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Abstract

Accounts of the architectural profession’s engagement with historic Anglican churches in England in the post-1945 period have tended, perhaps inevitably, to focus upon the seismic impact of the Second World War and the physical destruction of the buildings. Moreover, the re-instatement of bomb-damaged churches and how this was enacted through legislation has typically been described with reference to nineteenth-century attitudes to historic building preservation. Although this provides useful evidence of the conservation movement’s continued growth in the twentieth century, such narrow focus on matters of preservation or restoration has meant that the profession’s other activities in relation to historic Anglican churches have been somewhat overlooked. For example, following the comprehensive redevelopment of inner city areas in the post-1945 period, the fate of historic inner-city churches of all denominations has been presented as one of abandonment, demolition or adaptive re-use. Yet, as redevelopment plans faltered in the face of the Skeffington Report, published in 1969, what impact did such political and socio-economic change have on the Church of England’s attitudes towards its historic inner-city churches and their continued use for both worship or community purposes? Outside of any religious context, this is little understood; particularly the role of the architectural profession in facilitating and implementing changes to the buildings on behalf of the Church.

To address this lack, this thesis traces the changing relationship between the Church of England and the architectural profession from 1945 to the present day whilst highlighting the differing attitudes and approaches taken through time. The thesis covers three periods: the consolidation of the conservation movement and the reinstatement of bomb-damaged churches (1945 to 1968); the adaptation of historic churches for religious and community benefit, whilst aided by state funding (1969 to 1989); and finally where dwindling congregation have brought about the widespread adaptation of historic churches to serve as community hubs in what today is a predominantly neoliberal environment (1990 to the present day). Each time period has presented particular challenges to the way in which the architectural profession has engaged with the Church of England and its congregations. The thesis highlights how the Church’s understanding of its role in society has been pivotal in shaping its attitude to its historic churches, its engagement with the architectural profession, and the influence of community orientated architectural practices upon its historic churches thereafter; all issues of contemporary relevance in light of present day church adaptation.
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Introduction

In November 2015, the Grade I listed Church of St Wulfram, an Anglican church in Grantham, Lincolnshire, attracted the attention of the national press when the incumbent vicar invited local residents to celebrate Christmas by installing an ice rink within the church nave. This unusual step followed a similar initiative by Woking United Reformed Church who, in February 2012, installed an ice rink to give people ‘a reason to come into the church’. By 2016, with the release of the location-based augmented reality game Pokemon Go, the Church of England began encouraging the use of their premises as ‘Pokestops’ to give ‘churches around the country a great

---

opportunity to meet people from their area who might not normally come to church’. 3 Indicative of a growing trend for church organisations to provide functions beyond worship, the summer of 2019 witnessed the central aisle of Rochester Cathedral temporarily converted into a mini golf course and a helter-skelter erected in the nave of Norwich Cathedral (Fig. 0.01). 4 So why are church organisations in England increasingly adopting such novel methods of outreach?

Today, with many Christian places of worship facing closure due to declining attendance, coupled with a lack of funds for maintenance, the potential for churches as community assets has come under close scrutiny. A report commissioned by the Church of England in 2015, for example, acknowledged that whilst many of its churches may close in the near future, the incorporation of community facilities, such as a café or library, alongside worshipping activities could make others more financially viable. 5 In this respect, the Right Reverend John Inge, Bishop of Worcester, has asserted that ‘adaptation will be more important than preservation’. 6 A further report, known as The Taylor Review, which was published by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport in 2018 reiterated this stance and proposed a programme of ‘change and investment, during which congregations can be supported in opening up their buildings for wider community use’. 7 Accordingly, in an effort to secure the future of its historic churches as active places of worship, the Church of England has begun to host alternative uses in its buildings including ‘village shops, post offices, food banks, community and digital hubs, school space and arts venues’. 8 However, as owners of ‘approximately 14,775 listed places of worship including 45% of the nation’s Grade I historic buildings’, significant constraints are presented for the Church of England in its endeavour. 9 Regardless of the Church’s problem of declining attendance, listed status is designed to protect historic and architecturally significant buildings from inappropriate alteration, or even unauthorised demolition. How, therefore, can long term viability through adaptation of historic

---


places of worship for greater community use be managed and balanced against heritage concerns?

To date, much literature on the adaptation of existing places of worship has focused on liturgical reorderings, often authored, although not exclusively, by the clergy, and which reflect a concern to improve church mission. Liturgical change in relation to the design of new build churches in the twentieth century has also been well described; not least by Rudolf Schwarz, *Vom Bau der Kirche* in 1938. In addition, a comprehensive account of the impact of liturgical change on places of worship across Europe between 1500 and 2000 has been provided by the ecclesiastical historian Nigel Yates, although the emphasis on historical significance provides little contribution to the present dilemma. Only recently, have the competing concerns of community function alongside religious and heritage concerns begun to be considered together. For example, in the specific context of the city of Oxford in England, the documentation of various church adaptations for wider community use has highlighted the inherent conflicts of interest underlying such community orientated projects; not least how to take into consideration the wishes of the congregation versus the local community. One question arising from such conflicts of interest is: whose building is it anyway? If, as it has been asserted, ‘our church buildings are common property’, acting as ‘repositories for the collective memories of the local communities’, the role of the architect in helping communities to appreciate the significance and future potential of historic places of worship would appear increasingly critical. The concept of the architect as a ‘mediator’, therefore, remains persuasive.

Recent evidence, however, points to an architectural profession already combining conservation practice with an awareness of community need. For example, in works carried out

---


between 1997 and 2005, Ptolemy Dean, architect and Surveyor of the Fabric of Westminster Abbey, responded to the wishes of Farnham Royal Parish Council to make its Grade I listed St Andrew ‘better suited to its modern role in the wider community’ by removing the existing Victorian benched seating in order to create a meeting space within the church for parish, community and arts uses (Fig. 0.02).\footnote{Gilbert Jackman and Susie Alcock, \textit{The Story of St Andrew’s Parish Church at Farnham in Surrey} (Surrey: St Andrew’s Parish Church, 2006), pp. 16–17. These works were carried out alongside the restoration of the church tower and clock.}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig002.jpg}
\caption{Theatre production at St Andrew, Farnham}
\end{figure}

\textit{[Source: Photograph courtesy of Farnham Parish Church St Andrew & St Francis.]}\footnote{Ted Cullinan quoted in: ‘Talk 7: St Mary, Barnes’ (presented at the Ted Cullinan Talks series, St Mary, Barnes, 2015). See also: Kenneth Powell, \textit{Edward Cullinan Architects} (London: Academy Editions, 1995), p. 88.}

An even earlier example is the rebuilding and reordering of the Grade II* listed St Mary, Barnes, London following a fire which almost completely destroyed the building in 1978: in accordance with the wishes of the parishioners, the architect Edward Cullinan retained ‘the architectural and historical significance of the mediaeval original’, whilst adding a new roof canopy over the reordered nave which was to be used for community, as well as religious, purposes (see Chapter Six).\footnote{Ted Cullinan quoted in: ‘Talk 7: St Mary, Barnes’ (presented at the Ted Cullinan Talks series, St Mary, Barnes, 2015). See also: Kenneth Powell, \textit{Edward Cullinan Architects} (London: Academy Editions, 1995), p. 88.} Accounts of such interactions, however, are typically only to be found those potted histories retained by individual churches, contemporary reports of the local press or, occasionally, in the monographs of given architects. Academic accounts of conservation practices balanced with community need in the context of historic places of worship are, however, missing from the literature. Why might this be so, and why does this matter? How have architects and religious...
organisations approached the balancing of sacred and secular concerns? How has adaptation been received within congregations and the wider communities in which the church sits?

**Thesis scope**

In response to the research gap outlined above, the thesis constructs a historical and contextual analysis of the role of the architect in relation to historic places of worship in England in the post-1945 period, by concentrating on the two major traditions of architectural practice and ideology that have since predominated; namely, conservation and community architecture. Conservation, as defined by Historic England, the public body responsible for England’s historic environment, is ‘the process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and where appropriate enhances its significance’, and is the definition adopted within the thesis.\(^{18}\) Additionally, for the purposes of this thesis, community architecture is understood as ‘design in which local people assume responsibility for the creation and management of their environment, and in which the role of the expert is to give advice, but not make decisions’.\(^ {19}\) The thesis aims to understand and evaluate the relative impacts of conservation practice and community architecture on historic places of worship from 1945 to the present day, with a focus on how the architectural profession has engaged with concerns such as heritage significance and/or community value. The thesis examines the influence of training provision, the funding of projects, and impact of professional structures upon these two apparently distinct practices. The thesis also examines public understanding and engagement with regard to historic places of worship, as well as appraising the community role that such buildings may provide in the future through adaptation or re-use. The objectives of the thesis, therefore, are as follows: to understand the impact of the above upon architectural practice in England, specifically in relation to historic places of worship, from 1945 to the present day; to reflect critically on the histories of conservation practice and community architecture within the architectural profession post-1945 through case study analysis, and to draw out beneficial experiences relevant to today’s practitioner; and, finally, to understand the socio-economic, political, and legislative contexts, both nationally and locally, that contributed to the growth, in England, of the conservation and community architecture movements within the period of concern. Although legislation for the

---


The protection of historic buildings was introduced in the late nineteenth century, it was greatly increased post-1945 subsequent to the destruction of historic towns and cities during the Second World War. Thus, the time period for this study is delimited from 1945 to the present day. Given the differing religious and heritage contexts from country to country, the focus is on the experience of the architectural profession in England, albeit references to other countries and other home nations may occur if considered pertinent i.e. if practice or legislation was directly influenced by overseas innovation. Further, the study concentrates upon the experience of the Church of England. The unique relationship between the Church and the State, and the fact that its churches figure prominently under the English system of heritage designation, means that the tensions outlined above are particularly relevant for this denomination. However, with religious diversity growing throughout the time period concerned, the story of other Christian denominations and major faith groups is inevitably intertwined with that of the Church of England, which allows for a more inclusive narrative. This thesis will demonstrate how, through the Church’s engagement with the architectural profession, from 1945 onwards, an approach to the conservation and adaptation of its historic churches evolved; particularly with regard to the provisions secular community accommodation. Moreover, it will shows that the more successful examples were those that involved the wider community, outside of the congregation, as this prompted the Church to consider, in a more profound way, the nature of its mission and who it served. This is similar to the experience in the Roman Catholic Church and the nonconformists in this period, though to a lesser extent as for these denominations change was also driven by internal considerations: expansion in the case of the Roman Catholics, and contraction in the case of the nonconformists.

Other limitations have determined the scope of the thesis. There was a deliberate focus on urban and suburban places of worship, partly owing to an initial review of potential case studies which seemed to suggest that those churches adapted wider community use in the period when Community Architecture was dominating architectural discourse, occurred in urban and suburban areas. This may be due to an urban bias in the architectural press. A further explanation may lie in the fact that much consideration of the future of historic churches stemmed from the rebuilding work that took place in bomb-damaged cities after the Second World War. Certainly, further work might look at differences between rural, suburban, and urban communities. In choosing the case studies, therefore, there was also a deliberate attempt to focus on architects who, though perhaps not well-known, were working in the idiom of community architecture. Consequently, the noted ecclesiastical architect George Pace, although engaged with both the conservation and restoration of historic churches, does not figure prominently in the thesis due to
the lack of community engagement in his working practices. Similarly, Basil Spence's paradigmatic work at Coventry Cathedral is mentioned in consideration to differing approaches to restoration, but the impetus of his work was not to reorient the building for community use. The chosen case studies of St Matthew, Brixton, and St Mary, Barnes, both included a strong community aspect in their adaptations which draws attention to the evolving approaches of architects in their engagement with both congregations and non-worshipping member of the community.

Research Approach

Beyond stylistic concerns, two major traditions of architectural professional practice and ideology have dominated the area of historic faith buildings in the post-1945 period: namely conservation and community architecture. However, given that architectural historians of this period have typically focused on narratives of modernity, and modernist buildings by modernist-trained architects, knowledge of the two practices, particularly in relation to historic places of worship, is sparse. Moreover, the histories of these two practices are typically viewed as separate. One could conclude, therefore, that they are unrelated. However, given a shared interest in the rehabilitation of old buildings, it is worth examining whether the two specialisms interacted in the past or not, and, if not, why this was so. With regard to those places of worship constructed in the post-1945 period in England, much important and formative work has been undertaken on the main Christian denominations. Typically, however, this research has continued in the tradition of the architectural historian Nikolaus Pevsner’s Buildings of England series (1951-74) by scrutinizing the materiality of places of worship, in order to catalogue and categorise them. This approach has, in the field of the arts, been well described by the art historian George Kubler. However, whilst documentary analysis of the kind practised by Pevsner and exemplified by the work of fellow architectural historian Howard Colvin, provides the substantive facts, it does not, for example, account for ‘how designs evolve’. Nor does it help one to understand the independent life of a building ‘as an organic and ever-changing entity’ once constructed.

---

An alternative approach to the above, pioneered by the architectural historian Mark Girouard in the late-1970s, considers the social history of buildings.\(^{23}\) In the context of historic places of worship, there is a substantive body of literature which details the social history of churches as a means to better understand the buildings.\(^{24}\) This approach underpinned the historian Robert Proctor’s documentation of Roman Catholic churches erected in England between 1955 and 1975: the impact of institutional change within the Roman Catholic Church is well-described, as is the subsequent impact on church design, whilst the importance of localised discussions are acknowledged as a means to understand the buildings.\(^{25}\) Yet other factors, including the role of architectural pedagogy, the significance of individual architects’ interactions with local communities beyond clergy and congregation, the impact of government and local authority policy and, not least, the financing of such projects are, perhaps, underexplored. Furthermore, the focus on narratives of modernity by post-1945 scholars has skewed attention towards new-build churches, meaning that the sizable history of conservation and adaptation in relation to historic places of worship during this period has been overshadowed. Thus a gap in the existing literature is presented; one concerned not only with post-1945 architectural practices in relation to historic places of worship, but also the influences which came to bear upon those practices. Drawing upon a wide range of sources, this thesis addresses this gap and brings to the fore the technical, socio-economic, and political contexts which have informed the architectural professions’ treatment of historic places of worship post-1945. Accordingly, the thesis aims to contribute to knowledge in two key respects. Firstly, it considers how the conservation of historic places of worship has been approached since the end of the Second World War to the present day and highlights the tensions that have arisen through time owing to adaptation for contemporary concerns. This will provide substantive context for understanding current and recent policy of religious and conservation organisations in relation to historic places of worship. It also offers a corrective to an existing literature dominated by the provision of new places of worship in the post-1945 period, and one which is attentive to narratives of modernity whilst ignoring the diversity of post-1945 practice.\(^{26}\)

---


Secondly, it will consider how, or whether, community architecture has informed current practice through notions such as user-centred and participatory design; something of increasing in relevance in the current environment. This has potential to widen the scholarly narrative on the development of participatory design practices. Stemming from this are also some potential benefits beyond scholarly knowledge. Architectural practice is typically expert focused. Therefore, a sound historical investigation of how the conservation of historic places of worship has been approached in the past, and the potential uncovering of interactions between church communities and their architects, could offer potential lessons for today’s professionals to draw upon.

Research Methods

The project sought to provide in-depth case studies to demonstrate the architectural profession’s engagement with historic place of worship in England, from 1945 to the present day, whilst providing a national narrative of the events, circumstances, and policies which have affected professional ideology and practice throughout the period. Case studies are useful in design disciplines as they allow for the full exploration of hitherto unknown material, and offer an opportunity for comparative analysis. They help to draw out aspects of the research questions, particularly pertaining to the success or failure of a project, whilst highlighting different types of engagement practices. Moreover, case studies allow for an appraisal of changes to buildings through time. By focusing on a given country, England, and the experience of one religious organisation, the Church of England, it has been possible to trace the changing nature of the architectural profession’s engagement with historic places of worship through time in a specific legislative and religious context. Thus, an open-ended approach to theory development and design guided the research. Three themes were identified from the literature review which drove the selection of the case studies: reconstruction and renovation (1945 to 1965); redundancy and reordering (1966 to 1989); and reinvention (1990 to present). Within each time period, articles from the contemporaneous architectural press were searched for using the RIBA’s online library catalogue with specific key words and phrases such as ‘community’, ‘community participation’, ‘participatory’, ‘adaptation’, and ‘reordering’ applied. A long list of potential case

studies were drawn up and, from this, it was possible to discern certain individual architects or architectural firms associated with the various approaches. Emails were sent directly to the potential candidates and discussions with those who responded led to the identification of specific sites that that held the potential to be paradigmatic of each architectural approach. The three themes are outlined below:

1. Reconstruction and Restoration, 1945 to 1968

The theme of reconstruction and restoration brings to attention the scale of destruction to historic places of worship caused during the Second World War, and the attendant debates as to how bomb-damaged churches should be treated; a discussion which went well beyond mere reconstruction. The theme is accentuated by the continued growth of the conservation movement in the period, notably with the establishment of the Victorian Society in 1958, and the rise of modernist planning, which posed even further threats to existing historic buildings. Finances and technical resources were tightly controlled by government in the immediate years following the end of the Second World War and, with wider planning policy being developing in this period, there were identifiable concerns with the reconstruction of bombed churches, of which Coventry Cathedral and Christopher Wren’s London churches are amongst the best documented examples. In order to reposition themselves in a vastly different cultural milieu post-1945, religious organisations in England became more outward facing. This culminated in the establishment of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) by the Roman Catholic Church, whereby it was proposed that greater involvement of the laity in worshipping practices should be expressed through liturgical change.30 In addition to the redesign of new churches, this also called for the reordering of existing church buildings. However, were there factors beyond liturgy which informed such reorderings? The next theme, therefore, explores the wider socio-economic and political concerns of Britain, and how these influenced both church organisations and the architectural profession.

30 Proctor.
2. Redundancy and Reordering, 1969 to 1989

Further to the adoption of a more socially engaged outlook by religious organisations in England, culminating with the establishment of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), the second period is initially concerned with the impact of reorderings on historic places of worship and the tensions which arose in respect of conserving the historic fabric of those buildings affected. In addition, the drive for greater participation in worship within religious organisations parallels a growing discontent with exclusionary practices of modern planning. This reached its apogee with the publication of the Skeffington Report, in 1969, which called for greater public involvement in planning processes.\footnote{People and Planning: Report of the Committee on Public Participation in Planning (London: H.M.S.O., 1969).} Already, however, slum clearances had left many historic places of worship bereft of their congregations. The second concern of this period, therefore, was the impact of redundancy on historic places of worship, and the role that community architecture, prevalent from the 1960s onwards, may have played in the rehabilitation of such buildings for combined sacred/secular usage; or, indeed, as places of worship for immigrant communities. Inherent conflicts regarding the conservation of historic fabric whilst adapting a place of worship for community need come to the fore once again. The highpoint for community architecture came with the succession of Rod Hackney to the presidency of the RIBA in 1987. Yet, by the end his tenure in 1989, community architecture had fallen victim to wider socio-economic and political circumstance and its significance to wider architectural practice faded. The second themed period is, therefore, delimited accordingly.

3. Reinvention, 1990 to the present day

Along with the demise of community architecture towards the end of the 1980s, continued religious decline amongst Christian denominations saw church closures continue, albeit the rate of closures per year has since steadied. Drawing upon the recent histories and relevant practices of these two strands of the architectural practice described above, typically considered unrelated and studied accordingly, period three examines current practices of conservation in light of present circumstance. If Bishop Inge’s assertion that, in future, ‘adaptation will be more important than preservation’, how is the adaptation of historic places of worship for wider community use currently being managed and balanced against attendant heritage concerns?\footnote{Inge.}
Research Materials

The research relied on qualitative data including archival research, oral testimony, and site visits. Records held by the RIBA Library, architectural practices, local authority archives, and local church archives, where they exist, formed the basis for an analysis of architectural drawings and photographic material; the production of architectural material for differing audiences can, for example, be instructive. Records held by the RIBA, Historic Hansard, London Metropolitan Archives, Lambeth Palace Library, local authority archives, and local church archives, provided material for other forms of documentary review including contemporary policy discussion, press coverage, meeting minutes, and other written correspondence. Additional qualitative data was derived, where possible, through the oral testimony of those architects engaged to work on historic places, and also those architects whose experience lies beyond this specific field but whose practices have encouraged community participation. The testimony of other individuals involved in the conservation or adaptation of historic places of worship, whether directly or indirectly, was also sought, and included members of local parish councils, the clergy and congregations, and representatives of the wider church community. In approaching oral testimony, however, the fallibility of memory must be acknowledged and, where such materials were used, attempts were made to corroborate any insights garnered through other documentary sources.33 Site visits to the chosen case study churches, for example, allowed for further interrogation of a project’s success: how did the realised project compare with the original vision, or did it succeed in ways not imagined? Numerous churches were visited throughout the research process, though for practical purposes only the most pertinent examples are discussed in detail in the thesis. Church alterations and adaptations of the post-1945 period, whether for religious purposes or for community benefit, are too numerous for an exhaustive national account to be provided. Therefore, those churches selected for detailed case study relate to the themes identified above.

