

Annex J

Copies of the further comments received from
representors regarding the draft Scheme

Bishop Christopher's Letter 20th June 2019 to Rex Andrew, Church Commissioners

Comments from the Revd Jonathan Jeffery

Vicar of Leigh Park & Warren Park

The process as laid down by the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 is comprehensive, which enables full consultation with the interested parties but also by its nature means that it takes a not insignificant amount of time to undertake.

* It should be noted that whilst funding from the Archbishop's SDF is limited to 5 years, the effects of the proposed pastoral reorganisation will last considerably longer.

* The time-scale from October 2018 – July 2019 is only short compared with the period of time that the proposed scheme will be in place

I am grateful to all of those who attended the initial informal public consultation meeting in October and who have since participated in the subsequent phases of the consultation and its meetings. The time and energy that people have given to this has been substantial and is hugely appreciated.

When proposing to undertake changes as significant as those contained in the draft Scheme it is inevitable that there will be strong, differing points of view held by all concerned. This process has not been an easy process for anyone to experience and for the distress that has been felt, I am sorry.

* No one has previously received this expression of regret from the Bishop

* The Bishop has not previously made this apology directly to me, to the PCC of St Francis, Leigh Park, or to the PCC of St Clare, Warren Park.

* Why is the Bishop's expression of regret addressed firstly in this way and not directly to any that he knows have felt distress?

This draft Scheme, if it were to proceed, would mean that the current incumbent and priest-in-charge would be dispossessed of their offices and they would not be designated to posts in the new structure. I recognise that there are members of the community and our congregations who are very distressed at the thought of the dispossession of their beloved clergy. This is something that both I and the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee (DMPC) have prayed on, deliberated and debated extensively and agreed is necessary to ensure that the right structure is created to care for the cure of souls and to further the Mission of the Church across the greater Leigh Park estates. Therefore, I do wish the Scheme to proceed.

* Please be assured that there have also been fervent prayers said by me, the people of Leigh Park and the people of Warren Park

In order to help the Mission, Pastoral and Church Property Committee to consider this proposal I offer below my responses to the points raised in your letter dated 7 June 2019.

1. What were the main reasons for proposing to terminate the current plurality established for the Leigh Park and Warren Park benefices, unite the three benefices and their constituent parishes, and establish a team ministry for its area and how this would further the Mission of the Church in this area?

Since the establishment of the Diocese of Portsmouth in 1927, each bishop has presided over a steady decline in its congregations, in step with the rest of the Church of England. However, with the success of the Pioneer Project in 2016 and other initiatives, the diocese

saw a small increase in average weekly church attendance. This emboldened the diocese to aim for and strategically resource our churches for growth. The diocese asked the Strategic Development Unit for insights as to where this would have the most impact.

Key indicators were provided to the diocese by the Strategic Development Unit. These indicators allowed the diocese to identify areas of challenge and opportunity where a combination of the following factors applied:

- higher than average decrease in attendance over the previous ten years;
- low attendance when calculated as a percentage of local population;
- areas of strategic importance, such as main towns within a wider area;
- a large centre of population geographically distinct from other population centres and/or lacking local amenities.

* Sadly this appears to suggest that all areas of deprivation (in this case “lacking local amenities”) are homogenous. They are not.

* The Bishop has been led by data rather than attempting to understand the nature of the community of the wider Leigh Park Estate

* We are called by the scheme for church growth – “Leading your Church into Growth” (LYCIG) to “know your soil” – the Bishop’s approach has taken no steps to understand and know the soil of this particular mission field.

The three areas identified for pastoral reorganisation, including St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban have the potential in terms of population, but not currently the capacity within their existing congregations, to make a significant impact in mission even if they were only to seek to increase their attendance to around 2% of the local population.

* The Bishop will know that despite several requests over several years ministry in Leigh Park and Warren Park has continued under-funded, under-staffed and under-resourced

* The results of Mission, community engagement and impact in the real lives of real people are therefore all the more remarkable.

The aim of the draft Scheme is to create the right structures and to resource these with the appropriate staffing to enable church communities to grow in depth, impact and number in line with our diocesan vision. We want to do this by developing sustainable mission focussed church communities that can concentrate on the primary calling of the church to make new disciples. To do this we know that as well as adding new resources, we need to free the existing churches from the burdens of finances, administration and buildings so that rather than feeling forced to focus on maintaining the existing church structures they will also be able to support new projects, opportunities and communities. We will do this by:

- Undertaking pastoral reorganisation to create one mission unit consisting of a single parish benefice, with united leadership, ministry team, finance, governance, and administration; supported by some local decision making would be delegated to individual congregations. This new structure would enable the other developments:

* Whilst a Team ministry requires only one PCC, the proposed District Church Councils create a level of beurocracy, additional meetings, and commitments of a wider group of individuals, which the proposal says it seeks to avoid.

* The Bishop is aware of the counter-proposal of a Group Ministry, building on the existing foundations which are trusted, respected and embedded.

* Whilst focusing on the nature of a Team, the Bishop has consistently ignored the proposed use of a Group Council which provides virtually identical benefits to the single PCC of a Team ministry.

- **Creating new ministry structure, including at least an ordained stipendiary team leader, a church planting minister, operations support, and specialist ministers to focus on children/young families, outreach and social engagement;**

* This new structure is not the proposed scheme.

* This structure is dependent upon securing SDF funding – which we are told is not assured.

* During the consultation phases, we were informed that there was no plan for the full future structure as this would have to be explored, discussed and agreed by PCCs in the future.

* This is the first time that this information has been revealed, and I wonder why this is presented here, now – and without any prior consultation.

- **Planting a new congregation or congregations with a church planting team gathered from inside and outside of the new parish;**

* No evidence has been presented during the process, or now by the Bishop as to the benefits and likelihood of success of a church plant in an estate such as the wider Leigh Park Estate.

* I fear that the Bishop relies too heavily on evidence from the Harbour Church plant in city-centre Portsmouth.

* Harbour Church is extra-parochial, in a city context, relies heavily on a student population, has still not contributed Parish Share to the diocese. It is not clear how many “new disciples” have been created, rather than existing Christians worshipping with them.

- **Resourcing existing congregations to promote outreach and growth alongside good teaching and pastoral care;**

* This thread sounds like platitudes from the Bishop.

* Why have resources not previously been forth-coming when previously requested?

* Why do we have to wait for a new structure, sweeping all else aside?

* What more would the existing clergy and people have achieved with appropriate resources, finances and staffing over several previous years?

- **Deploying pioneer ministers to engage with points of social need, such as via the food bank and debt advice centre, with an emphasis on addressing life issues in the context of whole-life discipleship.**

* This is the first time that we have seen this proposal in this form.

* The diocese has not previously proposed a debt advice centre – rather, this was in the counter-proposal put forward by the PCCs of Warren Park & Leigh Park

* The Bishop appears unaware of the work of Foodbank PO9

* The Bishop appears unaware of the work of the Beacon Foodbank.

* The Bishop appears unaware of the work of Munch, Connect 4 Summer, and Chrunch

* The Bishop appears unaware of the Specialist debt-counselling of Citizen's Advice operating from the Leigh Park Community Centre.

* The Bishop appears unaware of the work of the Stop the Sharks scheme in Leigh Park

A new diocesan intern scheme, in conjunction with the national CEMES scheme, would be used to enhance elements of the new ministry structures: this would encourage interns, including as many as possible from the local area, to gain experience themselves in church planting, mission, and ministry in a variety of contexts while developing their own vocations. This builds on learning from the Discovery Gap Year and the Harbour Residency Year.

- * This is the first time that we have seen this proposal in this form.
- * What evidence is there that there are appropriate local candidates for internships?
- * How many young people have been placed from the Discovery Gap Year and Harbour Residency Year? How many are from the PO9 area?

Development of social enterprise opportunities suitable for the needs of the local area and other income generation activities will be explored with the community.

- * This is the first time that we have seen this proposal in this form.

Creating a new single parish benefice across the areas of Leigh Park, Warren Park and West Leigh will allow better coordination of mission energy, finance, and staffing, with strong vision and leadership, aided by skilled operations/administrative support, underpinning all ministry and mission in the area.

- * These individuals are clearly not yet identified
- * The same gifts, skills and graces could be deployed under a Group Ministry with a Joint Council.

Making growth intentional and putting the right structure in place to reduce legislative and administrative burden is a proven method for achieving numerical growth and so furthering the Mission of the Church. There are equally examples from around the country where not getting the structure right in the beginning hampers the ability of the parish leadership to be able to effect change and grow.

- * If this is a proven method, as the Bishop suggests why has no evidence been produced to me, to PCCs or indeed here to Church Commissioners?
- * If such model schemes exist are they directly comparable to the situation of the wider Leigh Park Estate?
- * As has been stated, I believe that the insistence on a Team and the non-designation of posts will severely hamper the initial change and growth desired.

All of the parishes are agreed that more resource is desired for them to take care of existing congregations, create new congregations and work and to work in their communities. The concerns raised by the representors objecting to the draft Scheme are in relation to the structure, and the dispossession of the clergy, not the shared aims.

- * Who would object to increased resources?
- * Whilst the aims might be shared, the opposition to the proposal is concerned less with structure, less with clergy and more about what will be the most effective scheme for the advancement of mission here.

2. Please give attendance figures for these parishes over the last ten years. How do they compare with those for other parishes in the deanery and across the diocese? Please comment on the view that too much weight is given to church attendance in defining whether parishes are succeeding in mission and on the comparison of mission statistics provided by the Venerable Peter Sutton.

The usual Sunday attendance figures for the parishes of St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban are in Table 1 below. Table 2 shows the attendance figures for the parishes as a percentage of their parish population. The additional parishes included in the tables are those outlined in the mission statistics provided by the Venerable Peter Sutton to enable a full comparison.

* The fact that we have ministered whilst being under-funded, under-staffed and under-resourced simply makes the examples of success highlighted by The Venerable Peter Sutton all the more remarkable.

* What could the current ministers, PCCs and churches achieve fully funded, fully staffed and fully resourced? This goes to the heart of the Gaulby judgement.

The percentage change in usual Sunday attendance from 2009 to 2018 for St Francis, Leigh Park was a decline of 12.07%. For the same period, West Leigh, St Alban saw an 11.36% increase and was the only parish in the deanery to see an increase in this measurement. Unfortunately, during the same period Warren Park, St Clare suffered a decline of 75%.

* The counter-proposal makes it clear that St Clare, Warren Park and St Francis, Leigh Park should be united into a single benefice.

* Further reference to St Clare, Warren Park is therefore no longer an issue here.

However, when viewed as a percentage change from 2009 to 2018 in relation to the population of their respective parishes: Warren Park, St Clare has suffered a decline of 76.72%, which is the most severe in the deanery; St Francis, Leigh Park has declined by 22.14% and West Leigh, St Alban has increased by 9.55%.

When looking at the percentage change from 2009 to 2018 for usual Sunday attendance, Warren Park, St Clare's 75% decline places it as the highest decline at number 6 in the diocese, place 1 being a 100% decline due to closure or a parish not making a return and place 140 being the parish with the largest increase. (Three churches that did not make the return for 2018 and there are two closed churches.) For the same period and measurement, St Francis, Leigh Park was placed at number 97 and West Leigh, St Alban was placed at number 117.

* It is generous of the Bishop to include this statistic.

* Clearly on this measure, out of 140 parishes in his diocese there are 96 parishes where, as a percentage, Sunday Attendance has reduced by a greater amount than St Francis, Leigh Park.

* There are only 23 out of 140 parishes that have performed better than St Alban, West Leigh.

When viewed again as a percentage change from 2009 to 2018 as a percentage of their respective parishes: Warren Park, St Clare was number 7 in comparison to the other parishes in the diocese; St Francis, Leigh Park was number 36 in the diocese and West Leigh, St Alban was placed as number 74.

* Again the fact that we have ministered whilst being under-funded, under-staffed and under-resourced simply makes the examples of success highlighted by The Venerable Peter Sutton all the more remarkable.

* What could the current ministers, PCCs and churches achieve fully funded, fully staffed and fully resourced?

Table 1 & Table 2 (redacted)

The total Sunday attendance of all three congregations is 110 people from a total population of 26,207 that is 0.42% of the population of the parishes. The combined parish share contribution is £44k while the allocated ministry cost for their three stipendiary posts is £165k, with 73% of that cost being met by the parish share contributions of larger parishes in other areas in the diocese.

- * The Parishes of St Clare, Warren Park and St Francis Leigh Park have for the 18 years (my period as Incumbent) have always paid parish share in full and on time.
- * The nature of the allocation of parish share will always be akin to "the Widow's mite".
- * The parish share requested by the diocese must be on the basis of "from each according to their ability, to each according to their need".
- * It should not be forgotten that over the last 4 years, the parish share requested from St Clare, Warren Park has increased by 14 %, and that requested from St Francis, Leigh Park has increased over 5 years by 57 %.

We recognise that usual Sunday attendance (USA) figures do not reveal the full picture of the health of a parish and that schools work happens regularly. The numbers of occasional offices, although they have declined, are relatively high; however, these forms of engagement have not readily translated into any other form of church attendance or engagement, into active discipleship, or into planned giving. Therefore, USA remains a significant indicator of the longer-term sustainability of the parish and its ability to undertake its mission.

- * This is the first time that this information has been presented either to me or to PCCs.
- * The key nature of Sunday attendance has never been raised with me at a Ministerial Development Review (MDR).
- * I have not had a MDR since January 2016.
- * The Sunday attendance figure takes no account of those who attend the church for baptism services.
- * Sunday attendance figures do not reveal the full picture of the health of a parish.

