



Response to the St Peter's Rebuild Survey

Thanks to everyone who returned a survey and gave feedback on how they would like to see the facilities of the church rebuilt.

As you will all probably know obtaining planning consent is not a fully democratic process and we will have to comply with local regulations and the requirements of the historical societies. However, there have been some clear requirements expressed in this survey and they will be entered into the architect's brief.

All of your responses were tabulated to form an overall opinion which I have outlined below. Not everyone commented on every aspect so the percentages do not all add to 100%. There were 36 responses in total.

There were a lot of comments added to the returns which were generally supportive of building a new church with open sight lines. The direction of the overall response was towards a church that is flexible with good visibility and designed for as wide a use as possible. Two responses asked for the exterior of the building to be similar to how it was before the fire (particularly the south / west side) and one other requesting it to be built to resemble the 13th century building. The rest either expressed no opinion on the outside or wanted a new church built on or around the remaining old walls with the emphasis being on having a new church rather than a rebuild of the old one. Three responses also mentioned that we should consider the facilities available in the Coffee Rooms, Parish Hall and Vicarage when planning the facilities in the church. One response mentioned designing the church so that it could be kept open at all times.

Many of the responses emphasised the installation of modern facilities such as a good sound system, hearing loop and projector or screen displays. One said that the church should not be "stuck in time". Other items people added to the survey included a kitchen and the replacement of the clock.

Some people mentioned the need to get expert advice on items like the heating. This might be because John didn't talk much about the full design process at the public meeting. Alexander Design is the lead consultant on the design, but they bring others in as required. To date we have only had need to consult with specialists in connection with the structure, history and costs but as the design develops other consultants may be brought in where necessary to advise on things like heating, and acoustics.

One respondent mentioned that the funds that we have should be targeted towards the structure of the building and, should there not be sufficient funds after, then fundraising could be done for specific items. I did mention at the meeting that this might be the case for the bells (for example) but it does apply to the complete fit out. We won't know the details of this until we are much closer to the final design and have the corrected cost projections. The reason for asking, at this stage, about items like the organ is that these need to be designed and planned for at this stage as they have a space and facility requirement.



The following is a breakdown of the responses.

Starting with the aspects where there was unanimity (or close to):-

Wheelchair / Pushchair Access

We had a 100% response on this. Achieving this may have an effect on the door size and floor in later responses. One response suggested this could be done with a movable ramp.

Accessible Toilets

Another popular item with a ninety-seven percent response and one person who didn't specify.

War Memorial

Everyone wanted a war memorial. There was one response each for inside and for out. All others just specified the need to have one. One response said that the original memorials should be restored.

Heating

We probably shouldn't have asked this question in the height of a British summer. We had another 100% response to this. There was a wide spread of response to the question of what type of energy. There was a spread from oil, through solar, to ground source. Sixty-one percent voted for green energy. There were a few comments specifying that it should be the most cost effective and cheap to run.

Bell Tower

Ninety-seven percent were in favour of replacing the bell tower and 19 percent of people added the comment that the clock should be replaced. One comment said that the original clock should be restored. Eight percent mentioned that the clock should not be the same as the one removed and one respondent said that it should chime.

Majority level responses:-

Altar

The result was split 67 / 28 in favour of having a movable altar.

Pulpit

There was a three way split on the pulpit. Thirty-six percent of replies said that one was not required and the remainder were split 42 / 17 in favour of having a movable pulpit.

Multi-use Facility

86% of responses were in favour of the church being multi-use and 8% were against.



Chair Store

The result was split 64 / 22 in favour of having a chair store. One comment said that the chairs could be stacked at the back and another wanted to have non stackable wooden chairs. There was one comment suggesting the use of reclaimed pews.

Vestry

Eighty-six percent of people said that the vestry should be replaced. Eight percent said there was no need for one. Two people mentioned that it was essential. There were several suggestions saying that it could be combined with the office.

Choir

94% of people wanted a choir and the split was 86 / 8 in favour of the choir area being flexible. One said that there should be no provision for a choir.

Organ

83% wanted an organ and that 83% was split 61 / 22 in favour of the organ being electric. One person wanted an original pipe organ, one wanted a modern pipe organ. Four people mentioned the need to have a piano too. Lines of site were mentioned with the organist being able to see the choir and main door. One person said that the electric organ should be of high quality.

Main Door Size

The size requirement was split 67 / 33 in favour of having the main door larger. Weddings and funerals were mentioned for the need. In addition, 78% wanted a draught lobby / porch and 8% didn't.

Office

The office requirement was split 61 / 28 in favour of having an office. Comments for not having one mentioned the use of the vicarage. It was also mentioned that this could be shared with the vestry.

Kitchen

This wasn't specified on the list but 19% of respondents added it as a requirement.