In relation to the first period, Reconstruction and Restoration, 1945 to 1968, these included, amongst others, three churches rebuilt by the architect Christopher Wren after the Great Fire of London in 1666 which, severely damaged during the London Blitz of 1941, now exist as memorial gardens; namely, Christ Church, Newgate, St Mary, Aldermanbury, and St Dunstan-in-the-East. Other examples of retained bomb-damaged churches visited included the Grade II* listed St Luke, Liverpool by John Foster and Son, and the Grade I listed medieval Cathedral Church of St Michael, Coventry. Restored bombed churches visited included other Wren churches in

London including All Hallows-by-the-Tower (by Seely and Paget, 1949 to 1958), St Andrew, Holborn (by Seely and Paget, 1960-1961), and St Vedast, Foster Lane (by Stephen Dykes Bower, 1953 to 1963). Beyond Wren’s City Churches, other restored bombed churches visited included two by the Diocesan Architect for Southwark, Thomas Ford; namely, the Grade II* listed St John, Lambeth, London, built to designs of Francis Octavius Bedford between 1822 and 1824, and the Grade II* listed St Mark, Kennington, London, built in 1824 to the designs of D. Roper and A. B. Clayton. Interest in the work of Ford was prompted, to an extent, by case study research for the second period, Redundancy and Reordering (1969 to 1989). A recurring name working on community-orientated church adaptation and reordering was the architect Raymond Hall who had carried out further work to St Mark, Kennington in the mid-1980s. Of more significance to this period, however, was his dramatic reordering of the Grade II* St Matthew, Brixton, London designed by Charles Ferdinand Porden. This church was visited along with another site for which Hall prepared a community-focused adaptation scheme, but which was ultimately overlooked: this was the Mayflower Centre, Canning Town, London, where an alternative scheme by Stillman and Eastwick-Field was implemented in the early 1980s. In relation to the final period Reinvention (1990 to the present day), the churches visited were an attempt to described the multifarious approaches applied in recent years including the flexible nave with ancillary community space, as seen at the Grade II* listed medieval All Saints, Hereford, the building-within-a-building concept adopted at the Grade II* listed All Souls, Bolton, Greater Manchester, a nineteenth-century church by the architects Paley and Austin, and the simple extension and internal re-ordering utilised at Emmanuel Church, Didsbury, Greater Manchester. Setting aside the bombed churches now used as memorial gardens, all but one of these churches – All Souls, Bolton – continue to function as places of worship having undergone adaptation for community use. In all instances, visits to the churches were carried out following an initial review of archival information to allow for personal reflections on the relative merits or success of the works undertaken when compared with the clients and/or architects’ stated intentions.

**Thesis Structure**

Chapter One describes how architectural historians have typically approached the study of buildings in the post-1945 period whilst bringing to attention existing historical research pertaining to places of worship. The main architectural practices of the period, in relation to historic places of worship - including conservation work, reorderings and community focused adaptations – are considered. Further, in order to better understand the wider circumstances
which may have influenced the architectural profession and informed such practices, socio-religious literature on issues such as such as secularisation will be examined.

Chapter Two extends the examination of wider contexts to that of the architects’ clients. In considering the profession’s engagement with historic places of worship, an understanding of religious organisations and the users of their buildings is essential. As the thesis is primarily concerned with the Church of England, for reasons that are outlined above, the chapter explores the historical contexts that have shaped the Church, the changing perception of its purpose and mission, and the implications of such perceptions for the planning and organisation of its churches.

Chapter Three directly addresses the first of the themes identified above; namely Reconstruction and Restoration, 1945-1968. The extent of destruction suffered by historic places of worship during the Second World War was such that questions arose, amongst religious organisations, as to the practicality of wholesale reconstructions in the face of declining church attendance. However, other factors such as the historical and cultural significance of the buildings were also seen as important. Debates as to whether to preserve bombed damaged churches as war memorials, carry out full restorative reconstructions, or reconstruct in a manner which would be better suited to contemporary purposes occupied both arts and religious organisations. This chapter argues that such debates have shaped our attitudes to historic places of worship to this day.

Emerging from this period of deep concern for the fate of historic places of worship, Chapter Four describes the continued growth of the conservation movement in the post-1945 period. With state-driven programmes of modernisation posing a threat to an ever widening range of historic buildings, particularly in urban areas, campaigns groups such as the Victorian Society and SAVE Britain’s Heritage were formed, in 1958 and 1975 respectively. The campaigns waged by these groups helped re-awaken, amongst the general public, an interest in traditional architecture and design at a time when the economic difficulties of the late 1960s and 1970s had begun to undermine policies of modernisation. It is within these contexts that Chapter Four explains the emergence of ‘community architecture’ and other participatory design process, and discusses the influence on the practice of certain British architects and their professional body, the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA). The chapter also argues that the implications of such practices on historic places of worship have been overlooked within the architectural historiography.
To address the limited understanding of the role community architecture and associated practices had in the adaptation of historic places of worship, and the funding opportunities it afforded, Chapters Five and Six offers two detailed case studies, both of which address the second theme of Redundancy and Reordering, 1969-1989. Chapter Five considers the example of St Matthew, Brixton, London; a Grade II* listed church of the nineteenth century which, with the help of Urban Aid Funds, underwent a dramatic transformation internally between 1976 and 1983. The role played by architect Raymond Hall in facilitating the needs and wishes of the local community is described and contextualised with wider architectural practices of the period. Similarly, Chapter Six considers the case of St Mary, Barnes, London; a Grade II* listed medieval church devastated by fire in the summer of 1978. The chapter considers the participatory methods employed by the architect Edward Cullinan and the local parish church council (PCC) in rebuilding the church, and how the works were funded in contrast to St Matthew’s.

Addressing the third identified theme of Reinvention, 1990 to the present day, Chapter Seven considers how historic church adaptation has changed in more recent years with examples including All Saints, Hereford, amongst others. The influence of the Church and clergy on such adaptation works in light of Heritage Lottery Funding, and how this has, perhaps, redefined once more the relationship between the Church and the architectural profession is discussed.
Chapter One: Understanding Church Buildings

This chapter investigates how architectural historians have typically approached the study of buildings in the post-1945 period; particularly existing historical research pertaining to places of worship. The relative merits of such approaches are appraised to identify gaps in the existing literature on churches, and the most relevant architectural practices of the post-1945 period in relation to historic churches, such as conservation and community-focused participation, are considered. Further, in order to better understand the wider circumstances which may have influenced the architectural profession and informed such practices, socio-religious literature on issues such as such as secularisation will be examined.

Approaches to Architectural History

Existing research on places of worship in the post-1945 period has typically concentrated on new build churches.1 Such studies have often produced useful inventories of individual denominations.2 However, with the exception of Robert Proctor’s study of post-1945 Roman Catholic church buildings and Christopher Wakeling’s account of nonconformist chapels, such endeavours have continued the Pevsnerian tradition of cataloguing and categorising; an exercise, perhaps, in antiquarianism or, to paraphrase the historian Raphael Samuel, the plodding accumulation of inconsequential facts.3 The alternative approach pioneered by Girouard, as a social history of architecture, considers the wider economic, social and political circumstances behind the commissioning and construction of buildings.4 In seeking to break out of the constraints of contemporary architectural historical methods, Girouard acknowledged the difficulties inherent with interdisciplinary research, such as not being attentive to key debates of other disciplines. Nonetheless, as other have noted, it is an endeavour, worth undertaking in
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1 Maufe; Gurney and Martin-Smith; G.E. Kidder Smith; Yelton and Salmon; Proctor.
4 Dana Arnold, pp. 140–42; Girouard.
order to illuminate the ‘interface between culture and architecture’. Accordingly, there are several studies of domestic architecture indebted to Girouard including, for example, Design and Plan in the Country House: From Castle Donjons to Palladian Boxes by Andor Gomme and Alison Maguire (2008) and Nicholas Cooper’s Houses of the Gentry, 1480-1680 (1999). In the context of historic places of worship, there is, likewise, a substantive body of literature which details the social history of churches as a means to better understand the buildings. These works include two studies of the eighteenth century church by Terry Friedman, The Eighteenth Century Church in Britain (2011) and The Georgian Parish Church: Monuments to Posterity (2004); Peter Draper’s The Formation of English Gothic: Architecture and Identity, 1150-1250 (2006); and an edited volume entitled The Victorian Church: Architecture and Society (1995) by Chris Brooks and Andrew Saint. Robert Proctor’s study of Roman Catholic churches in England continues in the tradition of Girouard in order to provide a greater understanding of post-1945 church architecture. Not only does Proctor document many of the buildings erected between 1955 and 1975, but he also acknowledges the importance of localised discussions between parish priests and their architects in shaping those buildings. Proctor posits such narratives within the context of wider institutional change effected by the Roman Catholic Church in the period concerned. A similar approach is taken by Christopher Wakeling in his account of nonconformist chapels in England. However, factors such as the influence of architectural pedagogy; individual architects’ interactions with local communities beyond clergy and congregation; the impact of government and local authority policy; and, not least, the financing of such projects, are, perhaps, underexplored.

Whilst the social history accounts of church buildings provided by Proctor et al remain important and formative work on the main Christian denominations, a possible criticism is that, for the most part, they are periodised studies of new build places of worship, thus retaining a latent tendency towards categorisation. Yet, buildings are constantly refined and reshaped by their occupants. Recent scholarship in architectural theory has noted the obsession with the creative and innovative moments in architecture and the lack of research around ‘processes of
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7 Friedman, The Eighteenth Century Church in Britain; Draper; Friedman, The Georgian Parish Church; Brooks and Saint.
wasting, deterioration, destruction, and “death”, to which buildings are inevitably subject. How churches have been used and adapted through time, and the role, if any, the architectural profession has performed in enabling their adaptation is underexplored in the literature discussed; pace Arnold, the independent life of the building post-construction is denied. One exception to this is the Geographer Tim Edensor’s study of St Ann’s Church, a 300-hundred year old building in Manchester’s city centre. Edensor introduces the notion of assemblage to show how buildings are constantly remade not only through repair and replacement of the original fabric, but also through interactions with both human and non-human actors. Thus, for Edensor, buildings are, ‘continuously emergent’. The historian Anatole Uphart’s recent account of St Gelasius in the Archdiocese of Chicago, America, supports this view. Closed in 2002 owing to declining attendance, St Gelasius was scheduled to be demolished. However, in 2004, the Institute of Christ the King, a Catholic religious organisation, took over the building and re-introduced Traditional Latin Mass to revive parish life; religion being the catalyst for improved community engagement rather than secular provision.

In considering the role changing circumstances can have during the lifetime of church, the post-1945 period in England is particularly instructive. From the first wave of the New Towns to the wholesale remodelling of cities such as Coventry and Plymouth, the urban landscape of England was in flux after the Second World War ended as programmes of rebuilding were embarked upon. Many religious organisations were supportive of local reconstruction plans, and actively sought a role in shaping embryonic communities. In Manchester, for example, the Church of England issued a booklet entitled Christians and the City Plan: A Timely Monograph Dealing Authoritatively with the Contribution Which Christians Must Make Towards The Long-Term Rebuilding of the Industrial Town (1946). Such interest by religious organisations was both material and practical: with proposal in hand for inner-city slum clearance to make way for new
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16 Christians and the City Plan: A Timely Monograph Dealing Authoritatively with the Contribution Which Christians Must Make Towards The Long-Term Rebuilding of the Industrial Town (Manchester: Dean and Canons, 1946).
roads, further and higher education institutions, and commerce, an opportunity arose to dispose of surplus historic places of worship.\textsuperscript{17} However, juxtaposed with an increasing appreciation of historic buildings consequent to wartime destruction and post-war renewal, and the consolidation of a legislative framework aimed towards their protection, adaptation to new circumstance became a key element in the story of many historic places of worship.\textsuperscript{18} Published ten years after an exhibition was held at the Victoria & Albert Museum in London to highlight the plight of redundant churches, Ken Powell and Celia de la Hey’s \textit{Churches: A Question of Conversion} (1987), discusses the fate of churches made redundant in the 1970s and 1980s, and makes suggestions for their future use including preservation as monuments.\textsuperscript{19} In a rural context, a retreat is suggested as a viable use, whilst in urban and suburban areas conversion to secular uses such as theatres, offices, libraries or community centres are proposed. The schemes included in the text are mainly Anglican, such as a proposal by Derek Latham Associates to convert St Michael, Derby (1858) into offices. Of interest here, however, is a proposal to adapt the Methodist Bethesda Chapel, Stoke-on-Trent, which retained worship space alongside other uses through built interventions.\textsuperscript{20} The scheme was only a proposal, though some executed schemes with extended religious use are discussed, albeit briefly with most being too recent at the time of publication for detailed analysis of their merits.

In addition, the post-1945 period has been characterised by an ongoing overall decline in church attendance amongst the main Christian denominations.\textsuperscript{21} Conversely, in the same period, the growth of other faith groups has been observed; the impacts of which will be considered in due course.\textsuperscript{22} In the next section, however, existing studies of the architectural profession are considered in order to identify the dominant strands of practice post-1945 and provide context to current practices in relation to historic places of worship.

\textsuperscript{17} Angela Connelly.
\textsuperscript{19} Ken Powell and Celia De La Hey, \textit{Churches: A Question of Conversion} (Save Britain’s Heritage, 1987).
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid, pp. 60–67.
Historical Accounts of the Architectural Profession

Formative accounts of the development of the architectural profession in England, such as those by the sociologist Barrington Kaye and the architect Frank Jenkins, typically trace the professionalisation of architects throughout the course of the nineteenth century, and describe a shift away from an earlier system of patronage.\(^{23}\) For Kaye, architecture followed a similar path to professionalisation as the legal and medical professions: ‘the foundation of a voluntary association, the exclusion of unqualified or other persons liable to lower public prestige, the growth of a system of tests and examinations, and the extension of control over the relevant educational systems’.\(^{24}\) Yet, whilst both Jenkins and Kaye cover the founding and institutional history of a professional body for architects working in the United Kingdom, namely the RIBA, and highlight contemporary debate regarding style through and up to the end of the nineteenth century, detail on architectural practice in the twentieth century is scant. The same is true of John Wilton-Ely’s chapter in Spiro Kostoff’s edited collection *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession* (1977) which draws heavily from the work of Kaye and Jenkins.\(^{25}\) In Andrew Saint’s *The Image of the Architect* (1985), the post-1945 period receives slightly more attention, albeit taking an international overview rather than looking specifically at the English case.\(^{26}\) Saint notes that professionalisation of architecture in the nineteenth century served to encouraged artistic individualism: ‘An individualized view of architecture attracts architects because it enables them to see themselves not only as top dogs in the construction process but also as creators and romantics’.\(^{27}\) This, Saint argues, has been to the detriment of professional collaboration in the twentieth century: ‘The wider community ... [lost] its involvement with the process of building’.\(^{28}\) Despite this observation, writing in 1985, Saint could hardly have been unaware of the phenomenon of community architecture which, from the late 1960s, had received a significant amount of commentary from the architectural press. As public confidence in modernist planning ebbed, the rehabilitation of buildings with the consultation and involvement of local communities became enshrined in national policy documents such as *The People and Planning: Report of the Committee on Public Participation in Planning* (1969).\(^{29}\) However, the story of community architecture and community architects is omitted from Saint’s account of the profession along


\(^{24}\) Kaye, pp. 13 & 22.


\(^{28}\) Ibid, p. 162.

\(^{29}\) The Skeffington Committee.
with the influence, more generally, of national and local policy on architectural practice. This lack of attention to national and local policy is, perhaps also the reason for another significant omission by Saint: specifically, the role of the architect as conservation specialist in the post-1945 period. One other significant account concerning the architectural profession in England is Mark Crinson and Jules Lubbock’s *Architecture Art or Profession?: Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain* (1994).\(^\text{30}\) In the two chapters dedicated to the twentieth century, the authors chart the changing landscape of architectural education to account for the dominance of the modern movement in the post-1945 period.\(^\text{31}\) Whilst being a worthwhile contribution to our understanding of the modern movement, it does not account for those alternative architectural practices with which we are concerned here. Accordingly, we now turn our attention to the published literature pertaining to conservation and community architecture in England in the post-1945 period. In these sections, the literature review provides historical context for the thesis by tracing these two strands of practice, which although prevalent in the post-1945 period, are not well-examined or documented in relation to historic places of worship.

**Literature on Conservation of Historic Places of Worship**

Current literature on the conservation of historic places of worship is mostly aimed towards practitioners, consisting of practical guidance handbooks, and commentaries of recent projects provided by niche journals such as *Church Building* (1984 to present) and *Ecclesiology Today* (1993 to present).\(^\text{32}\) In addition, conservation work in relation to historic places of worship post-1945 can be found in a limited number of architectural monographs.\(^\text{33}\) However, of the eleven titles published by the RIBA in the *Twentieth Century Architects* series, tellingly only one is dedicated to an architect who specialised in the restoration of historic places of worship; namely Stephen Dykes Bower who in 1962, amongst his other achievements, was responsible for the reconstruction, subsequent to war-time bomb damage, of Wren’s aforementioned St Vedast,

\(^{30}\) *Architecture - Art or Profession?: Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).

\(^{31}\) Crinson and Lubbock, p. 106.


London (Fig. 1.01). Subsequent titles in the series, now published by Historic England, feature none.

![Image: Interior of St Vedast, London: restored by Stephen Dykes Bower](Source: Author's own image.)

Fig. 1.01. Interior of St Vedast, London: restored by Stephen Dykes Bower

Despite post-1945 church restorations and reconstructions being numerous, a comprehensive historical account of conservation practice in relation to historic places of worship in England is lacking. Generalised accounts tracing the history of conservation in Europe, however, are provided by Miles Glendinning and Jukka Jokilehto, whilst similar ground is covered in the context of England by Ben Cowell and in the edited volumes of Michael Hunter and Jane

Whilst none of these texts focus specifically upon historic places of worship, paradigms cases, such as the late-eighteenth century restoration of English medieval cathedrals by the architect James Wyatt are referenced, whilst Coventry Cathedral (Fig. 1.02) and Dresden Frauenkirche, and the attendant debates surrounding their post-1945 rebuilding, are typically included as part of the overall narrative of conservation. In order to provide context to current debates regarding the adaptation of historic places, described in the introduction, a brief overview of conservation history vis-à-vis historic places of worship in England follows.

Fig. 1.02. The ruins of the Cathedral Church of St Michael, Coventry
[Source: Copyright of gawkerassets.com.]

A Brief History of Conservation in Relation to Historic Places of Worship in England

One of the most important debates in the history of conservation concerns the merits of preserving rather than restoring historic buildings. As far back as the fourteenth century, the master mason Henry Yevele arguably demonstrated an appreciation of the historical by choosing

---

to complete the nave of Westminster Abbey in a sympathetic Early English Gothic style, rather
than the then-in vogue Perpendicular Gothic (Fig. 1.03).36

![Picture of Westminster Abbey](image)

**Fig. 1.03. Nave of Westminster Abbey by Henry Yevele**
(Source: A. D. White Architectural Photographs, Cornell University Library.)

By the mid-eighteenth century, Enlightenment historiographical methods were being applied in
the newly-emerging discipline of archaeology, with the German art historian Joachim
Winckelmann insisting that restoration works to historic monuments should be made legible from
original elements.37 This distinction between *restoration* and *preservation*, critical to
Winckelmann’s understanding of authenticity, had particular resonance with the Society of
Antiquaries in England who objected to the restoration work of the architect James Wyatt.38 In
the late-eighteenth century, Wyatt received commissions to restore several medieval cathedral
buildings in England including Lichfield (restored 1787-1795), Salisbury (restored 1787-1792), and

38 Jokilehto, pp. 104–9; Cowell, p. 52; Glendinning, pp. 55–58.
Hereford (restored 1788-1795). However, rather than merely repair the existing fabric of these buildings, Wyatt’s ‘improvements’ included the removal of later-period Gothic features and the insertion of new elements to conform with his own vision of a uniform Early English Gothic style.\(^{39}\) Thus, battle lines were drawn between those who favoured the preservation of historic buildings, and those who favoured restoration.