The Venerable Peter Sutton has highlighted that some of the larger churches have undertaken fewer occasional offices, schools visits and services for schools and civic organisations than St Francis, Leigh Park. Whilst this is good it is not assisting the parish to attain ongoing sustainability whereas the churches named by the Ven Sutton are sustainable.

- * What is sustainability?
- * The diocese is claiming £9 million pound from SDF. Can "sustainability" be bought?
- * My understanding of the larger churches of the diocese is that they are using reserves to balance their finances year-on-year. Is this sustainable?

3. What is your response to the argument that there are significant differences between West Leigh and the other two parishes? Do you expect that the pattern of existing services would change significantly in a united parish and, if so, would there be an expectation that current worshippers would attend services at the other churches? Would the dual carriageway and lack of public transport be likely to reduce attendance at such services?

The representations that have highlighted differences between West Leigh, St Alban and the other two parishes of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare have stated that there is an existing formal relationship between St Francis and St Clare but they do not have

that relationship with St Alban. This is true. However, though there is not the same intimacy of relationship, it does not correlate that the people in the parishes are inherently different.

- * The Bishop produces no evidence that people of the parish are the same.
- * Does he believe that "the poor" are homogenous?
- * The Bishop appears ignorant of the divide between West Leigh and the rest of the Leigh Park Estate based on the historic housing stock.
- * The Bishop appears ignorant of the attitude of superiority that has traditionally been addressed to residents of West Leigh.

In 2016, the Portsmouth Council for Social Responsibility (CSR) undertook work with St Alban to look at its community profile to help inform what the parish should be doing in the future to further its mission in the area. It was realised that a community profile for St Alban could not be undertaken in isolation from the communities of St Francis and St Clare.

- * This is an interesting conclusion from work undertaken by CSR.
- * What did they do next?
- * Why has no further work been undertaken by CSR involving the united communities of St Alban, St Francis and St Clare?
- * In May 2019 Jenney Hollingsworth had a meeting at St Alban's Church with Karina Green. From the diocese the property manager was present but so too was Nick Ralph of CSR and Simon Whitbread the diocesan strategic manager. No invitation was extended to either me or churchwardens or any from St Francis & St Clare.
- * This smacks of dealing with a matter in isolation from the other two parishes

Further Tables (redacted)

CSR noted that poverty and many of the census categories can be quite stark and they do not necessarily tell us much about how people actually live so CSR also drew on Mosaic segmentation data provided by Experian. This data was more useful in some ways as it was more recent (it is from 2016), it could capture data from those who do not complete the census (e.g. private renters) and it groups people by various lifestyle factors and preferences which can give us a better idea of what might work in terms of engagement and mission locally. The Key mosaic groups for each of the three parishes is presented in table three below.

Table 3 (redacted)

The three parishes do have their own identities. Though this draft Scheme is aiming for one benefice and one parish, each area would keep its church as the focal point for the area.

The pattern of services is to remain as they currently are. This will be enabled through use of more self-supporting clergy in addition to the Team Rector and Team Vicar, and through the training and deployment of more lay ministers, such as Readers. Subsequently, there is no expectation for people to travel from Warren Park to West Leigh for services. Therefore, there is no expectation of a reduction in the attendance at services.

- * It is not sufficient for the Bishop to say that the pattern of services is to remain as they currently are.
- * Since I have ministered as the only priest in Warren Park and Leigh Park, services at St Clare's had to move from 10am to 8.30am on a Sunday. This was not convenient to many and St Clare's deserves to have more services later on a Sunday morning, as well as more and varied worship at different times and days. The lack of clergy resources has restricted the possibilities.

- * These enabling provisions are being revealed here for the first time.
- * Where will these self-supporting ministers be found?
- * Why has no previous offer been made of self-supporting ministers and other ministers over the past 18 years?
- * The pattern of Sunday and mid-week worship is Eucharistic in St Clare's and St Francis, lay ministers and Lay Readers will not be able to lead this worship. Nor can they conduct Baptisms or Weddings.

Map (redacted)

The dual carriageway already runs through a significant portion of the parish of West Leigh, St Alban as can be seen in the map below.

For the 99% of the population of these three parishes, who do not currently attend church services, parish boundaries are largely unknown and generally irrelevant.

* Although people may be unaware of the parish boundaries, the fact that the dual carriageway of the Petersfield Road divides West Leigh from the remainder of the Leigh Park estate is a physical and recognised boundary. It is a boundary that divides, and is one that people will not cross.

We are seeking to unite the benefices and parishes so as to reduce the legislative and administrative burden for our clergy and lay ministry team to release them for ministry to further the Mission of the Church in the area.

* The reduction would also be achieved by a Group Council within a Group ministry, but the Bishop has either ignored this or is unaware of it.

* Under a Team ministry, although there is only one PCC there is a further burden of beaurocracy created by the DCCs.

4. Is it correct that the Havant deanery plan allocated three stipendiary post to these three parishes? If so, why does the draft scheme provide for only one team vicar post? Would you expect to appoint other members of the team and, if so, what would their roles be? Please comment on the view that if the team vicar has a church planting role the burden of pastoral care across such a large parish will be too much for the team rector.

The Havant Deanery Plan – July 2016 looks at progress since the Deanery Review, current status and recommendations. In relation to St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban, it states that "discussions should be held about how these parishes work best together, including future parish structure".

* The amendments made to the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 which allowed for the new compensation for clergy dispossessed of their office were not introduced until the summer of 2018. They could not have been envisaged in the Deanery Plan of July 2016.

The Deanery Plan also states that the Pioneer Review of the diocese, which reported to the Bishop's Council in May 2014, identified the need to build capacity, increase training for lay and ordained pioneers, and find new missional approaches for new housing and difficult-to-reach areas. The Deanery review identified the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area and the great Leigh Park area as being best served by pioneer appointments.

* The Bishop does not comment on the success of these Pioneer posts.

- * How many new worshipping communities were created?
- * How many new people came to faith?
- * How many newly-created Pioneer communities are now "sustainable" in terms of leadership and financial self-sufficiency?

The vacant post which had previously existed at Warren Park, St Clare was therefore not renewed. Instead, a community pioneer post was created (housed in St Clare's Vicarage) to co-ordinate mission across the greater Leigh Park estates. It is intended that this post will continue to be a pioneer post within the proposed new structure.

- * The Pioneer post is not in the current proposal which is for a Team Rector and church-planting Team Vicar only.
- * The PO9 Pioneer was created in 2016 and ran until May 2018.
- * What new worshipping communities did it create?
- * How many new people came to faith?
- * What steps were achieved towards self-leadership and "sustainability"?

It is intended that the proposed team will be further expanded and assisted by its Readers, self-supporting ministers and lay pastoral assistants. National research suggests that focal ministry in a larger area can be a key support. If the draft Scheme were to proceed, this would be something that the Team Rector could explore with the Team Vicar, the wider team and the PCC. Whereas traditionally such an approach has meant appointing a person to have oversight of one church, there are also further models which we would want to explore for sharing responsibilities such as services, occasional offices, schools work etc. all of which involve sharing with clergy in their cure of souls and vision for mission.

- * This is the first time that this information has been presented either to me or to PCCs.
- * Where will these self-supporting ministers be found?
- * Why has no previous offer been made of self-supporting ministers and other ministers over the past 18 years?
- * The pattern of Sunday and mid-week worship is Eucharistic in St Clare's and St Francis, lay ministers and Lay Readers will not be able to lead this worship. Nor can they conduct Baptisms or Weddings.
- * The Bishop suggests that exploration could be made with PCCs as to future support for and shape of ministry, however, the PCCs of St Francis & St Clare have been clear as to what it would prefer ministry to look like, and for that to be better established by any proposal.
- * The Bishop suggests that further models should be explored for sharing ministry. We have been clear that rather than a Team Ministry we would prefer a Group ministry with a group Council.
- * It is entirely possible for ministers in a Group to be licensed in all areas of the Group.
- * Already in the diocese some clergy are licensed in the neighbouring parishes to allow for ease of co-ordinated ministry.

* In June adverts were placed for three posts in parishes neighbouring Warren Park and West Leigh. The diocese sought a vicar for Rowlands Castle, being also Vicar of Blendworth, Chalton & Idsworth. They sought a Vicar for Catherington & Clanfield, and a house for duty to serve across all three benefices.

- * All the posts were vacant but there was no suggestion of Pastoral reorganisation.
- * All three posts would need to work together but there was no suggestion of a team ministry.

* The role as Vicar for Rowlands Castle would also be the Vicar for Blendworth, Chalton & Idsworth, but there are to be held in plurality rather even than combining them.

* Those new to post (if appointed) and PCCs were being asked to explore working more closely together to form a group.

* To the people of Leigh Park and Warren Park this smacks of double-standards and hypocrisy and suggests that the proposed scheme for Leigh Park & Warren Park is less about the furtherance of mission and more about the acquisition of the SDF money.

5. To what extent are the current proposals based on the deanery plan? Has it been overtaken by the impact of the Strategic Development Funding?

As above, these current proposals are based on work that the Deanery had already undertaken and codified in its plan in 2016. The possibility of Strategic Development Funding has enabled us to make a bid for additional resources to be provided for the area, in order to nurture and grow the existing traditional congregations and the community outreach that they undertake, and in order to plant new congregations.

* The Bishop confuses the proposed legal scheme of pastoral reorganisation with his bid for Strategic Development Funding (SDF).

* The legal scheme offers only two stipendiary clergy.

* The SDF money is not yet granted.

* The SDF money is limited to 5 years.

* The legal scheme will not end after 5 years and so needs to be the best possible model for the advancement of mission in these parishes.

6. Was the alternative proposal put forward by the PCCs of Leigh Park and Warren Park considered by the DMPC? If so, what are the reasons for preferring the arrangements proposed in the draft Scheme?

The PCCs of St Frances, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare proposed a ten point plan in response to the proposals of the DMPC. The wider vision expressed through our Resourcing Growth SDF application, and the PCCs' proposals are the same for points six to ten of the PCCs' plan.

* My understanding of the wider vision is that it would be discussed, explored and agreed after extensive consultation within the community, the church families and the PCCs.

* In his responses the Bishop is presenting information for the first time to me and the PCCs.

The differences on points one to five of the PCCs' plan are around group ministry rather than team ministry structures and the designation of posts within the draft scheme.

The PCC of West Leigh, St Alban are satisfied that a team ministry is the right legal structure for future ministry in the area.

* The clear differences that emerged between the PCCs of St Clare and St Francis from the proposals of the DMPC were apparent at the meeting on Thursday 7th March 2019 with the strategic team from the diocese.

* The clear differences that emerged between the views of the PCCs of St Clare and St Francis and the PCC of St Alban's were apparent at the meeting on Thursday 7th March 2019 with the strategic team from the diocese.

* Since disagreements existed, and since the PCCs are expected to work more closely together in the future for the success of any scheme, it was incumbent on the diocese to address the issue of mediation.

* There were still 3 weeks before the published date for the end of the formal consultation, and in any event the time-scales and the process of consultation were still under the direction of the Bishop and the strategic team of the diocese.

The DMPC is clear that a single parish benefice with the necessary team ministry will offer the most suitable structure to enable a coordinated approach to mission across Leigh Park, Warren Park and West Leigh. This is a densely populated urban/suburban area where parish boundaries are either unknown or irrelevant to the 99% of people who do not currently attend any church.

*The Bishop is wrong in saying that a team ministry is "necessary".

* Can the Bishop comment on the potential use of a Joint Council in a group facilitated by recent legislation?

* Although people may be unaware of the parish boundaries, the fact that the dual carriageway of the Petersfield Road divides West Leigh from the remainder of the Leigh Park estate is a physical and recognised boundary

The diocese believes that the benefits of this structure are:

* These benefits are not exclusive to a team.

- One decision-making body (PCC) which sets the vision and strategy for mission and ministry and which makes overall decisions about how finance supports this work.

- A coordinated plan for ministry and mission, including the provision across the geographical area of traditional and modern forms of worship, the creation of a new church plant, the focussing of pioneering ministry around children and young families, and the integration of social engagement work with discipleship development across the team's churches.

- An unrelenting focus, across traditions, on creating space in church for those who do not currently have an active Christian faith

- The protection of both traditional and new forms of worship within the team, creating a mixed economy approach across the whole team area, and encouraging mutual flourishing.

- The ability to appoint lay and ordained stipendiary and self-supporting ministers across the team, to coordinate their energies, and to create some economies of scale in the delivery of their work. This will include a combination of a team rector, a team vicar for church planting, operations manager, pioneer specialising in children and families' ministry, and pioneer specializing in social engagement and whole life discipleship development.

* These enabling provisions are being revealed here for the first time.

* Where will these self-supporting ministers be found?

* Why has no previous offer been made of self-supporting ministers and other ministers over the past 18 years?

* The pattern of Sunday and mid-week worship is Eucharistic in St Clare's and St Francis, lay ministers and Lay Readers will not be able to lead this worship. Nor can they conduct Baptisms or Weddings.

- One coordinated approach to the use and management of buildings, including decisions about long-term viability, social enterprise and rental opportunities, and location and equipping of any future church plants.

- Planning across the team for encouraging stewardship, generating income from external sources, including grants and social enterprise, and ensuring the sustainability of ministry for this area for the future.

* This is being revealed to me and to the PCCs for the first time in these responses.

* What evidence does the Bishop rely on for wider estate ministry churches becoming "Self-sufficient" and financially "sustainable" after 5 years?

* No evidence has been produced to us previously.

A group ministry could serve a similar purpose of cooperating in ministry across an area and some of the affected parishes asked us to consider this as an alternative. However, the DMPC did not believe that a group ministry was the appropriate structure for the following reasons:

- This pastoral reorganisation is seeking to create a sustainable structure where strategic, mission-focussed decisions are made in one PCC for the one area.

