be offset by likely financial savings in the longer term. It continues to be the vocation of the Church of England to provide a Christian presence in every community, and any changes should be such as will provide more effective support to parishes and enable the Church to relate more effectively to the structures of civil society.

1.2.4 It is also important to underline that the Commission’s review work is conducted within the existing legal framework set by canon and statute law. While it is possible that reviews will suggest a need for minor amendments to the law, it is not the Commission’s role to propose solutions that would involve major changes to the law governing the roles of bishops, dioceses and cathedrals or indeed to the ecclesiology that the law reflects.

1.3 Process of the Review

1.3.1 Preparatory work undertaken by the Commission and its staff in 2009 included a tour of the Borough of Barnsley and much of the Diocese of Wakefield, guided by the Archdeacons of Doncaster, Pontefract and Halifax. This took place during the Commission’s residential meeting, which was held in Sheffield.

1.3.2 The Commission appointed a review team, consisting of Dr Priscilla Chadwick (Chair of the Commission), Professor Michael Clarke and Dr Colin Podmore (Secretary of the Commission) to conduct the review. The Review Team was joined by Mrs Lucinda Herklots for part of its visit to Wakefield. (Professor
Clarke is a former member of the local government Boundary Committee. Mrs Herklots is the Diocesan Secretary of the Diocese of Salisbury.)

1.3.3 Between January and June 2010 the Review Team made five visits to Yorkshire over a total of 15 days. In all, 80 meetings were held – in Bradford and Skipton; Ripon, Leeds, Harrogate and Richmond; Sheffield and Goole; Wakefield, Barnsley, Huddersfield and Halifax; York, Bishopthorpe, Ledsham, Bramham, Boston Spa, Tadcaster, Easingwold, Thirsk, Northallerton and Hutton Rudby; and London.

1.3.4 During these meetings the Review Team took oral evidence from well over 200 people. These included:

- almost all members of the senior staff of the five dioceses (bishops, deans, archdeacons, diocesan secretaries);
- almost all of the chairs of the houses of clergy and laity, and of the diocesan boards of finance, of the Dioceses of Bradford, Sheffield, Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield;
- the rural deans and some of the lay chairs of the Bowland, Calverley, Ewecross and Otley Deaneries (Diocese of Bradford), the deaneries in the Archdeaconry of Richmond (Diocese of Ripon & Leeds), the deaneries covering the Boroughs of Barnsley, Calderdale and Kirklees (Diocese of Wakefield), and the Easingwold and Mowbray Deaneries (Diocese of York);
- the Diocesan Director of Education for Bradford and Ripon & Leeds;
- clergy and lay representatives from
  - the Bradford Diocese parishes in Lancashire,
  - the Bradford Diocese parishes in the City of Leeds,
  - the Ripon & Leeds Diocese parishes in County Durham,
  - the Sheffield Diocese parishes in the East Riding of Yorkshire,
  - the Wakefield Diocese parishes in the Borough of Barnsley,
  - the Wakefield Diocese parishes in the City of Leeds, and
  - the York Diocese parishes in the City of Leeds;
- the Roman Catholic Bishops of Hallam and Leeds and the Dean of St Anne’s Roman Catholic Cathedral, Leeds.
- officers of the four Yorkshire-based Methodist districts;
- the County Ecumenical Development Officer for West Yorkshire;
- the Lord Lieutenants of South, West and North Yorkshire;
- members and officers of the five West Yorkshire unitary authorities and the East Riding unitary authority, of North Yorkshire County Council, of Craven, Harrogate, Richmondshire and Hambleton District Councils, and of Goole Town Council.

The Commission is grateful to those whom the Review Team met for their contribution to its thinking.

---

2 Meeting with officers of the four Yorkshire-based Methodist districts.
1.3.5 We wish to draw particular attention to the welcome that the Review Team received from the staff and members of the various local authorities. The readiness with which, in so many cases, arrangements were made for meetings with senior staff and/or councillors (in most cases including either the chief executive or the leader or both) was striking and greatly appreciated. It was clear that the contribution of the Church of England in general and its bishops in particular to the life of the community was greatly valued.

1.3.6 Clergy and lay representatives from the Bradford Diocese parishes now in Cumbria and some clergy and lay representatives from the Bradford Diocese parishes now in Lancashire were unable to attend meetings held in Skipton because of snow. Written evidence has been received from some of them, as well as from a small number of people in the other categories mentioned in para. 1.3.4 who were unable to attend the relevant meetings. Some of those whom the Review Team met have supplemented their oral evidence with written submissions. The Commission has also received other written submissions from individuals who live, or have lived, in Yorkshire.

1.3.7 A full list of those whom the Review Team met and those who submitted written evidence to the Commission is set out in the Appendix.

1.3.8 The Commission received full reports of the Review Team’s visits at its meetings in March, June and September 2010, as well as copies of all written evidence. The June meeting was a residential meeting held in Ilkley.

1.3.9 Financial information was supplied by the diocesan secretaries of the Yorkshire dioceses and this was reviewed by members of the Commission.

1.3.10 This report is the report of the Commission as a whole.

1.4 Responding to the Report

1.4.1 The process which may lead from a review by the Dioceses Commission to the approval of reorganization scheme is set out in section 6 of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007.

1.4.2 This report is addressed primarily to the ‘interested parties’, as required by the Measure. Some of these are identified in section 6(1):

- the bishop of each of the Yorkshire dioceses;
- the Archbishop of York as archbishop of the province;
- the diocesan synod of each of the Yorkshire dioceses;
- the bishop’s council and standing committee of each of the Yorkshire diocesan synods;
- the cathedral chapters of the Yorkshire dioceses;
• the Bishops of Blackburn, Carlisle, Durham and Lincoln and the diocesan synods, bishops’ councils and cathedral chapters of those dioceses (in respect of recommendations made in Chapter 9);
• the Church Commissioners;
• the Archbishops’ Council;
• the Charity Commission.

1.4.3 The Commission is also required to consult ‘to the extent that the Commission thinks fit, such other persons or bodies, if any, as would be affected by the implementing of a scheme’. The Commission has identified the following as actual or potential interested parties:
• the suffragan bishops of the Yorkshire dioceses;
• the archdeacons of the Yorkshire dioceses;
• the chancellors, registrars and diocesan secretaries of the Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield;
• the incumbents, priests in charge and PCCs of the parishes that are the subject of recommendations in Chapter 9 of this Report;
• the archdeacons of Blackburn, Lancaster, Westmorland and Furness, Carlisle, Auckland and Stow (in respect of recommendations made in Chapter 9);
• the Diocesan Boards of Finance and Education and the diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committees of the Yorkshire dioceses.

1.4.4 The Commission is also notifying those who gave evidence to it, and the General Synod members from the Yorkshire dioceses, of the publication of the report on its web site.

1.4.5 All of the interested parties, all those who gave evidence and others who wish to do so are invited to comment on the report and especially on the recommendations set out in Chapter 11. Comments should be sent to:

yorkshire.review@c-of-e.org.uk

or to:

Mr Sion Hughes Carew (Assistant Secretary, Dioceses Commission),
Central Secretariat, Church House, Great Smith Street,
LONDON SW1P 3AZ

by Monday 9 May 2011 at the latest. Where a response is being sent on behalf of one of the ‘interested parties’ enumerated in paras 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 above, this should be stated clearly.

---

3 The report is in fact being sent to all of the Yorkshire chancellors, registrars and diocesan secretaries.
1.5 Future Process

1.5.1 It is anticipated that the Commission will decide at its June 2011 meeting, in the light of comments received, whether to prepare a draft reorganization scheme, and if so, what the content should be. If the Commission decided to prepare a scheme, it would also have to prepare a statement of the effect of its proposals and a detailed estimate of their financial effect.

1.5.2 The draft scheme would then be sent out to the ‘interested parties’ for comment. It is anticipated that this would take place in October 2011.

1.5.3 Under s. 6(4) of the Measure the statutory process of consultation must last at least three and no more than six months. Assuming that the consultation period lasted for six months, the Commission would decide at its June 2012 meeting, in the light of the representations received, whether to pursue the scheme and, if so, whether to amend it.

1.5.4 If the Commission decided to proceed with the scheme and that amendments were needed, the revised scheme might be published in September 2012.

1.5.5 The scheme would then be considered by the relevant diocesan synods under s. 6(6) of the Measure.

1.5.6 Schemes prepared by the Dioceses Commission need the consent of the diocesan synods of the dioceses affected by them, but s. 7(2) of the Measure provides that, if any of the diocesan synods do not give their consent, the Archbishop of the Province may authorize the Commission to lay the scheme before the General Synod for approval if he is satisfied either

- that the interest of the diocese(s) in the scheme is so small that the withholding of consent should not prevent the submission of the scheme to the Synod, or
- that there are ‘wider considerations affecting the province or the Church of England as a whole which require the draft scheme to be submitted to the General Synod’.

1.5.7 If the scheme were submitted to the General Synod, this might occur in July 2013.

1.5.8 If approved by the General Synod, the scheme would need confirmation by Order in Council and would (unless the scheme provided otherwise) come into effect on the first day of the month following such confirmation. In these circumstances, the earliest a scheme could come into effect is the autumn of 2013. We set out in Chapter 10 the various means by which our recommendations would be implemented.
2 Bishops and Dioceses in the Church of England

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Before entering into the Commission’s review of the structure of the Church in Yorkshire, it will be appropriate to explore the Church of England’s understanding of the role of bishops and the principles that have underlain the configuration of the English dioceses and attempts to reform it.

2.1.2 We shall begin by looking at the role of diocesan bishops (section 2.2) and then briefly survey the history of the formation of English dioceses, drawing attention to the underlying principles (sections 2.3 and 2.4). (The history is set out more fully in the paper ‘Dioceses and Episcopal Sees in England: A Background Report for the Dioceses Commission’, which is available on the Commission’s web site.Accounts of the abortive attempts to reform the diocesan structure between 1967 and 1978 (section 2.5) and the work of the first Dioceses Commission (section 2.6) follow. In the light of this ecclesiology and history we shall then look briefly at the issues of suffragan bishops in general and area bishops in particular (section 2.7). Finally, we shall offer some concluding reflections (section 2.8).

2.2 The Role of the Bishop

2.2.1 The Church of England’s understanding of the role of diocesan bishops in particular and of bishops in general is set out authoritatively in Canon C 18 (Of diocesan bishops), in the 1662 Ordinal and in the Common Worship Ordination Services.

2.2.2 It is not necessary to offer here an exhaustive account of all the elements of that role, which has been the subject of a number of reports – most recently Episcopal Ministry: The Report of the Archbishops’ Group on the Episcopate (GS 944, 1990) and Women Bishops in the Church of England? A Report of the House of Bishops’ Working Party on Women in the Episcopate (GS 1557, 2004), especially Chapter 2 (‘Episcopacy in the Church of England’). Instead, it will be sufficient to mention a number of key elements that are relevant to consideration of the nature and size of dioceses.

2.2.3 A diocesan bishop is ‘the chief pastor of all that are within his diocese, as well laity as clergy, and their father in God’ (Canon C18.1). In the Common Worship rite for the Ordination and Consecration of a Bishop the Introduction to the Declarations begins thus:

---

4 The report may be accessed from this page: www.diocom.org/background.
5 Chapter 11 of GS 944 is available from this page: www.diocom.org/background;
GS 1557 is available at http://www.churchofengland.org/media/39784/gs1557.pdf
'Bishops are called to serve and care for the flock of Christ. Mindful of the Good Shepherd, who laid down his life for his sheep, they are to love and pray for those committed to their charge, knowing their people and being known by them.'

The bishop is not just the overseer and pastor of the clergy, but also the chief pastor of the laity, with whom he is expected to have a personal relationship. This means that the appropriate number of bishops cannot be determined solely by reference to the number of licensed ministers that they oversee – and still less to the number of clergy or even just stipendiary clergy. The number of laypeople and congregations is highly relevant.

2.2.4 The Introduction to the Declarations continues (building on Canon C 18.4):

‘As principal ministers of word and sacrament, stewards of the mysteries of God, they are to preside at the Lord’s table and to lead the offering of prayer and praise.’

It goes on to speak of the bishop baptizing and confirming, commissioning people for ministry and presiding over ordinations.

2.2.5 A diocese can therefore be said to be a ‘local church’ of which the diocesan bishop is the chief pastor and principal minister, able under his presidency to ordain ministers who can preach and minister the sacraments in and for it. In the Anglican (and catholic) understanding, an individual local congregation cannot do this for itself.

2.2.6 A bishop is a successor of the Apostles. (Both the 1662 Ordinal and the Common Worship Ordination Services make the connection between the Apostles and bishops.) An Apostle is ‘someone sent on a mission’, and in the Common Worship rite the Introduction to the service says:

‘Bishops are ordained to be shepherds of Christ’s flock and guardians of the faith of the apostles, proclaiming the gospel of God’s kingdom and leading his people in mission.’

A diocese can therefore also be said to be an area of mission led by the bishop. This means that the population of an area is also a highly relevant consideration when determining the number of bishops needed.

2.2.7 A bishop is also a minister of unity. The diocesan bishop in particular is a focus of unity for his own local church who also unites it with the Church throughout the ages and the Church throughout the world. The bishop’s representational ministry involves representing his diocese in the House of Bishops and in the Lambeth Conference, and potentially also in the House of Lords. All bishops are members of the college of bishops of the province, the national church and the whole Communion. Their ministry can never be purely local.
2.2.8 In addition to diocesan bishops, the Church of England has suffragan bishops and assistant bishops. Suffragan bishops have sees within the dioceses in which they serve. Some of them are ‘area bishops’ – bishops to whom oversight of a geographical area within the diocese has been formally delegated (the extent of the functions delegated varies from diocese to diocese). Assistant bishops do not have sees. A small number receive stipends and some are engaged in other work or ministries; most are retired. We shall return to the subject of suffragan bishops in section 2.7.

2.3 The English Dioceses to 1836

2.3.1 The ancient tradition, which continues in the Mediterranean countries to this day, is of small dioceses comprising a city or sizeable town and its hinterland. When Christianity came to Northern Europe, however, society here was organized on the basis of tribes or kingdoms rather than cities, so initially each tribe or small kingdom had a single bishop. Though Augustine’s Roman mission to England established sees in former Roman cities (Canterbury, Rochester, London, York, Dorchester), they were related to kingdoms. Bishoprics established by Irish missionaries from the North were essentially tribal in nature.

2.3.2 In his reform of the English diocesan structure in the 670s Archbishop Theodore divided the large kingdom-dioceses, but in creating smaller dioceses he had regard to political or tribal divisions (sub-kingdoms). In time Wessex was divided into counties (shires) and its original Diocese of Winchester was gradually divided into dioceses each covering a single county or a pair of counties.

2.3.3 After changes in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the diocesan map remained fixed from 1133 to 1540 – a period of just over three hundred years. In the South and West, diocesan boundaries almost all coincided fairly closely with county boundaries. In the Midlands and the North, by contrast, there were just five dioceses – the border dioceses of Durham and Carlisle and the three vast dioceses of Lincoln (from the Humber to the Thames), York (Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire, Lancashire north of the Ribble, South Cumberland and South Westmorland) and Coventry & Lichfield (most of the West Midlands, Chester and Lancashire south of the Ribble).

2.3.4 Between 1540 and 1542 Henry VIII founded six new dioceses. Four served single counties and one included Bristol and Dorset. Chester covered two counties and parts of three others. The Diocese of Westminster, which covered Middlesex, was suppressed in 1550, leaving the number of English dioceses at

---

6 Kent was split between Canterbury and Rochester, three dioceses each served a single county, four covered two each and Salisbury three. Worcester included Worcestershire, western Warwickshire and most of Gloucestershire, while Hereford covered Herefordshire and parts of Gloucestershire and Shropshire (the territory of the Magonsaetan that pre-dated the counties).
2. Thereafter the number of dioceses and their boundaries again remained constant for little short of 300 years.

2.3.5 In the ninety years from 1836 to 1927 the number of English dioceses almost doubled – from 22 to 42. In the last 83 years, by contrast, the number has remained constant and there have been only relatively minor boundary changes.

2.4 The Principles of Diocesan Configuration, 1836-1927

2.4.1 It will be seen that the configuration of the English dioceses has always been strongly influenced by the boundaries of the secular communities to which they relate. Before 1836, most dioceses were essentially coterminous with one or more counties. Even the vast dioceses of the Midlands and the North could, for the most part, be described by reference to county boundaries.

2.4.2 In establishing the Dioceses of Ripon (1836) and Manchester (1847) and adjusting the boundaries of most of the other dioceses, the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Commission and its successor the Ecclesiastical Commissioners added a new criterion: social and economic geography. Essentially, the Commission concluded that in the urban and industrial areas the secular boundaries no longer reflected social realities. Therefore, Ripon included what is now West Yorkshire (and the northern part of the Borough of Barnsley), but other areas of the West Riding to the east and south remained in the Diocese of York. Similarly, Manchester included most of Lancashire but not the Furness Peninsula (which eventually became part of Cumbria in 1974) or most of the Liverpool area (which in 1847 was recognized as forming a distinct area socially and economically). These dioceses were still configured to local communities, but the judgement was that the historic county boundaries no longer reflected the reality of those local communities.

2.4.3 The 1830s reformers sought to reduce the size of the largest dioceses and make dioceses more equal in size, but for political reasons they felt unable to propose an overall increase in the number of dioceses. (The Dioceses of Bristol and Gloucester were united so that the Diocese of Ripon could be created without increasing the number of diocesan bishops; rejection of a similar merger to make way for Manchester delayed its creation until 1847.) The desire to reduce the size of the largest dioceses without increasing the overall number resulted in association of areas that had little or no natural relationship with each other and in the division of natural communities. Nottinghamshire became part of the Diocese of Lincoln, while not only Huntingdonshire but also Bedfordshire and West Suffolk joined the Diocese of Ely. Rochester became the diocesan see for Hertfordshire and Essex, losing its territory in Kent apart from the Deanery of Rochester itself. These unions of unrelated areas were quickly found to be unsatisfactory and were eventually undone.
2.4.4 From the 1840s onwards, high-church bishops raised expectations of what bishops would do. They visited the parishes to confirm and to institute incumbents, instead of holding mass confirmations in the cathedral and institutions in their own chapels. But such a style of episcopacy would only work – in a church whose only bishops were diocesans, many of them old men who would die in office – if the number of parishes in a diocese was sufficiently small and its territory sufficiently compact that the bishop could travel round it with ease. The population and the number of churches and parishes were in fact growing – especially in the urban and industrial areas – but the size of the new dioceses formed from the later nineteenth century onwards reflected not just this growth but also the new model of episcopacy, which very quickly became standard everywhere. The expectation of the clergy and parishes as to the ministry that they will receive from their bishops continues to be a relevant factor in determining the size of dioceses and the number of bishops.

2.4.5 The new model of episcopacy necessitated either assistant bishops or smaller dioceses or both. Suffragan bishoprics were revived from 1870 and acts of Parliament of 1875, 1876 and 1878 provided for six new dioceses. The last of these to be formed, in 1888, was Wakefield.

2.4.6 The early twentieth century saw an unprecedented number of new dioceses created: five before the First World War (two in 1905 and three – including Sheffield – in 1913), two in 1918/19 and no fewer than five in the four years from 1924 to 1927 – a total of twelve in 22 years. Not only the ‘diocesan revival’ with its new model of diocesan episcopacy but also the revival of the Convocations and the creation of central church structures, both voluntary and official, had greatly increased what was expected of diocesan bishops and hence their workload. These factors prompted calls for an increase in the number of dioceses. The burden imposed on bishops and indeed archdeacons by the Church’s national structures and church legislation continues to be a relevant factor in determining the number of bishops, archdeacons and dioceses.

2.4.7 By the end of the nineteenth century, the principle that dioceses should normally be coterminous with counties had become well established. It was not an absolute principle, however; it obviously did not apply to the largest and smallest counties, and it was generally accepted that in the urbanized industrial areas the (newer) social and economic unit should take precedence over the (older and often now outdated) secular administrative boundaries.

2.4.8 The Diocese of Birmingham (founded in 1905) was unusual among dioceses established to reflect a ‘natural unit’ in that the unit concerned was not one or

---

two counties but an urban area together with at least part of its rural hinterland, including portions of three counties.

2.4.9 In 1913 a committee was established to consider additional dioceses and adjustment of diocesan boundaries in the Province of Canterbury. A report was published in 1916. Its argument for increasing the number of dioceses was based primarily not on the number of clergy or churchgoers but on population. However, it was clear in resisting ‘any attempt to reconstruct our Dioceses on lines adopted from considerations of population and extent only, without regard to county, commercial, social and other ties’. The fact that half of the diocesan bishops had suffragan or assistant bishops was seen as an argument for smaller dioceses in which such episcopal assistance would not be needed. The fact that in many dioceses many churchpeople had ‘no adequate sense of a diocesan corporate life’ was another argument for smaller dioceses.

2.4.10 The committee was clear that the territory of all dioceses should if possible coincide with a county, a ‘great municipality’ or a clearly-marked division of a municipal area. It believed that ‘The laity will be more ready to realise their place in the Diocese, and to regard their Cathedral as the centre of local life, if the areas of ecclesiastical and civil responsibility coincide’ and also cited the advantages for co-operation with the secular authorities. It quoted with approval a report which argued that ‘One of the great advantages in reconstructing a Diocese on county lines is to be found in the power of co-operating with the system of the State.’ However, where industrial developments had submerged ancient boundaries, dioceses should correspond to modern social and economic units, including both the municipal centre and its urban and rural hinterlands, so that the diocese contains ‘the population which is unified by easy communications, by daily intercourse in social and business life, and by common interests’.

2.4.11 The Church Assembly (established in 1920) set up a Committee on New Sees and Provinces, chaired by William Temple (then Bishop of Manchester) and this reported in 1922. Its principles for the formation of new sees, which it stressed were not rigid rules, may be summarized thus:

- Dioceses should generally consist of between 150 and 250 benefices, with between 200 and 300 clergy (bearing in mind that in a mainly urban diocese the number of clergy might be rather larger than in a mainly rural diocese).
- New dioceses should not be so large as to require more than one suffragan.
- No important town should be more than 25 miles and no village more than 30 or 35 miles from the ‘place of diocesan meetings’.

---

8 The Dioceses of the Province of Canterbury, being the first report of the committee appointed to consider the need for the formation of new dioceses and the re-adjustment of existing boundaries (London, 1916), pp. 20-22.
• If possible, a new diocese should contain a fair proportion of rural parishes.
• The whole of any county borough should be in the same diocese.

The report also made the important point that the most convenient unit for ‘spiritual supervision’ might be different from the most sensible unit for administration, and that it would therefore ‘very likely be necessary that certain dioceses should be grouped together for the purpose of finance and patronage on the ground that the best unit for spiritual supervision may often be too small for these purposes’.9

2.4.12 The report was criticized by the Bishop of Gloucester, A. C. Headlam, in an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*. In part, his objection to ‘little dioceses’ was that the diocesan bishop would be expected (in modern terms) to become a ‘micro-manager’: ‘The tendency would grow more and more for many things to be referred to him which the clergy may reasonably settle themselves’.10 Headlam also resisted those proposals that appeared to be based on in-house ecclesiastical arithmetic, paying insufficient attention to issues of identity affecting the wider community. In his view, the fundamental principle should be that ‘Where possible a Diocese should be conterminous with a county, or nearly so’, though he admitted that there were ‘certain cases where counties are too small, and certain cases where counties are too large’.11 Of the twelve dioceses proposed by the Committee, six were the subject of Church Assembly Measures. Headlam accepted the need for two county dioceses (Derby and Leicester), as well as a Diocese of Blackburn to reduce Manchester to manageable proportions, but he objected that both Portsmouth and Guildford would be too small and would ‘have no cohesion at all’, being ‘purely artificial creations, divorced from the natural provincial life of the country’.12

2.4.13 These five dioceses (Blackburn, Derby, Guildford, Leicester and Portsmouth) came into being, but Parliament’s rejection of the proposed Diocese of Shrewsbury put an end to the creation of new dioceses. It was to be forty years before the diocesan structure was looked into again.

2.5 Renewed Discussion: 1967-1978

2.5.1 In 1965 an Archbishop’s commission was established under the chairmanship of Sir John Arbuthnot to look at the diocesan structure of South-East England (an area, bounded by the Dioceses of Winchester, Oxford, St Albans and Chelmsford, covering eleven dioceses – more than a quarter of the 42 in England). It was instructed to take as the minimum size a population of 900,000 or a total of 200 incumbencies, though it was free to recommend

---

exceptions and to consider as an alternative smaller dioceses co-operating together.\textsuperscript{13}

2.5.2 The Commission’s report, \textit{Diocesan Boundaries}, was published in 1967. It identified a lack of general agreement within the Church of England about the optimum size of a diocese. Views depended on how diocesan episcopacy was understood. Those who believed that a diocesan bishop as father in God should spend a day a year in each parish and be in frequent contact with the clergy favoured small dioceses. Others thought it unnecessary for diocesan bishops to have such detailed involvement in the lives of their parishes. It was clear that smaller dioceses could only work if they shared administration and joint bodies for certain purposes. There was a related disagreement as to the desirability of suffragan bishops. For some the ideal was dioceses so small that suffragans would be unnecessary. The Commission, however, believed that each diocese should have a suffragan to whom episcopal powers could be delegated completely during the bishop’s illness or absence.\textsuperscript{14}

2.5.3 In the light of these considerations the Commission identified the following ‘guiding principles’ for the construction of dioceses:

- ‘Pastoral considerations, bearing in mind the effective exercise of episcop…, should pre-dominate.’
- Units of organization should be financially viable.
- ‘Economy should be exercised wherever this can be done without harm to the main purpose.’
- ‘Existing diocesan boundaries should not be disturbed unless there are clear advantages.’
- ‘People who regard themselves as a natural group in lay life should so far as possible be kept together in one diocese.’
- ‘Great regard must be paid to ease of communication. Minutes, not miles, are the important factor today.’
- ‘We pay considerable regard to local government boundaries, particularly those of counties and the new London Boroughs, because we feel that mutual loyalties strengthen both Church and State. No London Borough should be split between two dioceses.’
- ‘We do not think that an admixture of suburban, urban and rural livings is essential.’
- The bishop of a new diocese should have his \textit{cathedra} in a parish church, with the minimal staffing for which the Cathedrals Measure 1963 provided.


\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Diocesan Boundaries}, pp. 14-20.
• Changes should facilitate co-operation with other churches.
• ‘In considering any alteration in diocesan boundaries we have regard to the direction in which the area looks in its secular affairs and whether the alteration will make it easier or more difficult for the cathedral to be the centre of worship and diocesan life.’

2.5.4 With these Guiding Principles in mind, the Commission proposed five dioceses for Greater London, roughly equal in terms of population: London, Barking, Kensington, Southwark and Croydon. Much work would be shared between them, and there would be a college of bishops for the Greater London area, with a Regional Council chaired by the Bishop of London and a Regional Board of Finance (in addition to diocesan boards) to pay for shared services. Guildford would gain the area of Surrey that lies north of the Thames (i.e. the part of the former County of Middlesex that is now in Surrey) from the Diocese of London and the area of Surrey that lies south of London from the Diocese of Southwark. It would retain its small areas of Hampshire, but otherwise, diocesan boundaries should generally be rationalized so as to follow county boundaries where there were currently minor discrepancies. In view of the Diocese of Oxford’s area, number of parishes and number of clergy, and the fact that ‘In large parts of Berkshire and Buckinghamshire there is no sense of belonging to the Diocese of Oxford, and no real unity with it, or feeling of common purpose’, Oxford would be divided into three county dioceses, with shared administration and some joint boards and services. In each of the Greater London dioceses and the three dioceses formed from the Diocese of Oxford there would be a single suffragan, who in most cases would be one of the archdeacons. The report also showed how the South-East could be divided into smaller dioceses if that were preferred.

2.5.5 The fact that none of the proposals for change made in this 138-page report was implemented is sobering. When the Church Assembly considered it, debate was adjourned so that the Standing Committee could report on the issues raised. In response to the Standing Committee’s report, the Church Assembly commissioned three further pieces of work.

• a Cathedrals and New Dioceses Committee was formed to prepare such legislation as the dioceses concerned might request and also proposals for cathedrals for the new dioceses;
• the Standing Committee was asked to set up a committee to look at the London area and report on what proposals for it might be most generally acceptable;

15 Diocesan Boundaries, pp. 35-36.
16 Diocesan Boundaries, pp. 39-42, 76-79.
17 Diocesan Boundaries, pp. 47-75.
18 Report by the Standing Committee on ‘Diocesan Boundaries’ (CA 1679, 1968).
• the Advisory Council on the Church’s Ministry (ACCM) was asked to report on the most appropriate size for dioceses and to consider further the alternative of small dioceses.

