Church Buildings Council Suggested Template for a Diocesan Strategic Review of Church Buildings as part of Mission Planning

Contents

Introduction - Scope and Context

The national context is set out in the Church Buildings Review, which reported in January 2016. It was chaired by the Rt Reverend Dr John Inge, Bishop of Worcester and Chair of the Cathedral and Church Buildings Division. It gives the parameters for this diocesan strategic review. The Review states that:

What is understood by 'open for worship' has evolved over time depending on local contexts and will need to evolve further for some buildings over the coming years. Legislation needs to facilitate this.

More generally, the overall legislative framework governing the use and management of church buildings needs to be simpler, less prescriptive and less burdensome for laity and clergy. There needs to be more flexibility to reflect the wide diversity of local situations.

Dioceses need to integrate thinking about their church buildings with their mission and ministry planning. Regular diocesan strategic reviews, taking account of diocesan and deanery plans, mission action plans and parish audits are important for ensuring that buildings issues are given their proper weight- neither dominating nor being overlooked or regarded as a specialist subject.

Examples provided of mission planning focussing on activity at various levels included:

- *Diocesan strategic plans including planning for buildings, sometimes facilitated by deploying Places of Worship Support Officers part funded by Historic England.*
- *Diocesan surveys of parishes regarding challenges and opportunities offered by buildings.*
- *Categorisation of churches, e.g. as 'mission' or 'festival' churches.*
- *Deaneries expected to consider the viability and use of buildings when drawing up their deanery plans.*
- *Mission communities carrying out buildings audits to discover how best they may enable work of mission and ministry in their area and assessing budgetary implications.*
- *Parishes being encouraged to identify Growth Action Planning goals including missional use of buildings.*
- *Use of toolkits to assist parishes in creative use of their buildings.*
- *Promoting united alternate worship patterns in church buildings between parishes in united benefices*
- *Church plants where there are declining congregations. Installation of facilities or improvement of church buildings as a priority in enabling parishes to be better positioned to achieve missional growth.*

The Diocese's Strategic Review

In response to this and using / adapting a draft template provided by the Church Buildings Council (CBC), the diocese formed a Review Group, which was asked:

How can our church buildings support and enable the mission for witness and action in the community?

It is the opinion of this group, reflected in the Church Buildings Review, that a sustainable 'top-down' single strategy for church buildings is unachievable since PCCs enjoy a certain level of autonomy as separate and distinct charities.

However, the NCI's and the diocese can provide parameters and structures within which local decisions can be made, and give appropriate support within the available resources.

The group therefore concentrated on ways of easing the burden of maintaining a church building and freeing PCCs from some of the anxiety experienced in caring for their church, to enable mission activity to flourish. This is set within the context that many exciting projects are happening in our church buildings and they are generally in excellent condition.

The burden of maintaining, insuring, repairing and adapting these buildings can fall on a small number of people with little or no experience in looking after a listed, possibly Grade 1 medieval building. This report recognises that PCCs often struggle in this regard. It makes recommendations to the Bishop's Council and Diocesan Synod to assist our churches to become actively sustainable into the future.

Many of our churches are rightly the pride of their community, but they also take up a huge amount of time and resources for both clergy and lay alike. Together we can aim to form a strategy that will make them better equipped to be centres of mission and ministry. The Diocesan Advisory Committee (DAC), working with other groups and with the Church Buildings Officer […], can ease the burden for PCCs, and release energy for mission, using the potential of our buildings where this is possible.

The Strategy Review Group was convened in […] and reported / had meetings […]

The members of the Review Group were:

Papers or presentations were received from:

Regular meetings will be held to review progress on:

Part 1: The Statistics and their use for diocesan, deanery and parish audits

The picture seen from national and diocesan level

There are […] open churches in the diocese of […]. […] percent of them are listed as buildings of national significance (see Fig 1), with […] Grade I churches, […] Grade II*, […] Grade II and […] unlisted. These churches are not just heritage assets, they are the repository of their communities' memories and often the only local public building, treasured by many outside the regular worshipping congregation.