In the early part of the nineteenth century, a perceived weakening of the Church of England’s supremacy amongst a group of academics and clerics led to the mobilisation of the Oxford Movement. Although the Oxford Movement was mostly concerned with the relationship between State and Church, their published Tracts prompted the formation in 1839 of The Cambridge Camden Society, later known as The Ecclesiological Society, whose overriding interest was in the science of church building and restoration.\(^{40}\) This marked the next important phase in the development of the conservation movement in relation to historic places of worship. Through its monthly journal *The Ecclesiologist* (1841-1868), The Ecclesiological Society promoted the Decorated Gothic style as the highpoint of English church architecture and, in believing that each building type should have its own style, asserted that Gothic, also known as Pointed, should be adopted for churches.\(^{41}\) They believed that the Gothic style alone was ‘capable of bearing and articulating theological meaning’.\(^{42}\)

Along with the written works of the architect A.W.N. Pugin, the Society has been acknowledged as influential in shaping Victorian attitudes to church building and restoration.\(^{43}\) Despite objections by the art critic John Ruskin to the methods of the Society, the integration of restoration techniques into the architects’ apprenticeship system in 1865 gave official sanction to
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\(^{42}\) Quoted in: Whyte, p. 52.

the practice by the RIBA.\textsuperscript{44} Not until the establishment of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) in 1877 did the tide begin to turn.

In 1877, William Morris, an avid critic of over-zealous restorations of historic buildings, convened a meeting which led to the establishment of SPAB. In its early years, the SPAB attracted much publicity, although struggled to have practical impact: in 1878, for example, objections to the proposed removal of eighteenth-century furnishings at Southwell Minster were dismissed by the architect responsible, Ewan Christian.\textsuperscript{45} However, through a series of Parliamentary Bills brought forward by the SPAB committee member and Liberal politician, Sir John Lubbock, the 1882 Ancient Monuments Protection Act was passed which, although limited in its scope – medieval remains were excluded and ecclesiastical properties exempted – heralded the beginning of a legislative framework for conservation both in England and elsewhere in the United Kingdom.\textsuperscript{46} More Parliamentary Acts followed and several trusts and commissions were formed: the 1882 Ancient Monuments Protection Act was extended, in 1900, to include medieval remains; The National Trust was established, in 1907, to acquire places of ‘historic interest and natural beauty’; and Royal Commissions on Historical Monuments for England, Wales and Scotland were set up in 1908.\textsuperscript{47} However, with each new Act, further debate ensued as to what should, or should not, come under the protection of the State. For example, proposals to bring ecclesiastical buildings within the scope of the 1913 Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act were strongly resisted by the Church of England. One outcome of these debates, however, was a proliferation of amenity societies throughout the course of the twentieth century, each seeking to extend the legislative remit through the championing of a favoured architectural style. First amongst these was the Georgian Group, which was founded in 1937 out a concern for the preservation of eighteenth and early-nineteenth century buildings threatened by interwar town redevelopment.\textsuperscript{48} This enthusiasm for historic buildings and monuments saw architects dispatched across England during the Second World War to record any structures considered

\textsuperscript{45} Miele, pp. 24–25.
historically or architecturally significant in case of damage or loss due to enemy bombing raids; the findings of which were compiled in the National Buildings Record survey of 1941.49

After the Second World War ended, attention turned away from matters of protection to renewal. The question was: what should be rebuilt? In the context of places of worship, such decisions were not just the preserve of national and local authorities, however, but also faith organisations, and encompassed factors including ‘morale, culture and heritage’ alongside religious provision.50 Satisfying such criteria prompted differing responses from the architectural profession, with some calling for the symbolic preservation of bombed-out churches.51 Such was the case with the former Anglican church of St Luke, Liverpool (1832) by the architect John Foster Senior.52 An alternative approach was to attempt a reconstructive recreation: St James, Piccadilly, London, originally designed by Wren (1684) but restored by the architect Albert E. Richardson and rededicated in 1954, is one such case.53 The post-1945 restoration of St Vedast, London, by Stephen Dykes Bower, referred to above, is another. In the case of St Vedast and other Wren churches, it has been argued that national identity played a part in the decision to restore rather than build anew.54 Similarly, the perceived cultural importance of All Hallows-by-the-Tower, Barking, London, was likely key in the decision to commission its restoration by Seely and Paget (restored 1949-1958): it was from the tower of All Hallows that the diarist Samuel Pepys saw and described the Great Fire of London in 1666.55

Subsequent to the passing of the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, the compilation of lists of buildings of historical and architectural interest had been a statutory duty.56 Generally, however, the mood was one of anti-restoration, reinforced by ‘a century’s rhetoric against false historically-styled architecture, stretching back to Pugin through [the SPAB]’.57 The architect Ralph Tubbs, for example, argued that in reconstructing England’s towns and cities, ‘sham’ revivals of

54 Larkham and Nasr, p. 287.
57 Glendinning, p. 265.
older styles must be rejected.\textsuperscript{58} Therefore, as an older generation of architects established themselves as what are today referred to as conservation architects, prior professional experience having afforded such individuals a deep historical knowledge and intimacy with the past, younger modernist trained architects were increasingly turned to in the design of new places of worship. Why this was so requires consideration of another literature source, and is a matter to which we will return in due course. However, in the context of a widespread enthusiasm for modernisation and urban change by planning authorities, existing historic places of worship contrasted unfavourably with the new modern churches, and, in inner-city areas in particular, many Victorian churches came under threat of demolition. With similar threats facing non-religious Victorian buildings, The Victorian Society was formed in 1958 to campaign for their protection, signalling a strengthening of the conservation in the post-1945 period.\textsuperscript{59}

Whilst modernist trained architects dominated in the design of new places of worship post-1945, it was not uncommon for those same architects to be engaged in the restoration of historic places of worship.\textsuperscript{60} Such was the case with the restorations of Norwich Cathedral (restored 1963-1967), York Minster (restored 1965-77), and St Paul’s Cathedral (restored 1969-77); all carried out by the architectural practice of Feilden and Mawson.\textsuperscript{61} Elsewhere, modernist architects dealing with historic places of worship in urban contexts incorporated principles more closely associated with that of the mid-eighteenth century Picturesque Movement; a move designed to temper misgivings towards modernist planning and, with its support, conceptualised by the architectural press as ‘Townscape’.\textsuperscript{62} Sir William Holford’s treatment of St Paul’s Cathedral in his Paternoster Square scheme (1967), for example, placed the building as a standalone focal point in the landscape. A similar treatment proposed by Frederick Gibberd for All Saints, Camden, in 1949, was unrealised.\textsuperscript{63} By the late 1960s, however, a general disillusionment with state-driven programmes of modernisation in England had set in. The 1965 National Plan, established to tackle the growing economic disparity across the regions and lend support to improving industrial efficiency was abandoned after just one year.\textsuperscript{64} Further, planned housing developments and infrastructure projects were held back, and conflict with trade unions brought about industrial

\textsuperscript{58} Ralph Tubbs, \textit{The Englishman Builds} (Penguin books, 1945), p. 49.
\textsuperscript{59} Cowell, pp. 115–16; Glendinning, pp. 315–17.
\textsuperscript{60} Glendinning, p. 284.
\textsuperscript{61} Yates, p. 161.
\textsuperscript{63} Otto Saumarez Smith, ‘Cathedral Precincts and Pedestrian Precincts’, \textit{The Modernist}, 19, 2016, 50–53 (pp. 50–53).
unrest and strike action. As the economic crisis grew, the retreat of modernist planning allowed for an even greater emphasis on conservation, and presaged the arrival of the second architectural specialism of the post-war period, the community architect; a matter to which we will presently turn. It can be seen that there were differing opinions between those who wished for an ‘authentic’ preservation without change, and those who believed in progressive adaptation for contemporary purpose whilst retaining and/or restoring extant historic fabric: debates that continue to this day. Another issue arising is that of building afresh and the due function of conservation within that context: in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, England remained strongly wedded to the idea of itself as a Christian nation, and so, even in an era of widespread modernisation, the restoration of bombed historic churches prevailed. It can be asserted, therefore, that conservation practice is often bound up with those issues of national and cultural identity loosely described as ‘heritage’; a contested notion which came into popular parlance in the mid-1970s. Recent scholarship in heritage studies, building upon the work of American historical geographer David Lowenthal, has suggested the existence of an ‘authorised heritage discourse’ whereby certain features of the built environment are privileged by national bodies to create a sanctioned view of the past. Furthermore, an increasing number of theorists have examined the construction of heritage, both tangible and intangible. The thesis does not aim to contribute to this debate, but an awareness of how the ‘heritage’ value of historic places of worship may be constructed by different groups, on both the local and national scale, is important.

Literature on Community Architecture and Public Participation

It has been asserted that after the Second World War ‘the general ideological climate of the West, [including England], was hostile to any kind of monumentality’ in architecture. However, as public confidence in modernist planning faded in the 1960s, large-scale, state-driven modernisation gave way to a ‘socio-democratic rhetoric of progressive conservation’. Following earlier critiques of town planning provided by Jane Jacobs and John Habraken, Sherry Arnstein’s A Ladder of Public Participation (1969) highlighted the manipulation and tokenism inherent with community consultation and participation in America. In the English context, public engagement in planning matters can also be traced to the 1960s. The re-publishing of Robert Goodman’s invective against comprehensive development, After The Planners (1971) in London was indicative of a change of attitudes in England, and was followed by calls from British architects, including Colin Ward and John Turner, for further empowerment of communities in solving housing problems.

Acknowledging that various terms, including ‘community design’, ‘participatory design’, and ‘social architecture’ have been applied to the practice of community architecture through time, accounts of community architecture in England generally cease their narrative in the latter part of the 1980s. Yet the practice and its associated philosophy did not simply end. Indeed, articles promoting community architecture projects continued to appear in trade journals into the 1990s. Moreover, existing historical accounts focus on the impact of community architecture in 1980s. Moreover, existing historical accounts focus on the impact of community architecture in
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70 Glendinning, p. 295.
England on housing; understandable given its origins as an oppositional response to comprehensive redevelopment schemes. However, the workload of one community technical aid centre in London between 1983 and 1984 suggests a diverse practice which involved schools, community centres, and, of relevance to this thesis, places of worship.\(^76\) This diversity of practice is also evident in the work of The Glass-House, a national charity which has actively promoted public participation in the design of the built environment since its founding in 2001. The charity has been involved with projects ranging from the regeneration of Hastings Pier to the creation of a community building for Spitalfields City Farm, London.\(^77\)

Beyond the solely historical accounts of community architecture, there also exists a substantial literature which takes an approach informed by sociology in order to interrogate the processes and outcomes of community architecture. A major concern expressed is whether public participation is a useful exercise.\(^78\) Architecture, for example, is a specialist subject. Consequently, in inviting wider public involvement, it is probable that the participants will lack the necessary level of knowledge. Moreover, community architecture and other participatory processes often fall foul of attracting only ‘the usual suspects’, thus highlighting the difficulty of achieving equal participation in decision making.\(^79\) Another problem lies in establishing the appropriate level of public involvement in participatory processes.\(^80\) Arnstein’s ‘Ladder of Public Participation’ introduced a hierarchy of participation which placed full citizen control at the top and citizen manipulation at the bottom.\(^81\) However, reimagined by the town planner Scott Davidson as a ‘Wheel of Empowerment’, levels of participation from limited consultation to entrusted control can be assigned as appropriate.\(^82\) Who decides what is appropriate, however, is a question left unanswered. Problematic too is the very term ‘community’ which, it has been asserted, encourages a simplified understanding of communities as homogenous units with shared interests and needs.\(^83\) This is a view reinforced by the architect Jeremy Till who argues that community architecture constructs a ‘theoretical community’ and, like modern planning before it,

\(^76\) Wates and Knevitt, pp. 160–64.
\(^81\) Arnstein.
\(^82\) Davidson.
offers ‘idealised visions of society’. Similarly, the cultural theorist Malcolm Miles points to a presumption ‘that communities already exist and are simply waiting for nicer places in which to live their coherent and well-directed, meaningful lives’. In the context of current debates on the adaptation of historic places of worship, how is it possible to identify the many communities which may coalesce around a single building, what is it they require, and is it possible that adaptation for community use may serve different elements of a community unevenly?

A final concern raised in the literature is the impact public participation may have on the aesthetics of design outputs. For Till, the promotion of conservative stylistic values in formative accounts of community architecture has ‘forever associated community architecture with a certain type of regressive vernacular’. If, as Miles has also concluded, the outcome of community architecture is one of ‘nostalgia’, can the pressure placed upon architects to meet the expectations and popular tastes of the general public still produce satisfactory design solutions? For the architect Michael Shamiyeh, satisfying popular taste may not necessarily produce ‘traditional’ design, but he acknowledges that architects are increasingly called upon to deliver ‘what people want’. The architect Isabelle Doucet notes that 1990s ‘neoliberal politics celebrated virtues that had previously been part of participation’s oppositional activism … [and was thus] incorporated into a politics of consensus and appeasement’. In light of such statements, the adaptation of historic places of worship must be considered beyond the mere provision of additional community function, and the politics of style addressed. Whilst the thesis does not aim to contribute to the sociological debates directly, an awareness of how concepts such as community and participation are problematised is essential. The main finding of this part of the literature review, however, is that historical accounts of community architecture in England focus upon housing provision. Its impact upon historic places of worship, if any, and the amenity value of such buildings to communities is, as yet, an unwritten chapter in the story of community architecture.
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86 Till, p. 38.
87 Malcolm Miles, p. 155.
Consideration of Socio-Religious Literature

In order to examine the socio-religious history of places of worship, it is important to take account of the major debates relating to the function of Christian church organisations over time. In the case of the Church of England, Andrew Chandler has provided an institutional history which draws upon internal discussions and correspondence to examine its adopted policies throughout the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{90} External factors which informed its decisions, however, are not explored. Similarly, the impacts of these policies on the treatment of both new and existing churches are not discussed. Arguably, architectural history, and the practice of architects, can and should be informed by sociological and theological debates, in order to question contested concepts such as ‘heritage’ or ‘community’ and frame them with context-specific meanings. This is not entirely new in the design of places of worship in the post-1945 period. In 1957, frustrated by the quality of design and a lack of innovation in English churches, a group of theologians and architects led by Peter Hammond established the New Churches Research Group (NCRG) to explore the relation between liturgy and architecture, and to consider the design possibilities open to architects.\textsuperscript{91} However, the NCRG were concerned only with new buildings and not the adaptation of historic places of worship.

Given that the topic of the thesis is, as yet, mainly unexamined, it is reasonable to assume that the literature pertaining to the religious context of the post-1945 period may hold interesting insights. These include the development of worshipping congregations – a key concern of religious organisations – and, perhaps more importantly, ascertaining the meaning or relevance of historic places of worship through time and to differing groups within society. The thesis will not, however, contribute directly to these sociological debates, but may hold some interest with its focus on the material aspects of social processes. Looking broadly across the socio-religious literature, it has been possible to identify three themes that could have a bearing on the design, use, and adaptation of historic places of worship today: the nature of secularisation and its effects; increasing religious diversity; and closer interfaith working. Each will be taken in turn.

\textsuperscript{91} Proctor, pp. 133–35.
Secularisation

Secularisation, although a much-disputed concept, may be defined as ‘that process by which religious institutions, actions, and consciousness, lose their social significance’.92 This definition broadly refers to the declining importance attached to religious institutions in the public sphere. Early proponents of the secularisation thesis believed that religion would cease to function in the modern world.93 In order to prove the thesis, late-twentieth century sociologists developed indicators of secularisation based upon church attendance and participation in the major rites of passage, for example. They all seemed to inexorably point to a decline in participation in religious activities, particularly from the mid-nineteenth century, which coincided with industrialisation and mass urbanisation.94 However, a number of sociologists and religious historians have recently questioned the secularisation thesis in terms of: when it occurred, what the causes might be, the flourishing of religion in non-western contexts, and the narrow definition of religion that was employed.

In terms of reaching a causal explanation of secularisation, a number of views have been offered, which often relate to the timing of secularisation. Some sociologists believed that the seeds of religious decline had been sowed in the mid-nineteenth century with mass urbanisation and industrialisation in the modern period.95 Others have chosen to focus on the post-1945 era as the critical period. According to the historian Jeffrey Cox, the steady disappearance of Sunday Schools and Bible classes throughout the 1950s, along with a decline in pastoral visiting societies and Mothers’ Union meetings, undermined the social aspect of church life.96 As such, the sociologist Callum Brown has asserted that women – long key to the maintenance of church life – were significant in bringing about this change. Whilst acknowledging that church attendance had been in decline for several decades, Brown asserts that ‘discursive Christianity’ – those wider religious practices including the social aspect of church life – remained strong up until the 1960s.97 The departure of women from church life as they ‘cancelled their mass subscription to the discursive domain of Christianity’ was, according to Brown, the consequence of a resurgence in

feminist activism in the 1960s. However, the reasons for this defection is much disputed, one view being that the work opportunities afforded to women during the Second World War were causal in that it 'broadened their cultural horizons and made them less likely to marry the local lad from the same street and church'. Yet others hold that processes of population migration and suburbanisation in the post-1945 were factors, as communities became fragmented and less culturally uniform. Regardless of when secularisation occurred, the fundamental tenet remains the same: societal change in the early post-1945 period be it gender equality or urban renewal, weakened community ties with Christianity and, according to the priest and historian Jeremy Morris, disassociation from church life undermined wider civic responsibility. Thus, there is a question over the extent to which the widespread social and religious changes in the post-1945 period affected the material adaptation of church buildings, and how architects responded, or not, to such processes.

Some of those engaging with the secularisation debate have increasingly tried to widen the notion of what counts as religion beyond attendance at a church building. Traditionally, religion has been defined as the belief in the existence of a divine being (or beings) underpinned by religious practice and associated institutions. Yet Brown, with his 'discursive Christianity', has called into question what exactly constitutes religious practice. Others have suggested church attendance is not necessarily the only indication of religiosity, and described a 'diffusive Christianity', involving an affiliation with wider church networks, as evidence of attachment and religious identification. Similarly, the sociologist Grace Davie has described the phenomenon of 'believing without belonging', and more recently proposed the concept of 'vicarious memory' - a latent memory which exists in the general populace whereby church attendance is delegated to churchgoers until times of crises. Thus, although declining church attendance in England between 1945 and 1965 amongst Anglicans and nonconformists, if not Roman Catholics, is


undisputed, the extent to which Christian belief has persisted - discursive, diffusive, vicarious or otherwise - is contested. One recent study, for example, suggests, ‘belief has in fact eroded in Britain at the same rate as two key aspects of belonging: religious affiliation and attendance’.\textsuperscript{105} The extent to which this complicates the present relevance of historic places of worship, and current attitudes towards their function within communities is a theme that will be explored in the research. Perhaps more tangible, however, has been the material effect of declining attendance on historic places of worship.

It is rare for social and religious studies to consider places of worship, beyond quantifying the number built, and how their design and use might relate to these wider social processes. In the nineteenth century, a large number of churches were built by both Anglicans and nonconformists in response to urbanisation.\textsuperscript{106} However, this was often disproportionate to population growth and many religious organisations overprovided accommodation. In inner-city areas, the problem of over provision was exacerbated when slum clearance programmes were resumed with vigour after the Second World War. Places of worship became physically remote from former congregations now relocated to the New Towns and overspill estates. Thus churches in depopulated areas were increasingly abandoned.\textsuperscript{107} Unable to conduct effective outreach activities from such locations, and in response to contemporary liturgical thinking which encouraged greater unity between clergy and laity, the erection of new, smaller churches in suburban areas characterised the years up to the mid-1970s. Yet despite the widespread building of new churches throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the very presence of redundant historic churches, awaiting demolition or repurposing, reinforced a perception of religious decline and growing secularisation by acting as ‘visible reminders of a once religious past’.\textsuperscript{108} The post-1945 experience of inner-city historic places of worship demonstrates the tension between buildings which serve the purpose of the religious organisations and their mission, and those which exist in ill-suited locations with inadequate facilities to reflect changing circumstance.

\textsuperscript{105} David Voas and Alasdair Crockett, ‘Religion in Britain: Neither Believing nor Belonging’, Sociology, 39.1 (2005), 11–28 (p. 11).
\textsuperscript{107} Binney and Burman, pp. 33–37.
\textsuperscript{108} Gill, p. 58.
Increased Religious Diversity

Whilst acknowledging the presence, pre-1945, of other religious organisations, religion in England was, nevertheless, the preserve of the main Christian denominations: the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Nonconformists. However, consequent to increased immigration soon after the end of the Second World War, this began to change. A new wave of Irish immigrants aided the growth of the Roman Catholic Church in England, but attempts to assimilate West Indian immigrants by the existing Christian churches were mostly unsuccessful, and led to the creation of the Council of African and Afro-Caribbean Churches UK in 1979. Indigenous belief followed those migrants arriving from the Indian-subcontinent towards the end of the 1950s, considerably increasing the number of Sikhs, Hindus, Buddhists, and Muslims in the country. With housing policies skewed towards the settlement of such communities in inner city areas, it was commonplace for empty houses and abandoned churches to be used as places of worship by the minority faith groups. In the West Midlands, a nineteenth-century Congregational chapel in Smethwick was purchased by the local Sikh community and reopened as a gurdwara in 1958, and in 1965 a chapel in Didsbury, Manchester, which had been declared redundant by the Methodists, was purchased for conversion into a mosque by local Syrian Muslims. Information pertaining to the role of the architectural profession in the conversion of these buildings is scant, but, in the case of Liverpool, the work was carried out with the help of the Community Technical Services Agency (COMTECHSA), one of the first technical aid centres established in England to help communities with such projects. It is clear, then, that increasing religious diversity in wider society may hold some interesting insights into the adaptation of Christian church buildings for wider community use, and the meanings that these church buildings hold within the community even when there are changes.