* Can the Bishop comment on the potential use of a Joint Council in a group as facilitated by recent legislation?

- The diocesan experience of other group ministries has been that, whilst a group ministry may work well in its first iteration, when existing clergy share a joint vision, this relational working does not always survive clergy changes or differences in personality;

* The same issues relate to changes in personnel of a Team ministry.

* What is contained within the counter-proposal builds immediately on the foundations of ministry that is trusted, respected and embedded in the community.

- Group ministry provides a far weaker structure on which to base the deployment of additional posts, such as operations manager, community worker etc., than would be the case for a single parish with a team ministry. A group ministry cannot itself legally act as employer for paid posts;

* Can the Bishop comment on the potential use of a Joint Council in a group as facilitated by recent legislation?

- A group ministry does not give authority to other incumbent members of the team to act outside of their own parish when it comes to being involved in matters such as agendas for PCC meetings and the strategic decision making about mission, ministry, and finance which happens there.

* Can the Bishop comment on the potential use of a Joint Council in a group as facilitated by recent legislation?

- In a group ministry, responsibility for the cure of souls for all areas is not shared between all members of the group.

* This is disingenuous since across the diocese, and even within Havant Deanery clergy have been licensed across parish boundaries to allow for a wider sharing of ministry in neighbouring parishes.

* I refer again to the points made about a future group in neighbouring parishes (Q 4 above) With a team ministry, there would be one benefice, one parish, and therefore one Parochial Church Council (PCC), delegating some functions to small local District Church Councils (DCCs). Decisions about ministry and mission, including working towards significant outreach to those who do not currently attend church, will be made by the PCC, allowing finance and resources to follow strategic mission decisions across the team. DCCs would remain in control of finances related to their immediate congregational worship and the more minor aspects of their buildings. DCCs would retain any funds or future legacies that are restricted in use by a specific church and congregation.

DCCs would relate to the PCC via common elected members and by the clergy who may attend any of the DCC meetings. The DCC would make sufficient record of its proceedings and make these available to the PCC in an appropriate form at regular intervals.

* DCCs by necessity add a layer of bureaucracy.

7. Please comment on the view that there is an ignorance at the diocesan level of the mission and ministry currently taking place in these parishes and of their needs and wishes and that no detailed studies have been undertaken to establish these. Why were the current incumbent and priest-in-charge not asked for their input at an earlier stage?

The diocese has been well versed in the mission and ministry of the parishes via the current serving clergy; Havant Deanery; the work of the CSR with West Leigh, St Alban; the many and varied applications to the Mission Opportunities Fund and subsequent coverage in the diocesan newsletter and bulletins.

* This is so painful to read. No conversations regarding mission in a proposed scheme took place in advance. No work has been done with CSR since 2016. Applications to MOF and reports in Diocesan magazines are not the basis for sweeping wholesale changes!

* The Bishop has not witnessed mission in these parishes and no-one from the diocese has ever attended a mission event here.

* I re-state more firmly that there is an ignorance of current mission & ministry.

This has been underscored by meetings with the parishes by members of the diocesan team and members of Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee (DMPC) over the past eight months.

* These 8 months have been actually part of the process, but the diocese created its plans and schemes before the process began, and before any consultation.

* The scheme shows no understanding of the mission and ministry currently taking place in the parishes.

* If the Bishop's statement is true then they have taken no notice of current ministry and mission. This feels hugely damaging to the potential future mission on the estate.

Information from the incumbent and priest-in-charge and from the Havant Deanery Plan (2016) fed in to the initial consultation which focussed solely on unifying the benefices. There was no further detail underpinning the proposals that came out of the meetings with the clergy and their PCCs in the informal consultation process.

*Whatever was discussed in the Deanery Plan or 3 years ago, the expectation would always be that further consultation and discussion should take place between the parishes and the diocese. No further consultation or discussion has taken place since 2016.

8. Please explain what is meant by “different ways of doing ministry”, how this differs from the work currently being done in these parishes and how this would be facilitated by the reorganisation proposed in the draft Scheme? Are the proposals based on a model which has been successful elsewhere?

The diocese is seeking to better resource the greater Leigh Park estate for intentional growth in its existing traditional congregations and to church plant to grow new congregations for the majority of people in the area that do not currently access regular worship in church.

The single parish benefice structure, supported by a team ministry, will enable both the traditional congregations and the new congregations to exist within normal parochial structures with the collegial support of each other. For long-term sustainability of both, this is essential.

* These outcomes would be identical for the counter-proposal of a group ministry.

Traditional church congregations have been declining at a steady rate nationally and I have outlined the figures for these parishes above. The national rate of decline is circa 7%. Our traditional church congregations, as they are in the normal parochial structure, also bear the burden of all the legislative, administrative and building responsibilities.

* We have spoken of the ministry in Leigh Park & Warren Park under-funded, under-staffed, and under-resourced

* The ministry, including all of the results identified by The Ven. Peter Sutton have been achieved by a single priest, working with no full-time clergy support.

Portsmouth Deanery already has a church plant, Harbour Church. Whilst being outside of the parochial system, it still needs to be governed and so had to set up a charitable incorporated organisation and register with the Charity Commission. It was also set up in a commercial property on the high street, which comes with an expensive lease as well as maintenance and repair responsibilities.

* This is irrelevant to ministry in Leigh Park & Warren Park.

* It is an unsuitable model for the community here

Neither model is sustainable for either congregation in the long-term. However, there needs to be a structure that enables both forms of church to operate with integrity while also being responsible to each other for mutual flourishing.

* Can the Bishop comment on the potential use of a Joint Council in a group as facilitated by recent legislation.

The pastoral reorganisation of a single parish benefice with a team ministry is required to release time and energy from over-burdensome administration and legal requirements by reducing the number of PCCs to one, to enable both traditional and new forms of worship and mission to flourish and for more than one member of the clergy to have the responsibility for the cure of souls and be licenced to the parish.

* If all are alienated by the scheme, what then is the future of mission and ministry?

* Why did the Bishop and his team not seek mediation when this became clear?

* The Burden of meeting, minute-taking and accountability remains as a layer of beaurocracy with DCCs under a team ministry.

A number of examples of church planting and team ministry have been examined and each have experienced different issues. This proposed structure takes account of the lessons learned in these areas and is seeking to put the best structure in place to support both forms of ministry sustainably into the future.

* If the Bishop had details to share, which would be helpful, we would expect him to reveal them. The fact that no details are forthcoming leaves us feeling misunderstood and patronised.

* How can we be sure that these examples are directly comparable to the situation in Leigh Park & Warren Park?

* I refer again to the proposed group operating across Rowlands Castle, Blendworth, Chalton & Idsworth, and Catherington & Clanfield (above)

9. Why was it decided not to designate the two current incumbent and priest-in-charge as the first holders of posts in the proposed team ministry? Please comment on the view that one or both should be named in order to build on their existing work.

At the meeting of the DMPC on 3 April 2019, members recognised that in the past it had dealt with proposed pastoral schemes in which certain existing clergy were 'designated' to a new post. The example was given of the most recent scheme that was made for the West Wight Team Ministry. In this case, both clergy in that team had been recruited, with the agreement and input of the affected parishes, with the possible future team ministry structure explicitly in mind and indicated in the appointment process.

* It was stated at the public consultation meeting in October 2018 that posts would not be designated.

* That public meeting was wrongly informed that "it was the law" that posts had to be advertised.

* This was incorrect, and mirrors the understanding of those present for the presentations and public consultation in Gosport.

In this case, though the number of clergy posts in the proposed draft Scheme remains the same, the roles themselves will be different to the clergy roles that currently exist. The example of the 'team rector' and 'church-planting team vicar' has been widely circulated, as this is a potential team ministry model that DMPC members would like to see – a team rector with strategic oversight for both traditional parish ministry and the creation of new congregations in a range of traditions; and a team vicar with the specific expertise to create brand new worshipping communities; plus other clergy and lay people with different skills. However, this model is not set in stone – it could equally be that the team rector or a pioneer minister has the church-planting expertise.

Members therefore agreed that an open and transparent recruitment process was beneficial to ensure that clergy and lay ministers are appointed with the relevant gifts for these new roles.

* We were informed at a meeting of the PCCs with the diocesan team, by Archdeacon Gavin Collins that the Bishop had decided in advance that since the number of existing clergy in one of the three areas exceeded the number of potential posts he felt it would be unfair to designate some posts and not others across the board.

* As a result none of the posts under any of the four schemes across three areas would be designated – and there would be no individual consideration of designation of posts within each separate and distinct scheme.

* We assert that by accepting this at the out-set, the Bishop's Council as DMPC had fettered their discretion.

10. Please set out the consultation process on these proposals and confirm that the statutory requirements for consulting the interested parties were met and that the PCCs were offered meetings with the DMPC or its representatives and the clergy who would be dispossessed offered meetings with the full Committee. Were such meetings requested and held?

The timeline for the consultation process was as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Monday 24 th September | The Portsmouth Diocesan Clergy Conference opens with Bishop Christopher thanking clergy for all that they are and all that they do. |
| Tuesday 25 th September | Bishop James Jones delivers the key-note address on "Speaking Truth unto Justice".

In his address he references the intransigence of the Police Authority in the Hillsborough Inquiry and that of the Gosport War Memorial Primary Care Trust as demonstrating "The Patronizing Disposition of Unaccountable Power".

He affirms that we must continue to speak Truth unto Justice against The Patronizing Disposition of Unaccountable Power. |
| Wednesday 26 th September | The Portsmouth Diocesan Clergy Conference closes with the Eucharist presided over by Bishop Christopher. |
| Tuesday 2 nd October | The Revd Jonathan Jeffery receives an email from Deputy Diocesan Secretary Jenny Hollingsworth requesting his attendance at Peninsular House at a pre-determined meeting on 5 th October. |

a) Friday 5 October 2018: Private meeting with individual clergy who may be dispossessed of office should the DMPC decide to proceed with pastoral reorganisation.

* My meeting had only Jenny Hollingsworth and Rachel Brownbill (HR Consultant) present

* Karina Green's meeting was also attended by Archdeacon Joanne Grenfell

b) Monday 8 October 2018: DMPC decide to proceed to informal consultations on proposed pastoral reorganisation.

c) Wednesday 17 October 2018: Public deanery meeting held on proposed pastoral reorganisation at St Wilfrid, Cowplain. Buses provided for people wishing to attend from the affected parishes that may not have access to transport for the meeting.

d) Friday 19 October 2018: Informal consultation letters sent to all interested parties and to all who attended the public meeting.

e) Tuesday 6 November 2018: West Leigh, St Alban PCC met with the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals.

* Our understanding is that Archdeacon Joanne Grenfell attended this meeting.

* She has not attended a single meeting with the PCCs of St Clare or St Francis.

f) Monday 19 November 2018: St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare PCCs met with the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals.

* No alternative date could be offered by the diocese even though Monday is my published "day off".

* The meetings had to begin : at St Clare's 7.30pm (start) : at St Francis 9pm (start)

* This speaks of an un-seemly haste to complete the process.

g) Sunday 25 November 2018: West Leigh, St Alban PCC met with representatives of the DMPC at 3pm and the PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare met with the representatives at 5pm to discuss the draft proposals.

h) Friday 30 November 2018: Deadline for receipt of responses to the informal consultation.

i) Wednesday 5 December 2018: DMPC met to consider the responses to the informal consultation. Due to the volume of responses and the short period of time between the closing date for such and this meeting, the DMPC deferred its decision on whether to proceed to formal consultations or not until the next meeting.

j) Monday 28 January 2019: DMPC discussed the statements of view and agreed to proceed with formal consultations on the draft proposals.

k) Friday 1 February 2019: s.6 formal consultation letters were sent to all interested parties. Those who attended the public meeting were also informed of the decision.

l) Thursday 7 February 2019: Havant Deanery Synod met with members of the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals.

m) Thursday 28 February 2019: The PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare met with the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals and offer an alternative plan.

* No alternative date could be offered by the diocese – this was in fact my birthday

n) Thursday 7 March 2019: The PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban met with the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals and the alternative plan put forward by St Francis and St Clare PCCs.

* No later than at this meeting it was clear that there was not agreement between the parishes themselves, nor with the diocese. At this point Mediation should have been offered by the diocese.

o) Thursday 14 March 2019: The PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban met with representatives of the DMPC to give their views on the draft proposals.

p) Friday 29 March 2019: Deadline for receipt of responses to the s.6 formal consultation.

q) Wednesday 3 April 2019: DMPC heard representations from the Revd Jonathan Jeffery, discussed the statements of view and recommended the draft proposals to the Bishop and he approved the draft proposals. It was agreed that the draft scheme would be submitted to the Church Commissioners and they would be asked to undertake the notice and publication of the draft scheme.

Representors were allowed 10 minutes to speak. There were no questions of The Revd Jeffery, and subsequently no changes were made to the proposed scheme.

* This left me and many others feeling that the diocese was predisposed to the scheme, but more importantly that the consultation was simply a matter of form rather than of true information gathering.

r) Thursday 4 April 2019: A letter was sent to the interested parties informing them of the DMPC's decision. It also said a further letter would be sent within ten days giving more detail on the discussions.

s) Friday 5 April 2019: The draft scheme and supporting documentation were sent to the Church Commissioners.

t) Friday 5 April 2019: An email was sent to all those that attended the public meetings letting them know of the DMPC's decision.

u) Friday 12 April 2019: A letter was sent to all interested parties with further details of the issues discussed at the meeting of the DMPC on 3 April. It offered a further meeting with representatives of the DMPC should the PCCs wish to discuss the decision of the Committee.

v) Monday 15 April 2019: Church Commissioners publish the draft scheme. w) Tuesday 21 May 2019: The PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare met with representatives of the DMPC.

x) Wednesday 29 May 2019: Deadline for representations for or against the draft scheme.