Closer Results:-

Meeting Room

This response was split 56 / 36 in favour of having a meeting room. Reasons for not having one mentioned the Coffee Rooms and the Parish Hall.

Function Room

This response came in at 50 / 42. Again reasons for not having a function room were the facilities already available in the village.



Interpreting the responses into the Architect's Brief.

As John said at the meeting, it almost certainly won't be possible to get everyone's requirements into the new build but these responses will be used to put the majority opinion into the final design.

There are clearly questions raised in the responses about the church building's place in the village. Considerations were raised about introducing facilities that could be provided through use of the coffee rooms, parish hall or vicarage. Whilst these concerns were raised in a small minority of responses they are concerns which need to be taken seriously in the redesign. The new St Peter's is the rebuild of the church and the use is for church purposes. The new church should not be a second village hall, but we do need facilities in the church that will serve the village and congregations into the future for their various requirements.

Some responses mentioned the exterior of the church with one looking for the building to resemble the 13th century church and one asking that the west and south walls should look similar to how they did before the fire. Where mentioned in the other responses the emphasis was for a modern building and for the interior to be a flexible modern space with clear sight lines and modern facilities. Whilst the historical societies will probably have the biggest input into what we can put forward for planning permission as much drive as possible should be put into reaching a compromise with them to ensure that the new church is a modern worship space, of modern design whilst maintaining the feel of the old church.

The bell tower (and the bells) are very important to all but one respondent. This must form part of the new design and provision for the bells and ringing chamber be made. Many people also specified that there should be a clock and most said that the clock should be self-winding or electric. In addition, it was also requested that the clock should chime. In the old bell tower this was done by striking one of the bells.

The other two items with potential effect on the exterior of the building are the door & porch and the war memorial. The need for the war memorial was almost universal but with a split on whether this should be the same as the old memorial or a new memorial outside (at the flagpole). The original first world war plaque is still within the church, albeit badly damaged. Thought should be put into finding a site for the original plaque inside the church with space for adding a remade second war memorial and, possibly, others. A design for a complete war memorial outside the church should also be included.

The exterior door and porch needs to be retained and made bigger. This is obviously a difficult requirement, especially in conjunction with the requirements of the historical societies. What is needed is entry to the church that keeps the south aspect of the door and porch, but also provides wider access with draught lobby for events like weddings. The church entrance should also give wheelchair access.

The last item to be requested for the exterior of the building is provision for the storage of the mowers.

Internally, another "must have" is a toilet, and this should also be wheelchair accessible.



Heating is another definite requirement. There is a split over the type of heating but the cost effectiveness comes through as being important, as well as the requirement to use green energy, should it be possible within the cost and planning constraints.

Inside the building sight lines are essential, with unblocked view of the altar from all areas of the nave. It was also requested that the siting of the organ be such that there is a clear view of the door and the choir. With the requests for modern audio and visual facilities there also needs to be planning for the positioning of speakers and microphones and position of visual displays for use with hymn words or other displays. Associated with the audio equipment is also the need for good acoustics throughout the building.

The interior of the building needs to be designed with flexibility in mind. Both the altar and pulpit should be movable or removable. The church should be aimed at multi-use for smaller services and larger functions like weddings, funerals or school events. In a similar way there must be provision for a choir but this should not be in a fixed position.

Provision has to be made for an electric organ and possibly a piano. A few people specified that the organ should be of high quality with a good audio system, so investigations should be undertaken to see what space and facility requirements this type of organ has. It may also need storage space if it is movable.

Seating within the church should be by movable seats and, keeping to the multi-use aspect of the church, there should be some provision for the storage of the chairs. The majority of respondents want a separate chair store. Comments were made on the type of chair. One of these being that they should be strong, to support being able to use the rear of the chair in front as a support when standing. An investigation should be done into the appropriate chair for best use, storage and maximising the capacity of the church.

Additional rooms within the church gave a more mixed response. There should be a kitchen and a vestry and, if possible, an office. If space is an issue the office and vestry could be combined. A meeting room is also a requirement but a function room is not.

- The altar should be movable.
- The pulpit should be movable.
- The church should be of multi-use design.
- The design should be modern and fit for purpose.
- Provision for a choir is required. This should not be in a fixed position.
- There should be a store for chairs.
- Level access is required.
- The bell tower should be rebuilt with a chiming, electric clock.
- Provision should be made for a meeting room
- There is no requirement for a function room.
- There needs to be a vestry.
- There needs to be an office but this could be combined with the vestry.
- There is a need for a kitchen.
- Good acoustics are required. With hearing loop.
- Good sight-lines are required.
- Provision needs to be made for an electric organ.
- The current door and porch should be retained but with provision for wider access.
- Heating should be provided in the church sufficient to maintain temperature but at the best running cost; green energy should be considered.
- An external war memorial is needed with the old memorial inside the church restored too.
- An external mower store is required.