112 Singh and Tatla, p. 73; Angela Connelly.
Closer Interdenominational Working

Despite increasing faith diversity, a feature of post-1945 Christianity is the closer union, albeit disjointed, of the main denominations on certain social issues and the pooling of resources. This has even extended to the buildings. The challenges associated with war damaged churches, particularly in terms of compensation payment, saw an ecumenical body called the Churches Main Committee convened to negotiate war damage payments with the government, comprising of the main Christian churches and other religious organisations.\textsuperscript{114} In addition, the challenges associated with providing church buildings on council estates led to the 1969 Sharing of Church Buildings Act, which permitted the Church of England to share its buildings with all the Christian groups represented by the British Council of Churches, particularly on ‘new town or large housing estate where the sense of community, and even of identity, may be lacking’.\textsuperscript{115}

Summary of Socio-Religious Literature

Taken together, the review of the literature on social and religious history provides justification for exploring issues of wider community involvement in the design and siting of church buildings. It has shown how change occurring in one location can have consequences for places of worship that reverberate within local communities. As noted above, the thesis will not contribute directly to such debates directly, but they provide important context and suggest themes to explore in the fieldwork. Firstly, the fact that secularisation is widely disputed demonstrates that religion, and religious affiliation, in the twenty first century is a complex phenomenon with a number of intangible aspects. However, sociologists and historians of religion have tended to overlook the design and siting of church buildings in the secularisation debate. It is certain, however, that declining attendances amongst the main Christian churches poses questions regarding the function of historic places of worship in the twenty first century and their relevance to a more religiously diverse society - and those who are not attached to any religious organisation. This further complicates the range of communities who may use or contribute to the adaptation of historic places of worship; all of which add to the complexity of issues for architects to consider.


\textsuperscript{115} HL Deb 30 January 1969 vol. 298 cc. 1279-87.
Summary of Literature Review

This literature review has considered historic places of worship in the post-1945 period with recourse to two main bodies of scholarship; namely, architectural history, with a focus on conservation and community architecture, and the sociological literature on religious change. Of particular note is that the role of the conservation and community architect, with regard to historic places of worship, is missing from the architectural history literature which, when focused on religious buildings, tends to consider new buildings within a given period, whilst relating them to particular architectural styles or concerns of that period. In the present context, with maintenance of historic places of worship in ways that involve communities more in their design a pressing issue, this suggests that a historical study of the way that conservation has been approached in the post-1945 period would be germane and hold insights of academic and practical interest. A particularly important gap will be bridged in tracing the development of architectural skills in both conservation and community architecture, in relation to historic places of worship, since the literature shows that architectural education history tends to be covered at a general level, or else exists only in practical training manuals.

There are a number of major themes emerging from the literature review that will require examination through the empirical fieldwork. In terms of conservation, debate over the authenticity of buildings, following an intervention, has been a perennial concern in the field, and one where some of the strongest contestations have emerged. There is also a concern over how heritage is defined, and whose heritage is included. Here, there is crossover with the community architecture narrative in providing definitions of ‘community’. Further, the extent to which communities can participate effectively in design, and how the architect engages them, emerges across the literature writ large. This thesis will contribute to current academic debates in architectural history by tracing change over time in the definition of communities relating to historic places of worship. Whilst architectural history provides a rich seam of literature, and resultant gaps within which to situate the research for this thesis, one must also mention how architectural historians approach their material. An ongoing trend is towards situating material and aesthetic histories within their due socio-economic and cultural contexts. Given that the focus of this thesis is upon historic places of worship and the engagement of the architectural profession, it has been necessary to consider the abundant literature on religious change in the post-1945 period. This revealed the extent of declining religious attendance and affiliation which, in part, prompts concerns as to the long-term viability and meaning of places of worship in an arguably more secular age. Yet, recent insightful work has problematized the notion of what it
means to be religious, showing that considering religious attendance and/or affiliation only masks the more diffuse individual and collective relationships with places of worship. Again, this underscores the need to consider how communities are defined in relation to historic places of worship. Similarly, how has religious change impacted upon the way that architects engage with the conservation of historic places of worship? Change over time, evident in both religion and architectural practice, suggests that the thesis should adopt a chronological approach to the empirical work. This is appropriate for exploratory research, and will allow for a full examination of the development of conservation and community architecture practice in relation to historic places of worship considered within varying social, economic and religious contexts.
Chapter Two: The Church of England and the Architectural Profession

As the architectural historian Andrew Saint noted: ‘Architecture in all ages is intensely collaborative, and we mislead our readers if we present it as a craft of pure, creative individualism’.¹ In questioning the primacy of the architect in creative processes, Saint recognised the significant role that other individuals or groups may have in shaping not only the outcome of a project but also what it might be to begin with. As this thesis is primarily concerned with building works carried out on Anglican churches, an understanding the Church of England and its congregations is essential; the former being a client of the architectural professional, the latter users of the buildings. What, for example are the historical contexts which have shaped how the Church has perceived itself and its mission through time, and how have these changed? Further, how might the Church’s perception of its role have affected its attitudes towards its portfolio of buildings and the demands it has placed on the architectural profession thereafter?

It has been argued by Saint that the perceived primacy of the architect in creative processes was contiguous with the professionalisation of the role in the nineteenth century: ‘An individualized view of architecture attracts architects because it enables them to see themselves not only as top dogs in the construction process but also as creators and romantics’.² However, prior to the founding of the Royal Institute of British Architect (RIBA) in 1834, the professional body for architects working in the United Kingdom, architects were subject to a system of patronage whereby the balance of power lay squarely with the patron.³ Certainly, in the instance of the Church of England, this led to a generation of architects synonymous with their ecclesiastic work, such as William Butterfield and George Edmund Street in the nineteenth century. As this chapter will demonstrate, however, the architectural ambitions of the Church varied according to changing social and political circumstances, and its ability financially to respond to such developments. How the Church has perceived itself in the post-1945 era to the present day, and how this has affected its relationship with the architectural profession, can only be understood by considering the historical religious contexts.

³ Discussed in: Wilton-Ely; Frank Jenkins; Kaye.
The Church of England: A Brief History Pre-1945

Although Christianity is generally held to have arrived in Britain sometime around the beginning of the first millennium, not until the thirteenth century did the sense of a distinct English Christian church, an Ecclesia Anglicana, led by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York yet under the authority of the Pope in Rome.\(^4\) By the sixteenth century, however, English Christianity splintered as the ruling monarch Henry VIII came into personal conflict with the papacy following Pope Clement’s refusal to annul Henry’s marriage to Catherine of Aragon.\(^5\) Consequently, and subsequent to the 1534 Act of Supremacy, Henry VIII was made head of a new independent church, the Church of England, which although anti-papacy was not yet of a Protestant persuasion. It did not subscribe to the doctrine of reformers elsewhere in Europe, such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, in a complete rejection of the Roman Catholic Church.\(^6\) Nonetheless, the Church of England’s challenge to the authority of Rome presaged a rise in Protestantism which, in turn, produced the three-way split that defines Christianity in England thus: the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Nonconformists.\(^7\)

In the seventeenth century, the nonconformists included the Baptists, the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, and the Quakers. These were joined by the Unitarians and the Methodists in the eighteenth century; the latter being a group initially formed within the Church of England. Such was the growth in nonconformity that, by the nineteenth century, religious attendance exceeded that of the Church of England, whilst Roman Catholics were a minority group within society.\(^8\) It was this erosion of both the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church that has led some scholars to identify the English Reformation as the starting point of secularization in England as religion supposedly gave way to emergent Enlightenment thinking.\(^9\) However, the marked rise in nonconformity up until the twentieth century suggests a switching of allegiances, rather than an abandonment of religion altogether. As the population of
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\(^7\) Hastings, p. 32.


England’s cities grew in the early nineteenth century, concomitant with industrialisation, so too did the extent of urban areas. The Church of England was slow to react to this development, to the benefit of the nonconformists. Unencumbered by centuries of administrative and material concerns, the nonconformists were more mobile, and collectively able to embark upon significant programmes of building which saw the number of churches, chapels and meeting houses, along with attendance, increase in newly urbanised areas.10 Fearing a diminution of the Church of England’s influence, the government introduced the 1818 Church Building Act which aimed to increase the number of Anglican churches in urban areas.11 The effect was both numerous and numinous with churches of various Christian persuasions readily available to the working classes, albeit the Anglican churches were later denigrated as Georgian preaching boxes.12 Nonconformist churches increasingly acted as foci for recreational activities, and with youth education mostly the preserve of the Church of England through its National Society, Christianity’s influence permeated many levels of Victorian society.13 Still, for the Church of England, its churches at this time were, in common with the Roman Catholic Church in England, used almost exclusively for the purpose of worship. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, this had begun to change.

Writing in the late 1960s, the theologian John Gordon Davies reasoned that the idea of church buildings as wholly sacred entities, prevalent since the nineteenth century, had skewed twentieth-century attitudes.14 The Cambridge Camden Society, known from 1845 as the Ecclesiological Society, was largely culpable of promulgating this view: ‘The Society trusts that its members, while pursuing their antiquarian researches, will never forget the respect due to the sacred character of the edifices they visit’.15 However, according to Davies, ‘in the Medieval Ages, the church was an all-purpose building ... where people could sleep, live, eat, drink, play, act and meet’.16 As Christianity came to dominate in what had previously been a largely pagan society,
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12 Hastings, pp. 33–34; Yates, p. 87. Whilst the presence of the Christian churches in the Victorian city is undisputed, the extent to which the working classes engaged with them has been questioned, with some believing it to have been tenuous. See, for example, Kenneth Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England (London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1963), pp. 1–20; Standish Meacham, ‘The Church in the Victorian City’, Victorian Studies, 11.3 (1968), 359–78 (pp. 359–78).
15 See Appendix A in: White, p. 227.
16 Davies, The Secular Use of Church Buildings, p. 95.
churches were often the only buildings large enough to accommodate community gatherings. Thus, a two-room solution which provided dedicated spaces for clergy and laity evolved. The chancel remained sacred, out of bounds to the laity, whilst the nave was used by both for sacred and secular purposes.\textsuperscript{17} This arrangement held across Western Christendom until the Reformation of the sixteenth century after which Protestant challenges to the Pope’s authority saw the Roman Catholic Church introduce ‘rites of consecration’ to affirm the sacredness of church buildings.\textsuperscript{18} Under pressure from the Puritans to expunge itself of Catholic tendencies, the Church of England instead became entrenched in its view of the church as sacred; that is to say, existing solely for the purpose of worship.\textsuperscript{19} Railing off altars and installing chancel screens to separate nave and chancel became common practice in Anglican churches thereafter.\textsuperscript{20} Furthermore, under Canon Law, church wardens were instructed to ‘suffer no Plays, Feasts, Banquets, Suppers, Church-Ales, Drinkings, Temporal Courts, or Leets, Lay-Juries, Musters, or any other profane Usage’.\textsuperscript{21}

Whilst there is much truth in Davies’ account, it must be also be recognised that the strict demarcation between sacred and secular he described has, to some extent, been challenged by later scholars of religion and society.\textsuperscript{22} It has been noted by the religious historian Alan D. Gilbert, for example, that rural migrants arriving in the city at the beginning of the nineteenth century did not immediately feel a strong attachment to their local parish church, which gave rise to concerns regarding the irreligiosity of urban life.\textsuperscript{23} Secular temptations, such as the public house and music halls, demanded novel approaches from the nonconformists and the Church of England which, by the late-nineteenth century, saw a strain of social Christianity prevail.\textsuperscript{24} Religious teaching, combined with a concern to relieve urban poverty through charitable work, led to the blurring of sacred and secular function in nonconformist and Anglican church buildings which, in turn, placed additional demands upon the architectural profession; the church architect no longer a mere ecclesiologist. At the newly established city missions of the Church of England, for example, the role of the clergy was expanded beyond the spiritual to include secular, social concerns, whilst

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, pp. 39–40.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, pp. 99–103.
\textsuperscript{21} Canon LXXXVIII, ‘Churches Not To Be Profaned’, Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of the Church of England, approved by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1604 and 1606 respectively.
\textsuperscript{23} Gilbert, The Making of Post-Christian Britain, p. 84.
ministers were encouraged to ‘make their Churches into community centres, alternatives to both the streets and the public houses’.25 Around the same time the Reverend Samuel Barnett, an Anglican cleric and social reformer, proposed the idea of settlement missions whereby philanthropic Christians would work alongside the urban poor with the aim of becoming incorporated into the community; so-called ‘squires in the slums’.26 The most well-known of these is, perhaps, the first; Toynbee Hall, Tower Hamlets, which opened in 1884 and provided undergraduates from Oxford University and Cambridge University with lodgings whilst they performed social work in London’s deprived East End (Fig. 2.01).27 The Malvern Mission in Canning Town, London, established by Malvern College in September 1884, performed a similar function.

![Fig. 2.01. Toynbee Hall, Tower Hamlets](Source: Photograph copyright of Hampstead Garden Suburbs Archives Trust, Ref: HGSAT131.)

Alongside this social outreach, the late-nineteenth century saw Christian organisations including the Church of England expand their secular activities to include sports, music, drama, and craft.28 This was the ‘ideal of association’; an initiative which, indicative of institutional
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27 Scotland, pp. 27–54.
28 See, for example: Yeo.
change, came from within ‘the new churches and chapels themselves rather than one which emerged from the older structures of particular denominational organisations’.\textsuperscript{29} However, there were some members of the clergy who were reluctant to accept such innovations, arguing that the Church should not ape the activities of secular institutions.\textsuperscript{30} Despite evidence of a decline in religious observance, there remained a ‘concentration upon institution building rather than on external social development’.\textsuperscript{31} The sacredness of Sunday services was preserved and, indeed, enhanced, for example, in order to inspire more reverential worship.\textsuperscript{32} Thus, two distinct trends prevailed by the early twentieth century: the High Anglican view of the church as wholly sacred and, opposing this, the social Christians who sought to establish new places of worship that catered for both sacred and secular needs. Each required a different response from the architectural professional.

Toynbee Hall, along with many other city and settlement missions of the late-nineteenth century, may have paved the way for a return to secular activity in places of worship, but prejudices against such moves persisted. This tension was a defining characteristic of the Church of England in the early twentieth century, and was exemplified by the ongoing development at Canning Town’s Malvern Mission. Located in the docklands area beyond the River Lea, the notional eastern boundary of London outside of which ‘deleterious’ trades were permitted under the London Building Act 1844, the Malvern Mission’s purpose was ‘to carry on the church’s work amongst her people and to be a centre of religious influence and social good’.\textsuperscript{33} To this end, a two-roomed workers’ cottage on Cooper Street had been purchased, with one room to be used as a temporary chapel and the other as a clubroom; sacred and secular combined under one roof. Soon after, two adjoining cottages and two houses on Vincent Street were acquired by the Mission. The back yards were joined together and, on the vacant land in between, a corrugated iron church dedicated to St Alban and the English Martyrs was erected.\textsuperscript{34} This allowed the cottages and houses to revert back to secular usage.\textsuperscript{35} The distinction between the sacred and secular structures was, as a consequence, reintroduced.

\textsuperscript{31} Yeo, p. 325.
\textsuperscript{32} Green, Religion in the Age of Decline, pp. 302–8.
\textsuperscript{33} The then-incumbent missioner Revd G. F. Gillet, quoted in: Peter Watherston, A Different Kind of Church: Mayflower Family Centre Story (London: Zondervan, 1994), p. 17.
\textsuperscript{34} Unfortunately, photographic evidence of St Alban and the English Martyrs could not be found.
\textsuperscript{35} Watherston, pp. 16–17.
The Malvern Mission continued to serve the poor of Canning Town from its makeshift accommodation until after the First World War when, under the guidance of the incumbent missioner Reginald Kennedy Cox, some of the old buildings were pulled down and a new hall was erected containing several clubrooms. It was at this time, that the mission became known as the Dockland’s Settlement; Cox disliked the term ‘missioner’.36 Although staff accommodation at the Dockland’s Settlement was considered inadequate, Cox determined the next phase of development would be the building of a new church to replace the corrugated iron church of St Alban and the English Martyrs. Geoffrey Raymond was appointed as architect and, working in conjunction with Cox, a design based on the Old Hall (1489, restored 1924-8) at Lincoln’s Inn, London was developed.37 Raymond was, perhaps, an unusual choice as architect, not least given that his practice was more closely associated with designing Roman Catholic churches.38 However, given the tension that existed between High Anglicans and Social Christianity within the Church of England, it is probable a more illustrious church architect, such as Ninian Comper, would have declined the commission. Raymond, an architect outside of the High Anglican coterie, was possibly seen as somebody that Cox could collaborate with to produce a church appropriate for its location and purpose. The new church, liturgically traditional and dedicated to St Helena and St George, opened in April 1930; by which time undercurrents of further change within the Church of England begun to surface (Fig. 2.02).

36 Ibid, p. 22.
37 Ibid, p. 24. The design was kept modest by the exclusion of choir stalls; Cox insisted the congregation would do their own singing.
38 Geoffrey Raymond was a nephew and former partner to Alexander Joseph Cory Scoles who, like his father Joseph John Scoles, was both a priest and an eminent architect for the Roman Catholic Church. See: Antonia Brodie, *Directory of British Architects, 1834-1914: Vol. 2 (L-Z)* (London: A&C Black, 2001), p. 552.
Owing to a confluence of circumstances, the dominance which Christianity had enjoyed throughout the Victorian period began to wane early in the twentieth century. The passing of the 1902 Education Act saw state education greatly expanded, which was to the detriment of the church schools system.\textsuperscript{39} Although religion was still taught in the new state schools, marginalisation on matters of education hindered one of the key ways in which church organisations had been able to reinforce a Christian hegemony.\textsuperscript{40} Furthermore, with the post-1888 expansion of the trade unions movement, the political landscape of interwar Britain was drastically redefined as Labour succeeded the Liberals as the main party of social reform.\textsuperscript{41} This had a devastating effect on nonconformism whose membership had traditionally been closely aligned with that of the Liberals.\textsuperscript{42} Loss of political influence engendered a cautious attitude amongst the nonconformists, particularly with regard to church building. Consolidation became the by-word, and rivalries amongst nonconformists were set aside: the Methodist Union of 1932, for example, brought the Wesleyan Methodists, the Primitive Methodists, and the United


\textsuperscript{40} Parsons, pp. 59–62.

\textsuperscript{41} Hastings, pp. 160–61.