The incumbent of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare is against the draft scheme, as are the PCCs of both parishes.

There has been a campaign on Facebook and associated petition to save the vicars of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare; and of West Leigh, St Alban.

The incumbent of West Leigh, St Alban and its PCC are in favour of the draft scheme. The Archdeacon of Portsdown and the Joint Area Dean of Havant Deanery are also in favour of the draft scheme.

* Archdeacon Joanne Grenfell has never visited either Leigh Park or Warren Park to witness mission.

* She has been absent from every meeting with the PCCs of St Francis & St Clare and has not involved herself in the discussions.

* Even before any decision has been made by the Pastoral Committee, Joanne Grenfell has left the diocese.

* The perception is that she has begun a process that she will not see through.

* Since she was the most senior figure at the public consultation meeting, the perception within the community of Leigh Park is of the hierarchy of the church caring little for real people, and a real "top-down" model which will not benefit or enable a community.

* The Revd Ian Snares has never visited Leigh Park or Warren Park to witness mission.

11. What level of support for the proposals was there during the local consultation process? What consideration was given to concerns raised during this process? Were any changes made as a result of the consultations and, if not, what were the reasons for deciding to proceed with the original proposals? Please comment on the detailed concerns expressed by the representors about the consultation process.

Prior to the meeting of the DMPC on Monday 8 October, the incumbent of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare and the Priest-in-Charge of West Leigh, St Alban were asked to attend meetings at the diocesan office with an external HR advisor to be told of the proposed pastoral reorganisation of their benefices and that, if it did come to pass, this would mean that they might be dispossessed of their office. This has been criticised by a number of representors and at meetings with some of the PCCs. However, it is not clear how it could have been otherwise done. It would have been unthinkable for the clergy to have discovered this second-hand.

* I refer the Pastoral Committee to the fuller and complete time-line under Section 10. (above)

* It would appear from diocesan websites from around the Church of England and from other matters considered by the Church Commissioners that often dioceses have a "lead-in" period of consultations with clergy, PCCs and communities lasting from between 6 months and 2 years.

* The "lead-in" here was 2 days from the meeting with clergy on 5 October to the DMPC meeting on 8 October.

* This gives the impression of undue haste, lack of willingness to consult, and a pre-disposition to outcomes none of which suggest a scenario for the best furtherance of mission.

The informal consultation period began with a public meeting at St Wilfrid's, Cowplain on Wednesday 17 October 2018. It is accepted that the decision to hold the meeting in a neutral venue was unhelpful for those who wished to attend and that one of the local churches should have been asked to host the meeting. As it was too short notice to change the venue, the diocese did pay for buses to pick up people from St Clare's and St Francis.

* As with the Bishop's expression of regret in the introduction, this admission speaks of "too-little-too-late" on behalf of the diocese.

* Why is no-one now apologising?

* Why is no-one now apologising to our Community?

* We are left with the impression of being "guinea-pigs" of a system that has failed the Community and risks failing the Church.

* The public meeting was convened with less than 10 days notice.

* Between the first public meeting and the date for submissions there were 44 days.

* Why was a public consultation meeting not called at an agreed and better venue?

* Without such a meeting the impression is clearly given of a diocese that does not understand, does not want to listen, and frankly does not care.

Over 100 people attended the public meeting. A large number of attendees were clear that they did not want any change if any of the proposals meant that they could lose their clergy. There was a presumption that the diocese did not know or care about the communities in Leigh Park or Warren Park. However, in one to one conversations with members of the

diocesan team, both during and after the meeting, there was also some recognition that uniting the benefices made sense and that, whilst it was very sad to think that a member of their they might lose their current clergy, they or a family member had also gone through a similar redundancy process at some point.

* This report, like the notes published after the public meeting is very skewed and misleading.

* It is further evidence of an un-willingness or an inability to listen well if the diocese believes this to be a true representation of our community.

On the following Friday 19 October 2018, the informal consultation letter was sent out to everyone who had given their details at the public meeting as well as the legally interested parties asking them for their views on:

- the proposed termination of the holding in plurality of the benefice of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park St Clare;
- the proposed union of the benefice of St Francis, Leigh Park; the benefice of Warren Park, St Clare; and the benefice West Leigh.

The informal consultation was purposefully focussed at the benefice level in the first instance to enable ideas about the parish structure to be shaped by the meetings with PCCs during this period.

* Mention should be made here of the huge contribution of views via the Face book petition as well as on the Diocesan Face book page, and through social media as a whole.

During these meetings the PCCs agreed that less administrative burden and duplication of administration across the parishes would be welcomed; that they would be happy to work more closely together; that they wished to retain their current pattern of services and for each parish to retain its church, and that a team ministry would be an appropriate structure. These views were subsequently incorporated into the initial draft proposals that were brought to the DMPC meeting on 3 December 2019.

* This is incorrect.

* The PCCS of St Clare and St Francis were clear from the outset that posts ought to be designated.

* There was no support for a team ministry without designation of posts to the existing clergy.

* The counter-proposal offered a more vibrant, dynamic and appropriate model for these parishes.

Prior to the DMPC meeting on 3 December 2019, concerns were raised by representors that the members would not have enough time to fully take in the responses given. In light of the volume of responses on 3 December 2019, the DMPC asked for an explanation of the draft proposals before them and how they had been informed by the meetings during the informal consultation. It then agreed that the decisions on each of the draft proposals should be deferred to its next meeting on 29 January 2019 to enable its members to study the responses in depth. This delay has been criticised by some representors but equally was suggested and welcomed by others.

* I have never seen this argument put before, and find it hard to understand why the Bishop presents it in this way.

* My understanding was that the Bishop took the decision.

* It was revealed in Social media from the diocese that due to the weight of materials and the pressing date of the next meeting, the Bishop decided to carry discussions forward until the New Year.

I do not know whether or not the meeting on 29th January 2019 was the next scheduled meeting or an extra-ordinary one to get back on track with an SDF bid.

On 29 January 2019, the DMPC agreed to proceed to a formal consultation under section 6 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 with draft proposals seeking to unite the benefices and parishes of St Francis, West Leigh; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban, and to create a team ministry for the new benefice.

The meeting of the DMPC on Wednesday 3 April 2019 was addressed by the Revd Jonathan Jeffery. This statement, the written responses to the s. 6 consultation and the views garnered by the members of the DMPC that had attended meetings with the affected PCCs were discussed at length. The DMPC felt that the parish proposal and the diocesan proposal were similar in all but the structure and the resultant dispossession of the clergy. However, the DMPC agreed that the single parish benefice structure with a team ministry was the appropriate base for future mission in the area. Therefore, with all members voting in favour with the exception of one abstention, the DMPC decided to recommend the draft Scheme to me without any amendments.

* The Bishop's Council (DMPC) might have felt similarities "in all but the structure and resultant dispossession of the clergy – but these are vital ingredients for the furtherance of mission.

These elements are the essential components for the best possible outcome for mission for these estates.

12. Do you think your decision that none of the current clergy should be appointed to the new posts which would be created by this or the three similar draft Schemes unduly fettered the discretion of the DMPC? Would you have been prepared to reconsider this if the DMPC had recommended that Jonathan Jeffery or Karina Green should be appointed to new offices by this scheme? Would you be prepared to amend the draft scheme to provide for this now?

As outlined in the answer to question 9 above, the DMPC discussed whether current clergy should be designated or not within the draft Scheme. It was recognised that this is what the DMPC had done in Schemes previously. However, the DMPC decided that this would not be appropriate for this draft Scheme or the other three similar draft Schemes.

As mentioned earlier, the intention of the DMPC is to have one member of the team responsible for the traditional congregations and the other member of the team to be responsible for undertaking a church plant with new congregations. The DMPC recognises that there are currently two loved members of the clergy both undertaking good traditional ministry in their parishes and it stated that it could not choose one over the other for the traditional post in a new structure. The DMPC believed an open recruitment process, in line with the Patronage (Benefices) Measure, would enable the current clergy and the parishes to discern who should be the Team Rector and the Team Vicar should the draft Scheme proceed. Should the DMPC have decided to recommend that Revd Jonathan Jeffery or Canon Karina Green be appointed to posts within the new structure, I would have considered it, but this was not the case.

* We were informed at a meeting of the PCCs with the diocesan team, by Archdeacon Gavin Collins that the Bishop had decided in advance that since the number of existing clergy across the three areas exceeded the number of potential posts he felt it would be unfair to designate some posts and not others.

* As a result none of the posts under any of the four schemes across three areas would be designated – and there would be no individual consideration of designation of posts within each separate and distinct scheme.

* We assert that by accepting this at the out-set, the Bishop's Council as DMPC had fettered their discretion.

* It should be noted that no consultation, either prior to or during the process was made of me as to whether I might accept a post or have a preference.

The issues around the potential dispossession of our clergy have been prayed on, considered and deliberated by the DMPC and myself over the past eight months. The DMPC has made its recommendation to me in the draft Scheme and I will not amend it by fiat now.

* Sadly with the lack of understanding of the nature of this community and of existing mission, much of that prayer has been uninformed.

13. Please comment on the view that a policy of blanket dispossessions across the four draft Schemes is against the spirit of the Mission and Pastoral Measure and the Code of Practice. What are your reasons for adopting this policy?

To say that the four draft Schemes are against the spirit of the Mission and Pastoral Measure and the Code of Practice is to suggest that it was not intended that dispossession of clergy should be undertaken even though this is clearly allowed for by the legislation. This is not the case. The changes regarding compensation for loss of office under the 2018 amendment were specifically brought in to enable dioceses to undertake pastoral reorganisation, that may result in the dispossession of clergy, in order to further the Mission of the Church.

When General Synod voted on this, there was considerable support from within the House of Clergy as well as the House of Laity. It was felt that this indicates that there is, in the wider Church, a recognition that we need to find ways of being able to undertake such pastoral reorganisations when they are necessary for mission development.

Dispossessions without subsequent designation of first office-holders from existing incumbents is not something the DMPC or I take lightly. In all four draft Schemes that have come before you, the new offices in the proposed Schemes will not obviously accommodate or suit all of our existing clergy. Where there is a reduction in similar posts, the DMPC did not feel it could appoint one clergy person over another to that office. It was also noted that some of the existing clergy have felt called to other roles in the Church or have been unsure as to whether they are yet called to a proposed new office in their current area and the legislation enables them to be compensated for their loss of office while they discern the next phase of their ministry.

* This answer makes me wonder if the Bishop understands this question.

* It is not sufficient to say that simply because something is not prohibited – it must be allowed. That is a nonsense!

* Indeed the “spirit of the legislation” will never specifically be detailed in things permissible or authorised, but by being “the spirit” will be understood by the other elements of the legislation.

* It is clear that it is anticipated that most dispossessions will be of a technical nature, and that true dispossessions resulting in the need to pay compensation will be the exception and rare.

* With 10 clergy affected and threatened with an actual dispossession in four schemes across three areas, it cannot be said that the actual dispossession by Portsmouth Diocese will be either the exception or rare.

14. Please comment on the view that consideration should have been given to the ability of the current incumbent and priest-in-charge to contribute to the better cure of souls in the proposed arrangements when developing these proposals?

As above, consideration has been given to the ability of the current incumbent and priest-in-charge to contribute to the better cure of souls in the proposed new structure but the DMPC did not feel it could choose who should be appointed to the proposed traditional post. The DMPC decided it would be fair for the incumbent and priest-in-charge to be able to see which roles they might be called to and to apply for those posts in an open recruitment process and to be compensated for their loss of office.

* This is the question that relates to the Gaulby Judgement (rather than 15).

* The Bishop has not demonstrated that proper consideration was given to either me or Karina Green for posts under the scheme.

* No conversation took place prior to the process or during it.

* It is an essential element that the views, wishes and ministries of existing clergy be considered. The Bishop has not done this.

I have not had a MDR since January 2016.

15. Please confirm that dispossessing the current incumbent and priest-in-charge from their current offices is not the primary purpose of the Scheme and comment on how the draft Scheme sits with the advice in paragraph 2.13 of the Code of Practice to the Mission and Pastoral Measure (copy attached).

Dispossession of our current clergy is not the primary purpose of the Scheme.

The DMPC recognises that the current serving clergy are much loved by their congregations and that the wider community places a high value on traditional ministry. However, currently the church is not reaching 99% of the population in the greater Leigh Park estates. There is huge potential to expand the impact of the Church on the lives of people in the estates by diversifying the ways that we bring the message of Jesus to those people. In order to provide traditional ministry and new forms of worship through church planting in a strategically coherent way, we need a structure in place that releases ordained and lay ministers to minister and promotes mutual, sustainable flourishing. The DMPC believes that the single parish benefice structure with a team ministry is the best structure to support this mission. This is in line with the advice in relation to the Gaulby judgement.

* Again the Bishop majors on Sunday attendance, but worship does not solely mean mission and vice versa.

16. Was mediation considered as part of the consultation process and, if so, why was it not undertaken?

As demonstrated by the timeline above, an extensive consultation process has been undertaken. A suggestion of mediation was raised at the meeting between the PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare and the representatives of the DMPC at its meeting on Tuesday 21 May 2019. At that stage it was suggested that this could further delay the process and it would be unlikely to yield a result where all parties were in agreement as how to proceed with pastoral reorganisation in this area.

* I find this disingenuous.

* The Diocese at no stage suggested mediation even though it was clear that there was no agreement between the PCCs and with their preferred scheme.

