



## **REPORT ON THE PUBLIC MEETING**

**called by the Friends of Quarry**

**on 6 December 2017**

### **On Holy Trinity Church's application for a faculty to build an extension**

The meeting was opened by the Coordinator of Friends of Quarry who pointed out that the meeting was to be called to allow the expression of all views about the proposed extension to Holy Trinity, and he requested that this be done in a civilized manner. He then asked Reverend Tim Stead to put forward the church's position and followed this with an invitation to Jenifer Carpenter of the Holy Trinity Preservation group to address their concerns. The meeting was then opened to all participants to express their views.

The Vicar argued that the extension, and some changes to the interior, were necessary to enable the church to offer a welcome to all the community, including children, the disabled and the elderly. Furthermore these changes would make the church more welcoming and offer improved pastoral care. It was pointed out that the original plans had been scaled back taking into account many of the comments on the earlier planning application, and what was proposed now was much more modest in scope. It was clearly felt that the extension needed to be adjacent to, and part of, the church to best fulfil these needs. This view was supported from the floor by members of the congregation, and it was pointed out that the extension petition was made on behalf of the Parochial Church Council not just the Vicar. Supporters of the extension argued that only those who were regular church attendees could properly judge whether it was needed.

Those opposed to the extension argued that it was not needed, and if it was then it could have been sited elsewhere on other church property adjacent to, but not contiguous with the church. There was also a view that more minor changes to the existing building might go some way to achieving the needs of the church. The expense of the proposal was also criticised. The impact of the extension on the graveyard proved highly contentious. A number of families expressed their fears about the impact of the work on the graves of their relatives which were in close proximity to the proposed extension. Concern about the impact of the building work, such as the piling and use of heavy machinery, on other burial plots in the graveyard were also expressed. There was controversy over whether the ground immediately adjacent to the extension, over which it would be built, contained graves. Older families from Quarry have memories of such graves, and though no surface evidence of these remains, careful research of records and/or a geophysical survey of the area would help to resolve the issue. The idea that the one grave that would be directly affected by the building work should have the bodies left in situ, but have their grave marker moved close to where they lie beside the extension, was not favourably received. There was some scepticism about a reassurance that graves, adjacent to the building, could be protected and made accessible during the building work.

A number of questions were asked about the ease of access to the site for skips, lifting or other heavy equipment, and as to whether a risk assessment has been carried out by a building contractor. There was also concern as to how the waste and surface water systems would run, as these could impact graves more distant from the building. This concern was also expressed in the response of Friends of Quarry to the May 2016 planning application for the extension to the City Council.

The meeting was highly charged and views on both sides of the argument were passionately expressed, with understandably the issue of disturbance to the graves a major concern.