Methodists together under the banner of the Methodist Church.\footnote{Carter, ‘Methodism and Establishment’ in: Established Church: Past, Present and Future, ed. by Mark Chapman, Judith Maltby, and William Whyte (London: T & T Clark, 2011), p. 168.} Despite such initiatives, nonconformist membership in Britain was set on a trajectory of decline.\footnote{See, for example: Matthew Grimley, Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State Between the Wars (Clarendon Press, 2004), pp. 15–16.}

Whilst the impact of interwar political upheaval was significant for nonconformism in England, the Church of England was also vulnerable to such socio-political change. Fearful that its privileged position as the Established Church might be called into question, the Archbishop of Canterbury’s report Christianity and Industrial Problems (1919) highlighted the need for ‘a new beginning on the part of the Church in defining its attitude to the economic and social life of the nation’.\footnote{Ross McKibbin, Classes and Cultures: England 1918-1951 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 285; Erwin Fahlbusch, The Encyclopedia of Christianity (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2008), p. 618.} Prepared by the academic and former Toynbee Hall resident Richard Henry Tawney, it was Tawney’s influence over William Temple, Archbishop of York (1929-42) and Archbishop of Canterbury (1942-44), which ensured the Church became more socially engaged in the remaining interwar years. By adopting a more socialist stance, not only did this help stave off a potential split with the State, it also narrowed the distinctions with the nonconformists. In terms of outreach activities at least, there was now little to differentiate the Methodists from the Church of England, for example.\footnote{Hastings, pp. 276–77.} The Roman Catholic Church in England was largely unaffected by these developments. Long marginalised in matters of politics the strength of the Catholics grew in tandem with urban expansion, boosted both by Irish immigrants in the latter quarter of the nineteenth century and by its appeal to the working classes in the early twentieth century.\footnote{Such was the confidence of the Roman Catholic Church in the interwar years, it commissioned the architect Edwin Lutyens to design a new cathedral for Liverpool which had its construction not been halted due to the outbreak of the Second World War, and subsequently abandoned owing to the austerity which followed, would have been the largest church building in Britain. See: Christopher Martin, A Glimpse of Heaven: Catholic Churches of England and Wales (London: English Heritage, 2006), p. 193.} Opposition to birth control also aided endogenous growth.\footnote{Hastings, pp. 262–63.} Despite this, the church building boom that had occupied the architectural profession throughout most of the nineteenth century slowed substantially as fewer Anglican and nonconformist churches were built.\footnote{Church of England, Christianity and Industrial Problems: Being the Report of the Archbishops’ Fifth Committee of Inquiry. (London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1919), p. ix.} Concomitant with increased municipal governance in the first half of the twentieth century, architects were increasingly engaged in projects of a more civic, and secular, nature, whilst the number of architects specialising solely in church design declined throughout the interwar period. With a few exceptions, this remained the case in the decades to follow.
The Wider Picture: Christianity in Western Europe Post-1945

Since the late 1960s, the ascendant debate amongst scholars of religion and society in Western Europe has been that of secularization; a term broadly used to describe the shift from the supposed religious piety of previous centuries to the more profane stance said to characterise modern society.\(^{50}\) Often presented as a phenomenon of the twentieth century, the secularization thesis can, however, be traced to the beginning of the eighteenth century and the teachings of the theologian Thomas Woolston.\(^{51}\) His assertion that the decline of religion was intrinsically connected to economic and social modernisation gained traction during the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century; principally under Max Weber and Émile Durkheim, and with the emergence of sociology as an academic discipline.\(^{52}\) In the milieu of post-Second World War reconstruction, a period of major social, political and economic reform, the challenge to Christianity in Britain was arguably greater than before. New towns and estates saw existing communities disbanded, and inner-city churches, separated from their congregations, became redundant. Certainly in the instance of the Church of England, church redundancy and declining attendance increased perceptions of lessened religiosity. In Britain and elsewhere in Europe, this led to a re-emergence and re-evaluation of Woolston’s secularization thesis: firstly by the sociologists Bryan Wilson and Patrick Berger in the 1960s, and later by others such as David Martin.\(^{53}\) Its influence on our understanding of religion and society subsequently has been pervasive. Writing at beginning of the twenty-first century, the sociologist Steve Bruce followed the German philosophers Friedrich Nietzsche and Erich Fromm with his declaration that ‘God is Dead’.\(^{54}\) Controversial though such assertions may be, evidence of ongoing decline in church attendance in recent decades is, nonetheless, incontrovertible.\(^{55}\) How did the Church of England


\(^{52}\) Garnett and others, p. 2; Joas, pp. 13–14.


\(^{54}\) Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, Thus Spake Zarathustra: A Book For All and None (London: Macmillan, 1896); Erich Fromm, The Sane Society (Robinsdale, MN: Fawcett Books, 1955); Bruce, God Is Dead.


respond to such concerns post-1945, and how did this impact upon its relationship with the architectural profession?

**Church of England Post-1945**

By 1945, it was recognised that a return to the old order, desired or otherwise, would be impossible. With the national economy verging on bankruptcy, a problem compounded by the breakup of the British Empire, reforms in areas such as health and education, begun in the interwar period, were seen as vital to the future economic success of the nation.\(^{56}\) Perhaps unsurprisingly, Labour, the new party of reform, won the general election of 1945 and began to pursue wide-raging interventionist policies with cross-party support if not actual consensus.\(^{57}\) For example, the 1946 New Town Act aimed to alleviate the chronic overcrowding of inner-city slum areas through the provision of new municipal housing, whilst simultaneously freeing tenants from the hands of private landlords.\(^{58}\) Elsewhere, the nationalisation of industries such as coal and steel, in 1947 and 1949 respectively, enabled reforms to working practices and brought about greater wage equality.\(^{59}\) The formation of the National Health Service in 1948 increased the role of the State in matters of welfare, usurping church organisations, specifically the Church of England, in one of their key functions.\(^{60}\) Described by the historian Jeremy Morris as ‘institutional marginalization’, this and further reforms to education forced the Church of England to reconsider its position in relation to the State.\(^{61}\)

By 1938, educational reforms already meant that state schools significantly outnumbered ‘non-provided’ ones - those run by the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, and the nonconformists.\(^{62}\) Although non-provided schools received state subsidies, something initially resisted by the nonconformists, through time these became insufficient to meet rising educational standards. Cash-starved, both Church of England and nonconformist schools lagged
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\(^{58}\) 1946 New Town Act (London: H.M.S.O., 1944)


\(^{61}\) Morris, p. 973.

behind their state-run counterparts. Only the Roman Catholic schools, used to operating on limited finances, felt the benefit of the subsidies.\textsuperscript{63} Such was the general decline in standards in non-provided schools that, in 1941, the existing dual education system was revisited by R.A. Butler, the Minister of Education.\textsuperscript{64} In August 1941, Butler met with a deputation of church leaders, though notably lacking representation from the defiantly independent Roman Catholic Church, to discuss proposals to bring all non-provided schools under state control.\textsuperscript{65} To negate accusations of partisanship towards the Church of England as the Established Church, a standard syllabus of religious instruction for all school which accepted controlled status was proposed by the Ministry of Education.\textsuperscript{66} Once the proposals were enacted through the 1944 Education Act, large numbers of Church of England and nonconformist schools consented to controlled status, and those that did not typically adopted the agreed syllabus anyway.\textsuperscript{67} For the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple, it was better for the ‘nation’s church’ to be part of the new State settlement for education than to be outside of it.\textsuperscript{68} Roman Catholic schools, and those of the Jews – the only other numerically significant non-Christian faith group in England at this time – uniformly became provided schools, which meant they would receive financial support for general running costs whilst remaining exempt from teaching the agreed syllabus.\textsuperscript{69} The overall effect was two-fold: the financial burden for Roman Catholic schools was eased, whilst the Church of England was further divested of influence.\textsuperscript{70}

**The Church of England and Post-1945 Planning**

Just as the power of the Church of England and nonconformists in matters of education was largely ceded to the State from 1945 onwards, so too were the decision-making powers of the main Christian organisations in the siting of any planned new churches, subsumed as they were in the processes of post-1945 planning.\textsuperscript{71} The historical problem faced by both the Church of
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England and nonconformists of church overprovision had been exacerbated with the resumption of slum-clearance programmes after the Second World War. Moreover, typically oversized and physically remote from former congregations now relocated to New Towns and overspill estates, outreach activities could not be conducted effectively from existing inner-city churches. Speaking of war-damaged churches in particular, Geoffrey Fisher, then-Bishop of London, noted as early as 1940 that in many instances it was ‘neither possible nor desirable that a ... church should be rebuilt as it was and where it was’. Such concerns led to the formation, in 1941, of the Churches’ Main War Damage Committee (CMWDC); an ecumenical body comprised of the main Christian denominations (and later Jewish organisations), and members of the architectural profession. Chaired by Fisher, the purpose of the CMWDC was to negotiate terms of compensation for war damaged places of worship for all faith groups nationally; the implications of which are more fully discussed in Chapter Three. What is of interest here, however, is how the Church of England’s engagement with the state and emerging post-1945 planning policy affected its relationship with the architectural profession in terms of its future requirements. With the government and its various ministries taking charge in matters of welfare and education, architects were, inevitably, less reliant on the Church for work. However, as significant land owners, the Church still held influence over its treatment by the government; an influence which, in turn, benefitted other religious and charitable organisations.

Initially under the terms of the 1941 War Damage Act, the amount of compensation typically payable by the Government’s War Damage Commission was ‘either the cost incurred in the repair of the war damage or, if this was uneconomic, a value payment on the basis of prices ruling at 31 March 1939’. Fisher’s CMWDC established three further principles: all faiths and denominations were to be accorded equal treatment; compensation payments were to be portable so that religious organisations need not reinstate a place of worship if local authority redevelopment plans meant this was undesirable; and, lastly, new premises were to be of a type ‘which might reasonably be erected on the site of the damaged building by the denomination if it were paying the bill from their own funds and were neither financially embarrassed nor unduly

72 Binney and Burman, pp. 33–37.
75 The principles for assessing bomb damage and the level of compensation payable, accorded with the recommendations of an advisory committee, chaired by the judge Augustus Andrewes Uthwatt, which reported to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in November 1939 and March 1940.
Whilst this addressed the immediate problem of compensation for bomb-damaged churches, the proposed 1947 Town and Country Planning Act complicated matters further. The Act had been designed to strengthen local authority controls over post-war reconstruction and to prevent profiteering from private land owners through the introduction of development charges; these extending, even, to changing the use class of existing buildings.\(^7^7\) With compensation payments for compulsory purchased land or buildings based on existing usages, this was a matter of some concern for the Church of England whose estimated 300,000 acres of agricultural land was deemed of low value, yet in places such as Stevenage was being targeted for New Town developments.\(^7^8\) Accordingly, at a meeting between the Minister of Town and Country Planning and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners’ Estates Committee on 28 March 1947, it was requested that the Church be exempted from the Act’s provisions: ‘Members of the [Ecclesiastical Commissioners] deputation pointed out that the position of the Established Church ... was very different from that of other denominations and for this reasons there would be no danger that a concession made to them would form a precedent which would make it necessary to exclude also from the compensation/betterment provisions other land held for religious and charitable purposes’.\(^7^9\) Whilst a proposed exemption from development charges did not seem problematic for the Church, the Ministry felt differently and responded, ‘... in the case of all future land transactions a proportion of the benefit should pass to the community, and there could be no question of exempting Church lands from this rule’.\(^8^0\) In other words, increased land values resulting from a re-designation of use, known as betterment, was to benefit the new community, not the Church.

Despite this apparent setback for the Church, it would appear that a concession was later forthcoming. In a letter dated 26 June 1947 from Lewis Silkin, Minister of Town and Country Planning (1945-50), to Tom W. Burden, Member of Parliament and Ecclesiastical Commissioner, Silkin acknowledged the predicament of the Church, but reiterated that ‘the argument of allowing exemption for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners was a weak one’. The primary reason given by Silkin for disallowing exemption was that, ‘it would be difficult to persuade the other religious organisations that that alone is sufficient justification for treating the EC in a special


\(^{79}\) Ibid.
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way’. The alternative, as expressed by Silkin, would be to offer ‘exemption up to the level of the prevailing use in the area’. However, the ‘prevailing use value’ mechanism was intended for local authority development, development by statutory undertakers, and by charities ‘for profitable purposes, of land whose present use cannot be valued by the ordinary formula’. It was thought that such cases would be rare and for comparatively small pockets of land, yet given the extensive lands owned by the Church, Silkin noted ‘the difficulty becomes insuperable’. One solution he had considered was to take into account personal residences and ancillary buildings, as well as land, which the Church intended to use during the next twenty years for ecclesiastical development: such a concession would have to be extended to other religious and charitable organisation, and was, for Silkin, ‘the widest that I feel able to make’. He conceded that it did not provide ‘direct help to the Commissioners as estate developers’ but he hoped it would ‘help them indirectly through the special treatment that the places of worship and their surroundings will receive’. Accordingly, the relevant clauses were inserted into the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act demonstrating, albeit to a small degree, the influence of the Commissioners on post-1945 planning policy.

Whilst church leaders were not necessarily averse to the disposal of the large inner-city premises, planned New Towns and overspill estates in the suburbs determined to a great extent where their (smaller) replacements would be built; closer community ties in-keeping with the more-socially oriented stance adopted by the Church of England. In the instance of both the Church of England and the nonconformists, many new suburban churches built in the 1950s combined secular use with the sacred to provide much needed social amenity as the State concentrated on building new housing and educational facilities. Arguably, the combining of sacred and secular use could, in part, be attributed to the concession within the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act regarding adjacent land and ecclesiastical development: church halls having previously been separate. Regardless, it provided architects with a new brief from which so-called dual-purpose church or church centres emerged.

Developments in the Planning and Architecture of Church Buildings Post-1945

Although local authorities were preparing plans for reconstruction even as enemy bombs fell on English cities, construction activity in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War was limited. This was due to a severe lack of finance, ongoing negotiations regarding compensation, and licensing restrictions on building materials. Once meaningful reconstruction did get underway, the emphasis was placed on new housing and, in line with provisions of the 1944 Education Act, the building of new schools. The general lack of community amenities on new estates provided both religious organisations and their architects with the additional challenge of meeting both the secular and sacred needs of displaced communities.

In 1947, the Incorporated Church Building Society (ICBS) published a book which documented several Anglican churches built between 1930 and 1945, including dual purpose mission churches such as Bricket Wood, Hertfordshire (1936) designed by the architect Albert E. Richardson.83 The purpose of the book was to show religious organisations, planners and architects the variety of internal arrangements possible for new churches, encourage church building on the new housing estates, and demonstrate how both secular and sacred needs could be accommodated. Solutions to this final problem were documented by the ICBS in its 1957 publication, *Sixty Post-War Churches*.84 Firstly, where finances permitted, ‘church centres’ were preferred; a complex of buildings which would include a dedicated building for worship alongside additional accommodation in the form of a hall, a vicarage or presbytery, and possibly even a school. The hall would primarily be for the use of the local community, but could be used by the church as needed - such as during Festivals. Whereas the hall could serve a variety of purposes and must, therefore, be ‘utilitarian in effect if it is to be adaptable’, the dedicated worship space, it was felt, should express ‘dignity and a certain richness’ through its architecture.85 Examples of church centres included All Saints, Shard End, Birmingham (1955) by John P. Osbourne and Son (Figs. 2.03 and 2.04); and three variations of a similar design by Basil Spence in Coventry – namely St Oswald, St John the Divine, and St Chad (all 1957) – which could be prefabricated to provided three churches for the price of one (Fig. 2.05).

---

84 Gurney and Martin-Smith.
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Fig. 2.03. Exterior View of All Saints, Shard End, Birmingham (1955) by John P. Osbourne and Son

[Source: Gurney, H. and Martin-Smith, D.F. 1957. Sixty Post-War Churches: Churches, Church Centres, Dual-Purpose Churches [Incorporated Church Building Society], p.54]

Fig. 2.04. Plan View of All Saints, Shard End, Birmingham (1955) by John P. Osbourne and Son

[Source: Gurney, H. and Martin-Smith, D.F. 1957. Sixty Post-War Churches: Churches, Church Centres, Dual-Purpose Churches [Incorporated Church Building Society], p.54]
The second solution proposed was the ‘dual-purpose’ church. Although not considered ideal given that its design ‘may be conditioned rather more by social then devotional life’, dual-purpose churches were intended as a permanent solution for new parishes with little money, and were to include areas for both worship and social activities under one roof. It was recommended that at least one-third of each dual-purpose church be set aside exclusively for worship, and that a folding screen be provided between it and the hall when not in use: although church activities could extend into the hall when needed, the church itself, it was decreed, should never act as an extension of the hall. In designing such buildings, therefore, the primary purpose of worship was to be kept uppermost in the architect’s mind to avoid creating buildings of ‘an entirely secular appearance’ and of a ‘mean and poverty-stricken character’. Examples of dual-purpose churches included were Brentry Mission Church, Henbury, Bristol (1955) by Burrough and Hannam (Figs. 2.06 and 2.07), and Church of the Epiphany, Merstham, Surrey (1955) by Alleyn and Mansel (Fig. 2.08). The latter example, arguably, represented a compromise between the church centre and dual-purpose church in that separation between hall and nave was maintained by placing the altar/ stage centrally on plan (Fig. 2.09).

87 Ibid, pp. 11–12.
Fig. 2.06. Exterior View of Brentry Mission Church, Henbury, Bristol (1955) by Burrough and Hannam

[Source: Gurney, H. and Martin-Smith, D.F. 1957. Sixty Post-War Churches: Churches, Church Centres, Dual-Purpose Churches [Incorporated Church Building Society], p.74]

Fig. 2.07. Plan View of Brentry Mission Church, Henbury, Bristol (1955) by Burrough and Hannam

[Source: Gurney, H. and Martin-Smith, D.F. 1957. Sixty Post-War Churches: Churches, Church Centres, Dual-Purpose Churches [Incorporated Church Building Society], p.74]
Fig. 2.08. Interior View of Church of the Epiphany, Merstham, Surrey (1955) by Alleyn and Mansel

[Source: Gurney, H. and Martin-Smith, D.F. 1957. Sixty Post-War Churches: Churches, Church Centres, Dual-Purpose Churches [Incorporated Church Building Society], p.81]

Fig. 2.09. Plan View of Church of the Epiphany, Merstham, Surrey (1955) by Alleyn and Mansel

[Source: Gurney, H. and Martin-Smith, D.F. 1957. Sixty Post-War Churches: Churches, Church Centres, Dual-Purpose Churches [Incorporated Church Building Society], p.80]
Despite their social value to communities, such churches failed to stop the decline in attendance amongst Anglicans and nonconformists from 1956 onwards. Moreover, although Building Licences which restricted the availability of materials ceased to be enforced in 1954, ongoing austerity often resulted in buildings of a simple, traditional character, which were out of step aesthetically with the modern estates which they were being built to serve. Publications such as Edward D. Mill’s *The Modern Church* (1956), only served to emphasise the innovations in church design being witnessed across Europe and America. In 1957, frustrated by the quality of design and a lack of experimentation in English churches, a group of theologians and architects led by Peter Hammond established the New Churches Research Group (NCRG) to explore the relation between liturgy and architecture, and to consider the design possibilities open to architects.

In the first of his two books on modern church design, *Liturgy and Architecture* (1957), published soon after the NCRG was founded, Peter Hammond was deeply critical of those schemes included in *Sixty Post-War Churches*, singling out the ‘unimaginative drabness of the dual purpose churches, with their tawdry furnishing’. Similarly, the more ‘ambitious’ churches included by the Incorporated Church Building Society’s publication were considered akin to ‘nineteenth century church[es] in contemporary fancy dress’. In other words, despite utilising modern materials in their construction, the designers of these churches appeared to be mostly ignorant of the liturgical changes then occurring on the continent. When Rudolf Schwarz’s *Vom Bau der Kirche* was translated into English in 1958, however, interest shown in continental churches intensified and novel church forms soon began to appear in England. With declining attendance not a concern for the Roman Catholic Church in England at this time, early examples included St Catherine of Siena, Lowton, Greater Manchester (1959) by Weightman and Bullen (Fig. 2.10), and Our Lady of Fatima, Harlow, Essex (1960) by Gerard Goalen (Fig. 2.11); although the Church of England soon followed with the erection of St Paul, Bow Common, London (1960) to the designs of NCRG affiliates, Robert Maguire and Keith Murray (Fig. 2.12). Each of these churches were responding to earlier calls for a greater participation of the laity in worship in their designs. Shortened aisles compared with liturgically traditional churches of previous decades, and fan-shaped seating arrangements improved visibility of the altar thus bringing the congregation and clergy closer together in worship. Such matters were also being discussed in relation to existing
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89 Callum Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain*, p. 188.
90 Edward D. Mills.
91 Discussed in: Proctor, pp. 133–35.
historic churches. A conference organised by the Department of Extra-mural Studies at the University of Birmingham was held in May 1961, around one hundred participants including clergymen, liturgists, architects and artists. In a publication titled Making the Building Serve the Liturgy (1962), put together following the conference, it was noted that the requirement for Anglican churches differed from those on the continent in that they had did not share the same rites: Anglican churches were used for Matins and Evensong.94 To attempt to reorder historic churches would, according to Seiriol J.A. Evans, Dean of Gloucester, ‘do violent damage ... to the architecture of our churches ... because it would be yet another graft from an alien liturgical tradition’.95

Fig. 2.10. Exterior View of St Catherine of Siena, Lowton (1959) by Weightman and Bullen
[Source: Author’s own image, 2014 [building since demolished]]

95 Quoted in: Cope, p. 43.
Fig. 2.11. Exterior View of Our Lady of Fatima, Harlow (1960) by Gerard Goalen
[Source: Copyright of National Education Trust. Ref: 651341]

Fig. 2.12. Exterior View of St Paul, Bow Common (1960) by Robert Maguire and Keith Murray
[Source: Photograph available under Creative Commons Licence. Courtesy of Ekphraster.]
In 1958, Pope John XXIII succeeded Pope Pius XII as head of the Roman Catholic Church. His appointment was expected to be a conservative one, yet the new Pope felt that modernising reforms were needed and spoke of communion with other Christian churches - a view which contrasted sharply with the ultramontane philosophy of his predecessor.\(^{96}\) Between 11 October and 8 December, 1965, the Second Vatican Council hosted four meetings to discuss potential reforms, attracting a global attendance from senior church figures within the Roman Catholic Church. Although Pope John XXIII died in 1963 before the second meeting took place, the Council proceeded under his successor Pope Paul VI and reached agreement on, amongst other things, the need to improve Christian unity and encourage wider participation in Mass through the use of vernacular languages; the implication of which, for the architectural profession, we will consider in due course.\(^{97}\) By dispensing with the requirement for Latin Mass, Roman Catholic services became almost indistinguishable from those of some Anglicans as the Church of England too underwent significant change: the first new Eucharistic liturgy since 1928, *Series II*, was introduced in 1967, whilst the 1968 Pastoral Measure allowed for the merging of parishes and the setting up of team ministries.\(^{98}\) An era of greater ecumenicalism seemingly lay ahead, until the *Humanae Vitae* controversy of 1968; Pope Paul VI issued his encyclical letter *Humanae Vitae* which outlined the Roman Catholic Church’s opposition to birth control measures and came in response to the perceived prevalence of extramarital sex following the introduction of the contraceptive pill. In England, the pill was made legally available to married woman from 1961 and to single women in 1968.\(^{99}\) The issue caused a split within the Vatican between the reformists of the Second Vatican Council and those more conservative figures including the Pope. For this reason, moves towards greater ecumenicalism, stalled; an inertia which continued until the late 1970s.\(^{100}\)

In contrast, the Church of England, who had advocated birth control measures since 1930, continued to seek greater union with other Christian churches.\(^{101}\) For example, the 1969 Sharing of Church Buildings Act permitted the Church of England to share its buildings with the Roman Catholic Church and all the Christian groups represented in the British Council of Churches including the nonconformists. The Act even encouraged Churches to ‘pool their resources’ on
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\(^{96}\) Hastings, pp. 519–20.