Fig 1: The National Picture in Key Statistics– how the diocese compares

Dia. No.	Diocese	Population (mid 2016)	Area (sq miles)	Number of churches	No of stipendiary clergy (31st December 2016)	No of FTE stipendiary clergy (31st December 2016)	Attendance (Average weekly Adult+ Child attendance, 2016)	Attendance (Usual Sunday adult+ Usual Sunday child 2016)	Worshipping community (All age, 2016)	Population per church (2011 census)	% church in diocese in Rural areas (2016 census rurality)	% church grade 1	% church grade 2*	% church grade 2	% church Ungraded	Average weekly attendance per church	% Average weekly attendance per capita	Usual Sunday attendance per church	% Usual Sunday Attendance per capita	Worshipping community per church	% Worshipping community per capita	Churches per FTE stipend clergy	Parish Share Paid (% paid or requested 2016)	% Heritage At Risk (2017)
1	Bath & Wells	947,000	1,610	560	207	198	21,750	18,140	25,950	1,691	80%	33%	37%	19%	12%	39	2.3%	32	1.9%	46	2.7%	2.8	98%	5.7%
2	Birmingham	1,564,000	290	184	157	154	16,830	13,130	21,150	8,500	19%	8%	14%	23%	55%	91	1.1%	71	0.8%	115	1.4%	1.2	92%	1.4%
3	Blackburn	1,341,000	930	272	168	161	23,780	18,670	26,220	4,930	40%	5%	14%	32%	50%	87	1.8%	69	1.4%	96	2.0%	1.7	86%	4.2%
5	Bristol	1,019,000	470	202	108	106	14,070	11,360	18,010	5,045	41%	27%	26%	19%	28%	70	1.4%	56	1.1%	89	1.8%	1.9	101%	3.1%
6	Canterbury	1,128,000	1,050	361	146	130	21,940	17,190	26,630	3,125	64%	42%	20%	11%	27%	61	1.9%	48	1.5%	74	2.4%	2.8	93%	4.9%
7	Carlisle	496,000	2,570	335	114	110	12,620	9,680	14,150	1,481	86%	12%	18%	34%	36%	38	2.5%	29	2.0%	42	2.9%	3.0	101%	4.1%
8	Chelmsford	3,176,000	1,530	579	347	338	36,840	29,320	44,090	5,485	50%	26%	22%	13%	40%	64	1.2%	51	0.9%	76	1.4%	1.7	94%	2.5%
9	Chester	1,630,000	1,030	343	249	226	32,610	23,480	37,640	4,752	39%	10%	16%	33%	40%	95	2.0%	68	1.4%	110	2.3%	1.5	92%	4.8%
10	Chichester	1,680,000	1,450	481	265	253	36,970	30,300	48,240	3,493	59%	33%	17%	15%	36%	77	2.2%	63	1.8%	100	2.9%	1.9	100%	3.6%
11	Coventry	867,000	700	242	107	102	14,770	11,550	17,370	3,583	62%	20%	30%	24%	26%	61	1.7%	48	1.3%	72	2.0%	2.4	99%	3.7%
12	Derby	1,050,000	990	317	144	140	15,240	11,440	17,950	3,312	57%	18%	22%	29%	31%	48	1.5%	36	1.1%	57	1.7%	2.3	93%	5.1%
13	Durham	1,484,000	980	268	151	148	19,650	12,230	19,620	5,537	41%	13%	7%	34%	47%	73	1.3%	46	0.8%	73	1.3%	1.8	100%	3.4%
14	Ely	764,000	1,530	332	133	127	16,840	13,470	22,030	2,301	76%	41%	37%	10%	12%	51	2.2%	41	1.8%	66	2.9%	2.6	96%	2.2%
15	Exeter	1,177,000	2,570	603	212	201	23,290	19,270	25,740	1,952	78%	35%	30%	16%	19%	39	2.0%	32	1.6%	43	2.2%	3.0	94%	8.2%
16	Gloucester	663,000	1,130	385	124	120	17,940	14,100	23,320	1,722	75%	34%	31%	20%	15%	47	2.7%	37	2.1%	61	3.5%	3.2	101%	6.4%
17	Guildford	1,052,000	530	212	187	180	23,890	19,430	31,830	4,962	33%	13%	20%	28%	39%	113	2.3%	92	1.8%	150	3.0%	1.2	100%	2.6%
18	Hereford	326,000	1,650	403	89	86	9,850	7,780	12,750	809	93%	23%	38%	20%	19%	24	3.0%	19	2.4%	32	3.9%	4.7	95%	9.0%
19	Leicester	1,037,000	830	314	126	123	13,190	11,340	18,220	3,303	67%	16%	48%	17%	18%	42	1.3%	36	1.1%	58	1.8%	2.6	96%	5.8%
20	Lichfield	2,141,000	1,730	562	277	262	30,510	23,840	44,390	3,810	55%	10%	22%	27%	40%	54	1.4%	42	1.1%	79	2.1%	2.1	98%	2.8%
21	Lincoln	1,071,000	2,670	627	163	163	15,380	13,250	18,660	1,708	85%	37%	23%	23%	18%	25	1.4%	21	1.2%	30	1.7%	3.9	90%	5.9%
22	Liverpool	1,596,000	390	241	186	183	23,350	16,950	25,250	6,622	12%	5%	11%	27%	57%	97	1.5%	70	1.1%	105	1.6%	1.3	99%	7.2%
23	London	4,299,000	280	492	532	521	70,630	57,470	89,390	8,738	1%	16%	19%	27%	38%	144	1.6%	117	1.3%	182	2.1%	0.9	104%	8.5%
24	Manchester	2,153,000	420	314	215	211	27,240	20,360	28,400	6,857	5%	4%	9%	35%	51%	87	1.3%	65	0.9%	90	1.3%	1.5	86%	8.5%
25	Newcastle	818,000	2,100	237	121	118	13,490	9,500	14,190	3,451	62%	19%	10%	34%	37%	57	1.6%	40	1.2%	60	1.7%	2.0	92%	4.7%
26	Norwich	905,000	1,800	639	184	172	17,480	16,340	22,580	1,416	87%	46%	38%	4%	11%	27	1.9%	26	1.8%	35	2.5%	3.7	92%	6.4%
27	Oxford	2,375,000	2,210	815	378	371	48,450	41,110	64,790	2,914	67%	25%	35%	18%	22%	59	2.0%	50	1.7%	79	2.7%	2.2	97%	2.2%
28	Peterborough	910,000	1,140	381	157	151	15,290	12,820	21,960	2,388	79%	34%	40%	7%	13%	40	1.7%	34	1.4%	58	2.4%	2.5	94%	5.4%
29	Portsmouth	784,000	420	170	105	98	12,110	9,530	15,430	4,612	45%	17%	20%	35%	28%	71	1.5%	56	1.2%	91	2.0%	1.7	100%	8.2%
31	Rochester	1,351,000	540	261	209	201	24,370	19,850	31,070	5,176	39%	20%	20%	17%	43%	93	1.8%	76	1.5%	119	2.3%	1.3	90%	2.1%
32	St. Albans	1,917,000	1,120	408	251	242	30,180	22,380	34,320	4,699	53%	31%	23%	19%	26%	74	1.6%	55	1.2%	84	1.8%	1.7	97%	1.6%
33	St. Edms & Ipswich	663,000	1,430	479	128	124	14,300	12,710	17,760	1,395	87%	49%	36%	7%	8%	30	2.1%	27	1.9%	37	2.7%	3.9	94%	2.6%
34	Salisbury	948,000	2,050	570	200	196	22,890	18,990	31,210	1,663	81%	32%	33%	21%	14%	40	2.4%	35	2.1%	55	3.3%	2.9	98%	2.1%
35	Sheffield	1,287,000	610	213	126	125	16,250	12,080	19,510	6,042	28%	15%	12%	27%	47%	76	1.3%	57	0.9%	92	1.5%	1.7	97%	5.5%
37	Southwark	2,852,000	320	356	332	326	39,420	32,490	52,180	8,011	9%	8%	15%	24%	53%	111	1.4%	91	1.1%	147	1.8%	1.1	94%	2.7%
38	Southwell & Nottingham	1,140,000	840	300	121	113	14,020	11,890	18,700	3,800	60%	31%	21%	20%	28%	47	1.2%	40	1.0%	62	1.6%	2.7	90%	6.0%
39	Truro	557,000	1,390	306	93	89	10,420	8,220	11,540	1,820	88%	40%	23%	17%	19%	34	1.9%	27	1.5%	38	2.1%	3.5	86%	8.3%
41	Winchester	1,233,000	1,130	357	160	158	22,940	19,120	26,340	3,454	62%	18%	23%	29%	30%	64	1.9%	54	1.6%	75	2.2%	2.3	100%	2.0%
42	Worcester	883,000	670	276	116	115	12,120	9,350	13,600	3,199	61%	17%	28%	24%	31%	44	1.4%	34	1.1%	49	1.5%	2.4	85%	6.4%
43	York	1,438,000	2,670	588	212	207	26,250	19,470	28,760	2,446	74%	25%	23%	27%	25%	45	1.8%	33	1.4%	49	2.0%	2.8	101%	4.7%
46	Leeds	2,723,000	2,630	613	347	337	35,710	26,640	39,260	4,442	46%	14%	14%	44%	28%	58	1.3%	43	1.0%	64	1.4%	1.8	93%	6.3%

(This chart can be accessed and downloaded as a live spreadsheet on ChurchCare)

As can be seen from the table in Fig 1, this diocese has the highest / lowest […] and the […] population per church building. The statistics clarify the position of the diocese in the context of the wider church, and how we compare with our neighbours. This means […]

This data, which will be renewed annually, has been compiled by combining information held on the Church Heritage Record and by the national Research and Statistics Department, both accessible through the central hub https://cofeportal.org/login.

Deanery audits of buildings and Deanery Plans

The diocese will support Deanery buildings audits to support their Mission Plans by providing the data for each deanery, using the above resources, as shown below in Fig 2.   This will include other church plant, such as church halls. The Church Commissioners have produced draft guidance on how to write a Deanery Plan and how it can be used, which is attached as Appendix 1.

Recommendation

That the diocese takes the initiative and:

- supports Deaneries in collating the data shown in Fig 2 and in maintaining and using it

- Supports Deaneries in producing their plans, showing how they have included the buildings data in their mission planning

- Produces an annual overview of progress with the data collection and how it feeds into strategy and mission plans at diocesan and deanery level.

Codes				Church Building				People					Finance 2016	Wider Community			
Deanery ID	Benefice ID	Parish ID	Church ID	Name	Grade	QI	Condition	Clergy	LLM etc	El Roll	USA	AWA	UnRInc-Pshare	Comm Active	Population	IMD	Rank/%
30209	30/020X	300412	630412	Ambridge: St Stephen	0	2015	Fair	1	4	143	71	100	£ 24,584.00	Y	2771	5891	46.7%
30209	30/097CM	300671	630272	Penny Hassett: St James	2	2006	Fair	0.5	1.5	11	22	30	£ -	Y	722	7958	63.1%
30209	30/097CM	300671	630422	Lower Loxley: St Mary	1	2011	Fair	0.5	1.5	122	52	70	£ 32,809.00	N	1890	11819	93.8%
30209	30/097CM	300424	630424	Loxley Barrett: St Luke	0	2013	Fair	0.5	1.5	86	60	140	£ 38,041.00	Y	1106	9372	74.4%
30209	30/097CM	300287	630287	Leyton Cross: All Saints	1	2011	Fair	0.5	1.5	44	19	19	N/A	N	below 500	N/A	N/A
30209	30/143BF	300415	630415	Waterley Cross: St Nicholas	2	2015	Fair	0.5	0	68	24	28	N/A	Y	1741	10275	81.5%
30209	30/143BF	300417	630417	Hollerton: Christ Church	2	2008	Fair	0.5	0	31	22	43	N/A	N	604	6599	52.3%
30209	30/344BP	300418	630418	Edgeley: St John the Evangelist	0	2014	Good	0.3	1.3	73	32	300	£ 11,706.00	N	987	8553	67.8%
30209	30/344BP	300418	630419	Darrington: All Saints	0	2014	Fair	0.2	1.2	9	11	15	£ -	N	0	0	0
30209	30/344BP	300420	630420	Felpersham: Christ Church	0	2008	Good	0.5	1.5	107	83	168	N/A	Y	5001	9540	75.7%
30209	30/345BK	300410	630410	Little Croxley: St Saviour	2	2012	Fair	1.5	1.5	70	34	44	£ 8,768.00	Y	934	11463	90.9%
30209	30/345BK	300421	630421	Felpersham: S.Michael and All Angels	2*	2012	Poor	1.5	1.5	161	76	99	£ 23,635.00	Y	9066	7724	61.3%

Fig 2: The local picture – how each Deanery fits within the diocese (example taken from a fictionalised deanery, courtesy of Pat Evemy).