* When questioned about the possibility of mediation the individual members of Bishop's council (DMPC) were unaware of its place within the legislation.

* No later than at the meeting on 7th March 2019 it was clear that there was not agreement between the parishes themselves, nor with the diocese. At this point Mediation should have been offered by the diocese.

* It is unclear how a scheme can forward without proper mediation now and certainly that any un-mediated scheme that did not carry all three PCCs with be a hindrance to , rather than further mission.

17. Do you think there will be sufficient goodwill in the parishes to implement these proposals successfully if the draft Scheme proceeds? Please comment on the view that there will be a reputational risk for the Church and that some existing congregation members may leave the Church.

The incumbent, PCC and community of St Francis, Leigh Park; and Warren Park, St Clare are not in favour of the draft Scheme due to the prospect of the dispossession of the clergy.

* This assertion by the Bishop is wrong.

* I, and the PCCs are not in favour as we do not believe that the draft Scheme provides the best possible model for the furtherance of mission.

* Our objections were 3-fold not just based on the loss of "the greatest resource that the church has in the area", namely the clergy who would be dispossessed.

However, all have said that they are in favour of change and extra resourcing to grow the Church. The Priest-in-Charge and PCC of West Leigh, St Alban and its community are supportive of the draft Scheme and the wider vision based on it and so I am hopeful of their goodwill.

I recognise that irrespective of whether this draft Scheme proceeds or not there will be work to be undertaken to enable those of differing views to come together in reconciliation and I would pray that through that process all would find their spiritual home in our churches.

There is of course reputational risk for the Church by undertaking this Scheme. However, there is even more reputational risk if the mission of the church continues to essentially retreat from society, and to impact fewer and fewer people's lives. Therefore, we have to intentionally aim for growth in depth, impact and number, strategically and sustainably, and put in place the right structure to enable it.

* This statement has made me angry, sad and at turns, despairing for the church.

* It may be that the Bishop has used the same wording for each of the proposed schemes, even though they are far from identical.

* The fact that he has not applied himself directly to these parishes and to this community but has simply used a "stock answer" strengthens the view that he does not understand this community of the existing mission here of the church.

* However, he has chosen to use this phrase, and direct it to me personally and so I will take it personally.

* My ministry, and the witness of St Clare, Warren Park & St Francis, Leigh Park cries out that we are no way retreating from society. The evidence is clear of how we are reaching and impacting people's lives, and so I need to say to the Bishop "You are wrong."

These changes are Gospel driven with mission as the motivation. We should attempt to do all we can to draw others into friendship, relationship and discipleship with Jesus.

18. Please comment on the view that dispossession would impose particular hardship on Mr Jeffery and his family. What pastoral support has been offered to the clergy who may be dispossessed, particularly given the apparent lack of relationship between the Archdeacon and Mr Jeffery?

Both I and the DMPC acknowledge that dispossession of office would be incredibly difficult for both of our serving clergy. It is also recognised that having school-age children is a blessing for the Revd and Mrs Jeffery but will be an extra concern for them should Revd Jeffery be dispossessed. Should this arise, I will seek to support them in every practical way to ensure as smooth a transition as possible in such circumstances for the family, to Revd Jeffery's next ministry.

Canon Karina Green and Revd Jonathan Jeffery have been offered pastoral support consistently through the consultation process. Jenny Hollingsworth has also been holding meetings with Revd Jeffery throughout the consultation process and I have also had pastoral meetings with him. Both Jenny and I are available to provide and source whatever support Revd Jeffery and his family should require.

* This paragraph is misleading.

* My two meetings with Jenny Hollingsworth has been at my request and not prompted by an offer from her. The first was soon after the start of the process since I had been informed that I would hear from her to arrange a meeting. When I did not hear from her, that is when I called and arranged the first of our meetings.

* The second meeting with Jenny Hollingsworth was after I had been falsely accused of "rabble rousing". This meeting included Archdeacon Gavin Collins who in conversation revealed considerable misunderstanding of the facts concerning the lead up to the public meeting and the nature of that meeting itself.

* I have had two meetings with the Bishop during this process, both at my request. At the first I spoke about how I was viewed in the diocese and asked for reconciliation through facilitated conversation with Archdeacon Joanne Grenfell. I was assured that the Bishop would think and pray about that matter, but I never received any further reply from him on that point.

* At the second meeting I told the Bishop how his proposed scheme was damaging to our community, damaging to the church and damaging to me personally. He thanked me for my frankness.

19. Are there any other factors which the Commissioners should be aware of in their consideration of these representations?

At the meeting of the DMPC on 3 April 2019, members heard that there was concern in some areas that traditional ministry was being seen as a 'bad thing', and was adamant that this was not the case. They recognised that it is relatively easy to analyse average weekly attendance and occasional offices figures, but difficult to quantify or measure the significant

impact of pastoral care and ministry in the community. They understood that there was a fear that the importance of this ministry in communities was being underestimated.

They were clear that they wanted our traditional church congregations to continue to be nurtured and developed, whilst also having a structure in place to enable new worshipping communities to flourish. They believe that this gives us the best possibility under God of bringing into church people who do not currently engage with us either in church or out in the community. Recruiting clergy who are skilled at working across traditional parish ministry and new forms of church will be a vital part of the recruitment process for the proposed new parish structures

* It is not clear from other parishes in the diocese where church planting has been tried how the existing traditional congregations are cared for.

*If there were good examples I feel sure that the Bishop and his team would have wanted to share them.

Mr Ian Horn

9th July 2019

James Davidson-Brett, Esq
The Pastoral division
The Church Commissioners
Church House
Great Smith Street
LONDON
SW1P 3AZ

Dear Mr Davidson-Brett

Mission and Pastoral Measure
Proposed Pastoral Re-organisation - Diocese of Portsmouth
St Clare's, Warren Park, St Francis, Leigh Park & St Alban's, West Leigh

I have been asked to write to you in response to the plans of the Diocese of Portsmouth for pastoral re-organisation including our parishes – and in particular the responses of the Bishop of Portsmouth (his letter dated 20th June 2019) to the points raised. I am the PCC Secretary at St Clare's Church, Warren Park and I am making this formal response on behalf of St Clare's Church PCC before the deadline of 8th July 2019.

We have been meeting, talking and fervently praying over the situation, and feel just as strongly as the Bishop that our thoughts, ideas and counter-proposals are Gospel based, Mission-led and true to the incarnational ministry of Jesus Christ.

The PCC of St Clare's Church, Warren Park opposes the current proposal.

I am aware that the PCC of St Francis have written along with our Vicar The Revd Jonathan Jeffery. I am happy to endorse the views we have discussed. I should like to focus on three key areas which are highlighted by Bishop Christopher's replies

1) Knowing this field for mission

Time and time again in his replies the Bishop has shown a lack of understanding of these communities, and a lack of understanding of our church families. He visited St Clare's in July 2018 and witnessed the vibrant launch of our Community Pantomime,

on a Sunday, after worship. He also attended St Francis in March 2019 just before the deadline for submissions and saw and heard from a congregation of 150 people keen for him to understand this mission field.

His answers show that he and his team has looked without seeing and have listened without hearing.

No-one from the diocesan team or senior clergy have ever witnessed our mission. Despite funding from MOF they have not bothered to see the Community Nativity, the Prayer Spaces in Schools, the Community Pantomime, or the Starlight Festival. The Bishop arrived late and left early at the Havant Passion Play of 2017, and no-one has enquired about the prolific schools work, or our engagement with Good Neighbours, Lunch Club, Tuesday Club, Park Families, Foodbank PO9, Messy Mondays, Craft Days, Munch, Chrunch or the Holiday Schemes.

How can he say that we are retreating from Society?

2) The proven effects of church-planting and Pioneer ministry on growth

The Bishop presents no facts, figures or data of success of church-planting or pioneer ministers creating new disciples to a degree that will allow for self-leadership and self-sufficiency in finances.

He relies way too much on his experience of Harbour Church which is a different context, from a different background, in a different community, and with a different "soil"

To ignore our experience and our voice could also prove costly. We have experienced a Church Planting scheme in Warren Park from Leigh Park Baptists in around 2003. This grew quickly to around 20 people but never extended beyond that number. A similar experience was felt by Barney & Sarah Barron as the PO9 Pioneers appointed 3 years ago. Their church plant grew initially with people across Leigh Park & Warren Park but never grew bigger. The Bishop does not share these figures, nor show how many "new Christians" have been created. Why not? Is he ashamed of the results or does he not know?

3) Reputational risk to the Church

The Bishop disregards this threat with a paragraph that he repeats for parishes in Gosport and the Isle of Wight. Does he not appreciate that each context is different? Does he not realise that the church needs to understand its community and serve it accordingly?

The process, with the appearance of undue haste, of an over-reach with too many schemes in too many areas all at once has damaged the community's view of the diocese and the central church. The seeming failure to listen to a clear and united

voice from our communities will make future engagement near impossible. Why will people consult in the future? Why will the diocese be trusted when local people hear them say one thing and then do another?

We fear that with the reputation of the Church of England in tatters in our Community, The Archbishop's money – in the wrong hands – and spent in the wrong ways will be wasted. A costly error on behalf of the Church which would then be unable to rebuild to the position of trust it currently enjoys.

Whatever conclusions the Bishop has come to, we in Warren Park & Leigh Park long to see the church grow and wish to see our minister properly supported, funded and resourced. Just think what could have been achieved across this estate with a fraction of the money now promised if it had been paid when mission support was asked for?

Finally we still oppose the scheme not on the basis that we do not want to grow and change, but on the basis that we offer a more, vibrant, dynamic and authentic proposal for the true furtherance of mission here.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jan Horn', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mrs Jan Horn

PCC Secretary
St Clare's Church, Warren Park

James Davidson-Brett

From:
Sent: 09 July 2019 11:40
To: James Davidson-Brett
Subject: St Francis PCC response to Bishops Letter
Attachments: bishops_response_greater_leigh_park_estate_20.06.2019 (1).docx

Good morning Mr Davidson-Brett

Please find attached the St Francis, Leigh Park PCC's response to the letter from Bishop Christopher.

I have added our comments at the end of some of the questions.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge successful receipt of this email as we were given an extension to the original deadline to 4.00 pm this afternoon.

Kind regards
Alison Watson
PCC Secretary, St Francis, Leigh Park

Sent from Windows Mail

The Bishop of Portsmouth
The Rt Revd Christopher Foster

Mr Rex Andrew
Pastoral Division
Church House
Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3AZ

20 June 2019

**Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011
Benefices of St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban
Proposed Pastoral Scheme**

Dear Rex,

Thank you very much for your letter and for the copies of the representations you have received about this proposed scheme.

The process as laid down by the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 is comprehensive, which enables full consultation with the interested parties but also by its nature means that it takes a not insignificant amount of time to undertake.

I am grateful to all of those who attended the initial informal public consultation meeting in October and who have since participated in the subsequent phases of the consultation and its meetings. The time and energy that people have given to this has been substantial and is hugely appreciated.

When proposing to undertake changes as significant as those contained in the draft Scheme it is inevitable that there will be strong, differing points of view held by all concerned. This process has not been an easy process for anyone to experience and for the distress that has been felt, I am sorry.

This draft Scheme, if it were to proceed, would mean that the current incumbent and priest-in-charge would be dispossessed of their offices and they would not be designated to posts in the new structure. I recognise that there are members of the community and our congregations who are very distressed at the thought of the dispossession of their beloved clergy. This is something that both I and the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee (DMPC) have prayed on, deliberated and debated extensively and agreed is necessary to ensure that the right structure is created to care for the cure of souls and to further the Mission of the Church across the greater Leigh Park estates. Therefore, I do wish the Scheme to proceed.

Bishopsgrove • 26 Osborn Road • Fareham • PO16 7DQ
Tel: 01329 280247 • Fax: 01329 231538
Email: bishop@portsmouth.anglican.org • Website: www.portsmouth.anglican.org

In order to help the Mission, Pastoral and Church Property Committee to consider this proposal I offer below my responses to the points raised in your letter dated 7 June 2019.

1. What were the main reasons for proposing to terminate the current plurality established for the Leigh Park and Warren Park benefices, unite the three benefices and their constituent parishes, and establish a team ministry for its area and how this would further the Mission of the Church in this area?

Since the establishment of the Diocese of Portsmouth in 1927, each bishop has presided over a steady decline in its congregations, in step with the rest of the Church of England. However, with the success of the Pioneer Project in 2016 and other initiatives, the diocese saw a small increase in average weekly church attendance. This emboldened the diocese to aim for and strategically resource our churches for growth. The diocese asked the Strategic Development Unit for insights as to where this would have the most impact.

Key indicators were provided to the diocese by the Strategic Development Unit. These indicators allowed the diocese to identify areas of challenge and opportunity where a combination of the following factors applied:

- higher than average decrease in attendance over the previous ten years;
- low attendance when calculated as a percentage of local population;
- areas of strategic importance, such as main towns within a wider area;
- a large centre of population geographically distinct from other population centres and/or lacking local amenities.

The three areas identified for pastoral reorganisation, including St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban have the potential in terms of population, but not currently the capacity within their existing congregations, to make a significant impact in mission even if they were only to seek to increase their attendance to around 2% of the local population.