2.5.6 The Cathedrals and New Dioceses Committee’s first report (1969) included initial proposals for what eventually became the Dioceses Measure 1978.19 The report of the ACCM working party, *Bishops and Dioceses*, published in 1971, proposed different forms of episcopacy for different types of diocese:

• in the large urban areas, ‘collegial episcopacy’, in which a college of bishops would be (corporately) ‘the bishop of the diocese’;
• in many areas, small dioceses with a single bishop;
• in some rural areas, a ‘team episcopate of bishop-archdeacons’.20

The Cathedrals and New Dioceses Committee then produced a report on this report, which raised questions about some of the practicalities involved.21

2.5.7 The Standing Committee of the new General Synod decided that the best way to respond to these three reports was to commission a fourth report from one of its members, Canon Paul Welsby, summarizing their proposals and comments and formulating questions for the General Synod to engage with.22 His report, *Episcopacy in the Church of England*, was published in 1973. Canon Welsby described the division of responsibilities between diocesans and suffragans in nine dioceses, looked at the nature of episcopacy and asked a number of questions about how the Church of England viewed various aspects of it, and reviewed the proposals made in the recent series of reports for

• small dioceses without suffragans,
• small dioceses, grouped regionally,
• in large rural dioceses, suffragans with maximal powers, but with formal authority remaining with the diocesan, and
• for major conurbations a ‘college of bishops’ where authority would rest with the college rather than an individual diocesan.

To these he added, as a fifth possibility, the existing pattern in some dioceses of a diocesan with a single suffragan. Canon Welsby asked (a) whether the General Synod favoured small dioceses (with or without shared administration) as a matter of policy, and (b) whether episcopal collegiality at the diocesan level was ‘sound in theology and workable in practice’. Though generally even-handed in his approach, he was critical of the ACCM working party’s

---

theological arguments for its ‘college of bishops’ option as ‘misleading and confusing’ and the option itself as ‘open to question on pragmatic grounds’, since ‘the idea that a group of bishops can reach the kind of consensus which could be regarded as that of “the bishop of the diocese” ’ was ‘an unrealistic notion’ and the description itself therefore ‘a fiction, a misuse of terms’.  

2.5.8 Canon Welsby argued against a ‘top-down’ approach to diocesan reorganization, advancing a number of arguments of principle and also pragmatic reasons for leaving the initiative with the dioceses. The General Synod should offer co-ordination and supervision, however, and make final decisions.

2.5.9 Canon Welsby’s report was debated by the General Synod in November 1973. In 1974 the Standing Committee published a report in which it drew conclusions from the debate. Its ‘broad conclusion’ was that ‘there is no one pattern of episcopal organisation to which the Church of England would wish to commit itself, to the exclusion of all others’. There should, however, be legislation enabling dioceses to establish systems of ‘area bishops’ and to establish machinery which could create new dioceses without the need for a Measure in each case.’ It was felt that ‘the diocese or dioceses concerned should ordinarily have the right of initiative in all matters affecting diocesan organisation’, but that ‘in all cases that the interest of the wider Church should be taken fully into account’. The eventual result was the Dioceses Measure 1978 which created the 1978-2008 Dioceses Commission.

2.5.10 Canon Welsby’s report had also looked at the possibility of changing diocesan boundaries to match the new local government boundaries that came into effect in 1974. In 1975 a supplementary report by the Standing Committee responded to this. It argued that episcopal areas, archdeaconries and deaneries should be reconfigured to match the new districts as far as possible, but did not consider it urgently necessary to redraw diocesan boundaries to correspond with the new counties. Among other reasons, it noted that the secular new boundaries might be modified in the light of experience and judged that at a time of ‘turmoil’ on the local government side of local partnerships it would not be helpful for the church side also to be subject to re-organization. The possibility of the question being revisited in due course was left open.

2.6 The First Dioceses Commission, 1978-2008

2.6.1 The new Dioceses Commission was duly established in 1978. Reflections on its work by David Hebblethwaite, its Secretary from 1984 to 2002 (after which

---

24 Episcopacy in the Church of England, pp. 29-33.
26 Episcopacy in the Church of England: A Supplementary Report by the Standing Committee (GS 246, 1975).
date it did not meet for lack of business), form Chapter 4 of the paper ‘Dioceses and Episcopal Sees in England: A Background Report for the Dioceses Commission’ mentioned in para. 2.1.2 above.

2.6.2 An early result of the Dioceses Measure 1978 was the London Area Scheme (1979). This divided the Diocese of London into five episcopal areas, one (the Cities of London and Westminster) overseen directly by the Bishop of London and the other four by suffragan bishops, to whom a wide range of powers were delegated under the Scheme. The Scheme built on a history of increasing delegation since 1945, which had been formalized on an experimental basis in 1970.27


2.6.4 During the thirty-year existence of the first Dioceses Commission there were only two relatively minor reorganization schemes. In 1984 the Archdeaconry of Croydon was transferred from the Diocese of Canterbury to the Diocese of Southwark – the culmination of discussions that began with the Osmond Report of 1975.28 A prolonged attempt at a significant reshaping of diocesan boundaries in the West Midlands ran on from the inception of the Commission in 1978 through a major consultation exercise to its eventual outcome – the transfer of one deanery from Lichfield to Worcester in 1993.29 These were the only significant changes to the diocesan map of England since the 1920s.

2.6.5 Under the Dioceses Measure 1978 any change had to be instigated by the bishops of the dioceses concerned; the Dioceses Commission’s role was purely reactive. Very little change ensued, and the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 therefore created the present Dioceses Commission with a duty to review the size, boundaries and number of dioceses and power to bring forward reorganization schemes of its own volition.

2.6.6 The view was taken that the arrangements for episcopal oversight within dioceses should be a matter for the bishops and dioceses themselves. The Measure therefore enabled dioceses to amend or rescind existing area schemes without reference to the General Synod. Delegation of episcopal powers in

respect of geographical areas of dioceses would no longer involve the Dioceses Commission or the General Synod, thus providing maximum flexibility.

2.7 **Suffragan Bishops**

2.7.1 It will be convenient at this point to look briefly at the issue of suffragan bishops.

2.7.2 Most episcopal churches have at least some assistant, auxiliary or suffragan bishops, but the Church of England is unusual in having considerably more suffragan than diocesan bishops. As already mentioned, suffragan bishops were revived from 1870 onwards, but views as to the desirability of suffragan bishoprics varied. The Canterbury Province review that reported in 1916 regarded a diocese small enough for a diocesan bishop to oversee it on his own as the ideal. In the 1920s the Church Assembly committee argued that no diocese should be so large as to require more than one suffragan. In 1967 the Arbuthnot Commission recognized that for some the ideal continued to be dioceses so small that no suffragan would be necessary, because a diocese could have only one father in God, but argued that there should be a suffragan in each diocese to whom powers could be delegated at least when the diocesan was absent or ill. These issues were discussed in the ACCM report *Bishops and Dioceses* (GS 63, 1971) and again in Canon Welsby’s 1973 report *Episcopacy in the Church of England* (GS 167).

2.7.3 Since the 1970s discussion has continued. Some emphasize the fact that legally all episcopal ministry in a diocese is exercised in virtue of powers delegated by the diocesan. On this view, the suffragan’s ministry is an extension of that of the diocesan; the suffragan is involved in the diocesan’s ministry and oversight, which is understood very personally. Others stress very much the suffragan’s membership of a diocesan college of bishops and value the collegial nature of episcopal ministry within the diocese with more than one bishop. On this view the suffragan’s ministry has its own independent basis in the ministry that is his by virtue of his ordination or consecration to the episcopate and his appointment to an episcopal see. The tendency to see the suffragan’s ministry as an extension of that of the diocesan is likely to be greater where the suffragan’s role is primarily one of giving general episcopal assistance to the diocesan. Conversely, the sense of an episcopal college within a diocese is likely to be greater where the suffragans are area bishops to whom oversight of a geographical area within the diocese has been formally delegated.

2.7.4 These issues were most recently discussed in *Episcopal Ministry: The Report of the Archbishops’ Group on the Episcopate* (GS 944, 1990), and in the House of Bishops Occasional Paper ‘Suffragan Bishops’ (GS Misc 733, 2004).³⁰

2.7.5 Some may question the implications of an area system for the unity and integrity of the diocese. Is it in fact a single ‘local church’ or is it in danger of becoming merely a federation of local churches? In order to reflect Anglican and catholic ecclesiology, the diocesan bishop’s role as ‘father in God’, ‘chief pastor’ and ‘principal minister’ must have real content and the diocese must have a true sense of common life. In our view, this is not incompatible with an understanding of each episcopal area as having a corporate identity, led in mission by the area bishop who, under the oversight of the diocesan bishop, is the chief pastor and principal minister within the episcopal area. Indeed, there is evidence in those dioceses that have area schemes that this can be achieved.

2.7.6 There has also been much discussion over the years of the merits and demerits of suffragan bishops also being archdeacons. Some have favoured this as an economical solution, or as a means of providing both the ministry of a suffragan bishop and the ministry of an archdeacon in an area insufficiently large or populous to justify two senior posts. Others note that episcopal and archidiaconal ministries are different in kind and are concerned that combining the two roles in a single person removes the benefits of co-operation between two individuals with distinct responsibilities. Some question whether all bishops have the necessary skills to be an archdeacon and vice-versa. The increasing burdens placed on bishops and archdeacons by secular and ecclesiastical legislation and expectations of good practice further limit the practicality of combining the two roles.

2.8 Concluding Reflections

2.8.1 In this second Chapter of our Report we have surveyed the history and principles that lie behind the configuration of the English dioceses, and the history of attempts over the last half century to reform it. We have also touched on discussions of the role of bishops and the desirability of having suffragan bishops. We now offer some brief reflections.

2.8.2 One reason for surveying the history is to draw attention to the considerations that have underlain proposals for diocesan reorganization, both successful and unsuccessful, over the years. These considerations have informed our thinking and we hope that they will also inform discussion of our report. The relative weight that is to be placed on each of them will in part depend on the circumstances of each case.

2.8.3 The foregoing account also shows that episcopacy and suffragan episcopacy have been the subject of extensive consideration in a number of reports over the last fifty years. We have made some comments but have not sought to duplicate or add to this material by producing a treatise or even a summary of our own.
2.8.4 Thirdly, our survey indicates that over the last hundred years and more a range of solutions have been proposed to the perceived problems with the configuration of dioceses in England. None of the proposals that have been made to us in the course of our review is novel and indeed it seems unlikely that a solution could be conceived that has not been considered – and either implemented or rejected – in the past. In our recommendations we shall seek to learn from models that are found to have worked and to build on them.

2.8.5 The Arbuthnot Commission’s 1967 report on South-East England prompted no fewer than seven further reports, of varying length, over the next eight years. In 1974 the Standing Committee concluded that ‘there is no one pattern of episcopal organisation to which the Church of England would wish to commit itself, to the exclusion of all others’. There is every indication that there continues to be a diversity of view within the Church of England on all of the key issues that those reports addressed.

2.8.6 In 2003 the Revd Gareth Miller published in the *Church Times* an article entitled ‘A Church Simplified and Renewed’, in which he advocated smaller dioceses, 114 in number, grouped in ten provinces largely corresponding to the nine English regions. Each would have only one bishop and one archdeacon. Administration would be carried out on a regional basis in ten provincial offices. The overall number of bishops would be slightly larger than at present, while the number of archdeacons would be the same. In the course of our review, reference has frequently been made to this article in conversation and correspondence, indicating that the school of thought which would eliminate suffragan bishops, significantly increase the number of dioceses and ensure that they were small enough to be overseen by a single bishop still enjoys support. In broader public debate, not least in the church press, others have argued for a significant reduction in the overall number of bishops – often for financial reasons. This would entail a very considerable reduction in what bishops are expected to do, both within the Church and in relating to society.

2.8.7 The proposal in the 1971 ACCM report *Bishops and Dioceses* for ‘collegial episcopacy’, whereby in large urban dioceses a college of bishops would corporately be ‘the bishop of the diocese’ has not featured in national-level discussions since it was criticized by Canon Welsby in his 1973 report, but some have advocated it in conversation with us. Canon Welsby criticized the theological arguments for it as ‘misleading and confusing’ and he regarded it as ‘open to question on pragmatic grounds’. A prior consideration for us is that, even if it were desirable to make it possible for a group of individuals to hold and exercise jointly the office of diocesan bishop, this would require primary legislation of a radical nature. Our review is conducted within the framework of the existing law relating to episcopacy.

---

31 The article is available here: [http://www.sarmiento.plus.com/documents/garethmiller.html](http://www.sarmiento.plus.com/documents/garethmiller.html)
2.8.8 In July 2009 the number of episcopal and senior clergy posts was the subject of debate in the General Synod. In our Annual Report for 2009 (GS Misc 950)\textsuperscript{32} we commented as follows:

21. The Commission also prepared a background paper (GS Misc 1733B) for the debate at the July 2009 Group of Sessions on the Bradford Diocesan Synod Motion about the number of episcopal and senior clergy posts. Many of the contributions to the debate were informed by divergent views about a number of distinct, but related, issues of principle:

- the optimum size and number of dioceses;
- the desirability or otherwise of suffragan bishops;
- the question of whether there is a desirable overall number of bishops (or of bishops and archdeacons) and if so, what that number is.

The debate demonstrated a lack of consensus within the Synod on these issues.

22. The Commission believes that the optimum number and size of dioceses in any region should be determined according to local circumstances rather than a ‘one size fits all’ national approach, though the issue of ‘critical mass’ may need to be addressed in some instances.

23. Whatever may be appropriate for particular areas, the Commission does not regard the complete phasing out of suffragan bishops throughout the Church of England – by creating additional small dioceses capable of being overseen by a diocesan bishop without the assistance of a suffragan or assistant bishop – as a realistic objective. (It recognizes, however, that some will continue to view this as desirable in principle.)

24. Given the growth of the demands placed on bishops and archdeacons by secular and church legislation, policies and expectations, the Commission does not anticipate a significant reduction in the overall number of bishops and archdeacons. However, the numbers of bishops and of archdeacons can be expected to vary as the Commission and diocesan bishops review the provision of oversight within particular regions and within individual dioceses.

25. The new arrangements for the funding of episcopal ministry, to be introduced in January 2011, should make it easier for dioceses to think afresh about the need for suffragan bishops and archdeacons to support the bishop in his oversight of the diocese and about the balance between episcopal and archidiaconal ministry.

2.8.9 After ten years in which efforts at the provincial and national levels to identify an agreed solution to the perceived problems with the diocesan structure of the Church of England had been unsuccessful, in approving the Dioceses Measure 1978 the General Synod effectively decided that the initiative should be left with the bishops and dioceses concerned. During the next thirty years very little change occurred. It was frustration with that situation that resulted in the

\textsuperscript{32} \url{www.diocom.org/annual}
establishment of the present Commission, with a power of initiative (unlike its predecessor) but without the power to take final decisions.

2.8.10 We believe that, especially in situations where a reconfiguration is likely to involve more than two dioceses, proposals from the Dioceses Commission, as an external body, may serve as a helpful catalyst. We are conscious, however, that any scheme will be submitted to the synods of the dioceses concerned, and ultimately to the General Synod (in which they are represented), for approval. This means that, if it is to have any chance of success, the review process must involve conversation with and in the dioceses concerned. It is in this spirit that we offer our proposals to the dioceses of Yorkshire for consideration.

2.8.11 The history suggests that opportunities for change occur at most only once in each generation. No proposals for change anywhere in England were brought forward at all for forty years after the rejection of the proposed Diocese of Shrewsbury, and, except for the transfer of the Croydon Archdeaconry to Southwark and of the Himley Deanery to Worcester, no significant change to the diocesan boundaries in the South-East has occurred in the forty years since the effective rejection of the Arbuthnot Commission’s 1967 report. We see the publication of this report as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to shape the Church for its mission to the people of Yorkshire in the 21st century.
3 History of the Secular and Diocesan Boundaries in Yorkshire

3.1 Natural Communities

3.1.1 We began our Review with the aim of establishing whether the shape and boundaries of the existing dioceses tend to facilitate the Church’s mission to the people and communities of Yorkshire or whether different boundaries would enable the Church to relate to them more effectively. In what follows we set out the background to the approach that we have adopted.

3.1.2 People belong to communities of varying size and geographical extent. The most local communities beyond the street or neighbourhood have been civil parishes (and, in the case of larger parishes, individual settlements within them). People also belong at the same time to larger communities, however. These may be counties (and sometimes, ancient units within them) or cities. In some counties and cities the sense of common identity is and always has been strong; in others it is weaker. (In addition, people increasingly belong also to non-geographical communities formed by common interest and social grouping, sustained by swift means of transport and by the internet.)

3.1.3 Because the Church of England is the established church and because it understands itself as having a mission to the nation and not just to individuals, it seeks to relate to geographical secular communities at various levels – in particular, to parishes, counties and unitary authority areas, but also to regions as well as to England as a whole.

3.1.4 Some of this work of relating to secular society at its various levels is well known, but much of it proceeds without people in the parishes becoming directly aware of it. The fact that they are not very conscious of it does not mean that it is unimportant, however, or that they do not benefit from it.

3.1.5 There are occasions when the Church needs to address the wider community at a level other than the parish – not least, when an area is affected by disasters and emergencies. The modern media look for a comment from an individual, not a statement from a committee – ideally, from a person who is well known, and if not, then at least from one whose office is familiar. In this context, the role of bishops as representatives of the Church to the community at levels beyond that of the parish has gained in importance. Even if the bishop is not well known as an individual, the office is still familiar in a way that other ecclesiastical offices are not.

3.1.6 In an unpublished paper entitled ‘What is the Diocese?’, given in 1996, Professor David Ford commented:

‘A diocese serves and builds up both parishes and the region (just as a parish serves and builds up both its congregation and its locality). This is a pivotal issue in much current finance-led debate about the diocese: is
the diocese only a service organisation for parishes? If there is no vision of ministry to the region in ways that cannot be adequately fulfilled by parishes, then there will be a serious breakdown of the polity of the Church of England.’

Such responsibility was not delegated upwards from the parishes to the diocese, he added: the regional ministry of the diocese should be seen as ‘constitutive of the Church and needing to be recognised by the parishes as the truth of our polity’: ‘Not to recognise this is to want the character of our Church to change fundamentally.’

3.1.7 It is for these reasons that English dioceses have, for the most part, been configured to the secular communities that they have been intended to serve. Initially these were generally Anglo-Saxon kingdoms or political or tribal divisions within them. In many cases they were one or more of the counties into which those kingdoms or the Kingdom of England came to be divided. In the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when county boundaries had ceased to define the communities of urban and industrial England in particular, they were cities and their hinterlands. Where dioceses were expanded in the nineteenth century without regard to coherence in terms of secular communities, the changes were quickly found to be unsatisfactory and were eventually undone.

3.1.8 In the rest of this third Chapter we look at the history of the secular boundaries within Yorkshire (sections 3.2 and 3.10), the division of the Church in Yorkshire into the present five dioceses (sections 3.3-3.8), and the boundaries of the other churches for which Yorkshire is not a single unit – the Roman Catholic Church and the Methodist Church (section 3.9). As we do so, we shall identify and describe some of the boundaries that are most significant for our review.

3.2 Ancient boundaries

3.2.1 For secular purposes, Yorkshire was divided while under Danish rule into three Ridings (from ‘Thriding’, an Old Norse word meaning a third). Down to a point just south of Masham, the boundary between the West Riding and the North Riding was the western and southern watershed of the River Ure and its tributaries. Wensleydale was thus in the North Riding but Dent, Craven, Wharfedale and Nidderdale were in the West Riding. From just south of Masham onwards the Ure, which in its lower course becomes the River Ouse, formed the boundary between the West Riding and the North and East Ridings.

3.2.2 Originally, the whole of Yorkshire was within the Diocese of York, which also covered Nottinghamshire, Lancashire north of the Ribble, Cumberland south of the Derwent and southern Westmorland. By the mid-twelfth century the diocese had five archdeaconries, as follows: York (for the West Riding), Richmond (the western part of the North Riding and the part of the diocese
‘beyond the moors’ – in Lancashire, Westmorland and Cumberland), Cleveland (the rest of the North Riding), the East Riding, and Nottingham (Nottinghamshire).

3.2.3 The eastern boundary of the Archdeaconry of Richmond (and of its secular counterparts) was the River Wiske, which from a point close to the River Tees flows south to its confluence with the River Swale west of Thirsk. The northern portion of the eastern boundary of the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds still essentially follows the River Wiske.

3.2.4 The area under discussion in this report comprises most of the former West Riding of Yorkshire, together with that part of the North Riding that has for more than 900 years formed part of the Archdeaconry of Richmond.

3.2.5 In 1541 the Archdeaconry of Richmond was removed from the Diocese of York and united with the Archdeaconry of Chester (Cheshire and Southern Lancashire) to form the Diocese of Chester.
3.2.6 In the middle ages three collegiate churches had served effectively as secondary cathedrals for their respective areas of the Diocese of York: Ripon Minster (in the West Riding), Beverley Minster (in the East Riding) and Southwell Minster (in Nottinghamshire). Their foundations were dissolved with those of the other collegiate churches in 1547, but Southwell and Ripon were re-constituted as collegiate and choral foundations in 1585 and 1604 respectively. Ripon Minster was given a dean and six prebendaries, with a sub-dean added in 1607.

3.3 The Diocese of Ripon (1836)

3.3.1 In 1836 a new diocese was created, the first since the Reformation. The aim was to reduce the Dioceses of York and Chester to more manageable proportions and to serve the industrial area of Yorkshire (with a diocese for industrial Lancashire to follow). The Yorkshire part of the Archdeaconry of Richmond and the northern part of the West Riding were detached from the Dioceses of Chester and York respectively to form the new diocese. The southern part of the West Riding was recognized as being distinct and remained in the Diocese of York, as did the area of the West Riding immediately west and south of York, including Selby. (York was further reduced in size by the transfer of Nottinghamshire to the Diocese of Lincoln in 1839/1841.)

3.3.2 As the only ecclesiastical building within the new diocese that had the proportions and configuration of a cathedral, and being already a collegiate and choral foundation, Ripon Minster was the obvious candidate for designation as its cathedral. The 1830s was a time when the concern was to cut the cost of bishops and cathedrals and divert money towards making better provision for the cure of souls in populous parishes. To build a new cathedral church (or enlarge an existing building for that purpose) and endow a new cathedral foundation would not have been politically possible. The new diocese accordingly became the Diocese of Ripon.

3.3.3 The fact that Ripon was not situated within the industrial area that the new diocese was primarily intended to serve, and was not easily reached from it, was problematic from the outset, however. Not until 1849 was there a rail link between Leeds and Ripon.

3.4 The Diocese of Wakefield (1888)

3.4.1 The Diocese of Wakefield was founded in 1888 as the last of six dioceses provided for by acts of Parliament in the later 1870s.

3.4.2 Some of the new dioceses were natural units, at least when they were founded. For example, the Diocese of Truro was and remains a single-county diocese almost entirely surrounded by water, historically and culturally distinct from its
only neighbour, Devon. The Diocese of Liverpool similarly had a natural unity – though one based not on historic identity or correlation with a county but on social geography.

3.4.3 The Diocese of Wakefield, by contrast, was not a natural unit. It consisted of the southern part of the 1836 Diocese of Ripon and divided the industrial area which was ultimately to become the county of West Yorkshire, separating Wakefield, Huddersfield and Halifax from Leeds (which eventually became the area’s metropolis) and Bradford. In Owen Chadwick’s words, ‘Wakefield had no natural unity but became a success thanks to the extraordinary personality of its first bishop, little Walsham How.’

3.4.4 There had been much discussion in the mid-1870s as to which town should be the see city for the new diocese. Huddersfield was the largest, with a population of 70,000, closely followed by Halifax (65,000), while Wakefield only had 28,000. (Leeds and Bradford had 259,000 and 145,000 respectively.) Huddersfield’s parish church was completely rebuilt earlier in the nineteenth century, whereas Halifax had an impressive late mediaeval church. Wakefield, though much smaller than Huddersfield and Halifax, was the county town of the West Riding and at that time was also the focus of the area’s railway lines. Its sizeable mediaeval church was eventually chosen as the cathedral for what accordingly became the Diocese of Wakefield.

3.4.5 Though the Diocese of Ripon was relieved of half of its population, much of what was left, in Leeds and Bradford, was now at the very southern edge of the diocese, as Ripon was on its eastern edge.

3.5 The 1907 Report

3.5.1 A committee consisting of the Bishop of Ripon (convener), the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham and Manchester met in September 1907 to consider ‘the increase of the episcopate’ in the Northern Province. In 45 years its population had almost doubled, from 6.1 million to 11.7 million. Its average diocesan population was over 250,000 higher than in the south (a difference equal to the population of the Diocese of Hereford). Furthermore, hilly and moorland areas made communications slower and between some places virtually non-existent. The report pointed out that development of ‘diocesan consciousness’ in some dioceses was hindered by the fact that they lacked ‘territorial coherence’, comprising parts of different administrative areas – a factor that had often been overlooked in the shaping of northern dioceses. The committee identified the ‘real problem’ as being in Lancashire and Yorkshire and proceeded to review the dioceses in these two counties.

3.5.2 The Diocese of York, it found, ‘possesses a heavy population, a wide area and an incoherent territory’ (including the East Riding and parts of the North and West Ridings). If the diocese were reduced to York and the East Riding, it would be of ideal population size (500,000) with a manageable area. Given the Archbishop of York’s national responsibilities, it was desirable that his own diocese should not be too big.

3.5.3 In the committee’s view, the West Riding’s population was such that it needed two if not three dioceses in addition to the Diocese of Wakefield, with sees in Sheffield, Leeds and (if a third see were possible) Bradford.

3.5.4 If Dioceses of Leeds and Bradford were created, Ripon would lose almost all of its West Riding population. It was therefore suggested that the Diocese of Ripon could be refocused as the diocese for the North Riding, which was seen as another coherent area. If the Ripon, Knaresborough and Nidderdale areas were added to the North Riding the diocese’s population would be 450,000 and its area not much smaller than the reduced Diocese of York.

3.5.5 The committee also floated the possibility of a Diocese of Middlesbrough for the York part of the North Riding, but with the rather ambivalent comment that ‘There is much to be said for this scheme, provided an additional Bishopric in Yorkshire is practicable’. Such a diocese would in fact have rendered Ripon, with only the western half of the North Riding and without those areas of the West Riding that would become the Dioceses of Leeds and Bradford, unviable.  

3.6 The Diocese of Sheffield (1913)

3.6.1 Progress towards the creation of a Diocese of Sheffield was already well advanced, and the Diocese was established in 1913. It comprised most of that part of the West Riding which was still in the Diocese of York, except that York retained the area immediately to the south and west of York itself.

3.6.2 Thus, the western part of the Diocese of Sheffield’s northern boundary is that established between the Dioceses of Ripon and York in 1836. To the east of that, the boundary is the southern and eastern boundary of the former Hemsworth and Pontefract Deaneries, which in 1913 remained in the Diocese of York but were later transferred to Wakefield. East of Knottingley, the boundary is the River Aire and then the River Ouse down to the Humber.

3.6.3 A small part of the Diocese of Southwell (which initially embraced Derbyshire as well as Nottinghamshire) that was now in the see city of Sheffield was also transferred to the Diocese of Sheffield when it was founded.

3.7 The Diocese of Bradford (1919)

3.7.1 By 1911 the population of the residual Diocese of Ripon (what remained after the southern part became the Diocese of Wakefield) had reached almost 1.2 million, and a need for division was generally felt.

3.7.2 The 1907 committee had proposed allocating the City of York and the East Riding only to the Diocese of York, making the Diocese of Ripon cover the whole of the North Riding, and dividing the West Riding into four dioceses: Wakefield, Sheffield, Bradford and Leeds. Four of the dioceses would have been comparable in population: Ripon (nearly 450,000), York (500,000), Bradford (475,000) and Leeds (525,000); Wakefield and Sheffield would be larger. Views about this radical proposal were mixed, however, and there was a certain lack of enthusiasm in Leeds itself for a Bishop of Leeds – not least in view of the prominent position and influence already enjoyed within Leeds by the Vicar of Leeds. Discussion rumbled on until 1913, when Archbishop Lang (who in 1909 had succeeded Archbishop Maclagan, who had been a member of the 1907 committee) informed the Bishop of Ripon that he was willing to support a new Diocese of Bradford once the Diocese of Sheffield had been established (as it was later that year) but was not prepared to give up York’s part of the North Riding to Ripon. Without that addition to the Diocese of Ripon, a Diocese of Leeds could not be created, since the rump of the Diocese of Ripon, with only 100,000 inhabitants, would no longer be viable. The Diocese of Bradford was duly established in 1919.36

3.7.3 The Diocese of Bradford comprises the western part of the former Diocese of Ripon (in modern terms: the Craven District, the areas that are now in Cumbria and Lancashire, the City of Bradford and the western fringe of the City of Leeds). Two parishes in the south-east of what is now the City of Bradford (Wyke and Tong) were transferred to the new diocese from Wakefield in 1919.

3.8 York-Wakefield Boundary Adjustment (1926)

3.8.1 In 1926 the Diocese of Wakefield was expanded to include the deaneries of Hemsworth and Pontefract, which had remained in the Diocese of York when the Diocese of Ripon was created in 1836 and again when the Diocese of Sheffield was formed in 1913. There has been no substantial change to the boundaries of the Yorkshire dioceses since 1926.