- The **codes** data are defined by the National dataset held by the Church of England's Statistics and research team

- The **Church Building** data is found on the Church Heritage Record and are taken from 2012 national condition survey

- The **People** data are provided by Crockfords (Clergy numbers) and are also available on My Diocese and the CMS. CCB do not have access to the number of lay roles per diocese. For these numbers to be included within a national dataset, it would be necessary to export this data from My Diocese or the CMS, with benefice codes, and send this data to James Miles. Clergy and LLM are defined per Benefice but have been apportioned to the number of churches in a benefice. These include the total number of all possible Clergy and LLM, Readers, Church Army etc. Electoral Roll and Usual Sunday Attendance, and Average Weekly Attendance are taken from Parish mission statistics. These are defined per parish.

- The **Finance** data are taken from Parish Finance returns. The figure given is the total unrestricted income, less Parish share paid showing the revenue left for running and maintaining the church. This is defined per parish.

- The **Wider Community** data includes Comm Active (available through a Church Near You), the parish population, the Index of Multiple Deprivation, and their rank percentage (1 = the most deprived)

(This chart can be accessed and downloaded as a live spreadsheet on ChurchCare)

A separate spreadsheet per diocese of this data has been created by the CBC's Digital Projects Manager. Due to the sensitive and private nature of this data, this will not be shared online. Instead, to access this tool, please email James Miles (james.miles@churchofengland.org) who will provide this data to the relevant persons. This data can be complied separately by each diocese through the data they already hold, but through this tool, a great deal of time can be saved accessing and reviewing this data.

Parish audits of buildings

The "Crossing the Threshold - developing church buildings for community use" national toolkit for developing church buildings for community use produced by the Diocese of Hereford and partners including the CBC was recently relaunched, and is available on ChurchCare and from the diocese of Hereford website.

https://www.hereford.anglican.org/Crossingthethresholdtoolkit/

This contains comprehensive advice on how to do a parish audit, as a necessary precursor to developing a project. As it states in the relevant Chapter 2 of this document;

"The basic aim of most projects is likely to be that more people use the building and benefit from so doing. So you need to find out exactly what your local community wants from its church. This is your opportunity to create a plan of action led by the local community. Bear in mind, the result of a consultation may mean that you have to change your original ideas".

Such an audit will include other buildings belonging to the parish such as church halls, but also take into account other facilities provided by other groups, including secular organisations (like village halls, community centres), and other denominations and faith groups.

Recommendation

While it is likely that such comprehensive audits will usually only be undertaken when a development project is being considered, the Diocese recommends the general approach to all parishes as part of their mission planning.

Part 2: Roles of churches

This section looks at defining the roles of our church buildings more clearly so that they can fulfil their potential, and support or other action as necessary can be tailored to their needs. The Deanery Audits and Plans and (where available) parish buildings audits would provide the information needed to make this decision.

Recommendation

The diocese should work with the deaneries to seek to place all churches within one of these categories, after discussing this with them.

Parish churches and chapels-of-ease

These churches provide a traditional model of ministry, mission and outreach and are comfortable doing so, which may include innovative complementary uses and partnerships as set out in Part 3.

The way that parishes are organised can provide relief to understaffed PCCs. The parish has existed as the primary building block in the Church of England for centuries. Increasingly however, parishes are struggling to find sufficient numbers of people to be on a PCC. Each PCC needs two churchwardens, a treasurer and a secretary and the number of vacant positions grows each year.

The Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 offers a framework allowing parishes to unite thereby reducing the number of PCCs. Hence parish A may unite with parish B creating the new parish of A with B. Alternatively, one church can remain a parish church and the other become a chapel-of-ease, or a PCC can be formed which covers several parish churches within a benefice.

Recommendation

Deanery Plans should study the options available including the uniting of parishes, and look at how management of parish churches within multi-parish benefices can be best provided, perhaps separating buildings maintenance work from mission planning to allow enough space for the latter. Trusts can be set up to manage the maintenance of the building(s); advice on this can be found on ChurchCare and in this document (Part 3).

Festival Churches

References have recently been made in the Church Buildings Review and elsewhere to 'Festival Churches', some dioceses prefer other names such as "Celebration" or "Heritage" churches for the same concept. This model may work best within a local

pastoral reordering as set out under chapels-of-ease above, and within the framework of a Deanery Plan or other strategic mission objective.

Under Canons B 11 (Of Morning and Evening Prayer in parish churches) and the first part of B 14 (Of Holy Communion in parish churches), each parish church is required to celebrate Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer and Holy Communion on every Sunday (and on feast days). Canon B 14A (Of services in churches and other places of worship) empowers the Bishop to dispense with this requirement.

The Bishop, in doing so, must "ensure that no such church ceases altogether to be used for public worship". Forthcoming changes (from February 2019) to Canon B 14A mean that this can be expanded to a large number of churches, allowing them to have more freedom and flexibility in organising services and other uses for the building as laid out in Part 3, as needed in that parish.

This flexibility can avoid the requirement for a predetermined and inflexible rota of services in a number of isolated rural churches, which can lead to poorly attended services, a sense of failure and a waste of resources.

Recommendation

That information is circulated concerning the ability of a church to become a 'Festival Church' through all available channels, and that the diocese should support churches considering this model, working with the CBC and the Association of Festival Churches. See: http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/open-sustainable/association-of-festival-churches

Resource or Resourcing Churches

These are large churches, often in urban locations and often "planted", which are identified as having potential for growth and possible expansion, which may need to be supported or learned from. Some of these may have a special role which may go beyond the parish, deanery and even diocesan boundaries. Resourcing Churches may use existing church buildings, or appropriate others for their use.

Work is currently underway to explore the idea of rural Resourcing Churches, which may grow from Fresh Expressions Groups, or be strategically planted into market towns, with the intention of further planting into the countryside around. This model might work well with existing parish churches and chapels-of-ease or Festival Churches, which can provide traditional ministry and services such as weddings and funerals at the local level to complement Resourcing Churches.

Recommendation

Deanery Plans should clearly show how this is to be taken forward in a structured way, which complements rather than competes with existing congregations, buildings and parochial structures; if local resources are not in place to do this, the diocese should be asked to consider how it may give support. The possibilities of planting within the diocese and even outside it should be considered as part of the diocesan strategy. Bishops Mission Orders should be used where appropriate.

Major (and Greater) Parish Churches

Major Churches as identified by the CBC may require a higher level of attention from the diocese and the CBC due to their special functions, significance and potential. The list and searchable map can be found on the Church Heritage Record. The criteria and more detail can be found here:
http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/major-parish-churches

The CBC has recommended that all churches in this group should as a minimum compile **Conservation Management Plans** to allow them to recognise the risks they face and maximise their potential, with which the CBC can help. See ChurchCare for information on CMPs.
http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/guidance-advice/making-changes-to-your-building/conservation-management-plans

Recommendation

If a church is not on the present CBC list, an application can be made to the CBC who will assess it against their criteria. If the church makes the list the CBC offers to visit the church and discuss possible ways forward. The report recommends that information is circulated concerning the ability of suitable churches in the diocese to become a 'Major Church' through all available channels. Further to this, Major Churches should be encouraged to work together and learn from each other's examples, forming a local group which meets regularly and communicates through an online forum and/or social media.