The aim of the draft Scheme is to create the right structures and to resource these with the appropriate staffing to enable church communities to grow in depth, impact and number in line with our diocesan vision. We want to do this by developing sustainable mission focussed church communities that can concentrate on the primary calling of the church to make new disciples. To do this we know that as well as adding new resources, we need to free the existing churches from the burdens of finances, administration and buildings so that rather than feeling forced to focus on maintaining the existing church structures they will also be able to support new projects, opportunities and communities. We will do this by:

- Undertaking pastoral reorganisation to create one mission unit consisting of a single parish benefice, with united leadership, ministry team, finance, governance, and administration; supported by some local decision making would be delegated to individual congregations. This new structure would enable the other developments:
- Creating new ministry structure, including at least an ordained stipendiary team leader, a church planting minister, operations support, and specialist ministers to focus on children/young families, outreach and social engagement;
- Planting a new congregation or congregations with a church planting team gathered from inside and outside of the new parish;

- Resourcing existing congregations to promote outreach and growth alongside good teaching and pastoral care;
- Deploying pioneer ministers to engage with points of social need, such as via the food bank and debt advice centre, with an emphasis on addressing life issues in the context of whole-life discipleship.

A new diocesan intern scheme, in conjunction with the national CEMES scheme, would be used to enhance elements of the new ministry structures: this would encourage interns, including as many as possible from the local area, to gain experience themselves in church planting, mission, and ministry in a variety of contexts while developing their own vocations. This builds on learning from the Discovery Gap Year and the Harbour Residency Year.

Development of social enterprise opportunities suitable for the needs of the local area and other income generation activities will be explored with the community.

Creating a new single parish benefice across the areas of Leigh Park, Warren Park and West Leigh will allow better coordination of mission energy, finance, and staffing, with strong vision and leadership, aided by skilled operations/administrative support, underpinning all ministry and mission in the area.

Making growth intentional and putting the right structure in place to reduce legislative and administrative burden is a proven method for achieving numerical growth and so furthering the Mission of the Church. There are equally examples from around the country where not getting the structure right in the beginning hampers the ability of the parish leadership to be able to effect change and grow.

All of the parishes are agreed that more resource is desired for them to take care of existing congregations, create new congregations and work and to work in their communities. The concerns raised by the representors objecting to the draft Scheme are in relation to the structure, and the dispossession of the clergy, not the shared aims.

This paragraph contains a lot of detail of the plan of how this scheme will be implemented which we have always been told would not come into being until the scheme had been passed and the Rector appointed. The use of interns has never been mentioned before. The agreement on shared aims only concerns the introduction of Administrative / Operations Support which will free Clergy to concentrate on Ministry and the larger number of the right staff which will of course be of benefit to the community.

- 2. Please give attendance figures for these parishes over the last ten years. How do they compare with those for other parishes in the deanery and across the diocese? Please comment on the view that too much weight is given to church attendance in defining whether parishes are succeeding in mission and on the comparison of mission statistics provided by the Venerable Peter Sutton.**

The usual Sunday attendance figures for the parishes of St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban are in Table 1 below. Table 2 shows the attendance figures for the parishes as a percentage of their parish population. The additional parishes included in the tables are those outlined in the mission statistics provided by the Venerable Peter Sutton to enable a full comparison.

The percentage change in usual Sunday attendance from 2009 to 2018 for St Francis, Leigh Park was a decline of 12.07%. For the same period, West Leigh, St Alban saw

an 11.36% increase and was the only parish in the deanery to see an increase in this measurement. Unfortunately, during the same period Warren Park, St Clare suffered a decline of 75%.

However, when viewed as a percentage change from 2009 to 2018 in relation to the population of their respective parishes: Warren Park, St Clare has suffered a decline of 76.72%, which is the most severe in the deanery; St Francis, Leigh Park has declined by 22.14% and West Leigh, St Alban has increased by 9.55%.

When looking at the percentage change from 2009 to 2018 for usual Sunday attendance, Warren Park, St Clare's 75% decline places it as the highest decline at number 6 in the diocese, place 1 being a 100% decline due to closure or a parish not making a return and place 140 being the parish with the largest increase. (Three churches that did not make the return for 2018 and there are two closed churches.) For the same period and measurement, St Francis, Leigh Park was placed at number 97 and West Leigh, St Alban was placed at number 117.

When viewed again as a percentage change from 2009 to 2018 as a percentage of their respective parishes: Warren Park, St Clare was number 7 in comparison to the other parishes in the diocese; St Francis, Leigh Park was number 36 in the diocese and West Leigh, St Alban was placed as number 74.

Table 1

Usual Sunday Attendance (Adult + Child)												
Parish Name	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Percentage change past 5 Years	Percentage change past 10 Years
Leigh Park: St Francis	58	63	68	60	58	56	50	50	54	51	-8.93%	-12.07%
Warren Park: St Clare	40	32	30	19	21	18	14	11	11	10	-37.50%	-75.00%
West Leigh: St Alban	44	44	40	42	35	37	35	33	40	49	32.43%	11.36%
Leigh Park Estates	142	141	138	121	114	109	99	94	105	110	0.92%	-22.54%
Crookhorn: The Good Shepherd	157	160	150	136	119	143	125	107	111	95	-33.57%	-39.48%
Warblington with Emsworth	282	307	329	335	322	305	274	313	242	248	-19.34%	-12.77%
Alverstoke: St Mary	310	298	243	238	232	213	289	255	265	269	26.29%	-13.23%
Lee-on-the-Solent: St Faith	228	254	229	168	154	175	185	211	213	209	19.43%	-8.33%
Crofton: Holy Rood	436	378	354	448	428	355	338	319	394	349	-1.69%	-19.95%
Locks Heath: St John the Baptist	239	212	147	175	147	194	148	128	283	223	14.95%	-6.69%
Harbour Church, Portsmouth									295	370		

Table 2

Percentage of Parish Population														
Parish population 2001	Parish population 2011	Parish Name	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Percentage change past 5 Years	Percentage change past 10 Years
11598	13099	Leigh Park: St Francis	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	-8.93%	-22.14%
3052	3278	Warren Park: St Clare	1.3%	1.0%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	-37.50%	-76.72%
9870	9830	West Leigh: St Alban	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	32.43%	9.55%
24328	26207	Leigh Park Estates	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.92%	-28.11%
3398	2989	Crookhorn: The Good Shepherd	4.6%	4.7%	5.0%	4.6%	4.0%	4.6%	4.2%	3.8%	3.7%	3.2%	-33.57%	-31.21%
10834	10709	Warblington with Emsworth	2.6%	2.8%	3.1%	3.1%	3.0%	2.6%	2.6%	2.9%	2.3%	2.3%	-19.34%	-11.75%
16749	16532	Alverstoke: St Mary	1.9%	1.8%	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.7%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	26.29%	-12.09%
7067	10863	Lee-on-the-Solent: St Faith	3.2%	3.6%	2.1%	1.5%	1.4%	1.6%	1.7%	1.9%	2.0%	1.9%	19.43%	-40.37%
16298	14947	Crofton: Holy Rood	2.7%	2.3%	2.4%	3.0%	2.9%	2.4%	2.3%	2.1%	2.6%	2.3%	-1.69%	-12.72%
11382	11658	Locks Heath: St John the Baptist	2.1%	1.9%	1.3%	1.5%	1.3%	1.7%	1.3%	1.1%	2.4%	1.9%	14.95%	-8.90%

The total Sunday attendance of all three congregations is 110 people from a total population of 26,207 that is 0.42% of the population of the parishes. The combined parish share contribution is £44k while the allocated ministry cost for their three stipendiary posts is £165k, with 73% of that cost being met by the parish share contributions of larger parishes in other areas in the diocese. We recognise that usual Sunday attendance (USA) figures do not reveal the full picture of the health of a

parish and that schools work happens regularly. The numbers of occasional offices, although they have declined, are relatively high; however, these forms of engagement have not readily translated into any other form of church attendance or engagement, into active discipleship, or into planned giving. Therefore, USA remains a significant indicator of the longer-term sustainability of the parish and its ability to undertake its mission.

The Venerable Peter Sutton has highlighted that some of the larger churches have undertaken fewer occasional offices, schools visits and services for schools and civic organisations than St Francis, Leigh Park. Whilst this is good it is not assisting the parish to attain ongoing sustainability whereas the churches named by the Ven Sutton are sustainable.

The attention given to the figures of attendance especially on Sundays is interesting as we have only been told that “things need to be done differently” to increase the number of people coming to Christ. Ministry is not just about bringing people to Sunday worship but engaging with the community every day and in ways that show them that the Church cares and stands with them and therefore giving them a pathway to God

The point about Parish Share can surely not be relevant even if the numbers grew the income to church received from those living on the estate will never allow for the Parish Share to be four times as high.

School work happens weekly either in assemblies, classroom work or Prayer Spaces and if the parish had more staff then the relatively high number of occasional offices could have been followed up and possibly transferred into church attendance.

- 3. What is your response to the argument that there are significant differences between West Leigh and the other two parishes? Do you expect that the pattern of existing services would change significantly in a united parish and, if so, would there be an expectation that current worshippers would attend services at the other churches? Would the dual carriageway and lack of public transport be likely to reduce attendance at such services?**

The representations that have highlighted differences between West Leigh, St Alban and the other two parishes of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare have stated that there is an existing formal relationship between St Francis and St Clare but they do not have that relationship with St Alban. This is true. However, though there is not the same intimacy of relationship, it does not correlate that the people in the parishes are inherently different.

In 2016, the Portsmouth Council for Social Responsibility (CSR) undertook work with St Alban to look at its community profile to help inform what the parish should be doing in the future to further its mission in the area. It was realised that a community profile for St Alban could not be undertaken in isolation from the communities of St Francis and St Clare.

Basic social statistics for the three parishes were garnered from the 2011 Census.

Table 3: Key Parish Census Data

	St Albans (West Leigh)	St Francis (Leigh Park)	St Clare's (Warren Park)
Population of the parish (+/- change since 2001 Census)	9,830 (2%)	13,099 (13%)	3,278 (7%)
Growing demographic group	Young adults and older (75+)	Young adults	Young adults
% decline in identified Christians (pace)	24% (rapid)	29% (rapid)	25% (rapid)

Education	Very low	Very low	Very low
Tenure	50% private and social rented	54% private and social rented	56% private and social rented
"family" households	56% (30% with children)	62% (37% with children)	62% (38% with children)
Single person households	30%	25%	26%
Retired households (65+)	19%	16%	17%
Key social challenges	33% single parent, 33% child poverty	37% single parent and 36% child poverty	42% single parent, 40% poverty
Employment	Routine and low paid	Routine and low paid	Routine and low paid

Table two: Parish Poverty Profile

Parish	Diocese ranking	Child poverty	No formal qualifications	Social housing
West Leigh: St. Alban's	5 th	33%	39%	42%
Warren Park: St. Clare's	3 rd	40%	37%	49%
Leigh Park: St. Francis	4 th	36%	40%	44%
Average	-	36%	39%	45%

CSR noted that poverty and many of the census categories can be quite stark and they do not necessarily tell us much about how people actually live so CSR also drew on Mosaic segmentation data provided by Experian. This data was more useful in some ways as it was more recent (it is from 2016), it could capture data from those who do not complete the census (e.g. private renters) and it groups people by various lifestyle factors and preferences which can give us a better idea of what might work in terms of engagement and mission locally. The Key mosaic groups for each of the three parishes is presented in table three below.

Table three: Parish Mosaic groups

Parish (households)	Key Mosaic Group 1	Key Mosaic Group 2	Key Mosaic Group 3	Key Mosaic Group 4
St Alban's (4063)	Residents with sufficient incomes in right-to-buy social housing (2,111)	Young people renting flats in high density social housing (590)	Families in low-rise social housing with high levels of benefit need (495)	n/a
St Francis (5,159)	Residents with sufficient incomes in right-to-buy social housing (2,373)	Families in low-rise social housing with high levels of benefit need (1,102)	Owner occupiers in older-style housing in ex-industrial areas (480)	Young people renting flats in high density social housing (440)
St Clare's (1,280)	Residents with sufficient incomes in right-to-buy social housing (466)	Families in low-rise social housing with high levels of benefit need (429)	Young people renting flats in high density social housing (195)	

The three parishes do have their own identities. Though this draft Scheme is aiming for one benefice and one parish, each area would keep its church as the focal point for the area.

The pattern of services is to remain as they currently are. This will be enabled through use of more self-supporting clergy in addition to the Team Rector and Team Vicar,

and through the training and deployment of more lay ministers, such as Readers. Subsequently, there is no expectation for people to travel from Warren Park to West Leigh for services. Therefore, there is no expectation of a reduction in the attendance at services.



© Digital Map by Dorset of Portsmouth Crown Copyright Licence number 10019918

The dual carriageway already runs through a significant portion of the parish of West Leigh, St Alban as can be seen in the map below.

For the 99% of the population of these three parishes, who do not currently attend church services, parish boundaries are largely unknown and generally irrelevant.

We are seeking to unite the benefices and parishes so as to reduce the legislative and administrative burden for our clergy and lay ministry team to release them for ministry to further the Mission of the Church in the area.

Social indicators may well be similar but Leigh Park is viewed as Portsmouth's hard up cousin and West Leigh are closer affiliated to Havant and Rowlands Castle and do not wish to be attached to Leigh Park. This has always been the case and will not change.

How is it known that 99% do not attend church services when there are 11 different faith communities meeting in the area? Maybe these people just do not attend Anglican churches.

How can it be possible to increase the numbers of Sunday attendance if the services will be led not by regular clergy but by the use of self-supporting clergy. It is no coincidence that the numbers of attendees at St Clare decreased after the last priest in residence left. In the new scheme there is to be one "traditional" parish priest and yet the Bishop still maintains there will be no change in the pattern of services.

- 4. Is it correct that the Havant deanery plan allocated three stipendiary post to these three parishes? If so, why does the draft scheme provide for only one team vicar post? Would you expect to appoint other members of the team and, if so, what would their roles be? Please comment on the view that if the team vicar has a church planting role the burden of pastoral care across such a large parish will be too much for the team rector.**

The Havant Deanery Plan – July 2016 looks at progress since the Deanery Review, current status and recommendations. In relation to St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban, it states that “discussions should be held about how these parishes work best together, including future parish structure”.