\(^{100}\) Hastings, p. 670.

\(^{101}\) McKibbin, pp. 309–10.
‘new town or large housing estate where the sense of community, and even of identity, may be lacking’. 102 Thus, the building of new churches in suburban areas characterised the years up to the mid-1970s. Emboldened by the official sanctioning of liturgical reform by the Roman Catholic Church’s Second Vatican Council (1962-65), and with exposure to publications such Hammond’s second book, <i>Towards a Church Architecture</i> (1962), and G.E Kidder Smith’s <i>The New Churches of Europe</i> (1964), even more radical church designs appeared in England including the Church of England’s St John the Baptist, Lincoln (1963) by Sam Scorer (Fig. 2.13), the Roman Catholic St Mary, Leyland (1964) by Weightman and Bullen (Fig. 2.14); and the Anglican William Temple Memorial Church, Wythenshawe, Manchester (1965) by George Pace (Fig. 2.15).103 Whilst such churches were liturgically distinct from their nineteenth-century predecessors, they also embraced new forms of construction and materials common to secular modernist buildings thus challenging accepted notions of what churches should look like and how they should be built.

![Fig. 2.13. Exterior View of St John the Baptist, Lincoln (1963) by Sam Scorer](source.jpg)


103 Robert Maguire and Keith Murray, and later George Gaze Pace, were all members of the NCRG.
Despite the boom in the suburban church building, the presence of empty historic churches in urban areas, abandoned and awaiting demolition or repurposing, reinforced the idea of religious decline and growing secularization. As the theologian Robin Gill observed: ‘Redundant
urban churches ... stubbornly remain as visible reminders of a once religious past’. The role of the architectural profession in converting these churches to needs of other faith groups is little documented though some academic accounts have recently emerged. Even less understood, however, is the architectural profession’s role in adapting historic churches which have continued as functioning places of worship. This chapter has demonstrated that socio-religious and political change has influenced the design of new churches throughout both the nineteenth and twentieth century. From the incorporation of secular activities into Victorian mission churches and post-1945 dual-purpose churches and church centres to the impact of liturgical reforms and new methods of construction, such factors are critical in understanding their architecture. Likewise, an examination of contemporary circumstances and attitudes is necessary to understand the treatment of historic churches by both church organisations and the architectural profession in the post-1945 period. How such attitudes were formed, and what their influence might be on how we view historic church adaptation today, is the subject of the next chapter.

104 Gill, p. 58.
This chapter considers how contemporary debate and ideas around the reconstruction and restoration of bomb-damaged historic churches during the Second World War resonated with and informed the subsequent practice of architects in the ensuing decades; not only in the area of conservation, but also in consideration the role such buildings might play in society outside of religious use such as for leisure, recreation, or secular charitable endeavours.

The devastation suffered by historic places of worship during the Second World War raised important questions which, for religious organisations concerned the practicalities of reconstruction, and for other interested parties, brought forward the historical and cultural significance of the buildings. Systematic conventions for the preservation or restoration of historic buildings were still in their infancy before the War. For example, the ‘Athens Charter’ which emerged from an international conference on architectural conservation, held in Athens in 21-30 October 1931, endorsed the ‘tendency to abandon restoration in toto and to avoid the attendant dangers by initiating a system of regular and permanent maintenance’.¹ It did not, however, foresee the destruction across Europe which followed. As such, it was in England that ‘the practical responses to area bombing were first consistently developed’.² This chapter argues that debates around the treatment of bomb-damaged historic places of worship, during and after the war, were fundamental in shaping these responses.

It is natural at this moment ... to consider in regard to our war memorials whether we cannot do something which will help the living; but, right as is that thought, we must be careful that we do not forget our sense of duty to honour the fallen. Can we accomplish both objects?³

That was the question posed by Lord Chatfield, former First Sea Lord of the British Navy, in his address to the House of Lords on 14 February, 1945. As the Second World War crept towards its

² Glendinning, p. 238.
³ Lord Chatfield quoted in: HL Deb 14 February 1945 vol. 134 cc1019-20
conclusion, and with victory seemingly inevitable for the Allied forces, discussion in Britain turned towards matters of memorialisation and how this ought to be approached. Memorials erected after previous wars had tended to be either figurative, emphasising grief and commemoration, or religious, such as the simple crucifix often seen in towns and villages; particularly following the First World War. By 1945, however, there was a sense of unease with both approaches. As Viscount Samuel, responding to Lord Chatfield, commented: ‘At Hyde Park Corner ... there are several war memorials, some of them excellent as specimens of the sculptor’s art, but constituting altogether a rather unhappy jumble of different and discordant styles of sculpture and design’. Setting aside stylistics concerns, the main concern was for a more practical approach to memorialisation. Enemy bombing raids had impacted upon the civilian population on a scale not previously witnessed on the home front. It was felt, therefore, that any new memorials, should honour both civilians and combatants, and be of useful purpose. How one might achieve this was the topic of a conference, organised by the Royal Society of Arts, held on 27 April 1944. Speakers on the day included, amongst others, Lord Chatfield and, of later relevance with respect to the treatment of bombed churches, the landscape architect Geoffrey Jellicoe. One outcome of the Royal Society’s conference was the establishment of the War Memorials Advisory Council. Made up of establishment figures from the realms of the arts, politics and religion, and chaired by Chatfield, the Council subsequently published its recommendations in a document entitled War Memorials: A Survey made by a Committee of the Royal Society of Arts (1944); the merits of which were later debated in the House of Lords. Yet, whilst the Society’s Survey helped bring the issue of practical memorialisation to national prominence, a closer look at the initiatives taken by the Anglican Diocese of London earlier in the war suggest that the Council’s ideas grew from more local concerns. The response of the clergy and local lay organisations in the Diocese of London to the damage inflicted upon the City’s historic churches was important in shaping national attitudes

5 Viscount Samuel quoted in: HL Deb 14 February 1945 vol. 134 cc1029
6 Webster, p. 200.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
to memorialisation, including the architectural treatment of bombed historic churches, once the war had ended.

**Bomb-Damaged Places of Worship**

In January 1941, just weeks after the first air raids on London had been carried out, Harry Stuart Goodhart-Rendel, architect and former President of the RIBA (1937-39), wrote an article for *Country Life* magazine urging that the restorative reconstruction of London’s bomb-damaged buildings should only be attempted for those ‘whose designs appear to be intrinsically excellent’.\(^{13}\) Innocuous though this advice seemed, it was, nonetheless, a departure from prevailing, though contested, attitudes of the period which, informed by the rhetoric of the previous century, were mostly anti-restoration: ‘no restoration’, the Society of Antiquaries had advised in 1855 ‘should ever be attempted, otherwise than ... in the sense of preservation from further injuries ... Anything beyond this is untrue in art, unjustifiable in taste, [and] destructive in practice’.\(^{14}\) By July 1943, however, the Government’s War Damage Commission, established under the 1941 War Damage Act to pay compensation for bomb-damaged buildings, had received notification of ‘13,895 churches, monasteries, convents and other ecclesiastical buildings’ affected by the bombing raids.\(^ {15}\) The scale of this destruction could not be ignored, and a response was required which went beyond mere preservation. Inevitably this prompted discussions within religious and lay organisations as to which places of worship could, or even should, be repaired. In the Anglican Diocese of London, for example, the Bishop of London Geoffrey Fisher formed a diocesan-level War Damage Committee in December 1940, to authorize and provide grants for repairing the City’s bombed historic churches.\(^ {16}\) But as Fisher noted, in many instances it was ‘neither possible nor desirable that a very large destroyed church should be rebuilt as it was and where it was’.\(^ {17}\) The wider redevelopment of bombed cities and attendant population migration this would bring were factors that could not be ignored. Indeed, it was this concern that led to the formation of the Churches’ Main War Damage Committee (CMWDC) in 1941; an ecumenical body comprised of members of the architectural profession, and
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\(^{14}\) Memorandum of the Society of Antiquaries (1855) as quoted in: Cowell, p. 74. See also: Glendinning, p. 265.

\(^{15}\) Herbert Morrison, then-Home Secretary, quoted in: HC Deb 22 July 1943 vol. 391 c1091W


\(^{17}\) As quoted in: Hein, p. 25.
representatives from the main Christian denominations and, later, Jewish organisations. Chaired by Fisher, the purpose of the CMWDC was to negotiate the terms of compensation for war-damaged places of worship for all faith groups; not only at diocesan level, but also nationally.\textsuperscript{18} Another important aspect of the CMWDC’s settlement with the War Damage Commission, which echoed those views previously expressed by Goodhart-Rendel, was that exact reinstatement was preferred if a church was of ‘special importance for architectural, historic, or other reasons’.\textsuperscript{21} In such instances of reinstatement, ‘patching meant matching’ with repair work no longer needing to be self-evident; a requirement previously insisted upon by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB).\textsuperscript{22} Again, this national-level approach to the treatment of bomb-damaged places of worship, progressive given contemporary attitudes towards building restoration, can be traced back to initiatives taken within the Anglican Diocese of London.

In 1941, Fisher set up a Commission on City Churches to consider the possible ramifications of post-war reconstruction for the London’s City churches. Chaired by Lord Merriman, the Commission first met on 7 October 1941, and counted amongst its numbers influential figures such as William Henry Ansell, President of the RIBA (1940–43); Sir Alfred William Clapham, President of the Society of Antiquaries (1939–44); and Walter Robert Matthews, the Dean of St Paul’s Cathedral (1934–67).\textsuperscript{23} One of the first tasks of the Commission was to categorize all existing City churches such that a decision on their future fate could be determined.\textsuperscript{24} Unsurprisingly, this attracted pressure from certain local parishes keen to influence the decision-making process one way or another. The parishioners of St Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe, for example, petitioned the Commission to sanction the rebuilding of their church, whilst the parochial authorities of St Swithin, London Stone, went further still by preparing plans for a replacement church before any decisions had been made.\textsuperscript{25} Most notable amongst the lobbying was the campaign for church retention fought by the Friends of the City Churches.

\textsuperscript{18} Chandler and Hein, pp. 31–32; Hein, p. 26; Perkins, pp. 112–13. As noted by Larkham and Nasr, p. 292., the absence of records held at Lambeth Palace Library pertaining to London’s War Damage Committee beyond 1941 suggests that the Churches’ Main War Damage Committee was its de facto successor.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} Larkham and Nasr, pp. 292–93.
\textsuperscript{24} Larkham and Nasr, p. 294.
\textsuperscript{25} Parish level interventions are discussed in: Larkham and Nasr, p. 296. Ultimately, the Commission determined that St Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe and St Swithin, London Stone (also known as St Swithin, Cannon Street), were both unsuitable for restoration, though the former avoided demolition. See: Bishop of London’s Commission on the City Churches, \textit{The City Churches: Final Report of the Bishop of London’s Commission} (London: Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1946).
Friends of the City Churches (FOTCC) was formed in 1942, and drew together prominent members of the architectural profession, the arts, and senior clergymen. Indeed, two key members of Fisher’s Commission on City Churches, namely Clapham and Matthews, were amongst the small number of founder members.26 Other members included Sir Bannister Fletcher, past President of the RIBA (1929-31); John Eric Miers Macgregor, a conservation architect and key figure within the SPAB; and two winners of the RIBA Gold Medal, namely Sir Edwin Lutyens (1921) and Albert Edward Richardson (1947), the latter serving as the FOTCC’s chair.27 One likely catalyst to the formation of the FOTCC, beyond the apparent destruction wrought upon the City churches, was the high profile debate regarding a new setting for the Cathedral Church of St Paul. Whilst St Paul’s had itself survived the Blitz of London relatively unscathed, most of the buildings in the immediate vicinity of the cathedral had been destroyed (Fig. 3.01).28 Images of the destruction, which appeared in the national press, garnered much public attention; as did wider suggestions for London’s reconstruction, prepared by the Royal Academy, which followed.29

26 A full list of founder members can be found in: Friends of the City Churches, Statement of Policy and Rules, 1942.
27 Ibid.
The post-war replanning of London had long been of interest to the Royal Academy, and was the reason why, in January 1940, it set up a Royal Academy Planning Committee (RAPC) with Lutyens appointed as chair.\textsuperscript{30} The purpose of the RAPC was to help promote the distinctive character which London had ‘developed through [the] centuries’, and discourage in any future development proposals ‘a monotonous regularity which would be obviously alien to its nature’.\textsuperscript{31} In championing a scheme prepared by its chair Lutyens in 1942, the RAPC attempted to influence the replanning of St Paul’s (Fig. 3.02).\textsuperscript{32} However, considered contrary to broader redevelopment proposals by local authority planners, the scheme was unrealised. This is also a possible explanation as to the early involvement of Matthews, then-Dean, and Lutyens. Despite this, the publicity given to the RAPC proposals had meant that, with Matthews and Lutyens on board as members, the FOTCC could, in turn, expect a similar prominence.\textsuperscript{33} The objectives of the FOTCC were set out in a \textit{Statement of Policy and Rules} (1942) soon after.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{31} Royal Academy Planning Committee, ‘Official Report of the Royal Academy Planning Committee’ (Royal Academy, 1942), p. 266.
\textsuperscript{32} See: Bradley, p. 444.
\textsuperscript{33} The lack of enthusiasm for the Royal Academy Planning Committee’s scheme for replanning St Paul’s, along with that for a competing scheme by London’s City Engineer E.J. Forty, is discussed in: Bradley, p. 445.
\textsuperscript{34} Friends of the City Churches, \textit{Statement of Policy and Rules, op.cit.}
During the Blitz of London, from winter 1940 through to spring 1941, twenty of London’s historic Anglican City Churches suffered severe bomb damage; many were left with the external walls standing only.\(^\text{35}\) The FOTCC was of the opinion that all of these churches, many designed by Christopher Wren, should be ‘rebuilt on their original site and reused’.\(^\text{36}\) If, for some reason, this was ‘impracticable’, the group urged that any remaining vestiges of a bombed church ‘should be restored and preserved, and the site of the church, together with its churchyard, kept as an open space in perpetuity’.\(^\text{37}\) It also pledged, in all cases, to ensure that the Commission took into account any relevant ‘spiritual, architectural, historical, civic and imperial considerations’ before making any decision regarding a church’s fate; considerations which it could be said were prescient given the debates on heritage value which followed later.\(^\text{38}\) According to the FOTCC, the ‘spiritual’ value of the City churches were ‘so great that all of them, damaged and undamaged alike’ ought to be used ‘where they are, as they stand, for worship of God and the teaching of the


\(^{36}\) Friends of the City Churches, *Statement of Policy and Rules*, p. 2.

\(^{37}\) Ibid.

\(^{38}\) Ibid.
Christian faith’.\(^3^9\) Rebuilding in a new location, it was felt, would be counter to the ‘historical’ interest of the churches; all of which had stood on sites ‘that have been consecrated to Christian worship for many centuries, some of them for over a thousand years’.\(^4^0\) Moreover, anticipating the notion of ‘group value’ as a category of heritage significance, the FOTCC, claimed that there was no other city in the world able to boast such a collection of late-seventeenth century buildings; their ‘architectural’ importance not only attracting people ‘from all parts of the country, the Empire, and from America’, but reinforcing ‘civic and imperial’ character in doing so.\(^4^1\) If the Commission agreed, and decided in favour of rehabilitation rather than demolition of the City churches, the FOTCC suggested that ‘walls could be repaired and strengthened in position ... voids reroofed with timber to the form originally designed by Wren ... [and] windows reinstated with their wrought iron frames and glazed with crown glass’.\(^4^2\) Internally, walls were to be ‘plastered and left white’, and no attempt was to be made ‘to produce replicas of ceilings and internal fittings ’.\(^4^3\) In summary, the approach advocated by the FOTCC was one of conservation rather than restorative reconstruction, with conserved churches to be fitted out with ‘the best work that contemporary craftsmen [could] produce’.\(^4^4\)

Whilst Fisher’s Commission continued to deliberate the fate of the bombed City churches, the FOTTC held the first of its annual meetings to discuss and promote its policies. This took place on 7 October 1943, with two members of the FOTCC’s Executive Committee giving papers to the attendees. The first speaker was Gerald Cobb; an artist and historian who had embarked upon a visual and written survey of London’s City churches, later published under the title The Old Churches of London (1941), whilst serving as a fire warden at St Paul’s.\(^4^5\) As recently as 1919, Cobb told the gathered FOTCC members how Arthur Winnington-Ingram, Fisher’s predecessor as Bishop of London, had put forward a proposal ‘whereby, had it passed into law, nineteen City churches, including fourteen Wren’s [sic], would have been swept away’.\(^4^6\) Despite its eventual rejection by the House of Commons in 1926, Cobb lamented that the recent bombing had ‘done

\(^3^9\) Ibid, pp. 2–3.
\(^4^0\) Ibid, p. 3.
\(^4^1\) Ibid, pp. 3–4.
\(^4^2\) Ibid, p. 4.
\(^4^3\) Ibid.
\(^4^4\) Ibid.
the [former] Bishop’s fell work with even greater thoroughness’.47 Such events, for Cobb, only served to emphasise the need to fully document and protect those City churches that remained. The FOTCC’s chair and second speaker of the evening, Richardson, pleaded for ‘the repair of seventeen churches... and the complete reinstatement of two others’.48 Which two, Richardson did not specify. Nor did his total of nineteen bomb-damaged churches cohere with the twenty listed in the FOTCC’s Statement of Policy. Nonetheless, Richardson felt that the value placed upon St Paul’s by local authority planners should be extended to all City churches.49

Although the policies of the FOTCC were broadly supported within the architectural profession, there were certain reservations which came to the fore. As early as 1941 in his capacity as President of the Society of Antiquaries, Clapham had noted: ‘Where only the bare shell [of a building] remains, reinstatement would be largely without historical value or artistic justification’.50 Now, in an article published in The Architect and Building News in February 1944, Goodhart-Rendel drew attention to the problematic position adopted by the FOTCC: ‘I am not quite sure that many will go all the way with the [FOTCC] in its fundamental opinion that wherever possible, the churches themselves should be rebuilt ... what about where there is nothing left but all or most of the outside walls?’.51 Further, the FOTCC had stated that, if lost, original fittings and fixtures must not be reproduced. Yet, for Goodhart-Rendel, there were ‘one or two [Wren churches] that, if rebuilt, would absolutely require the ornamental plaster work without which their designs would lose their identity’.52 Wren’s St Mary-at-Hill, Billingsgate (1678) and St Anne, Limehouse (1714-27) by the architect Nicholas Hawksmoor were held up by Goodhart-Rendel as two successful examples of interior reproduction consequent to fire damage; the latter a particularly faithful rendering executed by Philip Hardwick and John Morris (1851-54) (Fig. 3.03).53 The approach taken by Hardwick and Morris was the most appropriate for at least one City church, according to Goodhart-Rendel; namely St Stephen, Walbrook, whose original interior was ‘a conjuring trick which any tampering might ruin’.54

47 Friends of the City Churches, Occasional Paper No. 1, p. 13. The City of London Churches Commission proposals were put before the House of Commons on 26th November, 1926, whereby the so-called Union of Benefices and Disposal of Churches (Metropolis) Measure (1926) was rejected. See: HC Deb 25 November 1926 vol. 200 cc673-708
49 Ibid, p. 16.
52 Ibid.
53 Ibid, p. 125. The restoration of St Mary-at-Hill was undertaken by James Savage (1826-49), and had a distinctly Georgian character. Further restoration work was done by Julian Harrap (1983-93).
54 Ibid.
Other problems with FOTCC policy went beyond matters of historical value and artistic justification. ‘[H]ow that great man [Wren] would laugh if he returned to this world and caught us piously rebuilding his hastily designed churches in the forms that for a hundred years had been found by us to be increasingly inconvenient!’, Goodhart-Rendel surmised in 1941.\(^{55}\) After the Great Fire of 1666, Wren had not sought to reproduce the designs of lost churches, because to do so would have to be required them to be ‘fitted up and used in a way contrary to their nature’.\(^{56}\) Was it sensible to restore a bombed church to a form unsuitable for contemporary worship? Open to the possibility of reordering conserved churches, Goodhart-Rendel insisted that it was, ‘perfectly possible for a good architect harmoniously to embody every remaining scrap of Wren in a church whose architecture allowed the space and emphasis now required for an altar, needed no high pews and galleries, and above all, was not covered with sham domes and vaults of timber and plaster’.\(^{57}\) Just weeks before his critique of the FOTCC was published, however, an alternative approach to full reinstatement began to emerge; one which Goodhart-Rendel acknowledged in a

\(^{55}\) H.S. Goodhart-Rendel, ‘Rebuild or Restore’, The Listener, XXV no. 629 (1941), pp. 143–46.
\(^{56}\) Ibid, p. 126.
\(^{57}\) Ibid, p. 127.
postscript to his article. The debate on whether to conserve or reinstate historic churches was clearly widening to include questions over their continued usage in the light of considerable liturgical and social change, and their contribution to the streetscape as living building versus possible redundancy.