3.9  **Roman Catholic and Methodist Boundaries**

3.9.1 For most of the Church of England’s ecumenical partners, Yorkshire falls within a single unit. The United Reformed, Baptist and Moravian Churches respectively have a Yorkshire Synod, Association and District. However, Yorkshire falls within three Roman Catholic dioceses (Hallam, Leeds, Middlesbrough) and five Methodist districts (Sheffield, West Yorkshire, Leeds, York and Hull, Darlington).

3.9.2 The Roman Catholic Diocese of Hallam, established in 1980, covers South Yorkshire, parts of the High Peak and Chesterfield Districts of Derbyshire, and the Bassetlaw District of Nottinghamshire. The Diocese of Leeds covers the former West Riding except for South Yorkshire. The Diocese of Middlesbrough covers the former North and East Ridings and the City of York.

3.9.3 Methodist districts consist of local churches rather than territorial parishes and thus the boundary between one district and another is often simply a line drawn half-way between the last church in one district and first in the next district. It is less precise than a diocesan boundary. Most Methodist districts are named after cities or towns and reflect their spheres of influence rather than the boundaries of the counties or districts within which they lie.

3.9.4 The areas covered by the five Methodist districts between which Yorkshire is divided are roughly as follows:

- **Sheffield:** South Yorkshire (except for four churches in the north-west of the Borough of Barnsley and a small area of Sheffield), most of northern Derbyshire (but not its western edge), most of northern Nottinghamshire and a small area of Lincolnshire.

- **West Yorkshire:** Four churches in the north-west of the Borough of Barnsley, the Boroughs of Kirklees and Calderdale, the City of Bradford and the Craven District of North Yorkshire.

- **Leeds:** The Cities of Wakefield and Leeds and part of the Harrogate District of North Yorkshire.

- **York and Hull:** The City of York, the East Riding and most of North Yorkshire.

- **Darlington:** The Boroughs of Stockton on Tees, Middlesbrough and Redcar & Cleveland, the Richmondshire and Stokesley Districts of North Yorkshire and adjacent areas of North Yorkshire together with most of County Durham.
3.10 Secular Boundary Changes

3.10.1 In 1974 two new counties were created within the former West Riding: South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire. Within them, local authorities were grouped together to form ‘metropolitan boroughs’. South Yorkshire comprises the City of Sheffield and the Boroughs of Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham; West Yorkshire comprises the Cities of Bradford, Leeds and Wakefield and the Boroughs of Calderdale and Kirklees. Calderdale includes the former County Borough of Halifax; Kirklees includes the former County Boroughs of Huddersfield and Dewsbury. In 1986 the county councils were abolished and the metropolitan boroughs became unitary authorities. However, South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire continue to be ceremonial counties, each with its own Lord Lieutenant. Various services (for example the police and the fire and rescue services) continue to be organized on a county basis.

3.10.2 Those parts of the West Riding that were not included in the new counties of South and West Yorkshire in 1974 were instead transferred to other counties, as follows:

- the M62 corridor east of Great Heck, with Goole and the Marshland, to Humberside (when Humberside was broken up in 1996 this area became part of the new East Riding of Yorkshire ceremonial county and the new East Riding unitary authority);
- the area east of Leeds and Wakefield was joined with the area of the former East Riding west of the River Derwent to form the Selby District of North Yorkshire;
- areas north of Bradford and Leeds formed the Craven and Harrogate Districts of North Yorkshire (the latter including a small part of the North Riding);
- areas north and west of the new Craven District were transferred to Lancashire and Cumbria.

3.10.3 The core of the North Riding, together with the northern fringe of the East Riding and the Selby District, became the new county of North Yorkshire. The City of York unitary authority forms part of the ceremonial county but is not in the administrative county.

3.10.4 The northern tip of the North Riding became part of County Durham. East of Darlington, a new county of Cleveland was formed, comprising areas on both sides of the River Tees. This was abolished with effect from 1996, the areas south of the Tees that had formerly been in the North Riding becoming part of the ceremonial county of North Yorkshire but remaining outside the administrative county. That area now forms the Borough of Redcar and Cleveland, the Borough of Middlesbrough and the southern part of the Borough of Stockton on Tees. These boroughs are unitary authorities.
3.10.5 The lack of correlation in many places between the diocesan boundaries and the new county boundaries within Yorkshire is one of the factors that prompted the present review.
4 Yorkshire as a Whole
and South Yorkshire (the Diocese of Sheffield)

4.1 Yorkshire as a Community

4.1.1 Before we try to identify the natural communities within Yorkshire to which the Church’s mission is or should be directed, we need to address the question of Yorkshire as a whole.

4.1.2 Yorkshire is not a unit of government, but it largely coincides with the region of Yorkshire and the Humber (which includes North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire, but not Middlesbrough, Redcar and Cleveland, or the Yorkshire portion of Stockton-on-Tees). Even before the 1974 boundary changes, Yorkshire was not administered as a single unit; each of the ridings and the county boroughs within them had its own council. Each of the ridings had its own lord lieutenant, and Yorkshire is now divided into four ceremonial counties for such purposes (North Yorkshire, the East Riding of Yorkshire, West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire).

4.1.3 Yorkshire none the less has a strong sense of common identity and this has occasionally prompted suggestions that a single diocese could be created for Yorkshire as a whole.

4.1.4 Such a diocese would be very large in every sense and significantly larger than the next largest diocese. If it comprised the whole of the five existing Yorkshire dioceses, its area would be 6,073 sq miles (more than twice the area of Lincoln) and its population 5.3 million (more than 1.5 million greater than London). It would have 1,105 parishes and 779 benefices (Oxford has 622 parishes and London 404 benefices). On 2008/9 figures it would have 671 full-time stipendiary clergy and 98,700 on its electoral rolls (London has 481 and 68,700). (In each case, the comparison is with the largest existing diocese.)

4.1.5 Though there would undoubtedly be a sense of common Yorkshire identity, it is difficult to imagine that the scale of such a diocese would permit it to have a strong sense of what earlier reports have called ‘diocesan consciousness’ or ‘a diocesan corporate life’. Moreover, the diocesan bishop would be the Archbishop of York. Responsibilities as metropolitan of his province and Primate of England already mean that no Archbishop of York can devote as much time to the oversight of his diocese as could be expected of a bishop without those additional responsibilities. The fact that Yorkshire has four lord lieutenants suggests that notwithstanding its common identity there are also discernible communities within it that are more suitable in size for oversight by a single person. The fact that Yorkshire is divided for administrative purposes into counties and unitary authorities is also significant. A diocese is, in any case, much more than a unit of administration and we are clear that in other respects a diocese covering the whole of Yorkshire would not be feasible.
4.2 South Yorkshire (The Diocese of Sheffield)

4.2.1 Our Review Team began its work in the Diocese of Sheffield. In looking at that diocese, we have asked ourselves whether its territory corresponds to a secular community and whether that community is of a size and distinctness that merits a diocese of its own. Our answer to both questions is ‘yes’.

4.2.2 The diocese corresponds very largely with the county of South Yorkshire, which was formed in 1974 largely within the territory of the West Riding. There is one South Yorkshire parish (Bawtry) in the Diocese of Southwell & Nottingham. One parish (Eastoft) and part of another (the village of Fockerby) are in Lincolnshire, because at this point the diocesan boundary follows the former course of the River Don, which was the county boundary until 1996. These anomalies could, if desired, be addressed under the Pastoral Measure 1983. There are two larger anomalies: Goole and seven neighbouring parishes at the eastern tip of the diocese are now in the East Riding of Yorkshire rather than South Yorkshire, while the northern half of the South Yorkshire Borough of Barnsley forms the Barnsley Deanery of the Diocese of Wakefield. We shall look at the Goole area and at Barnsley in Chapter 9.

4.2.3 There was a broad consensus among those who gave evidence to us both in South Yorkshire and in West Yorkshire that South Yorkshire is a ‘different place’ from West Yorkshire. Leaving aside at this point the question of the precise northern boundary of this sub-region, its distinctness from what is now West Yorkshire was recognized as long ago as 1836 when it was excluded from the Diocese of Ripon created in that year. It was similarly recognized in the creation of the Methodist Church’s Sheffield District, of the county of South Yorkshire in 1974 and of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hallam in 1980.

4.2.4 In 2006 the State of the English Cities report described ‘city regions’ as ‘enlarged territories from which core urban areas draw people for work and services’. Economically, city regions and other sub-regions make sense because investment, labour and housing markets all tend to cut across local authority areas and their administrative boundaries. People live, work and consume over wider areas. The Sheffield City Region comprises the City of Sheffield and the three other South Yorkshire metropolitan boroughs, the Bassetlaw District of Nottinghamshire, and four districts of Derbyshire. Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils are also involved, as is the Peak District National Park Authority. A Sheffield City Region Forum has been established for it, with a director and staff. Its activities and initiatives are detailed on its web site www.sheffieldcityregion.org.uk.

37 One of the parishes is partly in the Selby District of North Yorkshire.
4.2.5 The relevance of the Sheffield City Region for our purpose is not so much the need for the Church to relate to its structures: though that is important, such structures and initiatives may come and go as government policy changes. Its primary relevance is as another piece of evidence pointing to the fact that Sheffield is at the centre of a social and economic region or sub-region (a secular community) that is distinct and separate from the Leeds City Region which lies to the north.

4.2.6 The physical geography of South Yorkshire differs from that of West Yorkshire, as does its economic base. The steel industry is still prominent in Sheffield and, though there is now only one mine left open in the South Yorkshire Coalfield, its status as a former coal mining area still marks it out from most of the territory to the north. Physical geography and industrial history have combined to produce a culture that is distinct from that of West Yorkshire. This is reflected in the fact that BBC Radio has four radio stations serving Yorkshire: BBC Radio York, BBC Radio Humberside, BBC Radio Leeds and BBC Radio Sheffield.

4.2.7 Our conclusion is that South Yorkshire is a distinct community and should continue to have its own diocese.

4.2.8 Although on most measures of size the Diocese of Sheffield falls within the lowest third of the range of the 42 English dioceses (and in terms of area, number of parishes and churches, and number of licensed clergy it is in the lowest quarter), on only one measure of size is it among the six smallest dioceses, while its population of 1.2 million ranks it at 17 out of 42. Only a very significant reduction in the number of English dioceses would put a question mark against Sheffield in terms of size.

4.2.9 The diocese’s financial position is challenging – as, in different ways, is that of all of the Yorkshire dioceses. Sheffield has low realisable investments and cash in hand in its General Fund. However, though it predicts a deficit in 2010 and in the next two years, as do the other Yorkshire dioceses, the level of deficit is currently predicted to be lower and to decline more significantly over this period than those of the other dioceses. We believe that the Bishop and his senior colleagues are clear as to what needs to be done. The Bishop is confident that the diocese is sustainable in the longer term and we have no reason to take a different view. Our review is in any case not finance-driven and financial considerations are only one of the sets of factors that have to be borne in mind, but we do not believe that financial considerations require the merger of the Diocese of Sheffield with another diocese.

4.2.10 The social and economic realities that are reflected in the configuration of the Sheffield City Region, the Sheffield Methodist District and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hallam indicate that there is a question as to whether the Diocese of Sheffield should include some of Derbyshire and the Bassetlaw
District of Nottinghamshire. That question could only properly be addressed in the context of a future review of the East Midlands dioceses. For the present it is sufficient to note that, with the minor exceptions mentioned in para. 4.2.2, the boundary of the Diocese of Sheffield is identical with the southern and western boundaries of South Yorkshire. We shall return in Chapter 9 to the issues of its precise northern and eastern boundaries.

4.2.11 In the context of the present review we do not recommend any change to the southern and western boundaries of the Diocese of Sheffield that could not be made under the Pastoral Measure 1983.

Figure 3: The Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon & Leeds, Wakefield and Sheffield
5 The Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield

5.1 West Yorkshire

5.1.1 As we have seen, apart from the northern half of the Borough of Barnsley and one parish in the Diocese of Southwell and Nottingham, South Yorkshire is entirely contained within the single Diocese of Sheffield. By contrast, West Yorkshire is divided between three dioceses: Bradford, Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield, with eight parishes in the Diocese of York.

5.1.2 West Yorkshire is not alone in this: the West Midlands County and Greater London are each divided between four dioceses. Where it differs is in having three diocesan bishops resident (and three diocesan offices located) within its territory: no other county has more than two. By contrast, the three counties of Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Buckinghamshire are overseen by a single diocesan bishop and served by a single diocesan office.

5.1.3 Furthermore, the boundaries within West Yorkshire do not match those of the unitary authorities that it comprises. The City of Leeds is itself divided between all four dioceses: most of the City is in the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds, but it includes eight parishes in the Diocese of York, eight parishes in the Diocese of Bradford and seven parishes in the Diocese of Wakefield. There is thus no one who is able to engage with the City Council on behalf of all of the Church of England parishes that fall within the unitary authority area.

5.1.4 We were offered differing accounts of the extent to which, in the absence of a county council, the concept of ‘West Yorkshire’ is prominent in the minds of those who live in the county. Be that as it may, key services are provided on a West Yorkshire basis: public transport (Metro), the Police, and the Fire and Rescue Service. West Yorkshire Joint Services offers eight other services on a county basis, including trading standards and grants to voluntary bodies, while the West Yorkshire Lieutenancy fosters a county identity. Whether they are aware of it or not, decisions that affect the lives of people in West Yorkshire and the services they receive are taken not only by the unitary authorities but also at a county level, and the Church of England needs to engage corporately with the decision-makers concerned. West Yorkshire also has an active Ecumenical Council, founded in 1987, with an executive director. This is indicative of a sense on the part of the churches that West Yorkshire constitutes a community to which and in which the churches need to relate.

38 West Midlands: Birmingham, Coventry, Lichfield, Worcester; London: London, Southwark, Chelmsford, Rochester. (There are also five Greater London parishes in St Albans and one in Guildford.)
5.1.5 Leeds has an important role in the county as the hub of a wider economic area. It is important in relation to Bradford’s future prosperity; and the links of the other three unitary authority areas with Leeds are in most cases more significant to them than their links with each other. Leeds’ economic role is reflected in the establishment of the Leeds City Region Partnership. This covers not only West Yorkshire but also the neighbouring districts of North Yorkshire and Barnsley (which secured dual membership of the Sheffield and Leeds City Regions). The Leeds City Region Partnership Board brings together the leaders of all eleven partner local authorities. It was established as a Joint Committee in 2007 and in 2009 was one of two city regions in England to be granted more control over spending and programmes for housing, regeneration, skills and innovation. In 2010 the Partnership joined with a range of business sectors and other partners in submitting a joint bid for a Local Enterprise Partnership. The Partnership’s activities and initiatives are detailed on its website [www.leedscityregion.gov.uk](http://www.leedscityregion.gov.uk).

5.1.6 The importance of Leeds is also demonstrated by commuting patterns and the configuration of public transport. Information supplied by Kirklees Borough Council, based on the 2001 Census, indicates that more than twice as many people commute from Kirklees to Leeds as from Kirklees to Bradford, and almost twice as many commute to Kirklees from Leeds as from Bradford. For the cities and boroughs that are contiguous with Leeds, relationships with Leeds are more important than those with any other neighbour. For Calderdale, which is not contiguous with Leeds, its relationships with its neighbours Bradford and Kirklees are significant. The MetroTrain map indicates Leeds’ centrality to public transport in West Yorkshire. Ten of the twelve railway lines terminate in Leeds (though one of them, the Huddersfield Line, also has a branch terminating in Wakefield). (One line terminates in Huddersfield, while the Dearne Valley Line from Sheffield to York passes through the eastern fringe of West Yorkshire.)

5.1.7 West Yorkshire is relatively compact. Of its five unitary authority areas only Calderdale is not contiguous with the City of Leeds. There are four trains an hour from Halifax to Leeds, taking 36-42 minutes. Bradford and Wakefield Cathedrals are each less than eight miles from the centre of Leeds, where the Ripon & Leeds diocesan office is located. Indeed Bradford Cathedral is closer to the Ripon & Leeds diocesan office than it is to the Bradford diocesan office in Steeton (near Keighley). By rail, Wakefield is 14-22 minutes and Bradford is 20-24 minutes from Leeds. The distances and time taken by road and rail are comparable with, if not less than, those that apply between centres of population within other dioceses.

5.1.8 *Our conclusion is that West Yorkshire is a recognizable community with a relatively compact area.*
Figure 4: Rail Network Map for West Yorkshire

http://www.wymetro.com/TrainTravel/traintimetables
5.1.9 Even such a compact area may consist of smaller areas that are distinct from each other, and that is the case in West Yorkshire. There is a clear division, in terms of physical, social and economic geography, between the west and the east of the County (broadly, between Bradford, Calderdale and Kirklees on the one hand and Leeds and Wakefield on the other). The western half is an upland area with steep valleys, while in the east the landscape is gently rolling or flat. Houses tend to be stone-built in the west and brick-built in the east. In the west, woollen mills traditionally dominated, while in the east there was a mixture of cloth manufacture in Leeds with engineering and coal mining further south and east. Though much of this has now declined, the legacies of the different industries remain distinct.

5.1.10 This geography could in the past have supported an east-west division between dioceses, just as it prompted the creation of separate Methodist districts of West Yorkshire (Bradford, Calderdale and Kirklees plus Craven and north-west Barnsley) and Leeds (Leeds and Wakefield, plus the south of the Harrogate District). The Diocese of Wakefield’s northern boundary divides the County on a north-south basis, however. As already mentioned, the evidence that we received suggested that Bradford and Leeds, though remaining distinct cities, are increasingly linked together, not just as a physical conurbation but also economically. If West Yorkshire had to be divided between more than one diocese, the separation of Kirklees and Wakefield into two separate dioceses would arguably still make sense, but it would be difficult to argue convincingly for a division between Bradford and Leeds. In fact, of course, the Church of England’s current diocesan boundaries in West Yorkshire achieve precisely the opposite, linking Kirklees with Wakefield but separating Bradford from Leeds. It is thus questionable whether West Yorkshire should be divided into more than one diocese at all, and questionable whether the existing division, which unites east with west in the south but separates them in the north, any longer makes sense (if it ever did).

5.1.11 In addition, there are significant discrepancies between the diocesan boundaries and the western, south-western and eastern boundaries of the City of Leeds as they were established 36 years ago in 1974. A total of 23 parishes fall within three other dioceses – with the consequence, already stated, that no one is entitled to engage with Leeds City Council on behalf of all of the parishes that the City comprises. However, as the smallest English diocese on virtually every measure, the viability of the Diocese of Bradford in particular would be threatened by the transfer of any of its eight Leeds parishes to the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds.

5.1.12 All of this not only places question marks against the existing diocesan boundaries within West Yorkshire but also raises a question as to whether the division of West Yorkshire between three dioceses benefits or impedes the Church’s mission to the people of West Yorkshire.
5.2 **The West Yorkshire Dioceses**

5.2.1 We shall now offer some comments on each of the three dioceses whose diocesan bishops live in West Yorkshire (‘the West Yorkshire dioceses’) in turn.

5.2.2 Before doing so it may be appropriate to comment on the differences between them. In addition to differences of size, extent and composition (in terms of urban and rural areas in particular), there are also striking differences of culture and ethos. In part these reflect differences in social geography; in part they reflect different balances of churchmanship. The differences in ethos between the dioceses also seem to reflect to some extent the different personal styles of successive bishops. It is significant, however, that to varying degrees such differences are also noticeable between different areas within the same diocese.

5.3 **The Diocese of Bradford**

5.3.1 Having been formed in 1919, the Diocese of Bradford is the most recently founded of the three dioceses. It was formed out of the Diocese of Ripon and consisted of what was then the Archdeaconry of Craven (the present archdeaconry plus most of the present Archdeaconry of Bradford), plus the Otley Deanery (except for seven parishes with an over-riding natural affinity to Leeds) and the Wakefield parishes of Wyke and Tong. At the time, Bradford and Craven formed a natural unit. Craven was Bradford’s rural hinterland, and communications between Craven and Ripon were poor. The area was united by its railway lines, as the diocesan history published to mark the diocese’s 75th anniversary explains:

‘The diocese could almost be seen as built around the railway from Sedbergh to Bradford and its feeder lines, and early Year Books make no assumptions about private motor cars but list the rail and tram routes to the churches.’

5.3.2 Whether those parts of the Diocese of Bradford that remain in Yorkshire could still be said to form a natural unit distinct from neighbouring areas is highly questionable. The association between the two areas was described to us as ‘historic and sentimental, not contemporary’. The Craven District now forms part of North Yorkshire (whereas the City of Bradford is in West Yorkshire). It is part of the Skipton and Ripon parliamentary constituency. Road links between Craven and the Harrogate district are now better; we were told that from Skipton it takes 35 minutes to get to Ripon by car (compared with 25-30 minutes to Bradford). The evidence that we received indicated that people in the Craven District travel to Harrogate (to which five buses a day run from Skipton) and Leeds, and those at the northern end to Hawes, more than to Bradford. Indeed, the Review Team was frequently told that, for a variety of

---

reasons, people from outside the centre of Bradford (a significant area of which has been demolished and awaits redevelopment) are reluctant to go into it. From Skipton considerably more trains go to Leeds than to Bradford.

5.3.3 From its inception the diocese has fallen into two distinct parts – an urban area and a rural area. Its shape (‘a pan with a handle’) and the fact that the urban centre of the diocese is at one end of it are said to be problematic. Several of those whom the Review Team met regarded the urban-rural mix as an enrichment and wished for that reason to remain in the same diocese as the City of Bradford. At the same time, several of them expressed an aspiration for more episcopal attention to the rural area (the published diocesan history suggests that this has been a recurrent theme over the last fifty years at least). They also expressed a sense of common interest with parishes in the rural part of the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds.

5.3.4 Those from the urban area whom the Review Team met stressed the importance of the role of the Bishop of Bradford in the life of the city. The Bishop of Bradford is the only leader of any church with ‘Bradford’ as part of his title and as such is the leading Christian voice addressing the issues facing an important city in West Yorkshire – including issues of urban deprivation and the need for regeneration. The Bishop of Bradford is also a key figure in the well-established dialogue between Christians and the City’s large and growing Muslim population. (It was suggested in evidence that Bradford (narrowly defined) would be ‘a majority Asian city by 2020’ and that in the city centre wards about 40% of the population is already South Asian.) In the area of the unitary authority as a whole, ethnic minorities make up 26% of the population – 81% of these being of South Asian descent.) The Bishop plays a crucial role in helping the City to relate to its faith communities and is recognized as a spokesperson by the leaders of those communities. We shall return to these issues in para. 7.6.1 below.

5.3.5 The ethos of the Diocese of Bradford is predominantly low-church and evangelical. It is also a small diocese (in terms of the number of parishes, benefices, churches and stipendiary clergy, either the smallest or second smallest in England). Some of those whom the Review Team met expressed a desire for a style of episcopacy that was more low-key and even more local, the bishop having less of the panoply of a diocesan bishop, and being responsible for a smaller area, than is traditionally the case in the Church of England.

5.3.6 While the Review Team encountered no sense of immediate crisis in the Diocese of Bradford, most of those in senior positions within the Diocese expressed concern as to its sustainability. Despite recent initiatives there was a sense of the Diocese ‘just holding its own’ and covering its costs by selling houses and reducing the number of stipendiary clergy. However, a deficit is predicted for each of the next five years which would require further economies. We felt that the concerns expressed to us were justified. In 2008
the Diocese had 87 full-time stipendiary clergy. Some saw it as being already below the necessary ‘critical mass’. There were also concerns about the ability of the diocesan administration to offer a service of sufficient resilience, some essential roles being undertaken by people working on them only one day a week. The Commission’s view that proposals should not be finance-driven and should make sense in terms of mission enjoyed strong support, but most of the diocese’s senior leaders also seemed clear that financial considerations needed to be taken into account in any discussion of the future of the Diocese. It was also suggested to us that a diocese as small, in terms of clergy posts, as Bradford now is cannot offer its clergy sufficient development opportunities.

5.3.7 Among those with whom the Review Team discussed the diocese as a whole, there was a significant weight of opinion that quite radical change was desirable. Inevitably, views varied as to what form it should take. Some believed that the Diocese could ‘get by’ without major changes, however, though some of these were open to considering proposals on their merits. Any change would need to retain Bradford’s strengths of smallness and intimacy, and its ethos, yet offer more resilient and economic administration and place financial worries within a larger context.

5.4 The Diocese of Wakefield

5.4.1 The Diocese of Wakefield consists largely of those parts of West Yorkshire which are not in the Cities of Bradford and Leeds. Unlike the other two West Yorkshire dioceses, it is a diocese with a number of sizeable towns rather than one large urban centre. Much of the diocese is rural, but unlike the other two dioceses it lacks a large area that is deeply rural and remote from centres of population: Todmorden is only eleven miles from the centre of Halifax. Like Bradford, Wakefield falls into two parts. The difference is that Wakefield had no natural unity from the outset. In addition to the topographical, social and economic and cultural differences between the western and eastern halves of the diocese that have already mentioned, there is also a difference in churchmanship: broadly speaking, the western half of the dioceses is more evangelical and the eastern half more catholic. Though we gained no sense that this is a cause of tension, it reinforces the impression of ‘a diocese of two halves’. It has been put to us that such sense of common purpose and ethos as the diocese has enjoyed in the past has been due to the personality and efforts of successive diocesan bishops.

5.4.2 Calderdale and Kirklees, taken together, have just over half of the population of the Diocese, yet of the senior staff only the Archdeacon of Halifax lives in that western half of the Diocese. The Bishops of Wakefield and Pontefract, the Dean of Wakefield and the Archdeacon of Pontefract all live in and around Wakefield itself.
5.4.3 Those we met in Calderdale and Kirklees indicated that Wakefield was a place they rarely visited and with which they did not feel a close association. Wakefield felt remote – psychologically and because of the time taken to get there (it could take an hour from Halifax) rather than in terms of actual distance.

5.4.4 As almost 25% of Wakefield’s parishes are among the 10% most deprived in England (in Yorkshire only Sheffield has more), meeting its parish ministry costs is always going to be challenging. This underlying challenge has been exacerbated by a decline in the parish share collection rate, which in 2009 fell by 5.8% to 82.7% (a development that was raised repeatedly with our Review Team during its visits to the Diocese). The diocesan accounts nevertheless showed a surplus of £165,000, but we understand that in recent years surpluses have been achieved by cutting diocesan staff posts and keeping benefices vacant. The Diocese’s projections, like those of other Yorkshire dioceses, anticipate six-figure annual deficits in the years 2010-2014. These projections are based on a parish share collection rate of 88% of a total increasing annually by an average of 4%. If the collection rate cannot be raised above last year’s 82.7%, the deficits will be much greater. We do not believe that such a level of deficit is sustainable.

5.4.5 There is widespread awareness within the diocese of the gravity of the situation. Estimations of morale vary; one priest spoke of a ‘Dunkirk spirit’ among the clergy. While some attribute the fall in the collection rate to an inability to pay due to the general economic situation and the level of social deprivation within the Wakefield Diocese, the most frequent explanation that the Review Team encountered was a feeling of alienation in the parishes. Proposals for the future structure of the Church in West Yorkshire should not be based on short-term factors such as current income, morale and the quality of relationships. However, such factors do have some bearing on what people in the Diocese of Wakefield think about its future.

5.4.6 In response to the financial situation, deaneries have been asked to work on plans for combining benefices and reducing the number of clergy posts. A comment frequently made to the Review Team was that, if restructuring has to take place at the parochial and deanery level, the diocesan level should not be exempt from that. We had already received indications of a view among some in the Diocese of Wakefield that there should be a reduction in the number of dioceses in Yorkshire. A deanery synod motion to that effect was debated (but not passed) by the diocesan synod in 2008. It would seem that the current situation has strengthened that view, and it is shared by some members of the senior staff. What the overall balance of opinion in the diocese would be, it is of course impossible for us to judge.

5.4.7 One interesting feature of the Review Team’s conversations in the Diocese of Wakefield is that, while there was support for diocesan restructuring in West
Yorkshire and a hope that a more streamlined structure would produce savings,
there were few calls for the number of bishops and archdeacons to be reduced.
Indeed, there was a desire for bishops to be seen in the parishes more
frequently. Members of the diocesan senior staff spoke of the increasing
burdens placed on them by legislation and by the increasing expectations of the
Church and the parochial clergy, while one churchwarden commented that in a
context in which clergy were being asked to take on more parishes their need
for support from archdeacons and bishops was greater, not less.

5.5 The Diocese of Ripon & Leeds

5.5.1 The Diocese of Ripon & Leeds is the oldest of the three West Yorkshire
dioceses. Like Bradford and Wakefield, it is divided into two parts and, as in
Bradford, one is urban at the southern end of the diocese and one, to the north,
is rural – much of it deeply rural. The sense of duality is exacerbated by the
fact that the cathedral is in Ripon whereas the diocesan office has long been in
Leeds. In 1999 the name of the diocesan bishopric was changed from ‘Ripon’
to ‘Ripon and Leeds’ and in 2008 the present bishop moved from Ripon to
Leeds. The Bishop of Knaresborough had already moved from Leeds to Exelby
(just off the A1 near Bedale, between Ripon and Richmond).