Minsters

Although not clearly defined legally, the new status of Minster (as opposed to an historic honorific title) can be conferred by the Bishop to allow a church building to adopt an extra- or super-parochial role beyond that of a parish church. This can be adapted to circumstances but should always be carefully considered within an overall diocesan mission plan.

Recommendation

That possible candidates for Minsters are considered, although the final decision will be made by the Bishop. Bishops Mission Orders should be used where appropriate.

New churches

The population of the diocese is increasing and new homes are planned in existing towns and villages across the diocese. There may be occasions where a new church building should be considered, and where new housing developments are planned, representations should be made to the local authority that provision should be made for a place of worship. Fresh Expressions Groups or other new forms of church congregations may also come to need a permanent building.

Recommendation

The report recommends that the DAC Secretary and the Director of Mission liaise at an early stage in such cases. Sometimes a new church can be created within a new development on the site of an existing church which is demolished, using the benefits of sale of part of the plot; this can be achieved under faculty. The CBC should be informed and consulted on new churches. The diocese will also encourage parishes and deaneries to be aware in this respect of, and where possible contribute to, Local Authority Housing and Neighbourhood Plans.

Churches under Review

As explored in the next section, some deaneries and parishes may need to review the sustainability of their church buildings in their present roles. The diocese will seek to support such parishes in exploring their future role, or an orderly process of closure if this is necessary. In this way it should be possible to manage the pastorally painful and often expensive and time-consuming process of closure better, and indeed avoid unnecessary closures.

Recommendation

The DMPC will work closely with the CBC to facilitate this, by producing a 5-yearly "traffic light" report on the health of all the church buildings in the diocese using the tools provided by the CBC, with red meaning that the future of these buildings needs to be discussed with the CBC prior to any decision on the future. Such early consideration of the problems can lead to better decision making, whether regeneration, change of role or closure is the eventual outcome.

Again, Local Authority Housing and Neighbourhood Plans should be taken into account in such discussions.

Part 3: Options and models for change

This section sets out the various options and models which can be used to help the diocese, deaneries and parishes make better use of their church buildings within their mission strategies.

Closed or open?

There are two "black or white" legal statuses for a church building. Either it is open for public worship or it is closed. Closure means completely removing the legal effects of consecration in order to start the process of disposal, or occasionally "rebooting" the church in a different form (see Fig 3 below, Option 5). If the church is closed, the responsibility for the building passes to the Diocesan Board of Finance (DBF) until a further use is found. If the church is open it currently has to be maintained by (or on behalf of) the PCC.

Closing a church

Upon closing for public worship, the church becomes the responsibility of the Diocesan Board of Finance until an alternative use can be found. The costs of insurance and maintaining the building would be carried by the Board.

With [...] of our churches listed Grade 1 (the highest category) and [...] Grade II*, finding alternative uses acceptable to the local planning authorities will be a challenge. It can take many years of negotiation with the planners and Historic England for permission to convert a highly listed church to residential accommodation or other use.

Recommendation

All possibilities should be explored in good time before the decision to close is made, and the advice and help of the Church Buildings Council should be sought as early as possible, see: http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/closed-and-closing

Shades of Grey – Sharing Buildings

While understanding that some churches may face closure, the diocese is keen to avoid promoting this as an alternative, preferring to find ways of helping PCCs to keep churches open for public worship. There are many shades of grey, which are explored in the legal options table attached below. These options allow for part of

the building or sometimes the whole building to be looked after and used by other bodies or users, while maintaining regular worship. There is also the possibility of sharing space within churches with other denominations under the Sharing of Church Buildings Act (1969).

Recommendation

This report recommends the shared and complementary use of our church buildings where appropriate as a way of spreading the load of their maintenance and conservation, while simultaneously offering opportunities for mission.

The diocese will also in this respect encourage parishes and deaneries to be aware of and where possible contribute to Local Authority Housing and Neighbourhood Plans.

Community, Cultural and Commercial Use

The medieval church building was an important community hub as well as being a place of worship. With the reduction in local pubs, shops and schools many are again seeing the church as the last community building available.

PCCs are encouraged to consider the needs of the wider community and discuss how their building can be re-ordered accordingly within the Deanery Plan, complementing what other church buildings can offer.

Cafés, parent and toddler groups, luncheon and internet clubs are all regularly held in our churches, and some host drop-in centres, post offices, shops, Citizen Advice Bureaus and other community facilities. The Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 allows for parts of church buildings to be leased to third parties, see Fig 3 below.

A number of examples of successful conversion for complementary uses as well as worship can be found on ChurchCare, divided into community, cultural or commercial uses:
http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/open-sustainable/how-we-can-help

The Crossing the Threshold toolkit has recently (November 2017) been comprehensively updated and extended to include advice on managing major projects and gives comprehensive step-by-step advice on how to develop your church building(s) for these purposes:
https://www.hereford.anglican.org/Crossingthethresholdtoolkit/

Local examples within diocese:

Recommendation

Much flexibility is allowed for within current legislation and PCCs and deaneries are to consider how their church buildings can be used in partnership with each other, and if necessary developed in different and appropriate ways to best address the needs of the communities they serve.

Fig 3: Open and Sustainable Churches: Legal options for complementary use of church buildings

Option 1
A regular place of worship with facilities to support this function, limited other use under **licence regulated by a faculty**. This can include large parts of the church building at specific times. Legal issues: Church under **Faculty Jurisdiction (FJ),** Ecclesiastical Exemption (EE) applies. Financial / funding issues: NNDR exemption should continue to apply (but check with rating authority). Eligible for Listed Places of Worship Grant Scheme (LPOWGS, VAT rebate) grant schemes.

Option 2
Primarily a place of worship, some of the building used for other (complementary) purposes under **lease granted by faculty**, using **Section 68** of the **Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011** (**MPM**). Legal issues: Church under **FJ.** EE applies. Financial / funding issues: National non-domestic rates (NNDR, 'business rates') exemption may be affected - check with rating authority. Eligible for LPOWGS grant scheme.

Option 3
Mostly used for other purposes under lease but part still used as a regular place of worship, using **MPM.** Legal issues: EE applies to open part only. Church under **FJ** (at least open part, but could apply to whole) **and secular jurisdiction** (closed part). Financial / funding issues: Closed part should be a separate rateable unit so that NNDR exemption applies to open part. Grants relating specifically to places of worship may not be available, talk to your Diocesan Advisory committee.

Option 4
Primarily used for other purposes and closed for regular worship under **MPM**, but part used under licence for occasional services. Church building under **secular jurisdiction**. Legal issues: EE does not apply, though FJ can be maintained. Financial / funding issues: NNDR exemption does not apply. Grants relating specifically to places of worship might not be available, talk to your Diocesan Advisory committee.

Option 5 'Reboot'
This is a church closed using **MPM** and 'rebooted' as a **footprint parish, extra-parochial place of worship or Resource Church**. Then Options 1-3.

Notes on Fig 3: Section 68 of the [Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011](#) *has superseded the Pastoral (Amendment) Measure 2006 (commonly referred to as PAM). PAM enabled the lease of part of a church building, facilitating its wider use, provided that its primary use was still as a place of worship. A guide to Section 68 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 is available on the Church Commissioners section of the Church of England website.*

Option 3 is the most complicated and perhaps the least attractive of these options, as different parts of the building and site are subject to different systems of control (with the possibility of some overlap), and possibly different taxation regimes; we would hope that churches looking to embrace other uses and maximise potential income from these would use Option 2, making more use of Section 68 of the MPM.