In January 1944, the landscape architect Geoffrey Jellicoe had written an article in the *Architectural Review* (AR) under the heading ‘Save Us Our Ruins’, with a foreword provided by Matthews. In his article, Jellicoe claimed to offer ‘a new solution to the problem of the future of some of the bombed churches in Britain’. For Jellicoe, the two main considerations in the debate thus far were: ‘Should they [the bomb-damaged churches] be rebuilt, or should their sites be sold to raise sums for erecting churches in suburban areas with inadequate numbers of churches?’ To this, he added a third consideration ‘applicable to only a few, say two or three in the city [of London] and one each in some other towns and cities’. His proposition, in keeping with the FOTCC’s wish that unreconstructed churches be kept as an open space in perpetuity, was that ‘a few of the bombed churches of Britain be selected to remain with us as ruins ... that they be laid out and planted appropriately, and that they be regarded as permanent places of open-air worship, meditation and recreation, as national memorials of this war [the Second World], and focal points of picturesque delight in the planned surroundings of the post-war world’. As a precedent to his idea, Jellicoe cited the example of St Botolph, Colchester; a former-Augustinian priory destroyed by during the English Civil War and left as a ruin ‘of great picturesque beauty’ (Fig. 3.04). Retaining the ruins of churches bombed in the Second World War ‘would encourage ... an occasional retreat into a spiritual world, a world apart though close to the bustle of tram and car’, whilst providing ‘more open space for people to rest and enjoy their lunch hour’.
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64 Ibid. For more information on St Botolph, Colchester, see: Charles Reed Peers, *St. Botolph’s Priory, Colchester, Essex* (London: English Heritage, 1977).
Jellicoe outlined specific examples of churches which might be treated in this manner. Of London’s bomb-damaged City churches, four possible candidates, were identified, namely St Giles, Cripplegate; Christ Church, Newgate; St Alban, Wood Street; and St Mary, Aldermanbury.66 At St Giles, Jellicoe proposed to ‘[b]reak open the gates, pull down the fences, mark a flagged path, and expose undisguised what the war had left’, whilst the ruins of Christ Church ‘could by means of trees or a stone screen be made to emphasize seclusion’ (Fig. 3.05).67 At St Mary and St Alban, the proximity of the two ruined churches held the potential for a ‘double site’, whilst the creation of a sunken garden in the basement of the latter would ‘add to the height of the [remaining] church walls’ and help restore their scale having been undermined by nineteenth-century development (Fig. 3.06).68
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66 Jellicoe, pp. 13–17. Christ Church, Newgate, is also known as Christ Church, Greyfriars.
68 Ibid, p. 16.
Fig. 3.05. Proposal for Christ Church, Newgate, drawn by Neville Conder (1944)

[Source: Architectural Review, January 1944, p. 15.]

Fig. 3.06. Proposal for St Mary, Aldermanbury and St Alban, Wood Street (1944)

[Source: Architectural Review, January 1944, p. 16.]
In all instances, planting, it was suggested, would give ‘dignity and permanence to a picturesque ruin’. Although it would be some years before the architectural historian Nikolaus Pevsner would write his polemic In Defence of the Picturesque (1954), Jellicoe’s repeated use of the word ‘picturesque’ was significant. As an influential figure and advisory editor at the AR, Pevsner’s long-held view that modernist aesthetics and principles were a logical development of the English tradition predisposed the journal in support of Jellicoe’s ideas; then unfashionable amongst more strident modernist architects. Indeed, it was Pevsner who invited Neville Conder, a recent graduate of the AA, to provide the schemes which accompanied Jellicoe’s article. With the backing of Pevsner and the AR, Jellicoe’s article signalled the transition of bombed churches being of local diocesan concern to a matter of national significance.

The conference organised by the Royal Society of Arts in April 1944, to explore issues pertaining to memorialisation, gave Jellicoe a further opportunity to promote his ideas. Representing the Institute of Landscape Architects, in his capacity as President, Jellicoe began by suggesting that it was not for the artist, or architect, to determine what form a war memorial should take; rather, ‘we [the people] must lay down a philosophy, and then the artist has to interpret that’. Thus, to provide a ‘beautiful thing in bricks or stone’ was not enough, or even necessary: The example to follow was that of the ancient Greeks ‘who attempted to get at something which did not lie upon this earth’. Open spaces ‘varying in size from a national park to a small bombed area should’, Jellicoe proposed, ‘be laid out so that people can watch the balance of nature’. Such views were widely supported and echoed the other invited speakers; not least by Lord Chatfield who expressed his admiration for the ‘beautiful terraced garden’ of the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, where people could ‘sit quietly and reflect’. Thus it was resolved a War Memorials Advisory Council (WMAC) was to be formed ‘to transmit this consensus of opinion to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning and other interested bodies’.

72 anon, ‘Conference on War Memorials’, p. 328.
73 Ibid.
74 Ibid, p. 329.
75 Ibid, p. 324.
76 anon, ‘Conference on War Memorials’, p. 333.
Chaired by Lord Chatfield, the WMAC was comprised of representatives from the Royal Academy of Arts, the Royal Institute of British Architects, members of both Houses of Parliament, and church leaders. Its stated purpose vis-à-vis memorialisation was to: ‘obtain a wise solution of what is by no means an easy problem; secondly, to focus public opinion on all the possibilities; thirdly, to stress the necessity for a high standard of social and cultural value in our war memorials and that they shall fulfil a permanent rather than a merely temporary need’.77 Its recommendations, published in a document entitled War Memorials: A Survey made by a Committee of the Royal Society of Arts (1944), were subsequently distributed amongst ‘Government Departments, Lords Lieutenant and local authorities throughout England and Wales’.78 In the Survey, local communities were urged to consider a range of approaches to memorialisation which included the creation of gardens, parks and open spaces; the planting of memorial trees; and the creation of community amenities such as playing fields, children’s playgrounds or village halls.79 As Lord Chatfield later summarised, having motioned a discussion of the WMAC’s proposals in the House of Lords, the over-riding principle was to incorporate in any new war memorials ‘something which will not only honour the dead but also be a help to those who have survived’.80 The work of the WMAC was roundly appreciated in the discussion which took place in the House of Lords on 14 February 1945, although a singular note of caution was sounded by Lord Lang of Lambeth who, commenting on those children’s playgrounds previously established to honour the memory of the late King George V, wondered ‘how many of the young children who go in and out of the gateway will ever give a single thought to the good King’.81 This concern, Lord Lang felt, could equally apply to the community-oriented memorials now being proposed by the WMAC: ‘[T]here is no one in this House who is more eager for the establishment of community centres of that kind than I am, but those are for ourselves ... more obviously than they are a commemoration of the dead’.82 More appropriate, for Lang, were the suggested ‘gardens of memory, places of quiet and rest, beauty and meditation, where there will be no question of the memory of the dead being always seen and felt’.83 Conscious also of national policy impinging upon local wishes, the House requested that Chatfield withdraw his motion: ‘I do not think it is necessary or, indeed, desirable that His Majesty's Government should specify or elaborate what really constitutes a worthy and proper memorial. In fact, I could picture, and I

77 Lord Chatfield quoted in: HL Deb 14 February 1945 vol. 134 cc1018-19
79 War Memorials Advisory Council, op.cit.
80 Lord Chatfield quoted in: HL Deb 14 February 1945 vol. 134 cc1019-20
81 Lord Lang of Lambeth quoted in: HL Deb 14 February 1945 vol. 134 cc1038
82 Ibid
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have no doubt your Lordships could too, considerable opposition if the Government should endeavour to lay down a hard-and-fast rule to be followed by all these local committees’.  

Despite the WMAC’s recommendations not being adopted as official government policy, the idea of retaining bombed churches as war memorials gained momentum later that year when Goodhart-Rendel and others were signatory to a supporting letter published in The Times newspaper. Urgent action was called for in deciding which bombed churches should be restored, and which to preserve as ruins; those churches ‘so far destroyed that their restoration could be no more than a mockery of their former selves … must either be removed altogether or remain as ruins’. Meanwhile, hoping to keep the prospect of bombed churches as war memorials alive, the AR’s publisher, The Architectural Press, was preparing a book based upon Jellicoe’s earlier article. Before this was finalised, however, the Commission released, in late-1944, the first of its reports on the City churches.

Published in late 1944, the Interim Report of the Bishop of London’s Commission outlined the fate awaiting each of the bomb-damaged City churches. Set up ‘to inquire into and consider questions of policy concerning the churches in the City of London in relation to general problems of reconstruction’, it was evident that the combined efforts of the FOTCC, the WMAC, and the architectural press had gone some way towards influencing the Commission recommendations. In clear reference to the assessment criteria proposed by the FOTCC, the report stated that in making its recommendations the Commission had paid ‘regard to their spiritual function, to their historical and architectural claims, [and] to their place in the life of the City’. This approach cohered with the suggested treatment of City Churches as outlined in The Architectural Press’s forthcoming book; the contents of which Matthews, having provided the foreword, was privy to (Fig. 3.07)

84 Geoffrey FitzClarence, then-Parliamentary Undersecretary of State for the Home Department, quoted in HL Deb 14 February 1945 vol. 134 cc1051
85 ‘Letter to the Editor: Ruined City Churches’, The Times (London, 15 August 1944). Other signatories included Kenneth Clark (art historian); Thomas Stearns Eliot (writer); John Maynard Keynes (economist); Marjorie Allen (landscape architect); David Cecil (biographer and historian); Frederick Arthur Cockin (later Bishop of Bristol); Julian Huxley (academic); and Edward James Salisbury (botanist and ecologist).
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In *Bombed Churches As War Memorials* (1945), much of what had appeared in Jellicoe’s article was re-presented alongside new material described and elaborated upon by the architect Hugh Casson; an advisory editor to the AR along with Pevsner. The letter from Goodhart-Rendel *et al* to *The Times* newspaper was reprinted in full, and Matthews’ foreword commended the schemes proposed within. The first three of these schemes, all illustrated by the artist Barbara Jones, were for London churches of St John the Evangelist, Red Lion Square; St Vedast, Foster Lane; and St Swithin, London Stone. At St John, a nineteenth-century church designed by the architect John Loughborough Pearson, it was proposed to close a subsidiary road so that an
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91 Casson. The Architectural Press, at this time under the chairmanship of Hubert de Cronin Hastings, also published the AR. It was Hastings who was responsible for the AR acquiring its reputation as a campaigning journal. See: Erdem Erten, ‘Postwar Visions of Apocalypse and Architectural Culture: The Architectural Review’s Turn to Ecology’, *The Design Journal*, 11.3 (2008), 269–85.

92 Casson, pp. 3–4.
avenue of trees could be planted connecting the ruined church with the existing gardens in Red Lion Square (Fig. 3.08). Taking advantage of the ‘extensive cellars now mostly roofless beneath the nave’, it was proposed that these be re-roofed and used for ‘communal purposes’; else they could form sunken gardens.

At St Vedast, the ‘the more intimate scale of the Christopher Wren columns and furnishings’ were to be offset against an adjacent, larger building (see Fig. 3.07 above), whilst the ‘ravaged walls of St Swithin’ were to be given a ‘simple garden setting’ (Fig. 3.09). Beyond the illustrations, detailed information for these schemes was lacking. Neither the scheme for St John nor St Swithin was implemented, with both churches later demolished. St Vedast, however, underwent a restorative reconstruction, between 1953 and 1963, overseen by the architect Stephen Dykes Bower (see Chapter One).

---
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Fig. 3.09. St Swithin, London Stone: proposed ‘garden setting’ (1945)


Much more detailed than the proposals for the above churches were those prepared by the architect Peter Shepheard and landscape architect Brenda Colvin for Christ Church, Newgate; and by the architect Jacques Groag for St Anne, Soho (Fig. 3.10).\textsuperscript{96} Shepheard and Colvin’s proposal for Christ Church, Newgate, included a detailed planting scheme aimed at providing ‘as

long a season as possible of flower colour and foliage beauty’.\(^97\) Leading up to the west doorway of Christ Church’s tower, ‘the changing blooms and colour of the [proposed] border’ would, according to Colvin, ‘emphasize the passing seasons in contrast to the permanence of the stones’ (Fig. 3.11).\(^98\) Internally, a missing column was to be replaced with a tree and the stone-flagged nave bordered with a planting scheme ‘composed in a quiet harmony of copper and grey foliage’ (Fig. 3.12).\(^99\)

Fig. 3.10. Proposed Planting Scheme for Christ Church, Newgate, by Brenda Colvin (1945)


\(^97\) Ibid, p.23.
\(^98\) Casson, pp. 27–28.
\(^99\) Ibid.
Fig. 3.11. Proposed Approach to the West Door, Christ Church, Newgate, by Brenda Colvin (1945)

Fig. 3.12. Interior View of Proposed Nave at Christ Church, Newgate, by Brenda Colvin (1945)
Expansive on matters of landscaping and neatly illustrated though it was, Shepheard and Colvin’s proposals gave scant consideration to the building fabric itself. In this regard, Groag was more attentive in his proposals for St Anne, Soho; a seventeenth century church, thought to be by Wren, but with later additions by the architect Samuel Pepys Cockerell.\textsuperscript{100} Bombed out in the winter of 1940 to 1941, Groag proposed converting the ruins of St Anne ‘into a memorial of the war-sufferings of its congregation both on the home front and on fronts overseas’.\textsuperscript{101} To achieve this, Groag purposely ignored all existing town planning projects, in order to show how ‘a new beauty and function [could] be made out of destruction in the centre of a neighbourhood with so marked and manifold a character’.\textsuperscript{102} Maintaining the original street pattern, bombed out properties adjacent to St Anne were to be replaced, though built in a modern idiom with offices and restaurants occupying the upper floors (Fig. 3.13).\textsuperscript{103}
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\textsuperscript{100} Casson, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.
An emergency water reservoir, which occupied the corner of Old Compton Street and Dean Street, was to be converted to a lilypond as part of the new memorial gardens and, anticipating this would prove a popular meeting place, seating was to be incorporated into a parapet wall (Fig. 3.14).104 Meanwhile, the ruins of the church, together with a newly constructed covered passage leading from Dean Street, were to form part of a War Memorial Chapel; a place ‘for worship and rest’.105 A canopy projecting from the west side of the church was proposed which could be used ‘inclusive or exclusive of the nave, for religious or other community meetings’ (Fig. 3.15).106

Fig. 3.14. Proposed Lily Pond for St Anne, Soho, by Jacques Groag (1945)

104 Ibid, pp. 31 and 45.
105 Ibid, p. 35.
106 Ibid.
Fig. 3.15. Canopy Proposal at St Anne, Soho, by Jacques Groag (1945): ‘for religious or other community meetings’

The inclusion of recreational facilities aimed at all sections of the local community, recognised an inherent social value which ought to be preserved: ‘It should never be forgotten that in centuries in which churches were much more part of everyday life then they are as a rule to-day, the church was used for many community purposes which were of no immediate connection with religion’. The proposed location of a children’s play area was such that it would ‘enjoy the warmth of the afternoon sun’, whilst a ramp from Wardour Street would ‘make access more convenient for old people and for mothers with their young children in prams’. Another public space was the proposed terrace, located to the rear of the rebuilt properties along Old Compton Street, which was to serve as a link between the restaurant facilities housed within and the memorial gardens (Fig. 3.16). Whether St Anne could be redeveloped in this way was, Groag conceded, a matter for the church authorities. Unfortunately, the scheme was never implemented, and the site was used as a car park for many years after.


---
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110 St Anne, Soho, was re-established as a community church in 1991.
Belonging to the additional parishes of the City, St Anne, Soho, was not included in the interim report of the Commission.\(^\text{111}\) However, amongst its various recommendations, the sites of four ruined churches were suggested as suitable for alternative ecclesiastical uses: namely, Christ Church, Newgate; St Augustine, Watling Street; St Dunstan-in-the-East, Idol Lane; and St Stephen, Colman Street.\(^\text{112}\) In addition, it was suggested that the ruins of St Alban, Wood Street, should be preserved though possibly on another site.\(^\text{113}\) This represented some good news for the FOTCC who, in general, opposed restorative reconstructions. However, the churches of All Hallow, Barking and St Olave, Hart Street were considered so severely damaged as to require a complete rebuild, whilst the remaining nine City churches were recommended for full restoration. These included: St Andrew, Holborn; St Bride, Fleet Street; St Giles, Cripplegate; St Lawrence, Jewry; St Mary le Bow; St Nicholas, Cole Abbey; St Stephen, Walbrook; and St Vedast, Foster Lane.\(^\text{114}\) It was proposed that the remaining churches of St Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe, St Mary Aldermanbury, St Mildred, Bread Street and St Swithin, London Stone were demolished in order to sell the land.\(^\text{115}\) Unfortunately for the FOTCC, it was clear the Commission favoured restorative reconstructions, where possible, and disposal where not. When the final report of the Commission was published in 1946, these recommendations had not changed.\(^\text{116}\) Of those bombed churches recommended as suitable for other ecclesiastical uses, St Stephen, Colman Street, was eventually demolished and the site sold for commercial development.\(^\text{117}\) Christ Church, Newgate, fared better with remnants of its shell and tower restored by the architectural practice of Seeley and Paget in 1960; the east wall was demolished in 1974 to make way for the widening of King Edward Street, and a low-rise office building, also by Seeley and Paget, was erected against the south west in 1981.\(^\text{118}\) Not until 1989 were the present gardens established; a modest undertaking which failed to deliver the seclusion envisaged by Jellicoe or lush landscaping proposed by Shepheard and Colvin (Fig. 3.17).\(^\text{119}\)
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\(^{111}\) The additional parishes included all those within a three mile radius of the centre of the City. For a more detailed account on the creation of the additional parishes, see: Ronald Guy Ellen, *A London Steeplechase: A Survey of the 150 Parish Churches Historically Associated with the Parish Clerks’ Company of the City of London* (London: City Press, 1972), pp. 131–32.

\(^{112}\) Commission on the City Churches, *The City Churches: Interim Report*, op.cit.

\(^{113}\) Ibid.

\(^{114}\) Ibid.

\(^{115}\) Ibid.


\(^{117}\) Ellen, p. 94.


\(^{119}\) Seeley and Paget were also responsible for the restoration of the tower of St Augustine, Watling Street, which, replete with a fibreglass replica of Wren’s original spire, was integrated into the designs of a new choir school, completed in 1967, for St Paul’s Cathedral. See: Bradley and Pevsner, *London: The City*
Less straightforward was the fate of St Alban, Wood Street. As Jellicoe had previously highlighted, its proximity to St Mary, Aldermanbury, one of the churches earmarked by the Commission for demolition, offered the potential of a memorial garden encompassing both ruins. However, in 1955 the nave of St Alban was demolished. Only the tower, having been Grade II listed in 1950, remained, and the rest of the site was sold for redevelopment. A memorial garden was eventually established amongst the foundation stones of St Mary, with the upper walls having been dismantled between 1961 and 1963.\textsuperscript{120} This, like the memorial garden at Christ Church, failed to match the ambition of previously prepared schemes (Fig. 3.18).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig318.png}
\caption{Memorial Garden at St Mary, Aldermanbury (established 1961-63)}
\label{fig:3.18}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{120} Bradley and Pevsner, \textit{London: The City Churches}, p. 141; Huelin, pp. 65–66; Ellen, pp. 66–67. The dismantled remnants of St Mary, Aldermanbury, were sold to Westminster College, Missouri and, overseen by the architect Marshall Sisson, re-erected on campus as a memorial to Winston Churchill. For more information, see: G.J. Howling, 'The Winston Churchill Memorial, USA', \textit{The Builder}, 5th June 1964, p. 1177.
Of the City Churches, only the memorial garden established at St Dunstan-in-the-East came close to resembling these earlier visions. St Dunstan was an early nineteenth-century church, designed by David Laing, which incorporated a seventeenth-century tower by Wren.  