5.5.2 Although there is clearly regret in the rural area at the downgrading of Ripon
as a centre of the Diocese, our impression is that these changes have generally
been accepted in the rural area – not least because of the effort that the present
dioecesan bishop has made to continue to relate to the rural area and to be the
bishop for the whole diocese. He seems to be well known, and perceived as
frequently present, throughout the diocese. Some questioned whether this
would be true of future diocesan bishops. As in Bradford, the urban-rural mix
within the same diocese is seen as positive. There were no complaints of
episcopal neglect of, or lack of interest in, the rural north.

5.5.3 In the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds both bishops relate to the diocese as a whole,
the suffragan bishop holding certain ‘portfolios’ rather than having
responsibility for a geographical area. Among those whom the Review Team
met, views varied as to how well this works. Some were not clear as to which
bishop should be contacted about particular matters, and concern was
expressed that the lack of geographical spheres of responsibility could result in
duplication, with two bishops attending meetings at which the presence of one
would have sufficed.

5.5.4 The change of the name of the diocesan see and the move of the diocesan
bishop to Leeds were part of an attempt to address something that had long
been recognized – that a diocese focused on rural Ripon could not fully address
the needs of the Church in Leeds, and that Leeds may not have received the
sustained attention from the Church of England that its size and significance as
a city would require. Some of those whom the Review Team met suggested
that church life in Leeds was ‘at a low ebb’ and levels of church attendance there were not as good as they might be.

5.5.5 While some appreciated the partnership between two bishops working across the diocese as a whole, others, as we have mentioned, regarded this as resulting in duplication and lack of clarity. Some argued that there was a need, within a diocese that would retain the urban-rural mix, for one bishop to focus to a much greater extent on the rural area and rural issues and the other to devote most of his attention in a more concentrated fashion to the needs of Leeds. This would suggest an area system.

5.5.6 The fact that there are 23 parishes in the City of Leeds that are not in the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds was mentioned in several conversations with the Review Team as a problem – both for the Diocese, which cannot develop a strategy for the mission of the Church in the City as a whole, and for the City Council, which has to relate to four dioceses.

5.5.7 Financially, the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds is the strongest of the three West Yorkshire dioceses. It is able to meet a greater proportion of its expenditure from parish contributions and is accordingly much less dependent on central funds. Its parish share collection rate (93.3%) is higher than those of the other two dioceses. Though deficits are predicted, these should be on a much smaller scale than in the other two dioceses. Contributions from the churches in and around Harrogate, which contribute 20% of the Diocese’s total parish share, are crucial to its finances. Wakefield has no area of comparable wealth and those in the Diocese of Bradford are smaller and unable to contribute on the same scale. It should be underlined, however, that Ripon & Leeds’ position is one of relative prosperity in a context in which all of the Yorkshire dioceses face financial challenges.

5.5.8 Despite the challenges posed by the configuration of the Diocese (a large, often deeply rural, area, with two-thirds of its population concentrated at one end in the City of Leeds, significant parts of which are not in the Diocese), our impression is of a diocese ‘at ease with itself’ – relatively content, numerically small enough to be intimate, and relatively confident about the future. Fears were expressed to us that this could tip over into complacency, and that the impression that the Diocese would be ‘OK for the next twenty years’ could lead it to ‘stick its head in the sand’ and not take action that would help to secure the longer-term future.

5.5.9 In fact, our impression is that the Diocese’s sense of stability and confidence has made people even more ready to contemplate significant change to the structure of the Church in Yorkshire than is the case in the other two dioceses. The Review Team encountered a widespread willingness to embrace change if it would benefit the Church in Yorkshire more generally and the other two West Yorkshire dioceses in particular. Many could see benefits in terms of a
more coherent mission both to the rural area of the diocese and to the City of Leeds, as well as the potential for greater resilience and economies of scale if the administration of the three existing dioceses were unified.

5.5.10 In this case, confidence seems to engender not complacency but openness to change. Some of those whom the Review Team met recognized that given the dispersed nature of West Yorkshire and the distinctive ethos and traditions of the other dioceses, change could not simply constitute a ‘takeover’ by the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds with Leeds as the focus of a centralized diocese.

5.6 Administrative Sharing

5.6.1 Some administrative sharing already exists between the three West Yorkshire dioceses and there are discussions about extending this. Our impression, endorsed by some of those whom the Review Team met, is that hitherto initiatives for co-operation and sharing have generally been opportunistic rather than strategic, often based on the interests of individuals and relationships between them rather than on a strategic view of the needs of the Church in West Yorkshire as a whole.

5.6.2 The most notable development has been the establishment of a joint education team, under a joint Director of Education, for the Dioceses of Bradford and Ripon & Leeds. This was intended not to save money but to provide a comprehensive service of a calibre and resilience that neither diocese could afford on its own. It is regarded by the dioceses, and as far as we are aware by the local authorities and the schools, as a success. However, this example demonstrates not only the benefits of administrative sharing but arguably also its limitations as a solution. In various conversations, mention was made of the wastefulness of staff effort in servicing two Boards of Education and the difficulty that this could involve when their policies differed. Fears were expressed that the existence of two Boards militated against effective oversight of the staff, at least in principle (we are not aware that in practice difficulties have yet been encountered). These considerations could lead to the establishment of a single Board (as has already happened in the Dioceses of Portsmouth and Winchester), but even then the Director of Education would have to relate to two diocesan secretaries and two finance directors.
6 Our Primary Recommendation

6.1 Issues

6.1.1 Our review has led us to the clear conclusion that the existing configuration of the dioceses in West Yorkshire is no longer appropriate for the Church’s mission and is not sustainable into the future, and that the status quo is therefore not an option. Some of the issues that we have identified as pointing to this conclusion have existed since the inception of the dioceses. Others have arisen more recently from changes in the social and economic geography, and in communications, since the dioceses were founded.

6.1.2 We are clear that West Yorkshire is a single entity, albeit a decentralized one, and that the Church needs to engage with it as such. Its division between three main dioceses militates against the Church’s mission to West Yorkshire and indeed the Leeds City Region as a whole.

6.1.3 If one were to attempt to divide the area into dioceses, they would not be the existing ones. The Diocese of Wakefield in particular comprises two distinct areas that have little affinity or connection with each other beyond the fact that they both form part of West Yorkshire and the Leeds City Region. The halves each relate more to Leeds than they do to each other. Bradford and Leeds now merge into each other as cities, so that one can speak of the ‘Leeds-Bradford conurbation’; there is acceptance that the future of Bradford is tied to that of Leeds. Yet the diocesan boundaries separate the two cities rather than bringing them together. Both the Diocese of Bradford and the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds include deeply rural northern areas. These now not only have more in common with each other than they have with the urban areas but are also more interconnected in terms of travel, communications and administration than they were in the past. The Diocese of Bradford’s rural area in particular now has more connection and interaction with both parts of the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds than it has with Bradford itself.

6.1.4 Added to this is the fact that the City of Leeds is divided between four dioceses. Though this is not perceived as a problem by all of the parishes, it is an issue for those, both in the Church and in secular institutions, who are concerned with the good of the City as a whole and not just with its individual parts.

6.1.5 There is also a widespread view, both in West Yorkshire and beyond it, that the existence within that single, compact area of three diocesan administrations is a luxury that the Church of England can no longer afford. The fact that three diocesan bishops live within West Yorkshire similarly leads to a perception that the present arrangements involve duplication (indeed triplication) that is wasteful as well as unhelpful. At a time when deaneries and parishes are asked
to look at reconfiguration, there is a view that such diocesan structures cannot continue unchallenged.

6.1.6 Added to this is our assessment, which we believe reflects the predominant opinion within the leadership of each of the three dioceses and among those who are well acquainted with diocesan affairs, as to the sustainability of the present structures. The Diocese of Ripon & Leeds, while by no means immune from the financial pressures that all the Yorkshire dioceses face, could easily continue in its existing form for the foreseeable future, but there is a lack of confidence that that is true of the other two dioceses. The Diocese of Bradford, though not immediately threatened, is ‘just holding its own’ and is not regarded by many within its own leadership as sustainable in the medium term; there is a view that it has ‘lost critical mass’. The Diocese of Wakefield also suffers from a weak financial base and is widely (though not universally) perceived as facing a more immediate threat.

6.1.7 Changes with long-term consequences should not, if at all possible, be made in response to short-term factors but, even leaving these aside, we are concerned as to the future viability and sustainability of the current structures. Such concern is not in itself a sufficient reason for change. Moreover, in a context where none of the Yorkshire dioceses is financially strong, no structural change that we could propose could of itself solve the financial problems. If there were cogent reasons for keeping the existing structures intact for the sake of the Church’s mission, there would be an argument for seeking to address the problem by attempting to put them on a sounder financial footing rather than changing them for financial reasons. We have concluded, however, that the present configuration of the dioceses tends to impede the Church’s mission rather than fostering it. That being so, the argument for change is, we believe, stronger than any argument for retaining the status quo.

6.1.8 The Review Team were struck by the number of those whom they met who essentially took this view. One of the most common comments made was that the benefits to be gained from ‘tinkering’ with boundaries would not justify the effort involved. Some drew from this the conclusion that the status quo should be maintained, but a significant majority took the opposite view and urged the Commission to ‘be radical’ in its thinking and recommendations about how the Church in these dioceses could best be configured for its mission in the 21st century.

6.2 Possible Solutions

6.2.1 In Chapter 4 we have already considered, and dismissed, the possibility of a single diocese for the whole of Yorkshire. We have also concluded that South Yorkshire is distinct from West Yorkshire and that the Diocese of Sheffield should therefore continue. Before articulating our own proposal, we need to look briefly at some others that have been put to us.
6.2.2 Some have suggested that shared administration (possibly even a single administrative centre) would be sufficient to address the problems. We do not agree. It would improve resilience and should result in economies of scale but, if the existing dioceses continued, it would also create problems of oversight and accountability. Additional joint committees to oversee joint staff would add a new layer of meetings, when there is some evidence of difficulty in filling existing committees. There would also be difficulties involved in a single staff attempting to service dioceses which might have contrasting policies on the same issues. The creation of joint boards would address these issues up to a point, but would to an extent simply displace the problem, which would become one of multiple accountability of boards rather than multiple accountability of staff.

6.2.3 Some have spoken of a ‘federal structure’, which might simply mean the continuance of separate dioceses linked together by federal structures. But to what purposes would dioceses remain separate when their boards and their staff had been merged and their policies co-ordinated? Be that as it may, the proposed solution of shared administration does not address the issue of the problematic configuration and boundaries of the existing dioceses, nor does it address the need for a unified engagement on the part of the Church of England with West Yorkshire.

6.2.4 Others have proposed a range of ‘two diocese’ solutions to us. One of these would involve dissolving the Diocese of Wakefield and dividing its territory between the other two (doubtless also adjusting their existing boundaries), Kirklees and Calderdale going to Bradford and Wakefield to Ripon & Leeds. However, this does not address the need for linkage between Bradford and Leeds and between Craven and the rest of the Yorkshire Dales. Furthermore, while it reflects the dichotomy within the Diocese of Wakefield, it does not respect the fact that the links between all parts of Kirklees and Leeds are far more significant than those between Kirklees and Bradford. Transferring only Calderdale to Bradford would make sense up to a point, but would create a new separation between Calderdale and Kirklees, which do relate to each other. It is also doubtful whether adding Calderdale to Bradford would be sufficient to ensure its long-term sustainability.

6.2.5 Another proposal put to us would involve uniting the Dioceses of Bradford and Wakefield (again, probably with adjustment of existing boundaries). As far as West Yorkshire is concerned, this would create a ‘diocese of all the rest’, united only by the fact that none of its parts were in the City of Leeds, even though for most of them the relationship with Leeds would be their most important external relationship. Again the need for linkage between Bradford and Leeds and between Craven and the rest of the Yorkshire Dales is not addressed.
6.2.6 A third permutation often mentioned in the Dioceses of Bradford and Ripon & Leeds is the possibility of uniting those two dioceses while leaving Wakefield separate. This would recreate the Diocese of Ripon as it was until 1919 when the Diocese of Bradford was created. As far as those two dioceses are concerned, the proposal would make sense. It would reflect the growing importance of the relationship between the Cities of Leeds and Bradford and between the Craven District and the rest of the Yorkshire Dales. The southern boundary of the pre-1919 Diocese of Ripon was and remains a sensible one from the Bradford and Leeds perspective (apart for the fact that Morley, despite its strong individual identity as a town, is now part of the City of Leeds and relates more to Leeds than to Wakefield or Bradford). Sustainability would be increased. The problem with this solution is not that it would be incoherent in itself but that it does nothing to address the incoherence of the Diocese of Wakefield as a unit or the concerns over its sustainability. It also ignores the fact that West Yorkshire is a single, relatively compact area and fails to enable the Church of England to speak with a single voice to and for West Yorkshire. Finally, it reduces the number of diocesan bishops and of diocesan offices in West Yorkshire to two, but fails to meet the criticism that in an area as compact as West Yorkshire even this would involve wasteful and confusing duplication.

6.2.7 In our view, none of the two-diocese solutions addresses all of the issues that need to be addressed. None of them would create a sustainable structure for West Yorkshire as a whole.

6.2.8 *Our recommendation therefore is that there should be a single diocese covering the whole of West Yorkshire.*

6.3 North Yorkshire

6.3.1 So far our discussion has focused on West Yorkshire, although considerations relating to the rural areas of the Dioceses of Bradford and Ripon & Leeds have been introduced where relevant. Should they be part of the new diocese, or not?

6.3.2 It will be clear from what has already been said that we believe that Craven District should form part of the same diocese as the rural part of the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds. Taken together, the North Yorkshire parts of the two dioceses cover the Yorkshire Dales and their eastern fringe. (We shall address the question of those parts of the two dioceses that are no longer in Yorkshire and also the eastern border of the new diocese in Chapter 9.) There is no doubt that this area is distinct from the County of West Yorkshire and does not form part of it. We have asked ourselves, therefore, whether this area might form a diocese of its own.

6.3.3 Our conclusion is that it should not, for a number of reasons.
6.3.4 Removing this area from the new diocese would create an almost entirely rural diocese, whereas the urban-rural mix of the existing dioceses is widely appreciated, perhaps especially in the rural areas – notwithstanding the desire for more focused attention to rural issues to which we have referred.

6.3.5 Furthermore, though the area is distinct from West Yorkshire, the southern part of it is closely related to West Yorkshire. The Leeds City Region includes the Craven and Harrogate Districts, which are both closely related economically to Leeds. Many people work in Leeds but live in or around Harrogate. Though this area of North Yorkshire is distinct from West Yorkshire, it is not as separate from it as most of South Yorkshire is. The economic significance of Harrogate for the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds has already been noted. For Harrogate not to be included in the new diocese would have a very adverse effect on its finances. A northern diocese without Harrogate would not be viable economically, and we also need to bear in mind the strong request that we received from Harrogate District Council that the Church of England’s diocesan boundaries should foster the relationship between Harrogate and Ripon as the two main towns of the Harrogate District, rather than driving a wedge between them. Thus there are very good reasons, in terms of social and economic geography as well as in terms of finance, for retaining at least the whole of the Craven and Harrogate Districts in the new diocese.

6.3.6 On the latest figures available to us, even assuming that the areas of the two dioceses that are now in Lancashire, Cumbria and County Durham were included, the population of this northern area would be 315,000. It would have only 84 benefices and 81 full-time stipendiary clergy. On most measures it would be smaller than any existing English diocese. The addition of the Mowbray Deanery of the Diocese of York (the Northallerton and Thirsk areas of the Hambleton District), which some have suggested to us (a possibility that we shall consider in Chapter 9), would not materially alter the position. On that basis, we have concluded that this area would not be a sustainable unit on its own.

6.3.7 The case of Richmondshire and the Ripon & Leeds part of Hambleton District is slightly different from that of Craven and Harrogate. These areas were never part of the West Riding and were for almost three hundred years in the Diocese of Chester, when the rest of the area under discussion was still in the Diocese of York. They are more distant from Leeds and do not form part of the Leeds City Region or – more importantly – of the underlying social and economic reality to which the Leeds City Region gives expression. They relate not only to the Harrogate District but also to Northallerton and Thirsk in the Diocese of York’s part of the Hambleton District. In addition, there is a strong pull towards Darlington and Teesside. Television programmes come from Newcastle rather than Leeds (something which is in fact true as far south as Harrogate).
6.3.8 However, despite the distinctions between this area and that to the south, the Yorkshire Dales have a common identity that makes the present configuration plausible, and a strong Yorkshire identity that would be resistant to a diocese focused on Teesside. Expansion of the already large Diocese of York to include even part of the western part of North Yorkshire would increase the size of an already large diocese whose oversight is complicated by the Archbishop of York’s provincial and national duties.

6.3.9 One other possibility which should be mentioned is that of a Diocese of Ripon covering the ceremonial county of North Yorkshire apart from the City of York itself and areas immediately adjacent to it. This would reduce the Diocese of York to the City of York and its environs and the East Riding. However, we believe that, for the reasons already stated, the Craven and Harrogate Districts need to be part of the same diocese as West Yorkshire and that this northern area of the Yorkshire Dales should continue to be in the same diocese as the Harrogate District.

6.3.10 We therefore recommend that the new diocese should include those parts of the Dioceses of Bradford and Ripon & Leeds that are in North Yorkshire.

6.3.11 The Dioceses of Bradford and Ripon & Leeds also include areas that are now in Lancashire, Cumbria and County Durham. We shall consider these areas and also the precise boundary of the new diocese with the Diocese of York in Chapter 9.

6.4 A Diocese with Episcopal Areas

6.4.1 We have already mentioned in Chapter 2 the concept of ‘collegial episcopacy’ or ‘team episcopacy’, whereby the office of diocesan bishop would be held and exercised conjointly by a number of bishops rather than an individual. As we have seen, this idea was dismissed in the early 1970s on practical as well as ecclesiological grounds. As we have explained, our task is to propose solutions within the existing law of the Church of England, rather than solutions that would require significant primary legislation.

6.4.2 This does not mean, however, that the diocese that we envisage would be monolithic in its structure or that it would function as the existing West Yorkshire dioceses do. The Diocese of Wakefield has been described to us as ‘a community of West Yorkshire towns’ and despite the pre-eminence of Leeds this is in fact still true of West Yorkshire as a whole. West Yorkshire is not a ‘Greater Leeds’ comparable with Greater London or Greater Manchester. This makes a decentralized structure essential for a diocese covering the whole of West Yorkshire as well as half of North Yorkshire. We have emphasized the importance of the relationship between Bradford and Leeds, but the need to respect Bradford’s distinct and very different identity, and to respond to the particular challenges that it faces, is equally important.
6.4.3 We therefore recommend that the new diocese should be divided into episcopal areas, with area bishops to whom the day-to-day oversight of their areas would be delegated as completely as possible.

6.4.4 This would recognize and give expression to the identity of the significant areas within the new diocese and the area bishops would be released to concentrate on leading the mission of the Church in their respective areas.

6.4.5 The Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 ended the possibility of creating area systems whereby episcopal jurisdiction would be delegated by virtue of an area scheme that could only be amended or rescinded with the approval of the General Synod. This was not because the division of dioceses into such episcopal areas was thought undesirable, but because it was held that decisions about the arrangements for episcopal oversight within a diocese should be made within the diocese concerned. Episcopal jurisdiction in respect of specified matters can still be delegated to suffragan bishops with oversight of episcopal areas, and indeed the Diocese of Salisbury has recently replaced its area scheme under the 1978 Measure with a new system established by means of instruments of delegation.

6.4.6 The advantage of the new arrangements is that they offer flexibility. If the initial arrangements are found in future to require change, those changes can be made within the diocese without reference to the General Synod or the Dioceses Commission. By contrast, of course, if a single diocese for West Yorkshire is not established in response to our report, significant changes to the configuration of episcopal oversight across West Yorkshire as a whole could in future only be taken by action of the Dioceses Commission, whether at the unanimous request of the diocesan bishops concerned or following a further exercise such as the one we have undertaken. This would involve considerable time, effort and expense and require the Commission again to give Yorkshire priority over other parts of the country.

6.4.7 Another advantage of an area system is that it involves clarity over episcopal roles. In both of the West Yorkshire dioceses with suffragan bishops, we encountered some uncertainty among the clergy as to the precise roles and responsibilities of the suffragan bishops. However, in the new diocese each suffragan would be an area bishop and, as such, the chief pastor and principal minister to whom the diocesan bishop would have delegated the pastoral care of the clergy and people of his area and the leadership of their worship.

6.4.8 The area bishops would be responsible for the leadership of the Church’s worship, mission and engagement with civil society in their areas. What the diocesan bishop would be for the diocese as a whole (chief pastor, father in God, principal minister, leader in mission), they would be for their areas. We therefore believe that while the diocese would be a ‘local church’, it would also be appropriate to describe the area as a ‘local church’ – a unit of worship and
mission presided over and led by a bishop (see para. 2.7.5 above). We shall return to the theme of the unity of the diocese in section 6.7.

6.4.9 We believe that the structure that we are proposing would both enable the Church to engage in mission to this part of Yorkshire effectively and efficiently and, at the same time, result in mission and episcopal leadership that are more locally focused and closer to parishes, clergy and people than is possible within the existing structures. It is possible to create episcopally-led units of worship and mission that are truly local, while at the same time establishing a diocese that is large enough to be sustainable, with resilient and economical administration, and which can relate coherently to civil structures at the county and regional levels.

6.5 The Episcopal Area and the Area Bishop

6.5.1 There has never been an area scheme in operation in any of the Yorkshire dioceses. Although the present Archbishop of York has delegated responsibility to his suffragans by detailed formal instruments, the delegation is less extensive than in some other dioceses, the episcopal areas are less distinct from each other and the arrangements are in any case still relatively new. Thus, there is no experience within Yorkshire of arrangements such as those that we envisage and the only example in Yorkshire of delegation to suffragan bishops with responsibility for a defined territory does not reflect what we are proposing. Clergy who have previously worked in a diocese with an area scheme will have first-hand experience of such arrangements, but even that may be misleading, as formal area schemes under the 1978 Measure vary considerably in their contents. It is therefore important that we spell out in some detail what we mean by the terms ‘episcopal areas’ and ‘area bishops’ in this context.

6.5.2 Though the precise details would need to be worked out in dialogue with the representatives of the three dioceses as part of the implementation process leading up to the inception of a scheme, in what follows we shall set out in outline the arrangements that we envisage. These are based on (though not identical with) those contained in the London Area Scheme. We have taken that scheme as our model because it is the scheme that embodies the most extensive delegation of powers to the area bishops and, as we have already explained, we believe that a decentralized structure for the diocese would be essential given the nature and extent of the areas that it would comprise.

6.5.3 The Diocesan Bishop would be the bishop of the whole diocese. He would have overall responsibility for

- the unity of the diocese
- strategic issues
• engagement with the institutions and structures of West Yorkshire and the Leeds City Region
• representation of the diocese nationally and internationally.

In these responsibilities he would be assisted by the area bishops and the archdeacons.

6.5.4 A detailed list of statutory and canonical functions to be reserved to the diocesan bishop would need to be drawn up, and he would also retain all rights, powers and duties not expressly delegated to the area bishops. In summary, we envisage that functions that relate to the structure of the Church in the diocese, the making of appointments with significance for the whole diocese, and functions with a ‘judicial’ or disciplinary character would be reserved to the diocesan bishop. These might include:

• ‘disciplinary’ functions in relation to the Clergy Discipline Measure and the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure, functions relating to the Clerical Disabilities Act and the Incumbents (Vacation of Benefices) Measure, and exclusion of persons from Holy Communion;
• the right to hold episcopal visitations;
• functions relating to pastoral schemes and pastoral orders;
• consecration and licensing of churches and chapels;
• functions related to the faculty jurisdiction and closed churches;
• functions under the Parsonages Measures;
• granting of common licenses for marriage;
• appointment of the chancellor, registrar and archdeacons;
• the appointment of canons after consultation with the area bishops.

These functions could, of course, be delegated to one of the other bishops if circumstances required.

6.5.5 The area bishops would exercise the other statutory and canonical functions of the bishop. They would

• be ‘sponsoring bishops’ and examine for Holy Orders (subject to the diocesan bishop’s right to lay down common standards)
• admit to Holy Orders (subject to the diocesan bishop’s right to hold ordinations for the whole diocese);
• exercise the functions of the bishop in relation to the Patronage (Benefices) Measure 1986 and exercise the patronage of the diocesan bishop in respect of benefices in their episcopal areas;
• institute and collate to benefices and grant licences and permissions to clergy, Readers, layworkers and other laypeople;
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- suspend presentation to benefices where necessary;
- exercise functions under the Churchwardens Measure;
- give or arrange pastoral support to clergy facing proceedings under the Clergy Discipline Measure;
- exercise the canonical functions of the bishop regarding liturgy and worship;
- appoint rural or area deans;
- make parochial appointments;
- be responsible in practice for matters relating to pastoral reorganization, though as this is a matter affecting the structure of the diocese the diocesan bishop would sign this off.

6.5.6 The area bishops’ ministry would not only be internal to the Church, however. They would also take the lead in relating to the secular institutions of their areas (in West Yorkshire, primarily the unitary authorities; in North Yorkshire, the County Council and district councils). Nor would their ministry be confined to the episcopal area. We shall discuss their role in the diocese as a whole in section 7.11.

6.6 Bishops, Clergy and People Together

6.6.1 In the Church of England, bishops govern in consultation with their clergy and people in synods and councils, and with their formal consent where that is legally required. Synods and councils are permanent features of the Church’s life at every level. 41 How would this be reflected in the life of the new diocese?

6.6.2 There would be a diocesan synod and a bishop’s council for the diocese as a whole. The diocesan committee structure (the details of which would be worked out within the new diocese) would need to reflect significant delegation of non-strategic matters to the episcopal areas, which might in turn mean that a slim structure could be maintained at the diocesan level.

6.6.3 We do not envisage the creation of area synods. No English diocese has them, and the provision in the Dioceses Measure 1978 that permitted them to be created has been repealed. However, we do envisage the creation of formally constituted area councils. These would consist of the Area Bishop, Archdeacon, rural deans, deanery lay chairs and elected representatives of the clergy and laity and would need to be small enough to function effectively. The detailed membership would be determined by the new diocese, but there might be an advantage if the clergy and lay members of the diocesan synod from the area formed the core of the Area Council.

6.6.4 The functions of the Area Council would be:

(i) to provide support and advice to the Area Bishop on the whole mission, ministry and administration of the Church in the Area and to consider those matters about which the Area Bishop may choose to consult it; and

(ii) to decide on such matters of Area concern as the Diocesan Synod, or other competent authority within the Diocese designated by it, may from time to time delegate to it, subject to any policy agreed by the Diocesan Synod or other designated body.‘

6.6.5 The duties under part (ii) would include:

- certain of the functions of the Mission and Pastoral Committee established under the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 (except where proposals would have a strategic impact on the diocese as a whole or on more than one episcopal area);
- entitlement to discuss deployment of clergy and other accredited ministers within the total number allocated to the Area;
- financial responsibility for money allocated to the Area by the Diocesan Board of Finance;
- under the guidance of the Area Bishop, organizing area-wide gatherings and events beneficial for the development of worship, mission and evangelism, ministry teaching and other matters.

6.6.6 Decisions would need to be taken in the new diocese as to which aspects of the Church’s life should be supported and resourced at diocesan level and which at area level, but the Area Bishop’s responsibility for ordinands and ministry would mean that there would need to be area officers responsible for ordinands, initial ministerial education (IME 4-7), continuing ministerial education and readers – even if some activities relevant to these functions were in fact organized or resourced at diocesan level. Most of these functions might be combined with parochial responsibilities or undertaken on a voluntary basis, though there would probably need to be at least one paid officer at the area level (in addition to support staff for the bishop and archdeacon).

6.7 Unity and Ethos

6.7.1 In such an arrangement there would be a need to create a sense of unity and purpose for the diocese as a whole, but this would not prevent the creation and continuance of a sense of corporate identity and mission in the individual areas. A diocese of the sort that we envisage would be anything other than monolithic. Just as the existing dioceses, and indeed areas within them, would each have their own distinct ethos, that would be true of the episcopal areas in the new diocese. Such an ethos would relate to the social and economic factors that we have discussed, but also to church traditions and other customs. The
fact that parochial appointments would be made in the areas would be crucial to this. Experience in other dioceses indicates that area schemes tend to foster diversity between areas rather than inhibiting it.

6.7.2 The diocese would need to be characterized by unity but not uniformity, and the role of the diocesan bishop and the other area bishops in the diocese as a whole (to which we shall return in section 7.11), combined with the extensive delegation of powers and functions to the area bishops and area councils, would support this.

6.8 Conclusion

6.8.1 Our primary recommendation is, therefore:

(i) that there should be a single diocese covering West Yorkshire and also those parts of the Dioceses of Bradford and Ripon & Leeds that are in North Yorkshire, and

(ii) that the new diocese should be divided into episcopal areas with area bishops to whom the day-to-day oversight of their areas would be delegated as completely as possible, each with an area council to which appropriate functions would be delegated.

6.8.2 We have made these recommendations in response to the particular context of West Yorkshire and the western part of North Yorkshire. We do not see them as necessarily offering a model for other parts of the country where the circumstances and context are different.
7 Bishops, Archdeacons and Episcopal Areas

7.1 A New Diocese

7.1.1 It is fundamental to our approach that what we are recommending is the creation of a new diocese, not a take-over by one of the existing dioceses of the other two.

7.1.2 We therefore envisage a scheme that would dissolve the three existing dioceses, abolish the three diocesan bishoprics and provide for compensating the diocesan bishops for loss of office, in accordance with Compensation Rules approved by the General Synod under the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007.

7.2 The Diocesan Bishop as an Area Bishop

7.2.1 As we have explained in Chapter 6, the delegation of episcopal powers to the area bishops that we envisage is so extensive that the episcopal areas would be units of worship and mission of which the area bishop would be chief pastor, father in God, principal minister and leader in mission. The diocesan bishop would be all of these things for the diocese as a whole, its focus of unity and its representative to the wider Church and civil society, but we believe that the extent of the delegation that we envisage is such that, in order fully to be a bishop, the diocesan bishop should also be an area bishop. If he were not, he would be in danger of becoming too remote from parochial life and from the Church ‘on the ground’.

7.2.2 We therefore recommend that the diocesan bishop should also be area bishop of one of the areas of the diocese.

7.3 Archdeaconries and Deaneries

7.3.1 We envisage that no archdeaconry would be divided between episcopal areas and that each deanery would be entirely within one of the archdeaconries. We recommend that in principle no unitary authority area should be divided between archdeaconries. The archdeaconry and deanery boundaries within the new diocese would need to be adjusted accordingly. (Where secular boundaries run through the area covered by a single parish, a judgement would need to be made as to the archdeaconry to which the parish should belong.)

7.4 The Ripon Area

7.4.1 As already indicated, we believe that those parts of the County of North Yorkshire that fall within the new diocese should form a single episcopal area – a rural area within a mixed urban and rural diocese. The ancient ecclesiastical centre of this area is Ripon, which has been an episcopal see since 1836, and
we recommend that Ripon should be the see of the area bishop of the rural area. The existing Suffragan See of Knaresborough would be renamed as the See of Ripon. The Bishop of Ripon might hold a brief for rural issues across the diocese as a whole and might indeed be expected to make a contribution to the Church’s thinking on rural affairs at the national level.

7.4.2 The latest statistics available to us indicate the size of this area as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ripon Area</th>
<th>N. Yorks only</th>
<th>N. Yorks plus parishes in Lancashire, Cumbria and Co. Durham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>282,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,581 sq. miles</td>
<td>1,982 sq. miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parishes</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefices</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary clergy</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total licensed clergy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4.3 At present, the largest part of this area is in the Archdeaconry of Richmond. It also includes the greater part of the Archdeaconry of Craven (though most of the South Craven Deanery is within the City of Bradford) and four parishes in the Archdeaconry of Bradford.

7.4.4 Although this would be a large episcopal area geographically (larger than the majority of dioceses), the number of benefices and stipendiary clergy is more comparable with that of other archdeaconries (the average English archdeaconry has 65 benefices and 64 stipendiary clergy). We believe that this area could form a single archdeaconry, particularly if some or all of the parishes that are now in Lancashire, Cumbria and County Durham were detached from it (see Chapter 9). It would be appropriately named the Archdeaconry of Richmond and Craven. The Archdeaconry of Craven would be dissolved and its parishes within the new diocese divided between the new Archdeaconry of Richmond and Craven and the Archdeaconry of Bradford.

7.5 The Leeds Area

7.5.1 After Birmingham, the City of Leeds unitary authority has the second largest population in England. Many consider that historically the City of Leeds has not received the attention that it should have from the Church of England. Only since 1997 has a Church of England bishop had Leeds as part of his title. We believe that there should now be an area bishop focusing on the needs of what
is an expanding city in the twenty-first century. We believe that the City of Leeds should now form an episcopal area within the new diocese, receiving dedicated attention from an area bishop whose area should include only the City of Leeds.

7.5.2 Some concern has been expressed that confusion might arise from there being an Anglican Bishop of Leeds and a Roman Catholic Bishop of Leeds. There is already an Anglican Bishop of Portsmouth and a Roman Catholic Bishop of Portsmouth and this does not pose insurmountable problems. In our view, the aim of having an area bishop whose area is limited to the City of Leeds – the third most populous city after London and Birmingham, with a population that is still growing – is of overriding importance.

7.5.3 The latest statistics available to us indicate the size of this area as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leeds Area</th>
<th>Ripon &amp; Leeds, Bradford and Wakefield parishes</th>
<th>Including parishes from the Diocese of York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>773,000</td>
<td>788,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>185 sq. miles</td>
<td>218 sq. miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parishes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefices</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary clergy</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total licensed clergy</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.4 Though the area and number of parishes is much smaller than the Ripon Area, the Leeds Area would have a much larger population (larger than the Diocese of Bradford and six other English dioceses). The number of benefices and clergy would be broadly comparable. The area would comprise a single archdeaconry, the Archdeaconry of Leeds.

7.5.5 The City of Leeds includes eight parishes that are currently in the Diocese of York. We shall consider them in Chapter 9.

7.5.6 The City also includes two parishes that are currently in the Archdeaconry of Richmond, eight that are in the Diocese of Bradford and seven that are in the Diocese of Wakefield. We recommend that all of these should be transferred to the Archdeaconry of Leeds, so that all of the parishes in the new diocese that are in the City of Leeds come under the same area bishop and archdeacon, who can represent all of the Diocese’s parishes in the City to the City authorities.
Figure 5: Bradford and Wakefield Parishes in the City of Leeds
7.5.7 The parishes that are currently in the Archdeaconry of Richmond are already in the same diocese as the rest of the City of Leeds. Transferring them to the Archdeaconry of Leeds will also reduce slightly the overall increase in the size of the renamed Archdeaconry of Richmond and Craven compared with the existing Archdeaconry of Richmond.

7.5.8 Of the eight parishes currently in the Diocese of Bradford, four are in the Otley Deanery. According to the evidence given to the Review Team, three of these (Guiseley with Esholt, Yeadon and Rawdon) clearly relate in secular terms to Leeds rather than Bradford. Though Otley itself is fairly self-contained and does not relate strongly to Bradford or Leeds, its position in the City of Leeds makes it most logical to include it in the Leeds Archdeaconry.

7.5.9 The other four parishes (Calverley, Farsley, Woodhall and Pudsey) are in the Calverley Deanery. The former Borough of Pudsey (which included Calverley and Farsley) has an ambivalent relationship with Leeds. Older residents still resent its absorption by Leeds, but this would doubtless also have been true had it been absorbed by Bradford instead. That said, in secular terms parts of the area do relate quite closely to Bradford, and ties of sentiment link residents who moved out into these parishes with that city. Some have suggested that at this point the boundary of the City of Leeds was drawn too far west and too close to the centre of Bradford. Other parts of this area do seem to relate in secular terms to Leeds rather than Bradford, however, and only Calverley is part of the Bradford conurbation rather than that of Leeds (insofar as they can be distinguished). Furthermore, Bradford itself relates increasingly closely with Leeds; we were told that ‘people sleep in Bradford but live in Leeds’ – something especially true of young people. Our recommendation is that these parishes, with those currently in the Otley Deanery, should form part of the archdeaconry and episcopal area that relates to their local authority.

7.5.10 One objection that was put to us was a loyalty felt by the congregations in some of these parishes to the Diocese of Bradford and Bradford Cathedral that arises in part from a common evangelical churchmanship. In our view, the Church’s mission to secular society requires that its boundaries make sense to those outside the worshipping community; we do not believe that considerations of churchmanship should take precedence over this. In this case, the fact that these parishes would still be in the same diocese as Bradford Cathedral means that existing relationships with it could continue unchanged.

7.5.11 The seven Leeds parishes currently in the Wakefield Diocese comprise the former Borough of Morley. Morley has an even stronger sense of resentment at its absorption by Leeds than Pudsey has, but again the relationship is in fact ambivalent. It was suggested to the Review Team that younger and newer residents relate more to Leeds than older and more established residents do. Except in West and East Ardsley there is very little evidence of a relationship with Wakefield itself. All of the parishes except for East Ardsley are in the
Birstall Deanery and there is an historic affinity with that area of what is now North Kirklees. Thus, history might point to Morley being in the same archdeaconry and episcopal area as North Kirklees. However, present realities and the orientation of the younger generation would point to it being in the Leeds archdeaconry and episcopal area, and that is our recommendation.

7.6 The Bradford Area

7.6.1 Evidence from Bradford City Council was clear as to the importance of the Bishop of Bradford for the City of Bradford. As already stated, the Bishop of Bradford is the only church leader with ‘Bradford’ in his title and the only one resident within the boundaries of the City of Bradford. The Bishop plays a crucial role in helping the City to relate to its faith communities and is recognized as a spokesperson by the leaders of those communities. Among the other faiths present in the city, the Muslim community is much the largest. Christian-Muslim relations therefore dominate the interfaith agenda in Bradford and the Bishop’s role in this regard has regional and indeed national significance. Looking ahead, its significance is likely to grow. Demographic projections suggest that, as a result of immigration and high birth rates, by 2020 over 50% of Bradford city will comprise ethno-Muslim communities. As the population increase is likely to be in the most deprived parts of the city, issues such as poverty, inequality, discrimination and cultural divisions will continue to be hugely important. Whilst they are not unique to the city, Bradford will be experiencing these issues in a particularly concentrated way. Exercising leadership there and learning lessons will be critically important for the Church in other parts of the country.

7.6.2 The Bishop of Bradford would need to focus on the Church’s mission to and in the City of Bradford, but might also have an episcopal role at a wider, even national, level with particular regard to Christian-Muslim relations.

7.6.3 The latest statistics available to us indicate the size of an archdeaconry and episcopal area comprising the City of Bradford as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bradford Area</th>
<th>City of Bradford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>511,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>148 sq. miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parishes</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefices</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary clergy</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total licensed clergy</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6.4 The Archdeaconry of Bradford would lose eight parishes to the Archdeaconry of Leeds and four to the Archdeaconry of Richmond and Craven, but would gain sixteen parishes (and sixteen benefices) from the Archdeaconry of Craven.

7.6.5 On most measures, the Archdeaconry of Bradford would be a little below the average size of an English archdeaconry, but at 511,000 its population would be larger than that of the Diocese of Hereford, comparable with that of the Diocese of Carlisle and only 24,000 smaller than the Diocese of Truro. Its 62 parishes and 61 benefices would compare with the Stepney Episcopal Area in the Diocese of London, which has 62 benefices and 62 parishes (but 82 full-time stipendiary clergy and a population of about 640,000). Bradford is the fifth largest city in England, after London, Birmingham, Leeds and Sheffield; as such, we consider that, like Leeds, the City of Bradford merits being an archdeaconry and episcopal area.

7.7 The Kirklees/Calderdale Area

7.7.1 So far we have proposed the creation of the following episcopal areas:

- Ripon Area (Archdeaconry of Richmond and Craven): North Yorkshire part of the Diocese
- Leeds Area (Archdeaconry of Leeds): City of Leeds
- Bradford Area (Archdeaconry of Bradford): City of Bradford

7.7.2 The fact that the Bradford Area would, on most measures, be below average in size has prompted us to ask whether the Borough of Calderdale might also be included in it. There is clearly a relationship between Calderdale and Bradford. Among those whom the Review Team met there were different views as to whether Calderdale relates more closely in secular terms to Bradford or Kirklees. There are similarities between Calderdale and Bradford historically and in terms of physical, social and economic geography. On the latest statistics available to us, a Bradford/Calderdale Area and archdeaconry would have a population of 708,000, an area of 286 square miles, 103 parishes, 90 benefices and 81 stipendiary clergy, which would be manageable.

7.7.3 Such a solution would, however, militate against the focus on the needs of Bradford as a city that we believe is required. Furthermore, given the pressing challenges that Bradford faces, such energy as was left over from the maintenance and oversight of church structures and clergy would be likely to be devoted to Bradford, and in consequence Calderdale would be very much the junior partner.

7.7.4 Our principal reason for rejecting a Bradford/Calderdale Area concerns not Calderdale but Kirklees, however. On the latest statistics available to us Kirklees has a population of 382,000, an area of 166 square miles, 68 parishes, 47 benefices and 47 stipendiary clergy. Making the City of Bradford an
archdeaconry on its own is justified by Bradford’s status as England’s fifth largest city and the pressing problems that it faces as a city. We do not believe that the same would be true of Kirklees.

7.7.5 Three distinct areas can be identified within Kirklees: Huddersfield, the rural south of the Borough, and North Kirklees (of which the largest settlement is Dewsbury). The strong plea to us from the Borough Council was that in any reorganization the Borough should be united, not divided, by ecclesiastical boundaries. In any case, our conclusion from the evidence that we have received is that in secular terms Kirklees relates to Calderdale and Leeds, but that even North Kirklees does not relate significantly to Bradford.

7.7.6 The strong evidence we received was that most of Kirklees does not relate closely to Wakefield either. This argues strongly against including Kirklees in a Wakefield episcopal area.

7.7.7 Our recommendation, therefore, is that the Archdeaconry of Halifax should be expanded to include the whole of Kirklees, and that this archdeaconry should form a new episcopal area. The Suffragan See of Pontefract would be renamed and the bishop would move from Wakefield to Kirklees.

7.7.8 On the latest figures available to us, the statistics for this area would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kirklees/Calderdale Area</th>
<th>Kirklees</th>
<th>Calderdale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>197,000</td>
<td>602,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>166 sq. miles</td>
<td>138 sq. miles</td>
<td>304 sq. miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parishes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefices</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary clergy</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total licensed clergy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.7.9 We have demonstrated that a process of elimination arrives at this solution, but we wish also to argue strongly for it in positive terms. The evidence presented to us indicates that the two boroughs belong together (and are for the most part distinct from the City of Wakefield) historically, culturally and in terms of physical, social and economic geography. Their combined population is larger than that of three English dioceses (Carlisle, Hereford and Truro) and the number of parishes, benefices and stipendiary clergy is significantly higher than the average for an English archdeaconry.
7.7.10 In the Diocese of Wakefield at present both bishops, the Dean and the Archdeacon of Pontefract all live in and around Wakefield itself. Only the Archdeacon of Halifax lives in the western half of the diocese. The senior staff of the diocese of course engage with community life in Calderdale and Kirklees. To give just three examples, the Bishop of Wakefield is closely connected with Huddersfield University (having served on the University Council), the Bishop of Pontefract has been closely involved in interfaith and community relations work in North Kirklees in particular, and the Dean of Wakefield chairs the trustees of the new Trinity Academy in Halifax, of which the Diocese is the lead sponsor. All of this is much appreciated in the boroughs, but we believe that the mission of the Church in this area would be strengthened if it were led by a bishop resident within it, and that this would represent a more even distribution of senior staff.

7.7.11 So far we have argued that an expanded Archdeaconry of Halifax should form a ‘Kirklees/Calderdale Episcopal Area’ and said that the See of Pontefract should be renamed, but we have not identified a name for the new see and episcopal area.

7.7.12 Our assumption is that the existing name of the Archdeaconry of Halifax would be retained, and this would suggest that a town in Kirklees (which is twice as large as Calderdale in population terms) would become the episcopal see.

7.7.13 Historically, Dewsbury Minster was the mother church of the whole area. A huge preaching cross there, of which only fragments now remain, was inscribed ‘Hic Paulinus praedicavit et celebravit’ (‘Here Paulinus preached and celebrated’), suggesting that the church there was founded by Paulinus, who from 625-633 was the first Bishop of the re-founded See of York. In Saxon times, Dewsbury’s parochia probably covered modern Calderdale and Kirklees, the southern half of the City of Bradford and the area immediately around Wakefield. In the middle ages Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield, Almondbury, Kirkburton and Wakefield all paid tithes to Dewsbury, even after they became separate parishes at dates between the mid-twelfth and mid-fourteenth centuries. Dewsbury Minster’s historic status as the mother church of Kirklees and Calderdale might suggest that Dewsbury should be its episcopal see. (This would not involve any change to the status of Dewsbury Minster or imply that episcopal services would necessarily be held there more frequently than in the other significant churches of the Area).

7.7.14 However, though Dewsbury is the largest town in North Kirklees, Huddersfield’s population is almost three times as large (and almost twice as large as that of Halifax). It is the tenth largest town in England and undoubtedly the most important town in the proposed episcopal area. While the rivalry between Halifax and Huddersfield might suggest not preferring either

---

and instead choosing Dewsbury, as the historic mother church, to be the episcopal see for the area, there is a strong argument for basing the decision on current realities rather than history, and choosing the largest town in the area as its episcopal see. (Again, this would not involve any change to the status of Huddersfield Parish Church or imply that episcopal services would necessarily be held there more frequently than in the other significant churches of the Area).

7.7.15 We would especially welcome expressions of opinion on this issue, but subject to them, our recommendation is that the episcopal area covering Kirklees and Calderdale should be known as the Huddersfield Episcopal Area and the Archdeaconry of Halifax.

7.8 The Diocesan See

7.8.1 At this point in our argument we need to consider the location of the diocesan see. Some have suggested to us that the new diocese should be called ‘The Diocese of West Yorkshire’. The fact that the diocese would include a whole episcopal area which is in the County of North Yorkshire rather than West Yorkshire would make that name problematic, but in any case we have received clear legal advice that a see must be a place rather than an area, and that the diocese must take its name from the diocesan see.\textsuperscript{43}

7.8.2 When the Review Team discussed with those whom they met the possibility of a single diocese and asked where the diocesan see should be, the immediate reaction of the largest number was that it should be in Leeds. The fact that, as already described, Leeds is the principal city of West Yorkshire and the focus of the Leeds City Region would support this.

7.8.3 We have identified several arguments that tell in the opposite direction, however. One is that the decentralized nature of West Yorkshire as a community of large towns suggests that the new diocese should not be focused solely on any one of the cities and towns within it.

7.8.4 A second argument is our belief that the Church’s mission in and to the Leeds Area should be the focus of attention for its bishop. If the diocesan bishop were Bishop of Leeds, his other duties would prevent him from giving the City of Leeds the attention that it deserves.

7.8.5 The third reason is that fundamentally a see is a seat – the word is derived from \textit{sedes} (seat). The see takes its name from the church in which the bishop’s \textit{cathedra} (throne or teaching seat) is located. Some have suggested that Leeds Parish Church should be designated as the cathedral of a new diocese for West Yorkshire. Although Leeds Parish Church is the most significant Anglican

\textsuperscript{43} The Legal Advice is available at \url{www.diocom.org/background}
church in the City of Leeds and a very well appointed parish church, we do not consider its configuration and facilities to be ideal for a cathedral. Where parish churches have been designated as cathedrals in the past, they have often been expanded or reconfigured in time so that they could live up to the expectations aroused by existing cathedrals. Especially in the present financial context we could not recommend that, in a new diocese which already has three cathedral churches, a fourth church should be designated as a cathedral, especially when we have concluded that as a building it would be less suitable as it stands for that role than any of the three existing cathedrals.

7.8.6 Some have suggested to us that one of the existing cathedrals could be the diocesan bishop’s principal cathedral, but with Leeds included in the name of the see and hence that of the diocese. Our clear conclusions that the size of the new diocese would make an area system essential, that there should be maximal delegation to the area bishops, and that the diocesan bishop should also be an area bishop, rule this out. Including the City of Wakefield, the City of Bradford or the Ripon Area in the same episcopal area as the City of Leeds – even if that were otherwise acceptable – would make the resulting episcopal area far too large to be the episcopal area of the diocesan bishop. In any case, we stand by our argument that the City of Leeds needs to be an episcopal area of its own. It would also seem undesirable for the name of the new diocese to include all or part of the name of two of the existing dioceses but not that of the third.

7.8.7 For all of these reasons we have concluded that Leeds should not be the diocesan see or form part of the name of the diocesan bishopric. We shall, however, be recommending in section 7.12 that the diocesan office should be located in Leeds.

7.8.8 We are clear that the diocesan see for West Yorkshire, by far the largest area of population in the new diocese, should be a West Yorkshire city with an existing cathedral. This rules out Ripon as the diocesan see, even leaving aside the disadvantage of its location and the scale of the Bishop of Ripon’s task in overseeing an episcopal area larger in square miles than most dioceses. We shall consider the future of Ripon Cathedral in Chapter 8.

7.8.9 Bradford is the next largest city in West Yorkshire after Leeds and that fact alone makes it a serious candidate for consideration as the diocesan see. Again, we have concluded that it should not be. Though the City of Bradford is smaller than that of Leeds and includes fewer parishes, benefices and clergy, a similar argument applies. The importance of having an area bishop focused on the Church’s mission in and to Bradford, with its particular needs, makes it undesirable for that bishop also to be the diocesan bishop with responsibility for the diocese as a whole.
7.8.10 Another consideration is that part of the diocesan bishop’s role will be that of representing the diocese to the wider Church. Like many diocesan bishops he is likely to be expected to assume national responsibilities, which will involve significant amounts of travel and in particular travel to London. Rail travel from Bradford to London typically involves changing trains at Leeds and takes between 2 hours 50 minutes and 3 hours 15 minutes – far longer than the frequent direct trains from Leeds and Wakefield.

7.8.11 Bradford’s ancient parish church became the cathedral of the new Diocese of Bradford in 1919. It was extended in the 1950s and early 1960s to form a fine cathedral church, and in the 1970s the graveyard became a Close, with a deanery and canons’ houses in addition to the parish room. However, very many of those whom the Review Team met, both from the Diocese of Bradford and from neighbouring areas of the Diocese of Wakefield, spoke of a marked reluctance on the part of many people to travel into the centre of the city, especially in the evenings and on Sundays (see para. 5.3.2 above). In the light of this, we cannot recommend that Bradford Cathedral should be the principal cathedral of the new diocese. We shall consider its future more fully in Chapter 8.

7.8.12 These reasons combine to preclude us from recommending that Bradford should be the diocesan see for the new diocese.

7.8.13 The structure of our argument might imply that our recommendation that Wakefield should be the diocesan see was arrived at by a process of elimination. While such a process does, as we have demonstrated, lead to that conclusion, our recommendation to choose Wakefield rather than Bradford is in fact prompted also by positive considerations.

7.8.14 When the Review Team asked which city should be the diocesan see for West Yorkshire, Wakefield was the first answer of a significant number of people (both church and civic representatives) in each of the three dioceses. It was also the second answer given by those who first suggested Leeds but then began to see the arguments against Leeds becoming the diocesan see. Those who suggested Wakefield as their first or second choice all mentioned that Wakefield was the historic county town of the West Riding – a role that was already well established before it became the administrative centre for the West Riding County Council in 1889. The headquarters of the West Yorkshire Police are still in Wakefield.

7.8.15 We also consider that Wakefield Cathedral is suitable to be the principal cathedral of the new diocese, for reasons that we shall explain in Chapter 8. We received some evidence that Wakefield Cathedral is seen as a significant ecclesiastical building within West Yorkshire beyond the City of Wakefield. A development project, ‘Project 2013’, has been launched to refurbish the nave, making the cathedral more suitable for diocesan services, and to add a northern
extension (incorporating the existing Treacy Hall), providing a coffee shop, an education centre and meeting rooms. This would equip the Cathedral to take on an enhanced role in a larger diocese.

7.8.16 Wakefield is also conveniently located, the M1 running 3 miles to the west and the M62 4 miles to the north of the city centre. There are frequent direct trains from Wakefield to London, the fastest of which takes less than two hours.

7.8.17 The City of Wakefield unitary authority is significantly smaller in terms of population and numbers of parishes, benefices and stipendiary clergy than the other two West Yorkshire cities, and this makes it suitable to be overseen directly by the diocesan bishop.

7.8.18 For all of these reasons we recommend that Wakefield should be the diocesan see and that the diocesan bishop should also be area bishop of an episcopal area based on the City of Wakefield.

7.8.19 It follows from this that the diocese would be the Diocese of Wakefield, but in letterheads and publicity materials this could be expanded along these lines:

The Diocese of Wakefield
The Church of England in West and North-West Yorkshire

‘North-West Yorkshire’ is a convenient shorthand for the western half of the County of North Yorkshire.

7.8.20 We wish to underline that this would not be a continuance of the existing diocese of Wakefield but a new diocese with the same name. The scheme would dissolve the three existing dioceses (including the Diocese of Wakefield), dissolve their corporate bodies and abolish the diocesan bishoprics. It would create a new diocese with new institutions and make provision for the foundation of a new diocesan bishopric. A diocesan bishop would be chosen by a Crown Nominations Commission including diocesan representatives from the new diocese as a whole. We shall discuss the practical side of this process in Chapter 10.

7.9 The Wakefield Area

7.9.1 The Chief Executive of Wakefield City Council stressed to us the importance that the City of Wakefield attaches to the role of the Bishop of Wakefield in relation to the City. This would continue under our proposals.

7.9.2 There are boundary anomalies in relation to the Diocese of York (in that the Diocese of Wakefield includes four parishes in the Selby District of North Yorkshire) and the Diocese of Sheffield (in that the northern half of the Borough Barnsley is in the Diocese of Wakefield). We shall consider these issues in Chapter 9.
7.9.3 The latest statistics available to us indicate the size of this area as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Wakefield (plus Selby District parishes)</th>
<th>Including parishes in the Borough of Barnsley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>324,000 (333,000)</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>120 (155) sq. miles</td>
<td>234 sq. miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parishes</td>
<td>44 (49)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefices</td>
<td>39 (43)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary clergy</td>
<td>36 (39)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total licensed clergy</td>
<td>49 (54)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.9.4 The core area would be too small for an episcopal area overseen by a suffragan bishop, but we believe that it is suitable in size to be the episcopal area under the direct oversight of the diocesan bishop.

7.9.5 If the Wakefield episcopal area also included Kirklees, the figures would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Wakefield (plus Selby District parishes) and Kirklees</th>
<th>Including Kirklees and parishes in the Borough of Barnsley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>738,000</td>
<td>865,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>321 sq. miles</td>
<td>400 sq. miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parishes</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefices</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary clergy</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total licensed clergy</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On every measure, even without the Barnsley parishes, this archdeaconry and episcopal area would be larger than any other in the diocese, except that the Ripon Area would be larger in terms of square miles. It would be unreasonable to expect the diocesan bishop of this large new diocese also to offer direct oversight to an area of this size and this is a further reason, in addition to those mentioned in section 7.7 above, for Kirklees to form part of an episcopal area with Calderdale rather than being part of a Wakefield episcopal area.
7.9.6 We recommend that the Archdeaconry of Pontefract should be reduced in size so as to comprise only this new Wakefield Area. Though the core area without the Barnsley parishes would be significantly smaller than the other archdeaconries, experience in other dioceses indicates that, where the diocesan bishop has direct responsibility for the oversight of an archdeaconry without the assistance of a suffragan, more work is delegated to the archdeacon than in the other archdeaconries. If the Barnsley parishes were included, the archdeaconry would be about average in size for the Church of England as a whole.

7.10 The New Diocese: Statistics and Senior Staff

7.10.1 On the latest figures available to us, depending on whether the new diocese included only areas within West and North Yorkshire or included all of the territory of the existing dioceses, some key statistics (with rankings among the English dioceses), would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W. &amp; N. Yorks only</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>W. and N. Yorks plus rest of 3 dioceses</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2.5 million</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7 million</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,373 sq. miles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,866 sq. miles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parishes</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefices</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary clergy</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total licensed clergy</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.10.2 On each of these key statistics the new diocese would be one of the five largest English dioceses, except that excluding the parishes that are not in West or North Yorkshire would make it tenth in the number of parishes. The new diocese would be unusual in being large in both population and area; no diocese would be larger than it on both measures.
Figure 6: The Proposed New Diocese
7.10.3 The diocese would consist of the following archdeaconries and episcopal areas (figures in brackets include areas outside West and North Yorkshire):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archdeaconry</th>
<th>Population (000)</th>
<th>Area (sq. m)</th>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>Benefices</th>
<th>Stip. clergy</th>
<th>Total lic. clergy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield/Pontefract</td>
<td>333 (460)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49 (69)</td>
<td>43 (61)</td>
<td>39 (51)</td>
<td>54 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huddersfield/Halifax</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon/Richmond and Craven</td>
<td>282 (315)</td>
<td>1,581 (1,982)</td>
<td>141 (165)</td>
<td>74 (88)</td>
<td>71 (81)</td>
<td>100 (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,516 (2,676)</td>
<td>2,406 (2,886)</td>
<td>446 (490)</td>
<td>332 (364)</td>
<td>323 (345)</td>
<td>460 (489)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.10.4 The diocesan bishop would have direct oversight of the Wakefield Area (Archdeaconry of Pontefract) which (without the Barnsley parishes) would be the smallest area on most measures (though second to the Ripon Area in population and the Bradford Area in square miles). The Bradford Area would be the next smallest: the challenges facing the City of Bradford, together with the arguments for creating a Huddersfield Area, justify this relatively small size. If the Barnsley parishes remained in the diocese, the Wakefield Area would be comparable in size with the Bradford Area but the salience of the issues to be addressed would be less. The Huddersfield Area is comparable with the Leeds Area in the number of benefices and clergy and has significantly more parishes than any area other than Ripon.