Promoting Tourism and Visitors

Visitors have many reasons to enter our church buildings. They may be researching family history and want to see where family members were married or are buried. They may be local people stopping at the church for a period of calm reflection in a busy world. They may be tourists enjoying the heritage our churches provide. Buildings form part of the Church of England's sense of place and we can often underestimate the impact of their physical presence; see the section on this in the Church Buildings Review by Bishop John Inge.

The CBC is running a programme of churchyard recording called the National Burial Grounds Survey, and should be contacted if there is potential for the churchyard to be better understood and used in this way, for example as a means of engaging schoolchildren in historical and genealogical research and recording techniques.

The tourism industry is worth £[…] billion to […] per annum and visitor numbers are growing. Latest statistics reveal that a significant number of visitors are primarily drawn to […] for its culture and heritage. Our churches represent a considerable proportion of the county's heritage assets and therefore need to be open and welcoming to all visitors.

Recommendation

The report recommends that efforts are increased to promote tourism, working with secular partners, the CBC and the National Churches Trust http://www.nationalchurchestrust.org/explore-churches where appropriate.

Friends and Trusts

There are many Friends organisations across the diocese. Usually a separate charity, a typical Friends group has its own constitution which makes it clear that its primary purpose is to raise funds for the fabric of the church. The Friends need not

be worshippers at the church nor even be resident in the community but are attracted to support the building either financially or through organising fund-raising events.

Information about setting up a Trust can also be found through ChurchCare here: http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/guidance-advice/looking-after-your-church/friends-and-trusts. ChurchCare differentiates between three types – Passive, Active and Dedicated, as summarised below:

Fig 4: Open and Sustainable Churches: Types of Trust to help look after church buildings

Passive Supporters (Friends) - They support the PCC to fundraise, develop and care for the church
This group is keen to support the building and appreciates the role that the local church plays in the community. They may not have the time to commit to regular activities like repairs or cleaning, but they are able to financially support the church through a covenant or regular donations. They are likely to attend church events such as fetes and coffee mornings and promote and support the building to others.
Active Friends - They manage the building and take an active role in planning, caring for and promoting the church
These people have spare time twinned with energy and enthusiasm for the building. They may take an active role in cleaning and/or repairs of the church, and possibly have a skill or background which is of use to the management of the building, like an architect, fund-raiser or conservation expert. They attend the building regularly (not necessarily for worship) and help to organise events and activities. They help the PCC with faculty applications and raising funds through grant aid. A Memorandum of Understanding may be necessary to regulate the relationship with the PCC.
A Dedicated Trust - This group assumes responsibility (stewardship) for most or all of the building fabric and the overall management of the building
This group are dedicated to the church and hold the building 'in trust', often in lieu of a PCC. They invest both time and money. They curate and care for the building and have taken on the management of the church via a formal, contractual basis. They comprise of members of the worshipping congregation and non-worshippers alike. They run events and activities and work with local stakeholders to promote the church as a local venue and raise funds to develop and care for it. A Memorandum of Understanding or a contract may be necessary to regulate the relationship with the PCC.

Recommendation

This report recommends that PCCs discuss the subject of Friends organisations and Trusts and consider the advantages of creating one of the above types of Trust for their church building, with advice and technical support from the diocese who can put them in touch with others who have done this.

Part 4: Practical issues – maintenance, insurance, faculties, clergy and laity training

This section deals with some of the nuts and bolts of dealing with our buildings, making suggestions as to how current practice can be improved.

Maintaining church buildings

Lack of regular maintenance of a church roof and rainwater goods can lead to very expensive repairs down the line. The National Churches Trust's **Maintenance Booker** scheme is being rolled out across the country and may provide an attractive offer.

The Churches Conservation Trust (CCT) is keen to share its experience developing and maintaining its own building stock and is prepared to share this with dioceses and PCCs, although there may be a cost involved. A **Service Level Agreement** with the CCT for the management of insurance and maintenance of church buildings is conceivable and might be explored.

Much work in churches requires financial assistance from grant making trusts or other organisations. Money raised from these sources means less drain on the PCC's own resources allowing for regular payment of Parish Share. The Church Buildings Officer [...] provides assistance to PCCs in finding such grants as well as advice on Heritage Lottery Fund applications.

Recommendation

This report **recommends** that all PCCs arrange a maintenance contract and consider joining a local, diocesan or regional maintenance scheme where this is available. PCCs can increasingly look towards using the services of partner organisations to assist in the maintenance of church buildings.

Insurance

Paying the insurance premium is often seen as a burden on PCCs' funds. Premiums rise but few PCCs experience the need to claim. The group **recommends** that further work is undertaken on the current level of insurance and what practical alternatives exist, taking into account the work that Parish Buying and the Procurement Group has been doing. In particular, some churches including Festival Churches might not be insured for 100%. The diocese and Archdeacon should discuss with each parish the appropriate level of insurance.

Recommendation

Every parish should be encouraged to follow the CBC advice that, as in other areas of procuring services, **at least two quotes** should be obtained whenever insurance is reviewed, as well as the level of insurance required.

Simplification of Faculty Rules and Online Faculty System

The Church of England introduced new rules for the administration of faculties on 1st January 2016. Fewer works now require a faculty with most repairs able to be approved by the archdeacon (List B works) with a minimum of form filling and no up-front cost. This is part of the Church of England's simplification process and is aimed at making life easier for those applying for a faculty.

An online faculty application portal was also introduced recently by the CBC, accessed at facultyonline.churchofengland.org. Faculties or List B Archdeacon's permissions can be applied for via this paperless process, and List A works can be logged. Regular email updates are sent to applicants so they are always aware of the status of their application.

Recommendation

The sharing of good practice and simpler procedures is key to debunking the myth that change is not permitted. We **recommend** that parishes make full use of the Online Faculty System and the integrated Church Heritage Record to help them achieve necessary changes and record these.

Clergy and Laity Training

Lack of formal training for clergy and laity in looking after church buildings is a serious issue, leaving many new incumbents and churchwardens in particular unprepared for the challenges they face. Recommendations for changes to college curriculum is beyond the scope of this report but the group recommends that regular clergy training is undertaken within the diocese alongside the annual training for new churchwardens.

The Diocesan Advisory Committee's role is naturally reactive as it responds to faculty and List B applications. However, it has worked with incumbents by visiting churches within the benefice in order to advise on the possibilities for each building, and our Support Officer […] can also help with this.

Recommendation

A pro-active approach by the DAC has been welcomed by the incumbents and PCCs and the group recommends that this is continued and expanded.

Part 5: Summary Action Plan

This report should not be the end of the process but the beginning and to act as a springboard for future action. The following indicates areas of work where there needs to be continued appraisal or further investment of resources and this report **recommends** this to Bishop's Council and Diocesan Synod.

Issue	Action	Lead / Partner	Priority
Lack of reliable data on our church buildings	Collate national and local datasets via the CHR and national Statistics Department	Diocese and Deaneries, CBC	High
Accessible information and training for PCCs, incumbents and Churchwardens	Improve resources on website, raise awareness of ChurchCare, training events	DAC Secretary, CBC	High
Sharing of good practice and new ideas especially on complementary uses	Case studies both within and outside the diocese, also link to those on ChurchCare website	DAC Secretary, Archdeacons (articles of enquiry)	High
Lack of capacity within PCCs	List of volunteers / mentors willing to help other PCCs. Development of Trusts and local partnerships	Lay Chairs, LGAs, DAC	Medium
Serving the community	PCCs' records availability. Heritage events involving schools / wider community	County Records Office Church Buildings Officer [...]	Medium Medium
Parochial Structures	Help on options such as Festival Churches, Major Churches, PCCs and benefices, insurance	DAC Secretary / Diocesan Registrar / Archdeacons /CC / CBC / CCT	Medium
Mission Plans taking buildings into account	Develop or optimise Mission Plans	PCC /Deanery / Diocese	High

Part 6: Links to useful resources

ChurchCare: http://www.churchcare.co.uk/

ChurchCare Open and Sustainable Churches:
http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/open-sustainable

Church Heritage Record: https://facultyonline.churchofengland.org/churches

Hereford Diocese church development toolkit:
https://www.hereford.anglican.org/Crossingthethresholdtoolkit/