The Deanery Plan also states that the Pioneer Review of the diocese, which reported to the Bishop's Council in May 2014, identified the need to build capacity, increase training for lay and ordained pioneers, and find new missional approaches for new housing and difficult-to-reach areas. The Deanery review identified the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area and the great Leigh Park area as being best served by pioneer appointments.

The vacant post which had previously existed at Warren Park, St Clare was therefore not renewed. Instead, a community pioneer post was created (housed in St Clare's Vicarage) to co-ordinate mission across the greater Leigh Park estates. It is intended that this post will continue to be a pioneer post within the proposed new structure.

It is intended that the proposed team will be further expanded and assisted by its Readers, self-supporting ministers and lay pastoral assistants. National research suggests that focal ministry in a larger area can be a key support. If the draft Scheme were to proceed, this would be something that the Team Rector could explore with the Team Vicar, the wider team and the PCC. Whereas traditionally such an approach has meant appointing a person to have oversight of one church, there are also further models which we would want to explore for sharing responsibilities such as services, occasional offices, schools work etc. all of which involve sharing with clergy in their cure of souls and vision for mission.

How many people were in the new worshipping community set up by the pioneer here and how close was it to be self-determining and self-financing?

- 5. To what extent are the current proposals based on the deanery plan? Has it been overtaken by the impact of the Strategic Development Funding?**

As above, these current proposals are based on work that the Deanery had already undertaken and codified in its plan in 2016. The possibility of Strategic Development Funding has enabled us to make a bid for additional resources to be provided for the area, in order to nurture and grow the existing traditional congregations and the community outreach that they undertake, and in order to plant new congregations.

- 6. Was the alternative proposal put forward by the PCCs of Leigh Park and Warren Park considered by the DMPC? If so, what are the reasons for preferring the arrangements proposed in the draft Scheme?**

The PCCs of St Frances, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare proposed a ten point plan in response to the proposals of the DMPC. The wider vision expressed through our Resourcing Growth SDF application, and the PCCs' proposals are the same for

points six to ten of the PCCs' plan.

The differences on points one to five of the PCCs' plan are around group ministry rather than team ministry structures and the designation of posts within the draft scheme.

The PCC of West Leigh, St Alban are satisfied that a team ministry is the right legal structure for future ministry in the area.

The DMPC is clear that a single parish benefice with the necessary team ministry will offer the most suitable structure to enable a coordinated approach to mission across Leigh Park, Warren Park and West Leigh. This is a densely populated urban/suburban area where parish boundaries are either unknown or irrelevant to the 99% of people who do not currently attend any church.

The diocese believes that the benefits of this structure are:

- One decision-making body (PCC) which sets the vision and strategy for mission and ministry and which makes overall decisions about how finance supports this work.
- A coordinated plan for ministry and mission, including the provision across the geographical area of traditional and modern forms of worship, the creation of a new church plant, the focussing of pioneering ministry around children and young families, and the integration of social engagement work with discipleship development across the team's churches.
- An unrelenting focus, across traditions, on creating space in church for those who do not currently have an active Christian faith.
- The protection of both traditional and new forms of worship within the team, creating a mixed economy approach across the whole team area, and encouraging mutual flourishing.
- The ability to appoint lay and ordained stipendiary and self-supporting ministers across the team, to coordinate their energies, and to create some economies of scale in the delivery of their work. This will include a combination of a team rector, a team vicar for church planting, operations manager, pioneer specialising in children and families' ministry, and pioneer specializing in social engagement and whole life discipleship development.
- One coordinated approach to the use and management of buildings, including decisions about long-term viability, social enterprise and rental opportunities, and location and equipping of any future church plants.
- Planning across the team for encouraging stewardship, generating income from external sources, including grants and social enterprise, and ensuring the sustainability of ministry for this area for the future.

A group ministry could serve a similar purpose of cooperating in ministry across an area and some of the affected parishes asked us to consider this as an alternative. However, the DMPC did not believe that a group ministry was the appropriate structure for the following reasons:

- This pastoral reorganisation is seeking to create a sustainable structure where strategic, mission-focussed decisions are made in one PCC for the one area.
- The diocesan experience of other group ministries has been that, whilst a group ministry may work well in its first iteration, when existing clergy share a joint vision, this relational working does not always survive clergy changes or differences in personality;

- Group ministry provides a far weaker structure on which to base the deployment of additional posts, such as operations manager, community worker etc., than would be the case for a single parish with a team ministry. A group ministry cannot itself legally act as employer for paid posts;
- A group ministry does not give authority to other incumbent members of the team to act outside of their own parish when it comes to being involved in matters such as agendas for PCC meetings and the strategic decision making about mission, ministry, and finance which happens there.
- In a group ministry, responsibility for the cure of souls for all areas is not shared between all members of the group.

With a team ministry, there would be one benefice, one parish, and therefore one Parochial Church Council (PCC), delegating some functions to small local District Church Councils (DCCs). Decisions about ministry and mission, including working towards significant outreach to those who do not currently attend church, will be made by the PCC, allowing finance and resources to follow strategic mission decisions across the team.

DCCs would remain in control of finances related to their immediate congregational worship and the more minor aspects of their buildings. DCCs would retain any funds or future legacies that are restricted in use by a specific church and congregation.

DCCs would relate to the PCC via common elected members and by the clergy who may attend any of the DCC meetings. The DCC would make sufficient record of its proceedings and make these available to the PCC in an appropriate form at regular intervals.

The Diocese will only entertain a Team Ministry as part of this scheme and yet have recently advertised posts in neighbouring parishes to work as a Group Ministry with priests licensed to work in the other parishes. If this is possible elsewhere why not here?

7. Please comment on the view that there is an ignorance at the diocesan level of the mission and ministry currently taking place in these parishes and of their needs and wishes and that no detailed studies have been undertaken to establish these. Why were the current incumbent and priest-in-charge not asked for their input at an earlier stage?

The diocese has been well versed in the mission and ministry of the parishes via the current serving clergy; Havant Deanery; the work of the CSR with West Leigh, St Alban; the many and varied applications to the Mission Opportunities Fund and subsequent coverage in the diocesan newsletter and bulletins

This has been underscored by meetings with the parishes by members of the diocesan team and members of Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee (DMPC) over the past eight months.

Information from the incumbent and priest-in-charge and from the Havant Deanery Plan (2016) fed in to the initial consultation which focussed solely on unifying the benefices. There was no further detail underpinning the proposals, that came out of the meetings with the clergy and their PCCs in the informal consultation process

And yet the PCC and the church community again feel as if it has not being listened to.

Being told that our views were needed at the public meeting, then when the question was asked why the views of this community had not swayed the decision of the DMPC were then told that the community would be involved in the planning of the new team once the scheme had been agreed. It is so frustrating that all the efforts that people have made to give their views to then be told that these views will not be heard until after the scheme is passed. How are we supposed to keep our community engaged in this process if they feel ignored?

Now we are being given details of the make-up of the team before the scheme has been agreed, before the Rector has been appointed and before the PCC has been established. This shows that the Diocese have already planned the future team without taking into account the views of this community.

8. Please explain what is meant by “different ways of doing ministry”, how this differs from the work currently being done in these parishes and how this would be facilitated by the reorganisation proposed in the draft Scheme? Are the proposals based on a model which has been successful elsewhere?

The diocese is seeking to better resource the greater Leigh Park estate for intentional growth in its existing traditional congregations and to church plant to grow new congregations for the majority of people in the area that do not currently access regular worship in church.

The single parish benefice structure, supported by a team ministry, will enable both the traditional congregations and the new congregations to exist within normal parochial structures with the collegial support of each other. For long-term sustainability of both, this is essential.

Traditional church congregations have been declining at a steady rate nationally and I have outlined the figures for these parishes above. The national rate of decline is circa 7%. Our traditional church congregations, as they are in the normal parochial structure, also bear the burden of all the legislative, administrative and building responsibilities.

Portsmouth Deanery already has a church plant, Harbour Church. Whilst being outside of the parochial system, it still needs to be governed and so had to set up a charitable incorporated organisation and register with the Charity Commission. It was also set up in a commercial property on the high street, which comes with an expensive lease as well as maintenance and repair responsibilities.

Neither model is sustainable for either congregation in the long-term. However, there needs to be a structure that enables both forms of church to operate with integrity while also being responsible to each other for mutual flourishing.

The pastoral reorganisation of a single parish benefice with a team ministry is required to release time and energy from over-burdensome administration and legal requirements by reducing the number of PCCs to one, to enable both traditional and new forms of worship and mission to flourish and for more than one member of the clergy to have the responsibility for the cure of souls and be licenced to the parish.

A number of examples of church planting and team ministry have been examined and each have experienced different issues. This proposed structure takes account of the

lessons learned in these areas and is seeking to put the best structure in place to support both forms of ministry sustainably into the future.

It is stated above that **neither model is sustainable** but it is still preferred to bring in all these new untested approaches instead of giving more resources to a tested model that the community engages with and giving it the opportunity to grow.

9. Why was it decided not to designate the two current incumbent and priest-in-charge as the first holders of posts in the proposed team ministry? Please comment on the view that one or both should be named in order to build on their existing work.

At the meeting of the DMPC on 3 April 2019, members recognised that in the past it had dealt with proposed pastoral schemes in which certain existing clergy were 'designated' to a new post. The example was given of the most recent scheme that was made for the West Wight Team Ministry. In this case, both clergy in that team had been recruited, with the agreement and input of the affected parishes, with the possible future team ministry structure explicitly in mind and indicated in the appointment process.

In this case, though the number of clergy posts in the proposed draft Scheme remains the same, the roles themselves will be different to the clergy roles that currently exist. The example of the 'team rector' and 'church-planting team vicar' has been widely circulated, as this is a potential team ministry model that DMPC members would like to see – a team rector with strategic oversight for both traditional parish ministry and the creation of new congregations in a range of traditions; and a team vicar with the specific expertise to create brand new worshipping communities; plus other clergy and lay people with different skills. However, this model is not set in stone – it could equally be that the team rector or a pioneer minister has the church-planting expertise.

Members therefore agreed that an open and transparent recruitment process was beneficial to ensure that clergy and lay ministers are appointed with the relevant gifts for these new roles.

Flexibility has not been present in any of the outlines made by the DMPC. We asked if there was flexibility in the make-up of the team and were told it would be a Rector and Church Planting Team Vicar.

10. Please set out the consultation process on these proposals and confirm that the statutory requirements for consulting the interested parties were met and that the PCCs were offered meetings with the DMPC or its representatives and the clergy who would be dispossessed offered meetings with the full Committee. Were such meetings requested and held?

The timeline for the consultation process was as follows:

- a) **Friday 5 October 2018:** Private meeting with individual clergy who may be dispossessed of office should the DMPC decide to proceed with pastoral reorganisation.
- b) **Monday 8 October 2018:** DMPC decide to proceed to informal consultations on proposed pastoral reorganisation.
- c) **Wednesday 17 October 2018:** Public deanery meeting held on proposed pastoral

reorganisation at St Wilfrid, Cowplain. Buses provided for people wishing to attend from the affected parishes that may not have access to transport for the meeting.

- d) **Friday 19 October 2018:** Informal consultation letters sent to all interested parties and to all who attended the public meeting.
- e) **Tuesday 6 November 2018:** West Leigh, St Alban PCC met with the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals.
- f) **Monday 19 November 2018:** St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare PCCs met with the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals.
- g) **Sunday 25 November 2018:** West Leigh, St Alban PCC met with representatives of the DMPC at 3pm and the PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare met with the representatives at 5pm to discuss the draft proposals.
- h) **Friday 30 November 2018:** Deadline for receipt of responses to the informal consultation.
- i) **Wednesday 5 December 2018:** DMPC met to consider the responses to the informal consultation. Due to the volume of responses and the short period of time between the closing date for such and this meeting, the DMPC deferred its decision on whether to proceed to formal consultations or not until the next meeting.
- j) **Monday 28 January 2019:** DMPC discussed the statements of view and agreed to proceed with formal consultations on the draft proposals.
- k) **Friday 1 February 2019:** s.6 formal consultation letters were sent to all interested parties. Those who attended the public meeting were also informed of the decision.
- l) **Thursday 7 February 2019:** Havant Deanery Synod met with members of the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals.
- m) **Thursday 28 February 2019:** The PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare met with the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals and offer an alternative plan.
- n) **Thursday 7 March 2019:** The PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban met with the diocesan team to discuss the draft proposals and the alternative plan put forward by St Francis and St Clare PCCs.
- o) **Thursday 14 March 2019:** The PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park; Warren Park, St Clare; and West Leigh, St Alban met with representatives of the DMPC to give their views on the draft proposals.
- p) **Friday 29 March 2019:** Deadline for receipt of responses to the s.6 formal consultation.
- q) **Wednesday 3 April 2019:** DMPC heard representations from the Revd Jonathan Jeffery, discussed the statements of view and recommended the draft proposals to the Bishop and he approved the draft proposals. It was agreed that the draft scheme would be submitted to the Church Commissioners and they would be asked to undertake the notice and publication of the draft scheme.

- r) **Thursday 4 April 2019:** A letter was sent to the interested parties informing them of the DMPC's decision. It also said a further letter would be sent within ten days giving more detail on the discussions.
- s) **Friday 5 April 2019:** The draft scheme and supporting documentation were sent to the Church Commissioners.
- t) **Friday 5 April 2019:** An email was sent to all those that attended the public meetings letting them know of the DMPC's decision.
- u) **Friday 12 April 2019:** A letter was sent to all interested parties with further details of the issues discussed at the meeting of the DMPC on 3 April. It offered a further meeting with representatives of the DMPC should the PCCs wish to discuss the decision of the Committee.
- v) **Monday 15 April 2019:** Church Commissioners publish the draft scheme.
- w) **Tuesday 21 May 2019:** The PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare met with representatives of the DMPC.
- x) **Wednesday 29 May 2019:** Deadline for representations for or against the draft scheme.