7.10.5 We are recommending that the number of bishops in the area of the new diocese should remain the same, but that instead of three diocesans and two suffragans there should be one diocesan and four suffragans (all of whom would be area bishops). This would involve a reduction in the episcopal stipends and working costs (including staff support) attached to two episcopal sees. Negotiation with the Church Commissioners would be required in order to establish what consequential reduction, if any, there would be in the amount of financial support for episcopal and archidiaconal oversight given to the existing dioceses by the Church Commissioners (which is already lower than the national average of ‘episcopal funding per population’).

7.10.6 At present there are within the area of the new diocese five bishops and six archdeacons – a total of eleven. Our proposal is that this total should be reduced to ten (two less than the total number in the Diocese of London and the same as the total number in the Diocese of Southwark). This is a reduction of
9% of the total number of those giving oversight to the Church in this part of Yorkshire and of 16% in the number of archdeacons.

7.10.7 These savings in the cost of both episcopal and archidiaconal ministry would be in addition to any savings resulting from the creation of a single diocesan administration and diocesan office.

7.10.8 Some may question whether the number of bishops and archdeacons could be reduced further. We do not recommend this, for a number of reasons.

7.10.9 The evidence that we have received suggests that there is widespread support for restructuring to reduce duplication and indeed triplication. There is a desire to reduce the cost and panoply of diocesan episcopacy and for bishops who are closer in all respects to the parishes and clergy. We have not received many representations calling for a significant reduction in the overall number of bishops and archdeacons. The indications from bishops and archdeacons themselves are that the demands placed on them by secular and church legislation and expectations of ‘good practice’ are growing, not decreasing. There is no evidence of a direct correlation in this regard with the number of full-time stipendiary clergy rather than the overall number of licensed ministers and the number of parishes, congregations and church buildings. It has been suggested to us that at a time of change, when clergy are being asked to take on additional parishes, their need for support from archdeacons and bishops is growing rather than declining. These factors would make us cautious about a decrease in the overall number of bishops and archdeacons greater than the 9% reduction that we have recommended.

7.10.10 Our recommendations are, in any case, related to the units into which the diocese is naturally divided. We could not support a proposal that divided up the area of the diocese into units of equal size regardless of the affinities between parishes and the communities to which they relate. Natural communities vary in size and this will be true of any ecclesiastical units that seek to relate to them.

7.10.11 Local congregations and their clergy are at the ‘front line’ of the Church’s mission, but this does not mean that bishops are not. Bishops are not only called to ‘lead their people in mission’, as the rite for the Ordination and Consecration of a Bishop puts it. In an age in which communications increasingly occur through the local and national media and indeed the internet, they are themselves at the ‘front line’ of mission to and engagement with the community at large. Though the public profile of archdeacons is usually much lower and much of their work is concerned with the structures of the Church, archdeacons are or should be enablers of mission. We are not convinced that a further reduction in the number of bishops and archdeacons, beyond the 9% reduction that we have proposed, would foster the mission of the Church in West Yorkshire.
7.10.12 A further consideration is that our proposals would involve upheaval in the structures of the Church in West Yorkshire greater than has been seen at least since the creation of the Diocese of Bradford in 1919 and arguably greater than that, at least in the geographical extent of its effect. During the period of restructuring and immediately after, this will impose additional burdens on the senior staff of the three dioceses. This is another reason not to reduce their number still further at the present time.

7.10.13 One of the advantages of the creation of a larger diocese is that it would make further restructuring much simpler, as it would occur within the context of a single diocese. If in the longer term a further reduction in the number of bishops and archdeacons seemed essential, that could be decided and put into effect within the diocese, without reference to the Dioceses Commission and the General Synod.

7.11 Unity and Leadership of the Diocese: Roles of the Senior Staff

7.11.1 Some of the archidiaconal roles that we have identified would clearly be full-time, because of the number of units and licensed ministers to be overseen and/or because of the distances to be travelled within the archdeaconry. Strictly archidiaconal work might not fill the time of others.

7.11.2 There is a question, of course, as to whether archdeacons should also be residentiary canons or parish priests. The Archdeacon of Richmond is currently a residentiary canon of Ripon Cathedral, but we understand that her archidiaconal duties make it difficult for her to devote 25% of her time to the cathedral as had been hoped. We do not think that the expanded Archdeaconry of Richmond and Craven could be combined with a residentiary canonry in this way. In the case of one or more of the other archdeaconries, combination with a cathedral canonry or parochial ministry might be possible.

7.11.3 In the new diocese there will, however, be a need for the bishops and archdeacons to devote significant time to the structures of the diocese – probably to varying degrees. Especially in a diocese of the size of the one that we are proposing, it will be important that the most significant boards and committees are accountable to the diocese and work in line with its general policy. Members of the senior staff, and perhaps particularly the archdeacons, will need to be members of these bodies and in some cases to chair them. In other cases, where it is not possible to employ an officer, an archdeacon may also act effectively as the diocesan officer for the area of work concerned.

7.11.4 The lay staff of the diocese will require oversight from members of the diocesan senior staff and this is particularly important in a large diocese in which much will be done at area level. In the Diocese of London, for example, all the archdeacons meet fortnightly with the senior lay staff of the diocese and this model may commend itself.
7.11.5 More generally, in a diocese in which so much is devolved to the episcopal areas, it will be essential for all members of the senior staff to work together to ensure that there is coherence and unity at the diocesan level. We envisage that bishops and archdeacons would have ‘portfolios’ and would speak on behalf of the diocese and liaise with those concerned in relation to their area of responsibility. For example, the Bishop of Ripon might have lead responsibility for rural issues throughout the diocese and the Bishop of Bradford for Christian-Muslim relations. The bishops would need to meet regularly as a college, as well as with the senior staff as a whole.

7.11.6 In short, in a diocese of this size, the workload of the archdeacons cannot be judged solely by the number of parishes, benefices or licensed ministers in their archdeaconries. The details of the archdeacons’ diocesan responsibilities, and those of the area bishops, would need to be worked out in the new diocese and by those in the existing dioceses preparing for its inception.

7.12 The Diocesan Office

7.12.1 We believe that there would be a general recognition that the Diocesan Office for the new Diocese should be located in Leeds. Leeds is the public transport hub for West Yorkshire. It is also the centre within West Yorkshire that is most easily accessible by road from all parts of what would become the Ripon Area, and is easily accessible by rail from those parts of the Ripon Area that are served by railways. Furthermore, Leeds is a centre of legal, financial and other professional services and this also makes it sensible for the diocesan office to be located in Leeds.

7.12.2 Whether the existing building should become the diocesan office of the new diocese would be a matter for local decision. It is a modern building with parking space and was designed in such a way that a second storey could be added to it. There is some criticism that it is not as easy to reach as it might be, but in other ways it seems well suited.

7.12.3 Whether all departments should be located in the diocesan office would similarly be a matter for local decision, but the argument that Leeds is the most accessible place for the diocese as a whole would suggest this. Location of the Bradford and Leeds education staff in Harrogate makes sense in the context of those two dioceses, but Harrogate might not be the best centre from which to serve schools in the present Diocese of Wakefield.

7.12.4 Similarly, the questions of whether within the diocese there should be any staff permanently based in sub-offices in the other episcopal areas and whether there should be a facility in each episcopal area where staff members based in Leeds could hold meetings, would best be decided locally. It might be that, as in other dioceses with area schemes, a small area office might be established for each of the areas other than Leeds, and such an area office might include a room for small meetings.
8 Cathedrals

8.1 Wakefield Cathedral

8.1.1 As we have already indicated, we consider that the principal cathedral of the new diocese should be within the County of West Yorkshire and should be one of the two existing cathedrals. We have explained why we propose that the See of Wakefield should be the diocesan see. This means that *Wakefield Cathedral would be the principal cathedral of the diocese*.

8.1.2 We consider that in any case to be appropriate for a number of reasons. We received some evidence that Wakefield Cathedral is seen as a significant ecclesiastical building within West Yorkshire beyond the City of Wakefield. It also hosts special services for West Yorkshire institutions and organizations such as the West Yorkshire Police, Scouts and Guides, and thereby to some extent already serves West Yorkshire as a whole and not just the Diocese of Wakefield. The Lord Lieutenant of West Yorkshire has supplied the following figures for her attendance in her official capacity at services or events in churches that she attended more than once in the twelve months up to 25 July 2010:

- Wakefield Cathedral 9
- Leeds Parish Church 5
- Halifax Minster 3
- Bradford Cathedral 2
- York Minster 2

(The churches that she attended once included, outside West Yorkshire, Ripon Cathedral and Selby Abbey.) These figures constitute only one piece of evidence relating to one particular year, but they offer an interesting comparison with the Lord Lieutenant of North Yorkshire’s estimate of his attendance at York Minster every three weeks, Ripon Cathedral every two months and Selby Abbey every four months.

8.1.3 As already mentioned, a development project has been launched to refurbish the nave of Wakefield Cathedral, making it more suitable for diocesan services, and to add a northern extension (incorporating the existing Treacy Hall), providing a coffee shop, an education centre and meeting rooms. This should equip Wakefield Cathedral to take on an enhanced role in a larger diocese.

8.1.4 The importance that Wakefield City Council attaches to Wakefield Cathedral retaining its cathedral status should also be noted. It has been pointed out to us by a number of people that historically Wakefield’s city status arose from its ancient parish church becoming a cathedral. Thus the identity of Wakefield as a city is seen as inextricably linked with the identity of Wakefield Cathedral as a cathedral.
8.1.5 Wakefield Cathedral, which is also a parish church, is the centre of a great deal of activity. There are four services on Sundays and the Eucharist is celebrated, morning prayer said and evening prayer said or sung on every other day. The cathedral has a professional choir that sings on Sundays and on three or four weekday evenings. It hosts a large number of concerts and exhibitions, as well as daily carol services in December for schools and organizations across the region. It is active in work with asylum seekers, refugees, homeless people, night-clubbers and young people, in charitable work and in ecumenical, interfaith and community relations. In addition to congregations and audiences it receives 75,000 visitors a year – both tourists and local people who come in to light a candle and pray.

8.1.6 In addition to the dean, there are two canons (sub-dean/pastor and precentor) engaged full-time on the cathedral’s ministry. Two further canons with diocesan responsibilities (missioner and canon for education) devote one-third of their time to the cathedral, and the Bishop of Pontefract is also a residentiary canon.

8.1.7 Under the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 a re-organization scheme may provide for there to be more than one cathedral in a diocese. In the light of that we now need to examine the case for Ripon Cathedral and Bradford Cathedral retaining cathedral status in the new diocese.

8.2 Ripon Cathedral

8.2.1 As more than one witness pointed out to us, there is a sense in which York Minster is still the cathedral for the whole of Yorkshire. As the mother church of Yorkshire its influence and attraction extend well beyond the bounds of the Diocese of York. To some extent, any cathedral in Yorkshire will be in its shadow. That is true of Ripon Cathedral, not least because it is only 25 miles from York. Indeed, before the Reformation the role of Ripon Minster was to be a sort of ‘subordinate cathedral’ to York Minster. Though Ripon Cathedral is the only cathedral within the administrative county of North Yorkshire, York Minster is in the ceremonial county.

8.2.2 Ripon Cathedral offers a full round of daily worship: five services on a Sunday, four on Wednesdays and Fridays and three on each of the other days. The cathedral has a choral foundation. Evensong is sung every day except Wednesdays and the Eucharist or Mattins is also sung on Sundays. The cathedral draws worshippers from a wide catchment area that extends into adjacent areas of the Diocese of York.

8.2.3 A significant number of North Yorkshire organizations hold special services in Ripon Cathedral – in some cases, because York Minster is not available or because the size of Ripon Cathedral is more suitable. As mentioned above, the Lord Lieutenant of North Yorkshire indicated to us that on average he is in
York Minster every three weeks, in Ripon Cathedral every two months and in Selby Abbey every four months. Concerts and other events in the cathedral draw audiences from a wide area.

8.2.4 At the heart of Ripon Cathedral is St Wilfrid’s Crypt, built in A.D. 672. Though it subsequently became a parish church, Ripon Minster was built as a collegiate church. It is the most significant ecclesiastical building still in use as a church anywhere in the area of the three dioceses under discussion. The Cathedral receives educational visits from schools not only throughout the western half of North Yorkshire but also adjacent areas to the east and in significant parts of West Yorkshire – well beyond the existing boundaries of the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds.

8.2.5 The Leader and Chief Executive of Harrogate District Council stressed to us the importance of Ripon Cathedral to the economy of the District as an attraction for tourists and pilgrims and made a strong plea for it to retain cathedral status. Visitor numbers are increasing significantly and the Cathedral has plans for a new cathedral centre, including a refectory, to support the Cathedral in offering worship and receiving visitors.

8.2.6 It is important to note that Ripon Cathedral is a parish church with a significant number of parishioners. The parish also has three other churches.

8.2.7 All of this evidence suggests that Ripon Cathedral plays a significant part in the mission of the Church in North Yorkshire and through its educational work makes some contribution to outreach in West Yorkshire as well.

8.2.8 We have concluded that the western half of North Yorkshire cannot form a diocese of its own and should be an episcopal area within a larger diocese. However, we believe that Ripon Cathedral should continue to serve as the focus for the church life in the Yorkshire Dales and should be the focal point of the new Ripon Area. As such, it should retain its status as a cathedral and serve as a secondary cathedral within the new diocese – in a sense, returning to its pre-Reformation role as a subordinate cathedral for the Yorkshire Dales within a larger diocese.

8.3 Bradford Cathedral

8.3.1 Much that we have said about Ripon Cathedral does not apply, or at least does not apply to the same extent, to Bradford Cathedral.

8.3.2 There are daily services, but these are fewer in number than in Ripon and Wakefield. (In addition to the Sunday services, there is Morning and Evening Prayer every day and Holy Communion on Wednesdays.) There is a voluntary choir that usually sings on Sunday morning, Sunday evening and Monday evening.
8.3.3 Whereas Ripon Cathedral has a ‘reach’ that extends beyond the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds, the evidence we have received suggests that for various reasons it has been difficult for Bradford Cathedral to reach out beyond Bradford itself to other parts of the diocese, and that in recent years this has become more difficult owing to the reluctance, of which many have spoken, of people from outside the centre of Bradford to come into it, especially outside working hours.

8.3.4 Bradford Cathedral is a large, 15th-century parish church that was extended in the 1950s and early 1960s to form a fine cathedral for the Diocese of Bradford. It is unlikely to attract tourists, pilgrims or visitors from outside Bradford in large numbers, however.

8.3.5 Mention was made to us of some special services held in Bradford Cathedral for West Yorkshire institutions and organizations, but our impression is that these tend to be much fewer in number than in Wakefield and Ripon. (The figures quoted in para. 8.1.2 for attendance at services by the Lord Lieutenant are one indication of this.) Otherwise, we received little evidence of Bradford Cathedral exerting an influence or attraction beyond the Diocese of Bradford.

8.3.6 Bradford Cathedral’s significance for West Yorkshire as a whole may be less than that of Wakefield, or of Ripon Cathedral for North Yorkshire, but its significance for Bradford is very considerable. It hosts civic and legal services for Bradford and there are carol services each day in December. One of the two residentiary canons has played a key part in interfaith initiatives that are of high importance for Bradford. The Cathedral’s full-time education officer relates to upwards of 2,000 children. The officer goes into schools; children, including local Muslim children, visit the Cathedral.

8.3.7 The representatives of Bradford City Council who met the Review Team stressed the importance not only of the Bishop of Bradford but also of Bradford Cathedral for the life and cohesion of the City.

8.3.8 The withdrawal of cathedral status from Bradford Cathedral would be likely to be interpreted as the Church of England’s abandonment of a city that faces challenging problems and is in need of support. The consequences would be even more serious, since Bradford Cathedral is heavily dependent for its mission and ministry on financial support from the Church Commissioners which would not be available if it were not a cathedral. Bradford Parish Church was turned by the Church of England into a building that it would be very difficult for a parish to maintain in the absence of income from tourism and other sources on a scale that a building of its nature and in its location is very unlikely to attract.

8.3.9 Bradford Cathedral is now the only Christian place of worship within the inner ring-road of a city that is predicted to have a Muslim majority in ten years’
time. Mindful of the likely consequences that the withdrawal of cathedral status would have, in financial terms and in terms of the effect on Christian presence and on perceptions of the Church of England’s commitment to the city, we recommend that Bradford Cathedral should continue to have cathedral status and should, like Ripon Cathedral, be a secondary cathedral within the new diocese.

8.4 The New Diocese and its Cathedrals

8.4.1 Both Ripon Cathedral and Bradford Cathedral are, in different ways, places of high-profile engagement between the Church of England on the one hand and the institutions of civil society and the non-churchgoing population on the other. One is a church in a small town that draws people from a wide geographical area, while the other is in a large and populous city and draws people from that city. Both have a significance for the Church of England’s mission to and engagement with the wider community that is non-parochial in scale. Bradford Cathedral has a particular importance for interfaith relations and social cohesion in England’s fifth largest city. We have recommended that both churches continue to be cathedrals.

8.4.2 The Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 requires that in any new diocese there should be a single College of Canons to discharge functions for all three cathedrals in accordance with section 5 of the Cathedrals Measure 1999. The Dean of Wakefield would be the dean of the college of canons of the Diocese, and the Deans of Bradford and Ripon would be vice-deans of the college. The suffragan bishops and archdeacons and the residentiary canons of the three cathedrals would be members of the college. Honorary, lay and ecumenical canons would be members of the college and would each be appointed to a stall in one of the cathedrals as appropriate.

8.4.3 Concern has been expressed to us that, if the Bishop of Bradford were, as we recommend, an area bishop focusing solely on the City of Bradford, there would be a danger of conflict between his role and that of the Dean of Bradford. It has even been suggested that the roles of bishop and dean might be combined, as was the case in Truro Cathedral, of which the Bishop of Truro was the Dean until 1960. Others have argued that a bishop’s ministry should not be so closely focused on one church in that way. We are advised that, as the law now stands, combining the offices of suffragan bishop and dean could give rise to conflicts of interest that would be likely to make such an arrangement unworkable from the legal point of view.44 It will be important, however, to establish a clear division of responsibilities, with the Bishop relating to civil society on at a City-wide level and across the City as a whole and the Dean focusing on the ministry of the Cathedral and on the immediate inner-city area.

44 The Legal Advice is available at www.diocom.org/background
8.4.4 The evidence that we have received suggests that Wakefield Cathedral is carrying out important work that, taken together with its new role as the principal cathedral of the new diocese, would continue to justify the allocation of a dean and two residentiary canons paid by the Church Commissioners. By contrast, doubt has been expressed to us by more than one person from within the Diocese of Bradford as to whether the allocation of three senior clergy full-time to the ministry of Bradford Cathedral is justified. It has been suggested that at Bradford Cathedral it might be possible, by re-focusing the role of the Dean of Bradford, to reduce the staffing to a dean and one canon. At Ripon Cathedral, the present senior staffing level of a dean and 2.25 residentiary canons might be reduced at least to a dean and two canons – a level which might be justified by the extent of the cathedral’s liturgical, cultural and educational activity and its parochial and heritage responsibilities. We consider that in a diocese with three cathedrals the staffing of the cathedrals will need to be reviewed and recommend that such a review should be set in train by the diocesan bishop of the new diocese. We propose that the reorganization scheme should apply sections 8 and 21 of the Cathedrals Measure 1999 to each of the three cathedrals in such a way as to require the Church Commissioners to pay the stipends of the dean and two canons or, with the consent of the diocesan bishop, the dean and one canon.

8.4.5 Otherwise, we recommend no changes to the constitution and statutes of the three cathedrals, which would continue to be independent foundations, albeit with a common college of canons.

8.4.6 The diocesan bishop would be the bishop of the whole diocese and each of the three cathedrals would be his cathedral. He would accordingly remain the Visitor of each. Consideration would need to be given as to whether he should delegate any of his other powers and responsibilities under the constitution and statutes of Bradford and Ripon Cathedrals to the Bishops of Bradford and Ripon. Be that as it may, we envisage that they would have seats of honour in Bradford and Ripon Cathedrals respectively.

8.4.7 A number of factors combine to mean that the role of Leeds Parish Church would not be exactly comparable with that of Ripon Cathedral in North Yorkshire or Bradford Cathedral in the City of Bradford. Whereas there is no other cathedral in either Ripon or Bradford, Leeds already has St Anne’s Roman Catholic Cathedral. St George’s Anglican Church has a Sunday-morning attendance much greater than that of Leeds Parish Church. The situation of Leeds Parish Church is therefore different from that of Bradford and Ripon Cathedrals. It also suffers from being located in the far south-east corner of what is now Central Leeds, beyond a railway embankment. As indicated in para. 7.8.5, we do not consider the configuration and facilities of Leeds Parish Church to be suitable for a cathedral. None the less, Leeds Parish Church continues to play an important part in the civic life of Leeds and, as the largest ecclesiastical building in the Archdeaconry of Leeds, it would doubtless...
be a focus for the life of the Leeds Episcopal Area. The importance of Leeds within West Yorkshire means that Leeds Parish Church is likely to continue to play a part in the life of the county.

8.4.8 We cannot recommend that in a diocese that would have three cathedrals, two of them in the same county, cathedral status should be conferred on any other church. This means that our proposals would have no effect on the financial position of Leeds Parish Church, which we understand to be a challenging one. It would be for the new Bishop of Leeds to decide, in consultation with the diocesan bishop, how and to what extent Leeds Parish Church should relate to his own ministry and what status or role should be accorded to it following the creation of a Leeds Episcopal Area, but this cannot be cathedral status.

8.4.9 The position in the Huddersfield Episcopal Area (as we have proposed the Episcopal Area for Kirklees and Calderdale should be named) would be different again. This would be a decentralized area in which Huddersfield Parish Church, Halifax Minster and Dewsbury Minster would, in different ways, be significant churches. The Bishop of Huddersfield would doubtless wish to hold episcopal and other services throughout the Area and it is unlikely that any one church would have a paramount role within it.
9 Boundaries between Dioceses

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 We turn now to the external boundaries of the proposed new diocese and the other diocesan boundary within Yorkshire. In what follows we shall consider in turn the boundaries of the new diocese with the Dioceses of Blackburn, Carlisle, Durham and York, the boundary of the Diocese of Sheffield with the Diocese of York, and the boundary of the Diocese of Sheffield with the new diocese.

9.1.2 In para. 1.2.1 of this report we set out our intention to compare the Church’s boundaries with those of counties and unitary authorities. In discussions and correspondence, some have suggested that there is no point in taking secular boundaries into consideration since these might change in future. As we hope to have shown in Chapters 2 and 3, for the Church of England to ignore secular boundaries and the shape of secular communities in devising its diocesan boundaries would represent a radical break with its tradition of relating to the nation and its localities. The suggestion that church boundaries should not change because secular boundaries might change again is actually an argument for no change at all, which would undermine the Commission’s raison d’être as a body charged with keeping diocesan boundaries under review. The advice we have received is that the boundaries of ceremonial counties and of existing unitary authorities within them are unlikely to change even in the medium term. Boundaries between the boroughs and districts of ‘shire’ counties with a two-tier government system are of less relevance and may in some cases prove less durable. We have accordingly given them less weight in our thinking.

9.1.3 All of that said, it is important to emphasize that a discrepancy between diocesan and secular boundaries raises a question as to whether the diocesan boundary should change, rather than indicating that it definitely should. It indicates a question to be addressed; it does not answer that question. If a diocesan boundary reflects the realities of local life better than the secular boundaries do, there is a stronger case for retaining it. But, where it goes against the grain of secular life, there is a strong case for aligning the Church’s boundaries to those of the communities it seeks to serve.
9.2 Boundary with the Diocese of Blackburn

9.2.1 The Diocese of Bradford includes the parish of Hurst Green, which has always been in Lancashire, and eleven other parishes that were incorporated into Lancashire in 1974. Four of these parishes, comprising the benefices of Barnoldswick with Bracewell and Earby with Kelbrooke, form part of the Borough of Pendle, centred on Nelson and Colne. They are in the Skipton Deanery. The other eight parishes form part of the Ribble Valley Borough, centred on Clitheroe, and are in the Bowland Deanery.

9.2.2 Evidence from the four parishes in the Skipton Deanery suggested that residents of these parishes relate to Skipton and Yorkshire more than to Colne and Lancashire, going to grammar schools in Skipton, shopping in Skipton as well as in Colne and going to the Airedale Hospital in Steeton rather than to Burnley or Blackburn. It was recognized that younger people in the parishes had no memory of them being in Yorkshire and that many of them did not think much about the issue. However, it was pointed out that ‘Welcome to Lancashire’ signs continue to be vandalized; if younger people were responsible for this, that would suggest that resistance to inclusion in Lancashire was not confined to the older generation. Both Earby and Kelbrooke were formerly part of the parish of Thornton-in-Craven, with which they continue to enjoy links. One third of the parish of Earby is still in Yorkshire.
9.2.3 Some of the evidence that we received acknowledged that most of the eight Lancashire parishes in the Bowland Deanery relate more to neighbouring parts of Lancashire than they do to Yorkshire. All but one of the churches is closer to Clitheroe than to Skipton or Settle; indeed Waddington and Mitton are immediately adjacent to Clitheroe, while Hurst Green is further west. All of them are much closer to Blackburn Cathedral than they are to Bradford Cathedral. There were only isolated indications of relationships with Bradford Cathedral or of strong identification with the Diocese, though there are clearly loyalties to the rest of the Bowland Deanery, which is in North Yorkshire.

9.2.4 Many of the arguments put to us for the Bowland parishes remaining in the Bradford Diocese were arguments against joining the Diocese of Blackburn rather than positive arguments for remaining in the Diocese of Bradford. Some related to perceived differences in diocesan policy. There was a perception that the Diocese of Blackburn has a more catholic ethos than the Diocese of Bradford. There were also indications that some individuals would resist their parishes being transferred to a diocese in which two of the current bishops do not ordain women to the priesthood. We wonder whether some of these perceptions and concerns might be dispelled or allayed by discussion with the bishops, clergy and people of the Blackburn Diocese. We would encourage those concerned to engage in such dialogue. Many parishes in the Diocese of Blackburn in fact have a low-church tradition not dissimilar to that of some of the churches in the Bradford Diocese.

9.2.5 Some of those whom the Review Team met indicated that they would welcome their parishes becoming part of a Ripon Episcopal Area within a diocese with its diocesan office in Leeds, but for others the changed context might make a transfer to the Diocese of Blackburn seem more sensible.

9.2.6 The Commission therefore invites the twelve parishes in the Diocese of Bradford that are in Lancashire formally to consider, in the light of the proposal to create a Ripon Episcopal Area within a new diocese with its diocesan office in Leeds, whether their own mission and that of the Church in Lancashire would be strengthened by their being transferred to the Diocese of Blackburn.
9.3 Boundary with the Diocese of Carlisle

The Diocese of Bradford also includes five parishes in Cumbria (Sedbergh, Cautley and Garsdale; Dent with Cowgill; Howgill; Firbank; and Killington). Two of these, Firbank and Killington, have never been in Yorkshire but were transferred to the Diocese of Bradford in 1925 and 1951 respectively. The other three parishes were formerly in the West Riding of Yorkshire but became part of Cumbria in 1974. The parishes form part of the Ewecross Deanery.

Unfortunately, heavy snow prevented representatives of these parishes from attending our planned meeting with them in Skipton, but we received some written submissions and were able to meet the rural dean as well as the archdeacon.

Clearly this area continues to have connections with Yorkshire, not least because three of the parishes still form part of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. On the other hand, we received evidence that its social and economic connections are now primarily with Cumbria in general and Kendal in particular and secondarily with northern Lancashire. Although the area is linked with the rest of the Diocese of Bradford by road, anyone travelling from it to Skipton, for example, would normally drive through parts of the Dioceses of Carlisle and Blackburn. Although Carlisle is 45 miles away, there is a direct motorway link; Bradford is more distant and the roads are less good.

Both the Cumbria District of the Methodist Church and the North Western Province of the United Reformed Church include this area, and these parishes’
ecumenical links are with Cumbria rather than Yorkshire. The Diocese of Carlisle has very close links with the Methodist Church and the United Reformed Church, and it would be more convenient for relations with them if the Diocese of Carlisle included all of the Anglican parishes in Cumbria. Sedbergh School’s choir sings regularly in Carlisle Cathedral, yet, although the Bishop of Carlisle regularly preaches there, it falls to the Bishop of Bradford to conduct confirmations.

9.3.5 We believe that the time has now come to align the diocesan boundary to the realities of community life in this area. In the light of the proposal to create a Ripon Episcopal Area within a new diocese with its diocesan office in Leeds, we recommend that the parishes of Sedbergh, Cautley and Garsdale; Dent with Cowgill; Howgill; Firbank; and Killington be transferred to the Diocese of Carlisle.

9.4 Boundary with the Diocese of Durham

9.4.1 The northern boundary of the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds is the River Tees as far north as Holwick in the parish of Laithkirk. Since 1974, the area west of the Tees down to Barnard Castle and an area south of the Tees from Barnard Castle running eastwards to the boundary of Darlington (comprising seven parishes in all) have been in County Durham.

9.4.2 The southernmost of these parishes is the parish of Barningham, and to the east of it are the parishes Wycliffe and Hutton Magna. Part of the parish of Hutton Magna is still in North Yorkshire, and both Barningham and Hutton Magna
have Richmond postcodes. Hutton Magna relates closely to the nearby parish of Gilling in North Yorkshire, of which it was originally a chapelry and whose incumbent is its patron. After the Review Team’s meeting with representatives of these parishes, the Commission received a letter reporting the unanimous view of the members of the Hutton Magna PCC that they did not want the parish to be transferred to the Diocese of Durham. We recommend that Barningham and Hutton Magna should remain in the proposed new diocese.

9.4.3 Wycliffe, which lies to the north of Hutton Magna on the south bank of the Tees, is only a short distance from the larger village of Whorlton in the Diocese of Durham. We understand that its residents often cross the bridge into Whorlton and travel into Barnard Castle for shops and other services. It has a Darlington postcode.

9.4.4 The area west of the Tees consists of four parishes which share a priest in charge. Laithkirk and Romaldkirk form a single benefice running down one side of a valley, the other side of which is in the Diocese of Durham. The parish of Bowes and the parish of Startforth and Rokeby with Brignall similarly form a single benefice. Laithkirk and Romaldkirk are close to the town of Middleton in Teesdale, while the village of Startforth adjoins the town of Barnard Castle (both towns being in the Diocese of Durham).

9.4.5 The evidence that we received from these two northerly benefices was mixed. Some more longstanding residents said, ‘In our hearts we are Yorkshiremen.’ Some saw little advantage in change, suggesting that while they were ‘out on a limb’ in the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds – a feeling that had increased since the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds had become more focused on Leeds – they would similarly be on the edge and in danger of being lost sight of in the Diocese of Durham. However, social and economic contacts are primarily with Middleton on Tees and Barnard Castle and Durham. We were told that residents were more likely to travel to Newcastle than Leeds. Ecumenically, Startforth is included in Churches Together in Barnard Castle and Startforth, and we understand that Upper Teesdale Churches Together similarly operates on both sides of the Tees. Those who moved into the area in the last 36 years and younger residents have no memory of being in Yorkshire and this proportion of the population will of course continue to grow. We believe that the arguments in favour of transferring these parishes to the Diocese of Durham outweigh those in favour of the status quo.

9.4.6 We accordingly recommend that the parishes of Laithkirk, Romaldkirk, Bowes, Startforth and Rokeby with Brignall, and Wycliffe in County Durham be transferred to the Diocese of Durham.
9.5 Boundary with the Mowbray Deanery

Though the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds was only established (as the Diocese of Ripon) in 1836, north of Ripon its boundary with the Diocese of York is a very ancient one. It has been a diocesan boundary since the creation of the Diocese of Chester in 1541. Before that it had separated the Archdeaconry of Richmond from that of Cleveland since the twelfth century, and had formed the eastern boundary of the Honour of Richmond, which William the Conqueror granted to his cousin in 1071. The boundary basically runs along the River Wiske, a tributary of the Swale. In secular terms this boundary no longer has any meaning. It bisects not just the county of North Yorkshire but also its Hambleton District. In ecclesiastical terms it separates the Mowbray Deanery of the Diocese of York (including the towns of Northallerton and Thirsk) from the Richmond and Wensley Deaneries in the Archdeaconry of Richmond.

Several of those whom the Review Team met in the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds argued that the diocesan boundary lies too far to the west. They argued that the Mowbray Deanery – Thirsk in particular, but also Northallerton – relates to Ripon rather than to York, and that the Mowbray Deanery should be transferred to the Archdeaconry of Richmond. In shorthand, they spoke of the A19, which runs from York to Middlesbrough, forming the most appropriate boundary – though in fact the deanery’s eastern boundary is that of the Hambleton District, the ridge of the Hambleton Hills (the parishes east of the A19, which comprise a single benefice, relate to the deanery and district and not to the territory on the other side of the hills).
9.5.3 Evidence that we received from the Mowbray Deanery and the Diocese of York did not support transferring the Mowbray Deanery to the Archdeaconry of Richmond. While some people from Thirsk in particular go to Ripon Cathedral – to concerts, for example – our impression is that Thirsk and Northallerton are of greater significance for Ripon than Ripon is for them. People from Ripon might go to Northallerton to catch trains, but people from Northallerton are less inclined to go to Ripon. Communications in the Vale of York run primarily north-south, and the area’s linkage with York along the A19 was emphasized – people not only go to York Minster; they also shop in York. Furthermore, the importance of links with Thirsk to people in the neighbouring Helmsley Deanery to the east, especially the farming community, was stressed.

9.5.4 This evidence is sufficient to enable us to conclude that it would not be appropriate to recommend transferring the Mowbray Deanery to the new Diocese. We have not yet reviewed the northern boundary of the Diocese of York but, if the Mowbray Deanery were removed from the Diocese of York but the Stokesley and Middlesbrough Deaneries remained in it, anyone travelling from York to that northern part of the diocese would leave the Diocese of York south of Thirsk and re-enter it more than fifteen miles further north.

9.5.5 Several who gave evidence to us from the Diocese of York suggested that its western boundary should be the A1. The A1 is now the most prominent feature in the landscape between Northallerton and Thirsk on the one hand and Richmond, Bedale and Ripon on the other. South of the A168 to Thirsk and north of Catterick it is already a motorway (the A1M); the intervening section is currently being upgraded and due to open as the A1(M) in 2012.

9.5.6 Motorways were mentioned in conversations throughout Yorkshire with remarkable frequency. Clearly they are arteries and means by which places are connected with each other: towns linked by motorway can feel closer to each other than they actually are. The M62 was often mentioned as a unitive feature within West Yorkshire, as well as connecting it with Manchester on the one hand and with Goole and the East Riding on the other. At the same time, it is clear that motorways are increasingly identified as boundaries. This is not just because of their prominence as landmarks; it was repeatedly suggested to us that motorways formed at least psychological barriers and to some extent also physical barriers (for example, because there are fewer junctions). The parallel with the earlier role of rivers is striking: they were means of transport and travel, and were unitive factors linking the communities on either side of them, but they also very commonly served as boundaries.

9.5.7 In the north of the area, it is clear that the part of the Richmondshire District that is east of the A1 relates to Richmond. In the Hambleton District, one parish in the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds has the A1 as its western boundary:
Kirkby Fleetham with Langton on Swale and Scruton. Most of the parish is west of the Swale, and Langton is linked to it by a bridge. Further south, however, it is not (or not yet) the A1 which forms the boundary. It still bisects three parishes (Bedale; Leeming; Kirklington with Burneston and Wath with Pickhill). Some adjustment of the parochial boundaries may be sensible in future, but most of their churches and population are west of the A1 and should remain in the Archdeaconry of Richmond.

9.5.8 Within the Hambleton District, the significant boundary at present is not the A1 but the River Swale, of which the Wiske is a tributary. South of Langton, there is no bridge over the Swale between the A684 (Bedale-Northallerton) and the A61 (Ripon-Thirsk). Not surprisingly, the Swale forms the boundary between the parishes. The Hambleton District groups its civil parishes in clusters centred on Stokesley, Northallerton, Thirsk, Easingwold and Bedale. Of these towns, only Bedale is in the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds. For the most part, the Swale forms the boundary of the Bedale cluster.

9.5.9 The Mowbray Deanery has a covenant with the Thirsk and Northallerton Circuit of the Methodist Church. Extending its boundary to the Swale would make it coterminous with that Circuit.

9.5.10 This would involve transferring the following parishes to the Diocese of York:

- The Cowtons
- Great Smeaton with Appleton Wiske
- Birkby
- Danby Wiske with Hutton Bonville
- Ainderby Steeple with Yafforth and Kirby Wiske with Maunby

and possibly also:

- Kirkby Fleetham with Langton on Swale and Scruton.

9.5.11 The first four of these parishes currently form part of the ten-parish benefice of Richmond East. However, except for North Cowton they are in the Hambleton District and seem to relate more to Northallerton, to which they are linked by the A167, than to Richmond.

9.5.12 Ainderby Steeple is already part of Churches Together in Northallerton, while the southern part of the parish (Kirby Wiske with Maunby) can only be reached from the northern part of the parish (Ainderby Steeple and Yafforth) by passing through the Diocese of York. The parish clearly relates to Northallerton and Thirsk, both of which parishes it adjoins. It forms part of the Lower Swale Benefice with Kirkby Fleetham with Langton on Swale and Scruton. Whether that parish would also be transferred would depend on whether it now relates
more to Bedale or Northallerton. If it were transferred, the A1 would form the diocesan boundary at this point.

9.5.13 We invite the parishes of the Cowtons, Great Smeaton with Appleton Wiske, Birkby, Danby Wiske with Hutton Bonville, Ainderby Steeple with Yafforth and Kirby Wiske with Maunby, and Kirkby Fleetham with Langton on Swale and Scruton formally to consider whether it would be appropriate for them to be transferred to the Mowbray Deanery of the Diocese of York.

9.5.14 South of this area, between the A61 and the A168, the A1 already forms the boundary of another parish (Baldersby with Dishforth).

9.6 Boundary of the Ripon Area with the Easingwold and New Ainsty Deaneries

9.6.1 Further south, the Easingwold Deanery of the Diocese of York is almost exactly coterminous with the Easingwold cluster of the Hambleton District. The Easingwold Deanery plainly relates to York, which lies immediately to the south of it, rather than to Ripon, which lies to the west on the other side of the river and the A1(M). South of Brafferton its western boundary is the Swale and then the River Ure (of which it is a tributary) and then the Ouse. Between Brafferton and Beningbrough (at the southern end) only one bridge (a toll bridge on an unclassified road) crosses the river, which also forms the western boundary of the Hambleton District.

9.6.2 No one in the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds has suggested any need to adjust the boundary at this point. Some of those whom the Review Team met in the Diocese of York suggested that the area between the River Swale and the A1(M), including Boroughbridge, should be added to the Easingwold Deanery, but others were clear this area relates to Boroughbridge and Boroughbridge relates to Ripon.

9.6.3 There was some suggestion that the parish of Brafferton relates to Boroughbridge and should be transferred to the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds. If this were thought desirable, it could be effected under the Pastoral Measure. Subject to that possibility, the evidence available to us does not indicate a need for adjustment of the western boundary of the Easingwold Deanery.

9.6.4 The boundary between the Archdeaconry of Richmond and the New Ainsty Deanery of the Diocese of York runs north-west from the edge of the City of Leeds across Marston Moor. Though this part of this area is in the Harrogate District, it is closer to York than it is to Harrogate. No one has suggested to us that it relates more to the territory west of the A1(M) than it does to York. We therefore make no recommendation for change at this point.
9.7 Eastern boundary of the (expanded) Leeds Archdeaconry
9.7.1 We have proposed that the Archdeaconry of Leeds should be expanded so as to include all those parishes in the new diocese that are in the City of Leeds. We now need to consider whether the eight parishes within the City of Leeds that are in the Diocese of York should be transferred to form part of the expanded Archdeaconry of Leeds. The eight parishes fall into two groups.

9.7.2 The residential areas of the five parishes of Boston Spa, Thorp Arch, Walton, Bramham and Clifford are all east of the A1(M), which otherwise roughly forms the eastern boundary of the City of Leeds. Though there is open country between them and nearby Tadcaster, which lies at the centre of the New Ainsty Deanery, there is a much more substantial area of open country between them and Wetherby (which is also in the City of Leeds but is west of the A1) and Leeds itself.

9.7.3 The clergy and lay representatives of these parishes whom the Review Team met were emphatic in their wish to remain in the Diocese of York. They argued that the area’s affinity had always been with York and that it had only been included in the City of Leeds in 1974 because of political considerations, a change that was still resented. They further suggested that since 1974 the conversion of the A1 into the A1(M) had made it more of a physical and psychological barrier. They argued that the area continues to relate to York as much as, if not more than, to Leeds. Though many people in the parishes commute to Leeds, it was suggested, they do not feel part of it but choose to live in Boston Spa in order to get away from it. Leeds might be the place of work but, for most, York (along with Harrogate) was the place of recreation and shopping. People from this area would catch trains from York, whereas those west of the A1 would go to Leeds. Public transport to York was limited, however.

9.7.4 Though we believe that there are generally great advantages for the mission of the Church for its boundaries to be aligned with those of the secular communities to which it relates, this does not mean that local authority boundaries should always be preferred. In this case, the argument put to us is that the diocesan boundary reflects not only the historic sentiment of more longstanding residents but also current realities and sentiment better than the local authority boundary does.

9.7.5 We recommend that at this point the A1(M) should continue to be the diocesan boundary and that the parishes of Boston Spa, Thorp Arch, Walton, Bramham and Clifford should accordingly remain in the Diocese of York.

9.7.6 Further south, the residential areas of the parishes of Aberford and Micklefield and the greater part of the parish of Ledsham with Fairburn (with three of its four churches) are both west of the A1(M) and in the City of Leeds. (Fairburn is west of the A1(M) but not in the City of Leeds.) They remain in the Selby Deanery of the Diocese of York, however. Those whom the Review Team met
agreed that the people of these three parishes (other than those who live in Fairburn) thought of themselves as being in the City of Leeds. Ledsham with Fairburn also relates strongly to the adjoining parish of Castleford in the Diocese of Wakefield; the creation of a new diocese incorporating both Leeds and Castleford would make its position even more anomalous.

9.7.7 Some representatives from these parishes expressed strong loyalties to the Diocese of York and York Minster, but others believed that the mission of the Church in these parishes and in the City of Leeds would be strengthened if the parishes related to the Church in the place to which their parishioners relate. We take the latter view, and note that this would not prevent individuals from continuing to visit and worship in York Minster and participate in its life.

9.7.8 We recommend that the parishes of Aberford, Micklefield and Ledsham with Fairburn be transferred to the Archdeaconry of Leeds.

9.8 Parishes in the South of the Selby District

9.8.1 There are four parishes in the southern part of the Selby District of North Yorkshire that are in the Diocese of Wakefield.

9.8.2 Kirk Smeaton and Womersley are rural parishes south of the M62. For the most part, they appear to have little in common with the area north of the M62. They border not only on the Diocese of Wakefield but also the Diocese of Sheffield to the south and east. The formation of a new diocese covering not only West
Yorkshire but also half of North Yorkshire would make the position of these North Yorkshire parishes less anomalous. We have received no evidence that argues for them to be transferred to the Diocese of York.

9.8.3 We recommend that Kirk Smeaton and Womersley remain in the new diocese (though we would welcome their views on this).

9.8.4 Most of the parish of Kellington is north of the M62, though part of it lies south of the motorway, with a church at Whitley Bridge. A detached part of the parish is contiguous with Knottingley (with which this parish forms a single benefice), but the two parts are separated by the parish of Birkin in the Diocese of York. There might be an argument for Birkin, and possibly Haddlesey also, to be transferred to the new diocese in order to tidy up the boundary at this point, or for Kellington to be transferred to the Diocese of York, so that the M62 would effectively be its southern boundary.

9.8.5 We invite the Archdeacons of Pontefract and York and the parishes of Kellington with Whitley, Birkin and Haddlesey to consider where the boundary between the two archdeaconries would most helpfully be drawn.

9.8.6 Brotherton lies east of the A1(M), sharing boundaries with Knottingley, Ferrybridge (with which it shares a priest in charge), Ledsham with Fairburn, Monk Fryston and Birkin. It probably has more in common with the other parishes in the Selby District than with Ferrybridge, and an argument could be made for transferring it to the Diocese of York, making the A1(M) the diocesan boundary at this point also. However, Brotherton’s proximity to the nearby towns of West Yorkshire means that residents do go there for shopping and leisure, so there is also something to be said for the status quo.

9.8.7 We invite the parish of Brotherton formally to consider whether it would be more appropriate for it to remain in the proposed new diocese or to be transferred to the Diocese of York.

9.9 The Boundary between the Dioceses of Sheffield and York

9.9.1 Having considered the Diocese of York’s western boundary with the Diocese of Ripon & Leeds and its southern boundary with the Diocese of Wakefield, it will be appropriate to consider at this point its boundary with the Diocese of Sheffield.

9.9.2 The north-eastern corner of the Diocese of Sheffield includes

- the four Marshland parishes (Swinefleet, Whitgift, Adlingfleet and Eastoft)
- Goole
- Airmyn, Hook and Rawcliffe (which are linked by the M62) and
9.9.3 The Marshland parishes are isolated by the Ouse to the north, the Trent to the east and Thorne Waste to the south. The other parishes are very much in the M62 corridor. Goole was described to us as ‘in the middle of things’, relating to Doncaster, York, Hull and Scunthorpe. Though Wakefield is a little further away than these, we were told that there is more of a relationship between Goole and Wakefield than between Goole and Sheffield. The significance of the M62 is indicated, for example, by the fact that Goole cremations take place in Pontefract as well as in Scunthorpe and York (with some also in Doncaster and Beverley). There are also strong links with the Selby District, and Goole forms part of the Selby ‘travel to work’ area for government statistical purposes.

9.9.4 The Review Team received mixed evidence as to whether residents of those parishes that are now in the East Riding consider themselves to be part of the East Riding or not. Older and more long-standing residents are certainly conscious of having been in the West Riding, younger and newer residents less so. To an extent, however, the question is not whether this area identifies with the East Riding but with which areas of the West Riding it identifies. The Review Team’s conversation with lay representatives of the congregations
suggested greater identification with that part of the West Riding that remains in the Diocese of York than with that part that is now in South Yorkshire. People said that they went to York and Selby, but there was considerable resistance to travelling to Sheffield.

9.9.5 Indeed we were advised that travelling and commuting patterns make linkage between Goole and South Yorkshire more difficult to justify than linkage with West Yorkshire (along the M62), North Yorkshire or the East Riding.

9.9.6 The Review Team noted a strong loyalty on the part of the clergy of these parishes to the Diocese of Sheffield. Among lay representatives, however, there was less of a sense of positive loyalty to that diocese. Rather, there was some questioning as to what advantages change might bring and a sense that the area would be on the edge of whatever diocese it was in.

9.9.7 All things being equal, we believe that it is most helpful for the Church’s mission if its boundaries coincide with those of county and unitary authorities, though that is not a principle to be followed slavishly where there is evidence that diocesan boundaries reflect local senses of community and identity and social and economic realities more faithfully.

9.9.8 We have received no evidence that in secular terms this area relates more closely to South Yorkshire than to the areas covered by the Diocese of York. Indeed the reverse is true; the evidence we have received suggests that this area relates mostly to the areas to the north and east that are in the Diocese of York, to a significant degree also to the adjacent parts of West Yorkshire, and much less to South Yorkshire.

9.9.9 We were also advised that the Lincolnshire boundary, which places the parish of Eastoft and the village of Fockerby in Lincolnshire is now in the right place. If the other parishes in this group are transferred to the Diocese of York, it would be sensible to transfer the parish of Eastoft to the Diocese of Lincoln.

9.9.10 We recommend that the parishes of Great Snaith, Goole, Airmyn, Hook, Rawcliffe, Goole, Swinefleet, Whitgift and Adlingfleet should be transferred to the Diocese of York and that the parish of Eastoft should be transferred to the Diocese of Lincoln.

9.10 The Boundary between the Diocese of Sheffield and the Diocese of Wakefield

9.10.1 Having completed our consideration of the western and southern boundary of the Diocese of York, we turn now to the southern boundary of the proposed new diocese.
9.10.2 The southern boundary of the Diocese of Wakefield was, for the most part, established in 1836, when the territory to the north of it became the Diocese of Ripon while the area to the south remained in the Diocese of York. This division reflected a distinction between South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire that is still valid, but the precise boundary now seems problematic because it divides the Borough of Barnsley, which was formed in 1974, between the Diocese of Wakefield and the Diocese of Sheffield. 20 parishes are in the Barnsley Deanery of the Diocese of Wakefield and 15 parishes are in the Diocese of Sheffield (including Thurgoland, which was transferred to the Diocese of Sheffield in the 1980s). The Roman Catholic Diocese of Hallam, which was established after the formation of the Borough of Barnsley, includes the whole of the borough. Most of the borough is similarly in the Barnsley Circuit of the Methodist Church’s Sheffield District, though four churches in the north-west of the Borough (in Penistone, Thurlstone and Ingbirchworth) are in the West Yorkshire District (the core of which is Kirklees, Calderdale, Bradford and Craven).

9.10.3 One of the odd aspects of the situation is that in many respects the natural division within the Borough is not between the north and the south but between the rural upland area west of the M1 and the town of Barnsley and its surrounding villages to the east of the M1.

9.10.4 As Barnsley is a town situated between cities and larger towns, its residents are drawn in different directions. Barnsley is 10 miles from Rotherham and 12 miles from Sheffield to the south, but it is also 10 miles from Wakefield to the north; Leeds, though more distant, is only 18 miles away. There are affinities between the upland area in the west of the borough and the neighbouring areas
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to the north-west, around Holmfirth, and between the north-east of the borough and the former coal-mining towns and villages further north and east, such as Hemsworth, and indeed with Wakefield. The southern area of the borough looks to Sheffield and Rotherham, and the Dearne Valley parishes in the south-east of the borough have a strong affinity with Wath upon Dearne, Swinton and Mexborough further along the Dearne Valley. It was suggested to us that Thurnscoe, Goldthorpe and Bolton upon Dearne relate so closely to Wath and Mexborough that the borough boundary is unhelpful at this point.

9.10.5 Otherwise, no one from within the Borough of Barnsley has suggested to us that its boundaries are questionable. Most of the outlying areas seem to relate more to the town of Barnsley than to anywhere else. The fact that different parts of the Borough have affinities with different neighbouring areas does raise some questions about its allocation to larger units, however.

9.10.6 Barnsley has been in South Yorkshire since the county was formed in 1974 and no one has suggested to us that it was misallocated. Those whom we met were clear that there is a cultural distinction between South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire and that culturally Barnsley belongs in South Yorkshire. Economically, however, Barnsley relates to Leeds as well as to Sheffield. Accordingly, the Borough is participating in both the Sheffield City Region Forum and the Leeds City Region Board and their respective Local Enterprise Partnerships.

9.10.7 The relationship between Barnsley Borough Council and the leadership of the Diocese of Wakefield is seen by both sides as a particularly strong one. There has been close co-operation between the local authority and successive Bishops of Wakefield, including the present bishop.

9.10.8 The Barnsley Deanery is widely recognized as quite distinctive in that most (though not all) of its parishes have a catholic tradition. While those west of the M1 have become more liberal, those in the east have retained a traditional stance and include the majority of the nine parishes in the Diocese that receive episcopal oversight under the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod. Several of those of other traditions whom the Review Team met in the Diocese of Wakefield emphasized their regard for these clergy and parishes and the value that they place on their contribution to the Diocese’s life; they said that they would view their removal from the Diocese as an impoverishment.

9.10.9 Various views were expressed by the clergy and lay representatives of the Barnsley Deanery. The traditional catholic clergy enjoy close relations with the large number of clergy of the same views in the Diocese of Sheffield and were not opposed on churchmanship grounds to a transfer to that Diocese. Concern was expressed, however, that their withdrawal would leave the other clergy and parishes of their tradition in an isolated position within the Diocese of Wakefield. It was recognized that, if a new diocese were created to embrace the whole of West Yorkshire, the position of these South Yorkshire parishes
within it would be even more anomalous than it is now. Several thought that, in that changed context, it would make sense to take the opportunity to resolve the anomaly by transferring the Barnsley Deanery to join the rest of South Yorkshire in the Diocese of Sheffield.

9.10.10 The Diocese of Sheffield already has large numbers of catholic parishes (only four dioceses have more parishes receiving episcopal oversight under the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod) and of evangelical parishes. The representatives of the Diocese whom the Review Team met did not believe that the addition of the Barnsley Deanery would significantly affect the balance of traditions within the Diocese. Transferring the Barnsley Deanery would mean that all four South Yorkshire boroughs would be entirely within the Diocese of Sheffield, and in principle this would be welcomed, subject to further investigation showing that this would not place an additional financial burden on the Diocese of Sheffield.

9.10.11 We have not sought to identify the financial consequences of this or any the other transfers of parishes that are considered in this chapter or, where these might be problematic, what steps might be taken to mitigate them. Our aim at this point is to establish what would be desirable in principle rather than to offer recommendations determined by financial considerations. Work will need to be done on the financial consequences of transferring parishes and will form part of our deliberations on whether, in the light of the responses to this report, any particular proposed transfer should form part of a reorganization scheme.

9.10.12 Our approach has been to give greater weight to the desirability of aligning church boundaries to those of secular communities: we have not made proposals based on churchmanship considerations. The evidence is not unequivocal, because Barnsley clearly relates in social and economic terms not only to the rest of South Yorkshire but also to adjacent areas of West Yorkshire and indeed to Leeds. However, on balance the evidence suggests that the Barnsley Deanery should join the rest of the borough and the rest of South Yorkshire in the Diocese of Sheffield.

9.10.13 A further consideration is that we have aimed to make the Wakefield Episcopal Area the smallest of the five episcopal areas within the proposed new diocese, so that the diocesan bishop will have more time to address strategic questions, relate to West Yorkshire and its institutions, represent the Diocese externally and bear his share of national church responsibilities. While an episcopal area including both the City of Wakefield and the Barnsley Deanery would probably still be manageable (see paras 7.3-7.6), it would give the diocesan bishop a greater workload as an area bishop than we envisage.

9.10.14 We therefore recommend that the Barnsley Deanery be transferred to the Diocese of Sheffield.
9.10.15 Thus far our discussion has assumed that the Borough of Barnsley should be united within a single diocese. If our recommendation of a transfer to the Diocese of Sheffield were not pursued, that would raise the question of whether the southern part of the Borough should instead be transferred to the Diocese of Wakefield – as was suggested by one of those with whom the Review Team spoke.

9.10.16 The evidence that we have received would not support this in the case of the parishes in the south-east of the Borough, which relate to Wath upon Dearne in the Borough of Rotherham, and we have received no evidence that would argue for this in the specific cases of the other parishes along the southern edge of the Borough. However, regret was expressed by representatives from the parish of Penistone that their former relationship with Thurgoland had been diminished by its transfer to the Diocese of Sheffield.

9.10.17 It was also put to us that, if the Borough of Barnsley continued to be divided between dioceses, the boundary should run through open country rather than through the built-up area as it does at present. This would be achieved by transferring some or all of the parishes of Ardsley, Kendray, Worsbrough Dale, Worsbrough Common and Worsbrough from the Diocese of Sheffield to the Barnsley Deanery. If our recommendation were not to gain sufficient support, the views of the parishes named in this paragraph about the most appropriate boundary within the Borough would need to be sought.
10 Implementation

10.1 The recommendations made in this report would be brought into effect by a variety of means.

10.2 The principal scheme would

- dissolve the existing Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield, abolish the diocesan bishoprics and confer rights to compensation on the diocesan bishops;
- create the new Diocese of Wakefield and found its diocesan bishopric;
- create suffragan bishoprics of Bradford and Leeds;
- dissolve the Archdeaconry of Craven and confer rights to compensation on the archdeacon;
- alter the boundaries of the remaining archdeaconries and re-name the Archdeaconry of Richmond as the Archdeaconry of Richmond and Craven;
- alter the existing deaneries as necessary;
- designate the existing Wakefield, Bradford and Ripon Cathedrals as the cathedrals of the new Diocese;
- provide for a single College of Canons to discharge functions for all three cathedrals;
- apply sections 8 and 21 of the Cathedrals Measure 1999 to the three cathedrals in such a way as to require the Church Commissioners to pay the stipends of the dean and two canons or, with the consent of the diocesan bishop, the dean and one canon of each cathedral;
- provide for the compensation of other diocesan office-holders, not being employees, who would be displaced by the dissolution of the three dioceses.
- make a range of consequential provisions (including provisions for the diocesan synod, bishop’s council and diocesan bodies) as detailed in Schedule 2 to the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007.

10.3 The See of Pontefract could be renamed under section 11 of the Measure either in advance of the creation of the new Diocese or after the new diocesan bishop has taken up office. The See of Knaresborough could only be renamed ‘Ripon’ after the existing diocesan bishopric of Ripon & Leeds has been abolished and the new diocesan has taken up office.

10.4 Much preparatory work would need to be undertaken within the area of the new diocese. We envisage the establishment, by the three bishops’ councils, of an implementation group under the chairmanship of a bishop appointed by the
Archbishop of York. This group would have strategic oversight of the implementation process and would commission implementation work from others within the existing dioceses as necessary. It would need to consist of a small number of key people, representing the three dioceses in roughly equal numbers.

10.5 The group’s work would include, for example

- establishing shadow diocesan boards (and in some cases companies and/or trusts), which would be ready to assume the relevant functions when the scheme comes into effect;
- appointing a diocesan secretary-designate and other staff, where possible from among the existing diocesan staff;
- identifying the staff who would transfer to the new diocese;
- making TUPE and redundancy arrangements as necessary.

10.6 There will need to be further consideration of what the proposed changes will mean for the financing of episcopal ministry in the proposed new diocese, not least because responsibility for housing diocesan bishops rests with the Church Commissioners whereas suffragan bishops (including area bishops) are housed by the dioceses. It is not the intention of the Dioceses Commission that the proposed changes should lead to savings for one part of the Church as a result of extra costs to another.

10.7 Choosing the first diocesan bishop would be a priority once the scheme had been confirmed by Order in Council. The scheme would come into force in stages. The first step would be for a vacancy in see committee, established under the scheme and consisting of the members of the vacancy in see committees of the existing dioceses, to carry out its duties under the Vacancy in See Committees Regulation. The Crown Nominations Commission would meet to nominate the diocesan bishop. The new College of Canons, constituted by the scheme, would meet to elect the new bishop. (During the period up to the confirmation of his election, which should follow swiftly after the election itself, the functions of the diocesan bishop would be delegated by the Archbishop of York to another bishop.)

10.8 A priority for the new diocesan bishop would be the choice of Bishops of Bradford and Leeds. The bishop would be supported in his choices by advisory groups, which we suggest should be drawn mainly from the archdeaconries concerned.

10.9 The functions of the area bishops in their respective archdeaconries would be specified in instruments of delegation. The Commission proposes to publish draft instruments of delegation, issue them for comment alongside the draft scheme and then issue revised texts alongside the final scheme. The
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Instruments would need to be executed by the new diocesan bishop after consulting the transitional diocesan synod, but we hope that the fact that they had been the subject of consultation in advance would expedite this. In the case of Bradford and Leeds it might be necessary to delegate functions temporarily to other bishops pending the appointment of the new bishops.

10.10 The transitional diocesan synod would need to establish the area councils and approve their constitutions (including membership). Functions would need to be delegated and responsibilities assigned by the relevant diocesan bodies (chiefly the diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee).

10.11 When new dioceses were created in the past, boundary adjustments with neighbouring dioceses were often made separately, after the new diocese had come into existence. We propose to adopt the same course. A second scheme would transfer territory from and to the new Diocese and the Dioceses of Sheffield and York. This would mean that the principal scheme would only be submitted to the Bradford, Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield Diocesan Synods. The boundary adjustment scheme would be issued in draft with the draft principal scheme but would only go formally to the diocesan synod of the new diocese and the diocesan synods of the other dioceses concerned once the new diocese had come into existence.
Summary of Recommendations

In summary, we make the following recommendations:

11.1 The Diocese of Sheffield

11.1.1 South Yorkshire is a distinct community and should continue to have its own diocese. (4.2.7)

11.1.2 In the context of the present review we do not recommend any change to the southern and western boundaries of the Diocese of Sheffield that could not be made under the Pastoral Measure 1983. (4.2.11)

11.2 The Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield

11.2.1 There should be a single diocese covering West Yorkshire and also those parts of the Dioceses of Bradford and Ripon & Leeds that are in North Yorkshire. (6.8.1)

11.2.2 The new diocese should be divided into episcopal areas with area bishops to whom the day-to-day oversight of their areas would be delegated as completely as possible, each with an area council to which appropriate functions would be delegated. (6.8.1)

11.2.3 The three existing dioceses should be dissolved, and the diocesan bishoprics abolished, by a scheme that would provide for compensating the diocesan bishops for loss of office, in accordance with Compensation Rules approved by the General Synod under the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007. (7.1.2)

11.3 The New Diocese

11.3.1 The diocesan bishop should also be area bishop of one of the areas of the diocese. (7.2.2)

11.3.2 The archdeaconry and deanery boundaries within the new diocese should be adjusted so that no archdeaconry would be divided between episcopal areas and that each deanery would be entirely within one of the archdeaconries. In principle no unitary authority area should be divided between archdeaconries. (7.3.1)

11.3.3 Those parts of the County of North Yorkshire that fall within the new diocese should form the Ripon Area of the Diocese. The existing Suffragan See of Knaresborough should be renamed as the See of Ripon. (7.4.1)
11.3.4 The Ripon Area should form a single archdeaconry – the Archdeaconry of Richmond and Craven. (7.4.4)

11.3.5 The City of Leeds should form an episcopal area, receiving dedicated attention from an area bishop whose area should include only the City of Leeds. (7.5.1) It should comprise a single archdeaconry, the Archdeaconry of Leeds. (7.5.4)

11.3.6 All of the parishes in the Dioceses of Bradford and Wakefield that are in the City of Leeds should be transferred to the Archdeaconry of Leeds. (7.5.6)

11.3.7 The City of Bradford should be an archdeaconry and episcopal area. (7.6.5)

11.3.8 The Archdeaconry of Halifax should be expanded to include the whole of Kirklees, and this archdeaconry should form a new episcopal area. The Suffragan See of Pontefract would be renamed and the bishop would move from Wakefield to Kirklees. (7.7.7)

11.3.9 Subject to expressions of opinion on this issue, the episcopal area covering Kirklees and Calderdale should be known as the Huddersfield Episcopal Area and the Archdeaconry of Halifax. (7.7.15)

11.3.10 Wakefield should be the diocesan see and the diocesan bishop should also be area bishop of an episcopal area based on the City of Wakefield. (7.8.18)

11.3.11 It follows from this that the diocese would be the Diocese of Wakefield, but in letterheads and publicity materials this could be expanded along these lines:

*The Diocese of Wakefield*

*The Church of England in West and North-West Yorkshire*

‘North-West Yorkshire’ is a convenient shorthand for the western half of the County of North Yorkshire. (7.8.19)

11.3.12 The Archdeaconry of Pontefract should be reduced in size so as to comprise only the Wakefield Area. (7.9.6)

11.3.13 One or more of the archdeaconries might be combined with a cathedral canonry or parochial ministry, or an archdeacon might act as the diocesan officer for an area of work. Bishops and archdeacons would also have diocesan ‘portfolios’. The details of the archdeacons’ diocesan responsibilities, and those of the area bishops, would need to be worked out in the new diocese and by those in the existing dioceses preparing for its inception. (7.11.1-6)

11.3.14 The Diocesan Office for the new Diocese should be located in Leeds. (7.12.1) Details should be decided locally. (7.12.2-4)
11.4  Cathedrals

11.4.1 Wakefield Cathedral should be the principal cathedral of the diocese. (8.1.1)

11.4.2 Ripon Cathedral should continue to serve as the focus for the church life in the Yorkshire Dales and should be the focal point of the new Ripon Area. As such, it should retain its status as a cathedral and serve as a secondary cathedral within the new diocese. (8.2.8)

11.4.3 Bradford Cathedral should continue to have cathedral status and should, like Ripon Cathedral, be a secondary cathedral within the new diocese. (8.3.9)

11.4.4 There should be a single College of Canons to discharge functions for all three cathedrals in accordance with section 5 of the Cathedrals Measure 1999. The Dean of Wakefield should be the dean of the college of canons of the Diocese, and the Deans of Bradford and Ripon should be vice-deans of the college. The suffragan bishops and archdeacons and the residentiary canons of the three cathedrals would be members of the college. Honorary, lay and ecumenical canons would be members of the college and would each be appointed to a stall in one of the cathedrals as appropriate. (8.4.2)

11.4.5 It will be important to establish a clear division of responsibilities between the Bishop of Bradford and the Dean of Bradford, with the Bishop relating to civil society at a City-wide level and across the City as a whole and the Dean focusing on the ministry of the Cathedral and on the immediate inner-city area. (8.4.3)

11.4.6 The staffing of the cathedrals should be reviewed. We recommend that a review be set in train by the diocesan bishop of the new diocese. The reorganization scheme should apply sections 8 and 21 of the Cathedrals Measure 1999 to each of the three cathedrals in such a way as to require the Church Commissioners to pay the stipends of the dean and two canons or, with the consent of the diocesan bishop, the dean and one canon. (8.4.4)

11.4.7 Otherwise, we recommend no changes to the constitution and statutes of the three cathedrals, which would continue to be independent foundations, albeit with a common college of canons. (8.4.5)

11.4.8 The diocesan bishop would be the bishop of the whole diocese and each of the three cathedrals would be his cathedral. He would accordingly remain the Visitor of each. Consideration would need to be given as to whether he should delegate any of his other powers and responsibilities under the constitution and statutes of Bradford and Ripon Cathedrals to the Bishops of Bradford and Ripon. Be that as it may, we envisage that they would have seats of honour in Bradford and Ripon Cathedrals respectively. (8.4.6)
11.5 Boundaries between Dioceses

11.5.1 The Commission invites the twelve parishes in the Diocese of Bradford that are in Lancashire formally to consider, in the light of the proposal to create a Ripon Episcopal Area within a new diocese with its diocesan office in Leeds, whether their own mission and that of the Church in Lancashire would be strengthened by their being transferred to the Diocese of Blackburn. (9.2.6)

11.5.2 In the light of the proposal to create a Ripon Episcopal Area within a new diocese with its diocesan office in Leeds, the five parishes in Cumbria that are in the Diocese of Bradford (Sedbergh, Cautley and Garsdale; Dent with Cowgill; Howgill; Firbank; and Killington) should be transferred to the Diocese of Carlisle. (9.3.5)

11.5.3 The parishes of Barningham and Hutton Magna should remain in the proposed new diocese. (9.4.2)

11.5.4 The parishes of Laiithkirk, Romaldkirk, Bowes, Startforth and Rokeby with Brignall, and Wycliffe in County Durham should be transferred to the Diocese of Durham. (9.4.6)

11.5.5 The Commission invites the parishes of The Cowtons, Great Smeaton with Appleton Wiske, Birkby, Danby Wiske with Hutton Bonville, Ainderby Steeple with Yafforth and Kirby Wiske with Maunby, and Kirkby Fleetham with Langton on Swale and Scruton formally to consider whether it would be appropriate for them to be transferred to the Mowbray Deanery of the Diocese of York. (9.5.13)

11.5.6 The parishes of Boston Spa, Thorp Arch, Walton, Bramham and Clifford should remain in the Diocese of York. (9.7.5)

11.5.7 The parishes of Aberford, Micklefield and Ledsham with Fairburn should be transferred to the Archdeaconry of Leeds. (9.7.8)

11.5.8 The Commission recommends that the parishes of Kirk Smeaton and Womersley remain in the proposed new diocese (though it would welcome their views on this). (9.8.3)

11.5.9 The Commission invites the Archdeacons of Pontefract and York and the parishes of Kellington, Birkin and Haddlesey formally to consider where the boundary between the two archdeaconries would most helpfully be drawn. (9.8.5)

11.5.10 The Commission invites the parish of Brotherton formally to consider whether it would be more appropriate for it to remain in the proposed new diocese or to be transferred to the Diocese of York. (9.8.7)
11.5.11 The parishes of Great Snaith, Goole, Airmyn, Hook, Rawcliffe, Goole, Swinefleet, Whitgift and Adlingfleet should be transferred to the Diocese of York and the parish of Eastoft should be transferred to the Diocese of Lincoln. (9.9.10)

11.5.12 The Barnsley Deanery should be transferred to the Diocese of Sheffield. (9.10.14)
12 Conclusion

12.1 Our recommendations, we believe, are both radical and realistic. They reflect the evidence we received and, in many cases, suggestions made to us during the Review.

12.2 It continues to be the vocation of the Church of England to provide a Christian presence in every community. We envisage a structure that would enable the Church of England to engage more coherently with the people and communities of West Yorkshire and the western half of North Yorkshire, and with the institutions of civil society there.

12.3 Our proposals would eliminate duplication and triplication and offer the prospect of greater efficiency and resilience in the support of parishes, schools, clergy and other licensed ministers.

12.4 We anticipate consequential financial savings in the stipends and working costs (including staff costs) of two diocesan bishoprics that would be replaced by suffragan bishoprics. The total number of bishops and archdeacons would be reduced from eleven to ten. We anticipate further financial savings in the consolidation of support services in a single diocesan administration based in a single diocesan office.

12.5 We propose retention of the three existing cathedrals, each of which plays an important role that is valued by the wider communities and in particular by the local authorities.

12.6 The continuance of the see of Bradford as an area bishopric, the establishment of separate sees of Ripon and of Leeds as area bishoprics focusing respectively on the western half of North Yorkshire and on the City of Leeds, and the replacement of the suffragan see of Pontefract with a bishopric for Kirklees and Calderdale, offer the prospect of more focused mission and engagement with the important and distinct communities in these four areas.

12.7 The creation of episcopal areas with area bishops and area councils is a crucial part of what we propose. Our recommendations involve not only rationalization but also an emphasis on, and empowerment of, the local dimension of the Church’s life. The area bishops would be, as many have requested, closer in every sense to their clergy and people than it has been possible for the diocesan bishops to be. Thus there would be a strong element of devolution within a context of rationalization.

12.8 At the same time, the creation of a single diocese would place the financial challenges faced by the existing dioceses within a wider framework. A larger structure should be more robust and sustainable into the middle of the century and beyond. Any further reorganization that might prove desirable in response
to changes in Church and society could take place within the context of the new diocese and without the need for involvement by the Dioceses Commission or the General Synod.

12.9 Finally, it is important to stress that to recommend reconfiguring the Church in Yorkshire for mission in the twenty-first century is not to pass an adverse judgement on the suitability of structures established a century and more ago in response to the circumstances of the time. Nor is it in any way to devalue the life and work of the Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield in their respective histories of 176, 122 and 91 years. There is much to celebrate in their history of worship and witness, and much for which to thank God. What we propose now is that, for the next phase of the Church’s worship and witness in Yorkshire, those three dioceses should be brought together into a new structure for episcopally-led mission in the parishes, in the areas that comprise West Yorkshire and the Yorkshire Dales, and in that part of Yorkshire as a whole.
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Review Team Meetings and Evidence

Between January and June 2010 the Review Team made five visits to Yorkshire over a total of 15 days. In all, 80 meetings were held – in Bradford and Skipton; Ripon, Leeds, Harrogate and Richmond; Sheffield and Goole; Wakefield, Barnsley, Huddersfield and Halifax; York, Bishopthorpe, Ledsham, Bramham, Boston Spa, Tadcaster, Easingwold, Thirsk, Northallerton and Hutton Rudby; and London. During these meetings the Review Team took oral evidence from well over 200 people.

Some of those whom the Review Team met supplemented their oral evidence with written submissions. The Commission has also received other written submissions and comments, solicited and unsolicited, from individuals who live in the Yorkshire dioceses or have connections with them.

Those from whom the Commission has received oral or written evidence or both are listed below. Styles, titles and offices are as at the time of the meeting or submission of evidence. We apologize for any omissions or inaccuracies.

Diocese of Bradford

Rt Revd David James Bishop of Bradford
Very Revd David Ison Dean of Bradford
Ven. Dr David Lee Archdeacon of Bradford
Ven. Paul Slater Archdeacon of Craven
Revd Canon John Nowell Chair, House of Clergy
Sallie Bassham Chair, House of Laity
Sharron Arnold Chair, Diocesan Board of Finance
Malcolm Halliday Diocesan Secretary
Revd Canon Andrew Williams Residiitary Canon, Bradford Cathedral
Revd Preb. Patrick Dearnley (retired)
Revd Canon Malcolm Grundy former Archdeacon of Craven
Revd Canon Sam Randall Bishop’s Officer for Church in the World

Ewecross Deanery

Revd Ian Greenhalgh Rural Dean, Ewecross Deanery
Revd Peter Boyles Incumbent of Dent with Cowgill
Revd Canon Alan Fell Incumbent of Sedbergh, Cautley and Garsdale; Priest-in-Charge, Firbank, Howgill and Killington
Col. Tony Reed-Screen Churchwarden, Sedbergh

Bowland and Skipton Deaneries

Revd Roger Wood Rural Dean, Bowland Deanery
Revd John Lancaster Incumbent of Barnoldswick with Bracewell
Yvonne Cummer Churchwarden, Barnoldswick
Revd Hugh Fielden Incumbent of Earby with Kelbrooke
Vera Cocker Churchwarden, Earby
Liz Grose Churchwarden, Kelbrooke
Revd Eric Kyte Priest-in-Charge, Gisburn and Hellifield
Revd Gillian Mack Priest-in-Charge, Hurst Green and Mitton

45 Meeting with officers of the four Yorkshire-based Methodist districts.
### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revd Mark Russell-Smith</td>
<td>Priest-in-Charge, Slaidburn and Longpreston with Tosside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Matthew</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Longpreston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Johnston</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Longpreston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Johnston</td>
<td>Reader, Slaidburn and Longpreston with Tosside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd John Brocklehurst</td>
<td>Priest-in-Charge, Waddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Whitwell</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Waddington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Calverley Deanery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revd Paul Tudge</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Calverley Deanery and Priest-in-Charge, Farsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Ashby</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Pudsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Paul Ayers</td>
<td>Incumbent of Pudsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Nicholas Clews</td>
<td>Priest-in-Charge, Woodhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercia Hayes</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Woodhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Dominic Mughal</td>
<td>Community Outreach Priest, Calverley Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O’Neil</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Farsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Pickard</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Calverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd John Walker</td>
<td>Incumbent of Calverley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Otley Deanery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revd Cayte Norman</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Otley Deanery and Priest-in-Charge, Rawdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Graham Atherton</td>
<td>Incumbent of Guiseley with Esholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Graham Buttonshaw</td>
<td>Incumbent, Otley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Gill</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Otley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin King</td>
<td>Guiseley with Esholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Lockwood</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Yeadon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Milner</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Otley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Read</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Rawdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Richard Walker</td>
<td>Incumbent of Yeadon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Diocese of Ripon & Leeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rt Revd John Packer</td>
<td>Bishop of Ripon &amp; Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt Revd James Bell</td>
<td>Bishop of Knaresborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Revd Keith Jukes</td>
<td>Dean of Ripon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven. Peter Burrows</td>
<td>Archdeacon of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven. Janet Henderson</td>
<td>Archdeacon of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Canon Tony Shepherd</td>
<td>Chair, House of Clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Nichols</td>
<td>Chair, House of Laity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alastair Thompson</td>
<td>Chair, Diocesan Board of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Arundel</td>
<td>Diocesan Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Clive Sedgwick</td>
<td>Director of Education, Dioceses of Bradford and Ripon &amp; Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Canon Paul Greenwell</td>
<td>Precentor, Ripon Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Canon Keith Punshon</td>
<td>Chancellor, Ripon Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Alan Glasby</td>
<td>Incumbent, Richmond East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Richmond Archdeaconry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revd Nigel Sinclair</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Harrogate Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Caldwell</td>
<td>Lay Chair, Harrogate Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Stan Howarth</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Richmond Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Nicholls</td>
<td>Lay Chair, Richmond Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Mark Tanner</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Ripon Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Williams</td>
<td>Lay Chair, Ripon Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Dr Julie Nelson</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Wensley Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Warden</td>
<td>Lay Chair, Wensley Deanery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Richmond Deanery
Ven. Dr Stephen Adesanya Priest-in-Charge, Romaldkirk and Laithkirk; Startforth and Bowes and Rokeby with Brignall
Mary Shepherd Romaldkirk
Carol Lynn Cotherstone (parish of Romaldkirk)
Margaret Walton Laithkirk
Peter Nicholls Bowes
Andrew Bracey Bowes
Peter Hughes Brignall
John Hare Brignall
Tony Orton Barningham
Marian Lewis Hutton Magna
Keith Miller Wycliffe

### Leeds Parish Church
Revd Canon Tony Bundock Team Rector of Leeds
Peter Hart Churchwarden, Leeds Parish Church

### Diocese of Sheffield
Rt Revd Steven Croft Bishop of Sheffield
Very Revd Peter Bradley Dean of Sheffield
Ven. Bob Fitzharris Archdeacon of Doncaster
Revd Ian Smith Chair, House of Clergy
Canon Sandra Newton Chair, Diocesan Board of Finance
Malcolm Fair Diocesan Secretary

### Snaith and Hatfield Deanery
Revd Canon Cyril Roberts Area Dean, Snaith and Hatfield Deanery
Ken Barclay Hook
Shaun Clarkson Reader, Marshlands
David Dunstan Adlingfleet
Zoe Greenacre Airmyn
Revd Peter Hibbs NSM, Great Snaith
Revd Geoff Hollingsworth former Incumbent of Airmyn, Hook and Rawcliffe
Revd Ken Sargeantson NSM, Marshlands
Revd Tony Sophianou Incumbent of Goole
Francis Sykes Rawcliffe
Ian Wood Great Snaith

### Diocese of Wakefield
Rt Revd Stephen Platten Bishop of Wakefield
Rt Revd Tony Robinson Bishop of Pontefract
Very Revd Jonathan Greener Dean of Wakefield
Ven. Peter Townley Archdeacon of Wakefield
Ven. Robert Freeman Archdeacon of Halifax; Chair, Diocesan Board of Finance
Revd Canon Tony Macpherson Chair, House of Clergy
Mary Judkins Chair, House of Laity
Ashley Ellis Diocesan Secretary
Kay France Secretary, South Crosland PCC
Revd Canon Ian Gaskell General Synod member
Dr Edmund Marshall General Synod member
# Appendix

## Deaneries in Kirklees and Calderdale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revd James Allison</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Calder Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Dr Stephen Bradberry</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Halifax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd David Burrows</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Brighouse and Elland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Corps</td>
<td>Lay Chair, Huddersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Canon Catherine Ogle</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Huddersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Simon Pitcher</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Birstall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Richard Steel</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Almondbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Storr</td>
<td>Lay Chair, Calder Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Morley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Aveyard</td>
<td>Morley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Amanda Baraugh</td>
<td>Incumbent, West Ardsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Glen Coggins</td>
<td>Incumbent, East Ardsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Kathleen Davis</td>
<td>Assistant curate, Morley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Hargreaves</td>
<td>Churchwarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Canon Felicity Lawson</td>
<td>Incumbent, Gildersome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Pearce</td>
<td>Gildersome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Robert Sutherland</td>
<td>Assistant curate, Morley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Townsend</td>
<td>Woodkirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Wainwright</td>
<td>Drighlington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Barnsley Deanery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revd Stephen Race</td>
<td>Rural Dean, Barnsley Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Cockcroft</td>
<td>Royston; Lay Chair of Barnsley Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Neville</td>
<td>Royston; Secretary of Barnsley Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Canon Rodney Marshall</td>
<td>Dean, Transfiguration Chapter and Incumbent of Athersley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Bell</td>
<td>Monk Bretton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Burton</td>
<td>Athersley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Paul Cartwright</td>
<td>Assistant curate, Athersley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd June Crossland</td>
<td>NSM, Staincross and Monk Bretton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Crossland</td>
<td>Penistone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Jean Dakin</td>
<td>NSM, Cawthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Fletcher</td>
<td>Barnsley St Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin Gumbrell</td>
<td>Athersley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd David Munby</td>
<td>Incumbent, Barnsley St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Patrick Duckworth</td>
<td>Priest-in-Charge, St Mary, Barnsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Fletcher</td>
<td>Barnsley St Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd David Hopkin</td>
<td>Incumbent of Pensitone and Thurlstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Mowbray</td>
<td>Cawthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Peter Needham</td>
<td>Incumbent of Grimethorpe with Brierley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd David Nicholson</td>
<td>Incumbent, Cudworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Mark Poskitt</td>
<td>Priest-in-charge, Gawber and Barnsley St Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Stuart Ramsden</td>
<td>Retired priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Simon Reynolds</td>
<td>Priest-in-charge, Cawthorne and Darton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryl Sargisson</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Grimethorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Shaw</td>
<td>Cudworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Street</td>
<td>Cudworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Sturgess</td>
<td>Churchwarden, Barnsley St Peter and St John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Sturgess</td>
<td>Vice-Chair of PCC, Barnsley St Peter and St John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Selby District parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revd Adrian Judd</td>
<td>Incumbent, Went Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd Edward Woodcock</td>
<td>Priest-in-Charge, Brotherton, Ferrybridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Diocese of York

Most Revd and Rt Hon. Dr John Sentamu Archbishop of York
Rt Revd Richard Frith Bishop of Hull
Rt Revd Martin Wallace Bishop of Selby
Rt Revd Martin Warner Bishop of Whitby
Rt Revd Martyn Jarrett Bishop of Beverley,
Assistant Bishop in the Dioceses of Bradford, Durham, Liverpool,
Ripon & Leeds, Sheffield, Sodor & Man, Southwell &
Nottingham and Wakefield

Very Revd Keith Jones Dean of York
Ven. Paul Ferguson Archdeacon of Cleveland
Ven. Richard Seed Archdeacon of York
Canon Peter Warry Diocesan Secretary
Lionel Lennox Diocesan and Provincial Registrar

Easingwold Deanery
Revd Canon John Harrison Rural Dean, Easingwold Deanery
Jenny Mitchell Lay Chair, Easingwold Deanery

Mowbray Deanery
Revd Canon Richard Rowling Rural Dean, Mowbray Deanery
Bobby Cooper Lay Chair, Mowbray Deanery

New Ainsty Deanery
Revd Peter Bristow Rural Dean of New Ainsty Deanery
Incumbent of Boston Spa,
Priest-in-Charge, Thorp Arch with Walton, Bramham
Revd Ken Gabbadon Priest-in-Charge, Clifford
Val Gausden PCC Secretary, Clifford
Doreen Lister Churchwarden, Walton
Revd Stanley Menzies Assistant Priest, Bramham
Anne Palmer Chair of Group Council, Bramham
David Spurr Churchwarden and Treasurer, Thorp Arch

Selby Deanery
Revd Chris Wilton Rural Dean, Selby Deanery
Barry Bennett Churchwarden, Ledsham with Fairburn
Sara Fawcett Churchwarden, Aberford
Revd Bernard Fray Priest-in-Charge, Aberford and Micklefield
Revd Andrew Robinson Priest-in-Charge, Ledsham with Fairburn
Alec Walton Churchwarden, Micklefield

Bishops of Other Dioceses

Rt Revd Mark Bryant Bishop of Jarrow
Rt Revd James Newcome Bishop of Carlisle
Rt Revd Nicholas Reade Bishop of Blackburn
Rt Revd John Saxbee Bishop of Lincoln
Representatives of Other Churches and Ecumenical Bodies

Rt Revd John Rawsthorne  Roman Catholic Bishop of Hallam
Rt Revd Arthur Roche  Roman Catholic Bishop of Leeds
Mgr Philip Moger  Dean of St Anne's Roman Catholic Cathedral, Leeds
Revd Vernon Marsh  Chair, Sheffield Methodist District
Revd Peter Whittaker  Chair, West Yorkshire Methodist District
Revd Dr Elizabeth Smith  Chair, Leeds Methodist District
Michael Noble  District Development Enabler, Leeds and West Yorks Districts
Revd Kevin Watson  Moderator, Yorkshire Synod of the United Reformed Church
Revd Ernie Whalley  Regional Minister for Ministry, Yorkshire Baptist Association
Revd Kenneth Evans  Chairman, Yorkshire District of the Moravian Church
Revd Dr Clive Barrett  County Ecumenical Development Officer and Executive Secretary of the West Yorkshire Ecumenical Council

Lord Lieutenants

Dr Ingrid Roscoe  Lord Lieutenant of West Yorkshire
Lord Crathorne  Lord Lieutenant of North Yorkshire
David Moody  Lord Lieutenant of South Yorkshire

Local Authority Councillors and Officers

Cllr Steve Houghton  Leader, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Cllr Bill Newman  Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Phil Coppard  Chief Executive, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Elizabeth Wright  Mayor’s Secretary, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Cllr Kris Hopkins  Leader of Bradford City Council
Mary Weastell  Strategic Director, Performance and Commissioning, Bradford City Council
Philip Hume  Acting Head of Neighbourhoods & Community Engagement, Calderdale Borough Council
David More  Head of Regeneration, Calderdale Borough Council
Cllr Chris Knowles-Fitton  Leader of Craven District Council
Colin Iveson  Head of Democratic Services, Craven District Council
Alan Menzies  Director of Planning & Economic Regeneration, East Riding Council
Cllr John Frost  Mayor of Goole
Cllr Beryl Beck Taylor  Goole and East Riding Councils
Cllr Jean Kitchen  Goole and East Riding Councils
Cllr Brian Rust  Goole Town Council
Brian Robertson  Chief Executive, Goole Town Council
Phillip Morton  Deputy Chief Executive, Hambleton and Richmondshire District Councils
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Mike Gardner</td>
<td>Leader, Harrogate Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Sampson</td>
<td>Chief Executive, Harrogate Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Andrew Marchington</td>
<td>Kirklees Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Hume</td>
<td>Head of Policy &amp; Governance, Kirklees Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Andrew Carter</td>
<td>Leader, Leeds City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Stewart Golton</td>
<td>Leeds City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Rogerson</td>
<td>Chief Executive, Leeds City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Gay</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Executive &amp; Director of Resources, Leeds City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rogers</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Executive, Planning, Policy &amp; Improvement, Leeds City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Knott</td>
<td>Head of Civic &amp; Ceremonial Support, Leeds City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr John Savage</td>
<td>Chairman, North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr John Weighell</td>
<td>Leader, North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Welbourn</td>
<td>Director of Children and Young People's Services, North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Roney, OBE</td>
<td>Chief Executive, Wakefield County Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Chris Abbott</td>
<td>Chairman, The Yorkshire Ridings Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupert Barnes</td>
<td>Trustee, The Historic Counties Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd John Lees</td>
<td>(retired)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>