Church of England Portal: https://cofeportal.org/login

Church of England Parish Resources: http://www.parishresources.org.uk/

Church Urban Fund Parish Deprivation tool: http://www2.cuf.org.uk/lookup-tool

Arthur Rank Centre: http://www.arthurrankcentre.org.uk/

Inspired North-East: http://www.inspirednortheast.org.uk/

National Churches Trust: http://www.nationalchurchestrust.org/

Heritage Lottery Fund Grants: https://www.hlf.org.uk/looking-funding/our-grant-programmes

Historic England: https://www.historicengland.org.uk/

Appendix A: Church Commissioners Guidance on Deanery Plans

Deanery Plans Guidance (Draft 09/04.18)

Background and Legislative Change

1.1   The amendments made to the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 by the Mission and Pastoral etc. (Amendment) Measure 2018 included some intended to encourage the use of deanery plans by giving such plans statutory recognition. These provisions

     a)   Allow DMPCs to omit the first formal consultation stage on reorganisation proposals arising from a deanery plan which has been approved by the deanery synod and the DMPC and about which those who would be the interested parties for the reorganisation concerned have been consulted; and

     b)   Give added weight to such a plan when representations are being considered by the Commissioners – a presumption in favour of the proposals unless, in the Commissioners' view, there are material considerations which indicate that a scheme or order should not be made.

1.2   These provisions recognise that many DMPCs already use deanery plans as an element in fulfilling their duty to keep pastoral reorganisation in the Diocese under review. The Commissioners encourage this as in their experience reorganisation proposals which stem from a considered deanery planning process are likely to command wider support and attract less opposition later in the reorganisation process. This holds good even if even if the DMPC does not wish to use the powers outlined in 1 a) and b), although wide consultation will always be a key part of successful deanery planning. The Commissioners also consider that, where it is used, deanery planning is best applied on a diocesan wide basis so that reorganisation is carried out in a strategic way, although the legislation also applies to a one-off deanery plan. The provisions also recognise that other dioceses do not use deanery plans and would not wish to be compelled to do so and they are therefore permissive rather than mandatory.

1.3   Some dioceses already have a process of mission planning at deanery level, which may or may not include consideration of whether any pastoral reorganisation is required. If it does and it is intended that the deanery mission plan should also be the deanery pastoral plan, then the necessary consultations must take place and the pastoral element of the plan must be approved by the deanery synod and DMPC if it is intended to take advantage of the provisions outlined in 1.1 a) and b) above.

1.4   The provision in 1.1 a) is intended to cut out an unnecessary repetition of consultations. Previously the lack of any statutory status for deanery plans meant that although there would often have been extensive consultation of those who would become statutory interested parties as part of the process of drawing up the plan, the DMPC would nonetheless have to formally consult them again on any proposals which resulted from it. The interested parties would then be sent a copy of the draft scheme or order to give effect to the proposals, when it was published, and they were notified of their right to make representations to the Commissioners. This provision allows the second of these three stages to be omitted.

1.5   When they consider representations against a draft scheme or order an important factor for the Commissioners is often the extent to which the proposals fit in with a coherent diocesan or deanery plan rather than having been produced in isolation. The degree of support which the proposal has from the deanery as well as the diocese is another factor. The provision in 1.1 b) therefore gives a formal weight to an approved deanery plan and puts a greater onus on objectors to demonstrate why reorganisation stemming from it should not proceed.   In practice this would probably necessitate showing that the deanery plan itself was flawed (through insufficient consultation or being based on incorrect information) or had become outdated by significant changes in the factors on which it was based.

1.6   In many cases representations against a draft scheme are about the details of the proposed reorganisation (such as the patronage arrangements, or where the clergy are to be housed) rather than the reorganisation itself. These would be material considerations for the Commissioners if they were not covered in the deanery plan. However, another change made by the 2018 Measure is to give the Commissioners the power, when considering representations, to amend a draft scheme, with the agreement of the bishop and after such further consultations as they think fit. This means that a draft scheme can be more easily and quickly amended if the Commissioners think that specific provisions should be changed in response to representations. Those preparing the deanery plan therefore need to consider whether to produce a more detailed plan, to take full advantage of the presumption in favour or to omit the detailed provisions and accept that a scheme may be amended regarding these as a result of representations. They also need to bear in mind that the degree of support for the deanery plan in the deanery synod and opposing views expressed by the interested parties during consultations on the deanery plan might also be regarded as a material consideration by the Commissioners.

Purpose of this Guidance

2.1   This guidance is part of the Code of Practice to the Measure and DMPCs must therefore "have regard" to it. It has five main aims

- To identify the features and content of a robust deanery plan, to which the DMPC and Deanery Synod should have regard when deciding whether to formally approve it;
- To advise on the roles of the diocese and deanery in producing plans and the process for drawing them up;
- To offer models for producing deanery plans, based on the experience of different dioceses and advice on possibilities for reorganisation/extended use of church buildings;
- To encourage a consistency of approach within dioceses;
- To give advice on practical and other issues which may arise.

Essential/desirable features of a Deanery Pastoral Plan

3.1   The Measure is, intentionally, not prescriptive about the contents of a deanery plan. This recognises that between dioceses there is a great variety of approaches to deanery planning and to mission planning in the wider sense and is intended to leave individual DMPCs the greatest possible flexibility in how they wish to approach it. However, to ensure that there are no material considerations which might undermine the presumption in favour of a draft scheme or order which is to implement recommendations made in a deanery plan, a plan to which the DMPC gives its approval should, in general, meet, the following requirements. It should

- Relate to the wider mission planning context
- Have regard to diocesan-wide parameters set by Bishop, Diocesan Synod and DMPC
- Be comprehensive in scope (covering deployment of clergy and lay workers, use of buildings, financial resources, potential for Fresh expressions and ecumenical working)
- Be evidence based
- Fulfil the consultation requirements and have been approved by the deanery synod(s) concerned
- Have the widest possible engagement with and ownership by clergy and parishes and community bodies

The DMPC when setting the parameters for deanery plans will need to liaise with other diocesan bodies such as the DBF, the Diocesan Board of Education, and Mission and Ministry or Social Justice teams to ensure its criteria are compatible with other aspects of diocese's mission.

3.2   As a deanery plan may now have statutory force those preparing or approving it will be subject to the general duty, in section 1 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure, to have regard to the furtherance of the mission of the Church of England. In practice this will often mean that a deanery plan for pastoral reorganisation is not developed in isolation but is one element within a wider mission planning process, where that is being carried out at a deanery level. Where that is the case it will be necessary for those undertaking the wider process to be aware that, if the mission plan is also to be the

deanery pastoral plan, the requirements regarding consultation with interested parties and approval by the deanery synod and DMPC must be met. Where a deanery pastoral plan is being carried out as a separate exercise, those preparing and approving it should indicate how any reorganisation proposed will further the mission of the Church in the deanery.

3.3   DMPCs when approving deanery plans will do so in the context of any diocesan-wide policies or priorities which may have been set by the Committee itself or by the Bishop or Diocesan Synod. They will also have regard to the opportunities or limitations presented by other factors such as the number of clergy (stipendiary or self-supporting), pioneer ministers and lay workers available and any limitations on their deployment; the support which the diocese can offer in the way of financial or other resources; opportunities presented by the provision of strategic mission funding by the Commissioners; diocesan wide planning and development issues; and ecumenical considerations. Those preparing the deanery plan and deanery synods when approving them will also need to be aware of such opportunities and limitations if they are to produce plans which are robust and realistic, and which are likely to be approved by the DMPC.

3.4   Where the Bishop's Council acts as the DMPC and may have limited time to devote to the consideration of deanery plans it may wish to delegate the approving role to area or archdeaconry sub-committees or provide that the plans are reviewed by them before being recommended for approval by the DMPC itself.

3.5   The focus of some deanery plans has been determined by a single or limited number of factors, in particular by the number of stipendiary clergy available or the ability of PCCs to repair and maintain their church buildings. While these may impose constraints on what is realistically possible, it is also important that they should not have an unintentionally negative impact by unduly limiting the scope of a deanery plan. It is therefore recommended that DMPCs encourage deanery plans to be as wide-ranging and comprehensive as possible and to focus on providing the best framework for promoting mission and growth.

3.6   Some examples of this would include:
- The scope for developing lay ministry alongside that of the clergy and licensed lay workers
- Opportunities for working ecumenically through Local Ecumenical Partnerships
- An audit of churches and other church property identifying the scope for extended use of existing buildings or whether they should be replaced
- Possibilities for sharing church buildings with other denominations
- Possibilities for making greater use of church schools
- Opportunities for church plants or the establishment of Fresh Expressions
- Possibilities for grant funding or other resources from Church or secular bodies for particular buildings or projects
- Scope for working in co-operation with community bodies such as local charities or local authority sponsored bodies promoting regeneration
- Identification of initiatives better carried out at deanery rather than parochial level
- Scope for simplifying administration through joint councils

3.7   Such issues may not themselves lead to a need for formal pastoral reorganisation, but they may affect what is or might otherwise be required in terms of reorganisation and deaneries should be encouraged to consider them as part of their deanery planning. It is also important for deaneries to be made aware of the different options available for pastoral reorganisation; ecumenical working; sharing church buildings or their extended use; fresh expressions; and under the Church Representation Rules so that they do not limit themselves by a lack of knowledge of what the possibilities are.

3.8   It is clearly important for the presumption in favour of reorganisation stemming from an approved deanery plan that there should be full and accurate factual evidence to back up any recommendations made. If a representor against a draft scheme or order could show that there was no evidence to support a recommendation or that it was based on inaccurate information, then that would be a material consideration for the Commissioners.

3.9   Examples of the sort of evidence required are
- population of the deanery by parish/benefice
- potential housing growth including an examination of planning policies
- weekly attendance
- parish share records
- projected repair costs for churches based on the latest QIRs
- deprivation statistics
- student populations
- information about the presence of other denominations and faiths in the area
- number of C of E church school and availability of their premises

3.10 When the deanery submits a deanery plan to the DMPC for approval it will need to provide evidence of its approval by the deanery synod (as recorded in its minutes) and that those who would be interested parties under the Mission and Pastoral Measure process have been consulted. The latter should include the date of the consultation, who was consulted, what they were consulted on and a summary of their responses. The outcome of the consultations should also be provided to the deanery synod when it considers the plan. If the recommendations in the deanery plan would result in the dispossession of any incumbents or common tenure office holders who are receiving remuneration (including housing) the DMPC should offer them an opportunity to meet the Committee, as required by sections 6(4) and 21(4) of the Measure and hold any such meetings before approving the deanery plan.**].**

3.11 Although the consultation requirements in the Mission and Pastoral Measure apply only to the named interested parties, it is desirable in formulating deanery plans that there should be the widest possible consultation and ownership of the plan among the clergy, laity and local community. Those developing a deanery plan are therefore advised to consult as widely as possible. The revised provisions allow the DMPC to specify that additional persons or bodies should be treated as interested parties for the purposes of consultation on a deanery plan. For example, the DMPC should normally require formal ecumenical partners in an LEP or the other party in a formal sharing

agreement for a church building to be consulted. The DMPC should also ensure that those being consulted about a deanery plan are made aware of the presumption in favour of an approved plan and, therefore, of the importance of making their views known before the plan is approved.

Role of the DMPC/Diocese

4.1   The Measure does not specify the body responsible for producing deanery plans and there is therefore scope for either the diocese (through the DMPC) or the deanery to take the initiative in consulting on and drafting a plan. In practice, however, it is likely that the development of deanery plans will be a collaborative process between the diocese and deanery and that is the approach encouraged in this guidance. In that context the main roles for the diocese/DMPC would normally be

- Setting the context/parameters/timeframe for deanery plans
- Providing appropriate leadership and support/developing local leadership capacity
- Encouraging consistency of approach
- Ensuring that those carrying out consultations on the deanery plan are aware of who all the interested parties are
- Providing information (e.g. statistics or planning policies) for an evidence based plan
- Approving and monitoring plans

As indicated in paragraph 3.3 the DMPC when considering deanery plans for approval will be doing so in the context of furthering mission in the diocese as a whole. It will therefore be taking a view on how far a particular deanery's plan fits in with or takes account of diocesan policies and priorities and the wider picture in terms of resources, opportunities and ecumenical co-operation. It is therefore important that where the responsibility for producing plans lies primarily with the deanery, those preparing the plan are aware of the wider considerations which will affect the DMPC's view of it. A primary role for the DMPC is therefore to inform deaneries of the parameters within which they should formulate their recommendations.

4.2   The issue of women's ministry is an example of an area where the DMPC should be providing guidance for deaneries when producing a plan. Deaneries should be reminded of the five principles outlined in the House of Bishop's Declaration and of the guidance in the Code of Practice on this issue (paragraphs 4.10, 6.30-6.32, 7.1 and 11.3-11.5) and advised of ways in which proposed reorganisation can avoid problems in this regard as well as any particular policies of the bishop or diocesan synod on the matter.

4.3   Where the DMPC itself is encouraging a diocesan wide deanery planning process it will wish to set a timeframe both for the time within which plans should be produced and for the period which they should cover. Approaches to this might vary: for example, one DMPC may want all deaneries to produce plans within a given timescale in order to consider them all together to formulate a diocesan wide strategy whereas another might wish there to be a rolling cycle of plans for different deaneries.

4.4   A difficulty for some DMPCs is the perceived lack of capacity in some deaneries to produce good quality deanery plans. Another significant role for the DMPC therefore is to identify where this is the case and to offer the necessary support to enable these deaneries to provide plans of the requisite standard. This may take the form of identifying individuals who should be encouraged to participate in drafting a plan, providing training for those undertaking the task or providing an individual or team from the centre to support a deanery in formulating a plan.

4.5   For many dioceses a process of deanery planning will be undertaken within a wider strategic review or mission plan for the whole diocese. Where this is the case there are clear advantages in all deaneries producing plans based on a common methodology and format. Even where that is not the case it will be helpful to DMPCs which may consider plans on an occasional basis to ensure that they all include essential or desirable features. This is likely to involve the DMPC in setting criteria for matters to be considered, consultations to be undertaken and what is required in terms of supporting evidence for recommendations.

4.6   It is important that those carrying out consultations about a deanery plan are aware of who all the statutory interested parties are. Where the consultation is not being carried out by the DMPC secretary, (s)he will need to ensure that those undertaking it are informed of who the relevant parties are, the need to make them aware when the formal consultation is taking place and that a record is kept of when the consultation took place, who was consulted and the views which were expressed. Consultation could take the form of asking the interested parties for their views and suggestions prior to drafting the plan or seeking their views on a draft plan that has already been produced. Those undertaking the review may wish to do both.

4.7   Much of the statistical information which deaneries will need to produce an evidence based plan will be more readily available at diocesan or national level and DMPCs will need to provide it to deaneries or indicate where they should find it (see Part 1 of the CBC Diocesan Strategic Review Template) Dioceses will often also be better placed to provide information on local authority plans which they will be monitoring on their own behalf. Providing information from central sources also offers a greater opportunity to ensure that it is compiled on a consistent basis and using figures in which the DMPC can have confidence.

4.8   DMPCs have a statutory function of approving deanery plans where they wish to take advantage of the presumption in favour of reorganisation stemming from them and the omission of the first formal consultation stage. In practice they will also generally wish to monitor the implementation of approved plans (which will often include reviewing progress on recommendations other than pastoral reorganisation).

Role of the Deanery

5.1   It is recommended that the preparation of deanery plans is a collaborative exercise between the diocese and deanery to ensure that the plan developed is one which takes account of diocesan policies and is therefore likely to be approved by the DMPC. Where that is the case, the main roles for the deanery will be

- Providing local leadership
- Encouraging participation in formulation of the plan

- Provision of locally held information
- Formal approval of the plan

5.2   The legislation does not require that the process for formulating a deanery plan should be locally led and it is likely that in many **[some?]** cases it will be led by a member of the DMPC or facilitated by a member of the diocesan staff. However, it will be helpful in terms of promoting engagement in the process by parishes and community organisations if deanery representatives are included. Similarly, significant local input into the process is likely to result a greater level of support for or "buy in" to the recommendations. This in turn is likely to mean that the deanery synod is more likely to approve the plan. The area dean and deanery lay chair are likely to be leading the process but they or the deanery synod should also identify others who have the appropriate skills to take part and consider whether they might better lead the process. As suggested in paragraph 4.4, the deanery may sometimes need to be assisted by the diocese in identifying who should conduct a deanery planning process and what support or training might help them do so.

5.3   An important role for those leading a deanery plan process locally is encourage formal interested parties and others to participate in the development of the plan. it One of the hoped-for benefits of giving an enhanced status to deanery plans is that parishes will feel that they have more meaningful input in the development of recommendations for pastoral reorganisation at an early stage and a better understanding of the wider picture and how reorganisation can help to promote mission. However, participation is the key and should be encouraged by the deanery leadership team, which should also emphasise that the furtherance of mission is at the heart of the process.

5.4   While much of the statistical information which will help to underpin recommendations in a deanery plan will come from national or diocesan sources there will also be information which is only available locally, particularly in respect of parish-owned buildings and specific local considerations such as churchmanship.

5.5   Formal approval by the deanery synod is an absolute requirement to give a deanery plan legal status. It is recommended that when a draft deanery plan is presented to the deanery synod for approval it is circulated with the backing evidence and comments by those who have been consulted and a presentation is made to the synod by those who have drafted it. A formal vote should be taken to approve the scheme and should be minuted. It is suggested that the vote should be taken at a subsequent meeting (which may need to be an additional one) to give synod members time to reflect on the presentation and raise any further questions. The deanery when seeking approval to a deanery plan from the DMPC should make the Committee aware of views of consultees who opposed the recommendations in the plan and of the views of any deanery synod members who voted against the plan approved by the majority. If a significant minority on the deanery synod votes against the plan the Commissioners may regard this as a material consideration when considering representations against a draft scheme or order arising from the plan and the DMPC may also be reluctant to endorse it. However, approval by a deanery synod on a narrow majority is still sufficient for the plan to qualify as an approved deanery plan if also approved by the DMPC.

Models and Advice on options for reorganisation/use of buildings

6.1

- Choose two or three diocesan models (with adaptations/commentary if necessary)
- Should the guidance restate options for reorganisation/fresh expressions/use of buildings or just direct readers to information elsewhere in the Code or on the website?

Practical and other issues

Scope of a deanery plan

7.1　The wording of the Measure indicates that an approved plan can cover more than one deanery.　Thus, a plan could be developed as an archdeaconry or even a diocesan-wide review or plan provided that each deanery approved the relevant part as its deanery plan. One of the issues covered by such a plan could be the appropriateness of the existing archdeaconry or deanery structures and a plan could include recommendation for amending the archdeaconries or deaneries themselves, again subject to each deanery adopting recommendations relating to itself as part of its own deanery plan. A plan could also relate to only part of a deanery .

Who should carry out the review/consultation and produce the plan?

7.2　The Measure is not specific about this. As recommended above the usual model is likely to be that a deanery review is carried out either by a locally led team with support from the DMPC or by members of the DMPC with local input. However, the wording of the Measure would not preclude a diocesan deanery-planning team or DMPC sub-committee from doing so where a deanery lacks the willingness or capacity, provided that the plan itself is approved by the Deanery Synod. It is likely that there would greater input from the diocesan level if a plan was to cover several deaneries.

Can the Deanery Synod delegate its approval to a deanery pastoral committee or standing committee?

7.3　This will depend on the rules that the diocesan synod has made for deanery synods in the diocese under rule 28 of the Church Representation Rules.　Rules made by the diocesan synod must provide for the deanery synod to have a standing committee with such functions as the diocesan synod's rules provide. However, it is strongly recommended that this function of the deanery synod should not be delegated in this way even if the rules made by the diocesan

synod would allow it. As stated in paragraph 3.1 it is desirable that a deanery plan should have the widest possible ownership by the clergy and laity in the deanery and to delegate approval of the plan to a body with a more limited membership would be at odds with this principle. Delegation of approval to a deanery mission and pastoral committee would be particularly inappropriate as where there is such a committee it is likely to have be closely involved in formulating the plan so would have a conflict of interests if it was also to approve it on behalf of the deanery synod.

Can consultation be on issues rather than specific proposals?

7.4 Yes. This is now the recommended approach for all pastoral reorganisation and is particularly appropriate in the case of a deanery plan where there should be as much scope as possible to consider a range of options. It would therefore generally be unhelpful to for the consultation to focus on specific proposals at an early stage. The wording of the Measure does not rule out an initial consultation on issues followed by a further round on specific proposals.

How detailed should the plan be?

7.5 it does not need to cover all the details which would go into a scheme or order but could be on a "Heads of Terms" basis. However, as stated in paragraph 1.6 above, in many cases representations against a draft scheme are about the details of the proposed reorganisation (such as the patronage arrangements, or where the clergy are to be housed) rather than the reorganisation itself. These might be material considerations for the Commissioners if they were not covered in the deanery plan.

What about reorganisation proposals which arise other than in the context of the plan?

7.6 There will often be circumstances in which proposals for reorganisation which arise during the process of developing a deanery plan and are too urgent to await the approval of the plan, or after the plan is in place and fall outside its terms of reference or recommendations. For example, the terms of reference for a plan might have specifically excluded consideration of closing any churches for regular public worship but such a proposal might arise because of unexpected problems relating to the structural condition of a building. Something often likely to be outside the scope of a deanery plan is a request or proposal to dispose of an area of consecrated churchyard. In such cases the normal procedure under the Measure would apply and that reorganisation could be progressed without being subject to the provisions regarding omission of the first consultation stage or the presumption in favour.

7.7 However, in some cases such a proposal might have an impact on the recommendations in the deanery plan sufficient to be a material consideration; e.g. closing or replacing one church for unforeseen reasons might affect a recommendation to close or replace a different church. In those circumstances the advantages of formally revising the deanery plan to take account of the

changed circumstances would have to weighed against the urgency of the unforeseen proposal.

What about consultees who won't engage, deaneries which don't produce plans or where the plan is not approved?

7.8   As with all consultations under the Measure, those who are entitled to be consulted about a deanery plan cannot be compelled to respond. A plan remains valid if they do not. However, it should be emphasised by those undertaking the consultation that mission in the deanery area is likely to be better promoted by a plan which has a high level of local engagement. They should make it clear to the interested parties that the likelihood of successfully objecting to proposals which stem from an approved deanery plan later in the Mission and Pastoral Measure process, is reduced, given the presumption in favour of such proposals. Contributing to the deanery plan process is therefore likely to be their best opportunity to influence the shape of any reorganisation in the deanery.

7.9   As indicated in 7.2 above where a deanery doesn't produce a plan because it lacks the capacity to do so there are options for the DMPC to undertake the process of producing a plan, which the deanery synod can then approve. However, if it is not possible to arrive at a plan which both the deanery synod and the DMPC are willing to endorse then, in the absence of an approved deanery plan, all reorganisation proposals in the deanery will have to be progressed under the default process, fulfilling all the consultation stages and with no presumption in favour.

What if the interested parties change between when the consultations on the deanery plan takes place and when reorganisation proposals are brought forward?

7.10   Consultations are with an office rather than the current office-holder and are therefore not invalidated by a subsequent change of office holder. A new office holder may of course object to a draft pastoral scheme or order arising from a deanery plan but the presumption in favour would not be affected by the change. It is possible however that the gender, personal characteristics, or views of the new office holder might be a material consideration for the Commissioners.