The incumbent of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare is against the draft scheme, as are the PCCs of both parishes.

There has been a campaign on Facebook and associated petition to save the vicars of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare; and of West Leigh, St Alban.

The incumbent of West Leigh, St Alban and its PCC are in favour of the draft scheme.

The Archdeacon of Portsdown and the Joint Area Dean of Havant Deanery are also in favour of the draft scheme.

The above sentence on the campaign on Facebook and the petition shows a failure to understand where the people of Leigh Park stand and this was started by a lady from the wider community who felt passionate about what was happening. Facebook and the petition were an accessible platform for the community to comment on how they valued the clergy and the Church's provision to the community. They took to Social Media as it provided them a voice, as they didn't believe they had been heard at the meeting especially as it was made clear that if the same point was made it would only be recorded once, completing skewing the percentage levels of comments made.

Members of the church community were then able to update the wider community using this platform so that they could be kept up to date with the different meetings and decisions that were made.

11. What level of support for the proposals was there during the local consultation process? What consideration was given to concerns raised during this process? Were any changes made as a result of the consultations and, if not, what were the reasons for deciding to proceed with the original proposals? Please comment on the detailed concerns expressed by the representors about the consultation process.

Prior to the meeting of the DMPC on Monday 8 October, the incumbent of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare and the Priest-in-Charge of West Leigh, St Alban were asked to attend meetings at the diocesan office with an external HR

advisor to be told of the proposed pastoral reorganisation of their benefices and that, if it did come to pass, this would mean that they might be dispossessed of their office. This has been criticised by a number of representors and at meetings with some of the PCCs. However, it is not clear how it could have been otherwise done. It would have been unthinkable for the clergy to have discovered this second-hand.

The informal consultation period began with a public meeting at St Wilfrid's, Cowplain on Wednesday 17 October 2018. It is accepted that the decision to hold the meeting in a neutral venue was unhelpful for those who wished to attend and that one of the local churches should have been asked to host the meeting. As it was too short notice to change the venue, the diocese did pay for buses to pick up people from St Clare's and St Francis.

Over 100 people attended the public meeting. A large number of attendees were clear that they did not want any change if any of the proposals meant that they could lose their clergy. There was a presumption that the diocese did not know or care about the communities in Leigh Park or Warren Park. However, in one to one conversations with members of the diocesan team, both during and after the meeting, there was also some recognition that uniting the benefices made sense and that, whilst it was very sad to think that a member of their they might lose their current clergy, they or a family member had also gone through a similar redundancy process at some point.

On the following Friday 19 October 2018, the informal consultation letter was sent out to everyone who had given their details at the public meeting as well as the legally interested parties asking them for their views on:

- the proposed termination of the holding in plurality of the benefice of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park St Clare;
- the proposed union of the benefice of St Francis, Leigh Park; the benefice of Warren Park, St Clare; and the benefice West Leigh.

The informal consultation was purposefully focussed at the benefice level in the first instance to enable ideas about the parish structure to be shaped by the meetings with PCCs during this period.

During these meetings the PCCs agreed that less administrative burden and duplication of administration across the parishes would be welcomed; that they would be happy to work more closely together; that they wished to retain their current pattern of services and for each parish to retain its church, and that a team ministry would be an appropriate structure. These views were subsequently incorporated into the initial draft proposals that were brought to the DMPC meeting on 3 December 2019.

Prior to the DMPC meeting on 3 December 2019, concerns were raised by representors that the members would not have enough time to fully take in the responses given. In light of the volume of responses on 3 December 2019, the DMPC asked for an explanation of the draft proposals before them and how they had been informed by the meetings during the informal consultation. It then agreed that the decisions on each of the draft proposals should be deferred to its next meeting on 29 January 2019 to enable its members to study the responses in depth. This delay has been criticised by some representors but equally was suggested and welcomed by others.

On 29 January 2019, the DMPC agreed to proceed to a formal consultation under section 6 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 with draft proposals seeking to unite the benefices and parishes of St Francis, West Leigh; Warren Park, St Clare;

and West Leigh, St Alban, and to create a team ministry for the new benefice.

The meeting of the DMPC on Wednesday 3 April 2019 was addressed by the Revd Jonathan Jeffery. This statement, the written responses to the s. 6 consultation and the views garnered by the members of the DMPC that had attended meetings with the affected PCCs were discussed at length. The DMPC felt that the parish proposal and the diocesan proposal were similar in all but the structure and the resultant dispossession of the clergy. However, the DMPC agreed that the single parish benefice structure with a team ministry was the appropriate base for future mission in the area. Therefore, with all members voting in favour with the exception of one abstention, the DMPC decided to recommend the draft Scheme to me without any amendments.

How could it be presumed that the Diocese did not know or care about the communities as those present other than the Diocesan team had no knowledge of what was to be proposed? The not knowing was apparent from the fact that those who had written the presentation did not know about the Foodbank run from St Francis or that the original Pioneers were no longer in post.

As for not caring, the community had been told that the Clergy who they trusted and respected and who had become valued members of the community were to be removed, the community felt aggrieved for the clergy and for this valuable community asset being taken away without them being asked what they wanted or needed.

Also how is it that the comments about individual conversations were recorded but not the majority of comments against the proposal.

12. Do you think your decision that none of the current clergy should be appointed to the new posts which would be created by this or the three similar draft Schemes unduly fettered the discretion of the DMPC? Would you have been prepared to reconsider this if the DMPC had recommended that Jonathan Jeffery or Karina Green should be appointed to new offices by this scheme? Would you be prepared to amend the draft scheme to provide for this now?

As outlined in the answer to question 9 above, the DMPC discussed whether current clergy should be designated or not within the draft Scheme. It was recognised that this is what the DMPC had done in Schemes previously. However, the DMPC decided that this would not be appropriate for this draft Scheme or the other three similar draft Schemes.

As mentioned earlier, the intention of the DMPC is to have one member of the team responsible for the traditional congregations and the other member of the team to be responsible for undertaking a church plant with new congregations. The DMPC recognises that there are currently two loved members of the clergy both undertaking good traditional ministry in their parishes and it stated that it could not choose one over the other for the traditional post in a new structure. The DMPC believed an open recruitment process, in line with the Patronage (Benefices) Measure, would enable the current clergy and the parishes to discern who should be the Team Rector and the Team Vicar should the draft Scheme proceed. Should the DMPC have decided to recommend that Revd Jonathan Jeffery or Canon Karina Green be appointed to posts within the new structure, I would have considered it, but this was not the case.

The issues around the potential dispossession of our clergy have been prayed on, considered and deliberated by the DMPC and myself over the past eight months. The DMPC has made its recommendation to me in the draft Scheme and I will not amend it by fiat now.

13. Please comment on the view that a policy of blanket dispossessions across the four draft Schemes is against the spirit of the Mission and Pastoral Measure and the Code of Practice. What are your reasons for adopting this policy?

To say that the four draft Schemes are against the spirit of the Mission and Pastoral Measure and the Code of Practice is to suggest that it was not intended that dispossession of clergy should be undertaken even though this is clearly allowed for by the legislation. This is not the case. The changes regarding compensation for loss of office under the 2018 amendment were specifically brought in to enable dioceses to undertake pastoral reorganisation, that may result in the dispossession of clergy, in order to further the Mission of the Church.

When General Synod voted on this, there was considerable support from within the House of Clergy as well as the House of Laity. It was felt that this indicates that there is, in the wider Church, a recognition that we need to find ways of being able to undertake such pastoral reorganisations when they are necessary for mission development.

Dispossessions without subsequent designation of first office-holders from existing incumbents is not something the DMPC or I take lightly. In all four draft Schemes that have come before you, the new offices in the proposed Schemes will not obviously accommodate or suit all of our existing clergy. Where there is a reduction in similar posts, the DMPC did not feel it could appoint one clergy person over another to that office. It was also noted that some of the existing clergy have felt called to other roles in the Church or have been unsure as to whether they are yet called to a proposed new office in their current area and the legislation enables them to be compensated for their loss of office while they discern the next phase of their ministry.

14. Please comment on the view that consideration should have been given to the ability of the current incumbent and priest-in-charge to contribute to the better cure of souls in the proposed arrangements when developing these proposals?

As above, consideration has been given to the ability of the current incumbent and priest-in-charge to contribute to the better cure of souls in the proposed new structure but the DMPC did not feel it could choose who should be appointed to the proposed traditional post. The DMPC decided it would be fair for the incumbent and priest-in-charge to be able to see which roles they might be called to and to apply for those posts in an open recruitment process and to be compensated for their loss of office.

15. Please confirm that dispossessing the current incumbent and priest-in-charge from their current offices is not the primary purpose of the Scheme and comment on how the draft Scheme sits with the advice in paragraph 2.13 of the Code of Practice to the Mission and Pastoral Measure (copy attached).

Dispossession of our current clergy is not the primary purpose of the Scheme.

The DMPC recognises that the current serving clergy are much loved by their congregations and that the wider community places a high value on traditional ministry. However, currently the church is not reaching 99% of the population in the greater Leigh Park estates. There is huge potential to expand the impact of the Church on the lives of people in the estates by diversifying the ways that we bring the message of Jesus to those people. In order to provide traditional ministry and new forms of worship through church planting in a strategically coherent way, we need a

structure in place that releases ordained and lay ministers to minister and promotes mutual, sustainable flourishing. The DMPC believes that the single parish benefice structure with a team ministry is the best structure to support this mission. This is in line with the advice in relation to the Gaulby judgement.

16. Was mediation considered as part of the consultation process and, if so, why was it not undertaken?

As demonstrated by the timeline above, an extensive consultation process has been undertaken. A suggestion of mediation was raised at the meeting between the PCCs of St Francis, Leigh Park and Warren Park, St Clare and the representatives of the DMPC at its meeting on Tuesday 21 May 2019. At that stage it was suggested that this could further delay the process and it would be unlikely to yield a result where all parties were in agreement as how to proceed with pastoral reorganisation in this area.

17. Do you think there will be sufficient goodwill in the parishes to implement these proposals successfully if the draft Scheme proceeds? Please comment on the view that there will be a reputational risk for the Church and that some existing congregation members may leave the Church.

The incumbent, PCC and community of St Francis, Leigh Park; and Warren Park, St Clare are not in favour of the draft Scheme due to the prospect of the dispossession of the clergy. However, all have said that they are in favour of change and extra resourcing to grow the Church. The Priest-in-Charge and PCC of West Leigh, St Alban and its community are supportive of the draft Scheme and the wider vision based on it and so I am hopeful of their goodwill.

I recognise that irrespective of whether this draft Scheme proceeds or not there will be work to be undertaken to enable those of differing views to come together in reconciliation and I would pray that through that process all would find their spiritual home in our churches.

There is of course reputational risk for the Church by undertaking this Scheme. However, there is even more reputational risk if the mission of the church continues to essentially retreat from society, and to impact fewer and fewer people's lives. Therefore, we have to intentionally aim for growth in depth, impact and number, strategically and sustainably, and put in place the right structure to enable it.

These changes are Gospel driven with mission as the motivation. We should attempt to do all we can to draw others into friendship, relationship and discipleship with Jesus.

So what then is the reputational risk to the Church for alienating an entire community? By removing someone that is respected and trusted and who works tirelessly in the community, to which he was called by God. Losing the impact he has on the lives of many, who would have no contact with the Church otherwise, is far greater than risking all on this plan. A plan that has the potential **not** to work and the potential **not** to further mission as it fails to take into account the needs and values of this community.

18. Please comment on the view that dispossession would impose particular hardship on Mr Jeffery and his family. What pastoral support has been offered to the clergy who may be dispossessed, particularly given the apparent lack of relationship between the Archdeacon and Mr Jeffery?

Both I and the DMPC acknowledge that dispossession of office would be incredibly difficult for both of our serving clergy. It is also recognised that having school-age children is a blessing for the Revd and Mrs Jeffery but will be an extra concern for them should Revd Jeffery be dispossessed. Should this arise, I will seek to support them in every practical way to ensure as smooth a transition as possible in such circumstances for the family, to Revd Jeffery's next ministry.

Canon Karina Green and Revd Jonathan Jeffery have been offered pastoral support consistently through the consultation process. Jenny Hollingsworth has also been holding meetings with Revd Jeffery throughout the consultation process and I have also had pastoral meetings with him. Both Jenny and I are available to provide and source whatever support Revd Jeffery and his family should require.

19. Are there any other factors which the Commissioners should be aware of in their consideration of these representations?

At the meeting of the DMPC on 3 April 2019, members heard that there was concern in some areas that traditional ministry was being seen as a 'bad thing', and was adamant that this was not the case. They recognised that it is relatively easy to analyse average weekly attendance and occasional offices figures, but difficult to quantify or measure the significant impact of pastoral care and ministry in the community. They understood that there was a fear that the importance of this ministry in communities was being underestimated.

They were clear that they wanted our traditional church congregations to continue to be nurtured and developed, whilst also having a structure in place to enable new worshipping communities to flourish. They believe that this gives us the best possibility under God of bringing into church people who do not currently engage with us either in church or out in the community. Recruiting clergy who are skilled at working across traditional parish ministry and new forms of church will be a vital part of the recruitment process for the proposed new parish structures.

With good wishes.

Yours sincerely,

Chryshas Portsmouth: