

Jenny Dart

From: Paul Walker <pauljwalker273@gmail.com>
Sent: 17 August 2024 08:54
To: Emma Critchley
Subject: Fwd: Wigginton St. Bartholomew

Dear Emma,

Thank you for your email and please see the architect's response to the questions raised. I hope this is satisfactory.

I have reached out to Minerva and will be working with them regarding the archaeological aspects. As you will be aware this adds further cost to the project.

I have applied for two grants for assistance with the work.

Please note that our architect Stefan Skanski does not consider it necessary to apply for planning permission as the works are effectively repair and will not alter the appearance of the building in any way. I raised this point also with David Hillelson a Heritage Consultant at Heritage Network (who works with Minerva) and who advises another diocese on church matters and he also was of the view that planning permission would not be required.

Please let me know if you have any further comments or questions.

Many thanks

Kind regards

Paul

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cannon Morgan & Rheinberg Partnership <cannon.morgan@btconnect.com>
Subject: Re: Wigginton St. Bartholomew
Date: 16 August 2024 at 15:42:11 BST
To: Paul Walker <pauljwalker273@gmail.com>

Our Ref: SVS/JSS/2261/5

Dear Mr. Walker,

Re: Porch Wall Repairs, St Bartholomew's Church, Wigginton, Herts

Thank you for your e-mail today, forwarding and bringing to our attention today's email on the subject of the above which we were copied-in on from Emma Critchley.

In response to the 3 queries:

- 1) The intention is to build the new Porch East Wall up to the church wall.
- 2) Subject to investigating what has already been done as a junction with the main church wall, it would be the intention not to 'bond-in' the new wall. The reasoning behind this is; there is potential for minor movement

of the new works in relation to the existing church wall. A straight joint pointed-up in lime mortar should accommodate any movement that may occur.

3) The footings will project slightly to the South. This projection should not interfere with the drainage channel. The top of the foundations will be below the channel; see Section BB drawing № 2261/5/A3:3. This indicates the top of the footings and 3 courses of brickwork below ground underneath the new wall. The channel will be above the foundation within the depth of the 3 courses of brickwork.

We agree with your conclusion, that the proposed wall repairs to the Porch would not attract the need for Planning Permission.

Yours sincerely,

Stefan Skanski

for Cannon, Morgan & Rheinberg Partnership

Cannon, Morgan & Rheinberg Partnership
Chartered Architects

Tel: 01727 861622

Email: cannon.morgan@btconnect.com

From: Paul Walker <pauljwalker273@gmail.com>

Sent: 16 August 2024 10:45

To: Cannon Morgan & Rheinberg Partnership <cannon.morgan@btconnect.com>

Subject: Fwd: Wigginton St. Bartholomew

Good Morning Stefan

I believe you were copied into Emma's email below where she has asked for more information on three points. Would you be able to respond to these please?

On the point of whether planning permission is required, I am minded to work on the basis that the works proposed will not alter the appearance of the church at all and hence the works can be described as maintenance and that planning permission will not be required.

I welcome your thoughts on this.

Kind regards

Paul
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: DAC - Diocese of St Albans <dac@stalbans.anglican.org>

Date: 16 August 2024 at 09:48:28 BST

To: Paul Walker <pauljwalker273@gmail.com>

Cc: cannon.morgan@btconnect.com

Subject: RE: Wigginton St. Bartholomew

Dear Paul,

1. The DAC standing committee has now reviewed the proposals for the porch rebuilding work. The depth and width of the new concrete footing to the porch wall appears structurally a realistic proposal for this particular situation, and in accordance with the discussion at the May 2024 site meeting.

The drawings should clarify three items:

1. *Is the intention to build the new porch east wall right up to the main church wall, or leave a stub of the existing porch east wall? This is not clear from Section AA.*
2. *How will the new wall be tied/bonded to the existing wall?*

3. Will the concrete footing project slightly from the new wall to the south, as would be normal practice? Note that the footing should be detailed not to affect the drainage channel.

I look forward to seeing clarification of these points.

2. I note the proposals are out for comment by statutory external consultees at the moment as well. Thank you for doing those consultations.

We have already had a response from the Diocesan Archaeological Adviser. He considers that it is necessary to include information in the 'statement of significance' about the significance of the porch and whether there is any evidence for a medieval predecessor of the 'Victorian' structure, although there is some information in the DAC site visit report and good general photographs together with an apparent intention to rebuild as found. The specification does mention the need for archaeological attendance but this is felt to be too vague for proper control.

The Archaeological Adviser's advice is therefore as follows:

A competent and experienced church archaeologist should be appointed and as a first pre-works task investigate whether there appears to be any evidence for an earlier porch. Archaeological attendance will then be required during the ground disturbance phase of works rather than simply relying upon the main contractor to identify a need. Proposed archaeological involvement should be encapsulated in a WSI [written statement of investigation] submitted for DAA approval following initial contact. If the works require planning permission from the local planning authority with archaeological conditions, then contacts should be made to enable a single process satisfying both regulatory requirements.

For the moment I'll put this as a proviso in the case, but it will be helpful if you can approach an experienced archaeologist sooner rather than later. The DAC site visit report referred to the following firms who are known to have experience in this context:

KDK Archaeology

[Archaeologists in Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire](http://www.kdkarchaeology.co.uk)
(kdkarchaeology.co.uk)

Minerva Archaeology [Minerva Archaeology - Minerva Archaeology Ltd \(minerva-archaeology.com\)](http://www.minerva-archaeology.com)

Thames Valley Archaeological Services [Home - Thames Valley Archaeological Services \(tvas.co.uk\)](http://www.tvas.co.uk)

Best wishes,
Emma

Emma Critchley
Deputy Diocesan Secretary
DAC Secretary
DD 01727 818132
Mobile 07552 805469

The St Albans Diocesan Board of Finance. Company limited by guarantee.
Company Registration: 145227; Charity Registration (England and Wales):
248887
Registered Office: Holywell Lodge, 41 Holywell Hill, St Albans, Herts. AL1 1HE
www.stalbansdiocese.org/

Certified Carbon Literate



From: Paul Walker <pauljwalker273@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2024 3:47 PM
To: peter lunoe <plunoe@gmx.co.uk>
Cc: Mayra Shaw <mayra.shaw@stalbans.anglican.org>
Subject: Re: Wigginton St. Bartholomew

Hi Peter,

Thank you for your email.

I think you may be looking at the first set of plans and specification which were uploaded on to the portal. A revised Specification was subsequently uploaded together with a third plan showing the detail around supporting the roof whilst the works were ongoing and a cross section through the proposed new foundation.

I attach a full set of documents for your perusal.

Kind regards

Paul

Paul

On 26 Jul 2024, at 15:28, peter lunoe <plunoe@gmx.co.uk> wrote:

Paul, greetings:

The latest Specification and details for the works have been copied to me, for any comments I might have as structural advisor.

However there are two anomalies in the documents.

1. The Specification refers to three drawings, Nos. 1, 2 and 3. However only drawings Nos. 1 and 2 have been included. (I believe drawing No. 3 includes drainage details.)
2. The Specification refers to drawing No. 1 being revision 'A'. However the drawing included is not a revision.

Please can these two points be clarified?

Regards
Peter Lunoe

Copy for information: Mayra Shaw.