Although, the Commission saw no purpose in rebuilding Laing’s church, it nonetheless considered the tower to be amongst Wren’s finest work and worthy of saving. Accordingly, the spire was carefully dismantled, stacked in the grounds of the church and, between 1950 and 1955, both tower and spire were restored by Alexander Thomas Scott of the architectural firm Sir Herbert Baker and Scott (Fig. 3.19).


---
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The ruined walls of the nave were also stabilised and, with the site having been acquired by The City of London Corporation, a memorial garden was established to the designs of its Architects and Parks Departments and, opened to the public in June 1971, was the recipient of Landscape Heritage Award in 1976 (Figs. 3.20, 3.21 and 3.22).124

**Fig. 3.20. Memorial Garden at St Dunstan-in-the-East, photograph taken in October 2017**

*Source: Author’s own image.*

Fig. 3.21. Memorial Garden at St Dunstan-in-the-East, photograph taken in October 2017

[Source: Author’s own image.]

Fig. 3.22. Memorial Garden at St Dunstan-in-the-East, photograph taken in October 2017

[Source: Author’s own image.]
Despite the accolade awarded to the memorial gardens at St Dunstan, fears that retaining ruins as memorials could only ‘lower [one’s] mind] to the inferno where hate and revenge dwell’, appear to account for the scarcity of similar schemes elsewhere in England.\textsuperscript{125} For example, a scheme for the seventeenth-century Charles Church, Plymouth, prepared by Casson was not executed, whilst proposals by Patrick Abercrombie and James Paton Watson to make the ruins part of the city’s wider reconstruction plans were only partially realised. It was purchased by Plymouth Corporation in 1957, and subsequent infrastructure planning left the ruins marooned on a traffic island (Fig. 3.23).\textsuperscript{126} With limited public access, what exists today could hardly be described as a memorial garden.

\textbf{Fig. 3.23.} Memorial Gardens at Charles Church, Plymouth

[Source: Photograph available under Creative Commons Licence. Courtesy of KevinColyer.]

\textsuperscript{125} Sir Herbert Baker, Scott’s late business partner, as quoted in The Times, 22nd August 1944, p.2

Also to be found in the south of England, are the bombed-out remains of Holy Rood, Southampton; and St Peter, Bristol. It was decided in 1957, that the former, a fourteenth-century church largely rebuilt in the nineteenth century, would be kept ‘as a memorial and garden of rest dedicated to those who served in the merchant-navy and lost their lives at sea’. The latter, a mostly fifteenth-century church with twelfth-century elements, is located within the confines of Castle Park, a public space created by Bristol City Council in 1977, and dedicated to the approximately 1,400 people killed in the Bristol Blitz. The only bombed church in the north of England officially included on the War Memorial Register, however, is St Luke, Liverpool; a nineteenth-century Grade II* listed church, designed by John Foster and his son, whose ruins were acquired by Liverpool Corporation in 1968 to be ‘maintained as a place of rest and tranquillity’. Two further examples, both found in the Midlands, are St Thomas, Birmingham, and the Cathedral Church of St Michael, Coventry; the latter perhaps the most well-known example of all. St Thomas, a nineteenth-century church by Rickman and Hutchinson, was purchased by Birmingham Corporation in 1941, and incorporated within a public space the following year; the gardens were added in 1953 to celebrate the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II. The ruins of the medieval Cathedral Church of St Michael, however, were originally intended to be cleared to make way for a new Gothic-style building designed by the architect Giles Gilbert Scott. Dissatisfaction with Scott’s proposals prompted him to relinquish the commission though, and following the use of St Michael in a ceremony to mark Victory in Europe Day in May 1945, interest in retaining the ruins grew; bolstered further with the establishment of a memorial garden within confines of its walls in 1947 (Fig. 3.24). This idea of standing ruins being retained as memorials to the Second World War was also reflected in Europe and internationally, with the French president Charles de Gaulle ordering that the ravaged village Oradour-sur-Glane be regarded as a permanent memorial whilst in Japan a Peace Memorial Park was establishment

---


130 See War Memorial Register (Ref: 38693). Available online at: <www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/38693> [accessed 15th July 2018].


around the remains of the Genbaku Dome, Hiroshima, between 1950 and 1964. Accordingly, in the design competition that followed at Coventry, it was stipulated that the spire and two medieval crypts be retained. The winning scheme by Basil Spence went further still, retaining the whole of St Michael’s ruins, apart from the north wall, which were connected via a covered walkway to a new cathedral. Consecrated in May 1962, an inscription added to the surviving east wall of St Michael reads: ‘FATHER FORGIVE’. The old Coventry Cathedral is, perhaps, the fullest expression of a bomb-damaged church as an ecclesiastical memorial, in contrast to the more secularised ruin-to-garden sites. Much more common in the treatment of bombed churches throughout England, however, were full reinstatements and restorative recreations.

With buildings materials in short supply, and licences remaining in place until November 1954, construction activity was severely limited in Britain for some years after the war had ended; a situation which left even those bombed churches scheduled for restoration in a state of ruination for over a decade; this despite the introduction, in 1955, of the Inspection of Churches
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134 Ibid, p. 216.
135 See War Memorial Register (Ref: 17718). Available online at: <www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/17718> [accessed 15th July 2018].
Measure which made quinquennial inspections a statutory requirement for Anglican churches.\textsuperscript{136} The intention was to identify any with a church before it became a major problem. However, funded by the relevant diocese, remedial works were prioritised according to risk and carried out only when finances permitted. Yet, by 1959 the architectural critic Ian Nairn was able to write: ‘Six Wren churches. One blasted, one blown like an egg, four completely gutted. And here they are, 14 years later, spick and span and newly roofed’.\textsuperscript{137} The Wren churches referred to included St James, Piccadilly and St Clement Danes, both located in the City of Westminster, and four City Churches: namely St Mary Abchurch; St Lawrence Jewry; St Bride, Fleet Street; and St Stephen, Walbrook. St Mary, in common with St Clement Danes, had suffered internal damage, but remained structurally intact. Both were restored by the specialist contractor Dove Brothers under the guidance of W. Godfrey Allen and W.A.S Lloyd respectively, and in adherence with the FOTCC’s edict that damaged walls should be plastered and painted white. This approach was lamented by Nairn: ‘The whiteness of such City Churches is not [akin to] the metaphysical clarity of buildings like the Portuguese Synagogue in Amsterdam where everything is seen in level-headed clear light: it is simply a record of a breakdown of imagination’.\textsuperscript{138}

Of the three other Wren City Churches, all of which had been commended for full restoration by the Commission, the approach taken by each of the appointed architects differed slightly. At St Lawrence Jewry, where all original fitting and fixtures had been lost, Cecil Brown chose to replace them with ‘miscellaneous mock-Wren designs’ rather than exact replicas or modern equivalents. Neither a true reconstruction of the Wren church, nor a modern church incorporating elements of Wren’s original, it was, for Nairn, ‘not quite anything’.\textsuperscript{139} Meanwhile, Godfrey Allen’s restoration of St Bride, Fleet Street, although deemed ‘a thorough-going and partly-successful neo-Wren essay’, had seen the upper galleries removed and the east window obscured by a new free-standing altar. Allen’s side stalls moreover, being out of step with contemporary liturgical thinking, were thought ‘nonsense, either on Wren’s terms or considering St Bride’s as a new building’.\textsuperscript{140} Less problematic was the restoration of St Stephen, Walbrook where much of the original interior had survived the bombs. The main damage was to the domed roof, which was carefully replicated under the guidance of the architect Gilbert Meadon.\textsuperscript{141} Yet

\textsuperscript{138} Nairn, p. 103; Braithwaite, p. 96. Nairn incorrectly attributes the restoration of St Mary Abchurch to Lord Mottistone of the firm Seely and Paget.
\textsuperscript{139} Nairn, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid, p. 103.
whilst the FOTCC, the Commission, and the variously appointed architects spent several years agonising over what was to be done with the bombed Wren churches, the restoration of St John, Lambeth, proceeded much more quickly due to its official designation as the 1951 Festival of Britain church.

**Thomas Ford and the Festival Church**

With Britain facing increased competition from resurgent manufacturing industries overseas, a committee set up in 1945 to investigate ways to boost Britain’s export trade concluded that ‘a first category international exhibition should be held in London at the first practicable date to demonstrate to the world the recovery of the United Kingdom from the effect of war in moral, cultural, spiritual and material fields’.\(^{142}\) Consequently, when planning the 1951 Festival of Britain, the involvement of the Church of England was considered no less significant in helping to re-establish national identity.\(^{143}\) St John, Lambeth, built between 1822 and 1824 to the designs of Francis Octavius Bedford, was one of four churches erected in the Diocese of Southwark to celebrate victory over Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo (Fig. 3.25); the others being St Mark, Kennington (1822-24) by David Riddall Roper, St Matthew, Brixton (1822-24) by Charles Ferdinand Porden, and St Luke, West Norwood (1822-25) also by Bedford.\(^{144}\) As with the Wren churches then, St John’s selection for restoration for the 1951 Festival of Britain was cultural as much as spiritual. Located on Waterloo Road, a short distance south of the proposed Festival site, it had been struck by an incendiary bomb on 8 December 1940. The copper-covered timber roof was completely destroyed, the spire rendered structurally unstable, and internally the side galleries were lost along with the east end reredos, the baldacchino, and church organ.\(^{145}\) Exposed to the elements for ten years, the remaining timber-work and plaster deteriorated further still until, in what was to be a career defining role, the architect Thomas Ford was made responsible for overseeing the restoration.\(^{146}\)
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\(^{142}\) As quoted in: Conekin, p. 28. The so-called Ramsden Committee was appointed by the British Government’s Department of Overseas Trade and chaired by Lord Ramsden.

\(^{143}\) Conekin, p. 118.


\(^{145}\) anon, ‘Restoration of St John’s Church, Waterloo’, The Builder, 4th May 1951, p. 620.

\(^{146}\) Ibid.
Unlike many of the architects working on the Festival, Ford was of an earlier generation. Having moved to London in 1908 to take up an apprenticeship in architecture, his subsequent education at the AA followed a Beaux-Arts model: a second year study titled ‘Half Inch of West Front Memorial Church’ (1909-10) was indicative of Ford’s early interest in traditional church design.¹⁴⁷ Raised a member of the Plymouth Brethren, an evangelical nonconformist Christian movement, Ford later switched his allegiances to the Church of England and, having qualified as an architect in 1919, undertook various works on their behalf.¹⁴⁸ Early commissions included overseeing repairs to St Michael, East Wickham, a church of twelfth-century origins, and St John the Baptist, Malden, a church of Saxon origin though substantially rebuilt in the early seventeenth century (Fig. 3.26).¹⁴⁹ New build commissions followed also, including the replacement of St Michael, East Wickham with a new church in 1933; the old church being retained as a Chapel of Ease (Fig. 3.27).¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷ Held at the offices of Thomas Ford and Partners, Sydenham, London.
¹⁵⁰ The old church of St Michael, East Wickham was declared redundant in 1973 and presently leased Greek Orthodox Church. See: Former places of worship in the Diocese of Southwark. East Wickham, St Michael (Old Church), Ref: EAS08. Available online at: <www.southwark.anglican.org/downloads/lostchurches/EAS08.pdf> [accessed 18th July 2018]
Fig. 3.26. Exterior View of St John the Baptist, Malden (1930)

[Source: Courtesy of the Thomas Ford and Partners archive.]

Fig. 3.27. Exterior View of St Michael, East Wickham (1933)

[Source: Courtesy of the Thomas Ford and Partners archive.]
Subsequently appointed as Diocesan Architect for Southwark, Ford became responsible for inspecting numerous bomb-damaged churches during the Second World War; an experience which made him more qualified than most to take on the restoration of St John. Yet, Ford was not simply an antiquarian. His evangelical upbringing, which had seen a young Ford conduct open-air mission meetings in Peckham, London, meant he had reformist tendencies. Just after the war, for example, Ford and his brother Ralph authored a modern English translation of the King James Bible which was intended to be read by the less-educated working classes.\footnote{Thomas F. Ford and Ralph Ewart Ford, \textit{The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: The Letchworth Version in Modern English} (Hertfordshire: Letchworth Printers, 1948). See also: Paul, pp. 83–84.} Such tendencies would inform his approach to the design and restoration of church buildings. Although Ford had prior experience of designing churches, it was his work on St John, Lambeth, for the 1951 Festival of Britain, that earnt him a reputation as a specialist in restoration (Fig. 3.28).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig_3_28.png}
\caption{St John, Lambeth: scaffolding ahead of restoration, May 1950}
\footnote{Source: Courtesy of the Thomas Ford and Partners archive.}
\end{figure}
Work on St John began in May 1950. An early decision taken by Ford was to omit the existing side galleries and supporting columns. This reduced the amount of space for seating, but demographic change in Lambeth meant the Church could no longer expect congregations numbering in the hundreds.\(^{152}\) Inexpensive accommodation in bomb-damaged property had attracted economic migrants from the West Indies and Indian sub-continent to the Lambeth area, which had previously been distinctly middle-class and white (see Chapter Five).\(^{153}\) That is not to say that Ford sought to dissuade such groups from attending the newly restored church; rather, as one commentator put it, the idea was to create ‘an airy, light building where ... the style and purpose of [Bedford] ... blended with the requirements of to-day’.\(^{154}\) Another consequence of removing the side galleries was the broadening of the nave and the loss of the original axial arrangement. Concerned that this would potentially lessen the visual impact of the sanctuary at the east end, Ford enlarged the two vestries on either side such that it was ‘reduced to its proper proportions’ (Fig. 3.29).\(^{155}\)
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154 anon, ‘Restoration of St John’s Church, Waterloo’, *The Builder*, 4th May 1951, p. 618.
A new plaster reredos was created to replace that which was destroyed in the bombing, whilst the stained-glass east window, installed in 1826 and also lost, was bricked up and covered over with a mural titled ‘The Crucifixion’ by Hans Feibusch (Fig. 3.30).156 A smaller mural by Feibusch depicting the Nativity was inset into the new reredos.157

Fig. 3.30. St John, Lambeth: mural titled ‘The Crucifixion’ by Hans Feibusch
(Source: Courtesy of the Thomas Ford and Partners archive.)

As well as responding to the practical needs of St John’s congregation, Ford’s proposals were in keeping with contemporary liturgical thinking in Western Europe (see Chapter Two). Although Ford was an Anglican, his family upbringing had been within the Plymouth Brethren, a nonconformist Christian group which existed outside of mainstream religious culture. Arguably, this made him more receptive to a non-traditional approach to church design. At St John, the removal of the side galleries produced an open nave which, finished with an olive green ‘Granwood’ floor, allowed for more flexible worshipping practices. Individual moveable chairs were favoured over the formal benched seating. Further, a plaster baldacchino designed by the architect Ninian Comper and installed in 1928 was omitted; the baldacchino was considered symbolic of high church practice (Fig. 3.31). Thus, whilst seemingly a conservative restoration - the roof was replaced as before but using steel rafters instead of timber and the coffered ceiling was faithfully reproduced in fibre plaster - there were progressive elements to Ford’s work on St John which were in further evidence in his subsequent restoration of its sister church St Mark, Kennington.

Fig. 3.31. Rededication Service at St John, Lambeth, April 1950
(Source: Courtesy of the Thomas Ford and Partners archive.)
Successive bombing throughout September 1940 had left St Mark, another of Lambeth’s Waterloo churches, in a state of ruin. Of Roper’s original church (1822-24), the entire roof was completely destroyed, upper side galleries were severely damaged, and internal fittings such as the benched seating were lost to fire; also lost was a glass dome installed over the nave in 1937. Despite the Diocese of Southwark initially intending to demolish the remaining outer walls, after seven years of dereliction permission was obtained by the incumbent vicar, Reverend Wallace Bird, to rebuild the church. Unlike at St John, whose elevated status as the Festival Church allowed for a complete restoration, at St Mark’s initial works were limited to making the building weather-tight. A simple timber door was installed in the tower entrance, damaged seating in the upper side galleries was cleared away, and the remaining gallery floor was used to support a temporary roof comprised of timber trusses and corrugated asbestos sheeting. This enabled the church to be used, pending full restoration, for worship once more. The partially restored St Mark was rededicated on 9 April 1949 (Fig. 3.32).

Fig. 3.32. Temporary Church at St Mark, Kennington (1949)
(Source: Courtesy of the Thomas Ford and Partners archive.)
With post-Second World War restrictions on the availability of building materials lifted in 1954, the full restoration of St Mark was able to begin soon after. Firstly, the temporary roof and entrance door, installed in 1949, were to be removed and with the outer wall stonework repaired, the main roof was to be reinstated with a new glazed dome, ‘very flat … à la Soane’ and featuring an abstract design in blue and grey (Fig. 3.33). The dome was fundamental in allowing natural light into the re-modelled interior proposed by Ford. With the upper galleries retained and enclosed with acoustic panelled walls to provide additional accommodation, the outer wall windows would no longer bring light into the nave. Electric lighting, incorporated within a facsimile of Roper’s original ceiling, was intended to supplement the natural light from the dome (Fig. 3.34).

Fig. 3.33. Sketch Proposal for the Dome of St Mark, Kennington by Thomas Ford

[Source: Thomas Ford and Partners archive, not dated.]
Re-consecrated on 12 March 1960, the additional accommodation which now occupied the former-gallery spaces included a reception area and conference room on the north side, offices and a typing room on the east side and, on the west side, a kitchen and cleaners’ room, a demonstration room, a bookkeepers’ room, and toilet facilities. Although the intended user of these facilities was not specified by Ford, annotations to the architectural drawings suggest this was known in advance. In the demonstration room, for example, provision was made for ‘medical store cupboards’ and an area for ‘uniforms’; both of which correlate with the known eventual occupiers, a charitable organisation known as the Ranyard Mission and Ranyard Nurses (Fig. 3.35). Mission Churches, the term used to describe those lacking full status as a parish church, were not a new phenomenon and were commonly found in working class area in the Victorian era (see Chapter Two). Close association with an existing parish church was typical for mission organisations, and church halls were often utilised for charitable activities.

158 Founded in 1857 by Ellen Henrietta Ranyard as The London Bible and Domestic Female Mission, the organisation was originally made up of Anglican ‘Bible woman’; so-named for distributing and reading the Bible to the poor.
Similarly, in the early twentieth century, crypts within Anglican churches started to be used for purposes other than storage. In 1915 at St Martin-in-the-Fields, London, for example, the Reverend Dick Shepherd used the church crypt to provide hospitality for soldiers returning from the battle and, after 1918, it performed a similar function for the homeless. Ford’s incorporation of the Ranyard Mission’s operational and administrative facilities at St Mark was, however, untypical for the Church of England in that the charitable activity was brought above ground and displaced areas previously used exclusively for worship. Certainly, secular activity in Anglican churches was becoming more common in the 1950s with the advent of the dual-purpose church. However, whereas sacred functions could displace secular in such churches, the same was not true in reverse. In this respect, Ford’s remodelling of St Mark was pioneering.

What this chapter has demonstrated is how discussions regarding the future of the Church of England’s historic churches influenced attitudes both to preservation for reasons of memorialisation and debates around conservation versus restoration. Discussions which began at diocesan level, came to inform national policy and shaped notions of heritage. In turn, this impacted upon the practice of architects in the post-1945 period which, arguably, persist to this day. Chapter Four further considers these practices in relation to historic places of worship in light of the community architecture phenomenon which emerged in the late 1960s, and the impact on their design and/or adaptation.

Chapter Four: Community Architecture to Participatory Design

The previous chapter charted concerns for the fate of historic places of worship both during and after the Second World War. With urban modernisation posing a threat to an ever-widening range of historic buildings, campaign groups such as the Victorian Society and SAVE Britain’s Heritage were formed demonstrating a continued growth of the conservation movement in the post-1945 period. Through their activities, these groups fought for a re-evaluation of traditional architecture at a time when economic difficulties had begun to undermine government policy; and, in turn, modern planning and architecture. It is within these contexts that this chapter explains the emergence of community architecture and participatory design, and their influence on architectural practice in Britain. This chapter argues that such practices and their influence upon the treatment of historic places of worship, at a time when churches were concerned for the pastoral needs of their communities, have been overlooked within the architectural historiography. It also brings to the fore emerging questions within the period as to the difference between sacred and secular buildings, and whether aesthetics mattered in this regards.

Although the treatment of bombed historic places of worship in Britain was a matter which vexed both religious and secular organisations alike, it was also true that the sheer number of new post-1945 church buildings which followed represented a highpoint of modernist expression. The comprehensive redevelopment of the cities, and the suburban expansion which sparked this boom in new church building, was indicative of the modern movement’s ascendancy over the conservation movement in the period.\(^1\) Even in the field of historic church restoration, engineered solutions to structural problems were applied by architects with modernist leanings.\(^2\) Such was the case with the restorations of Norwich Cathedral (restored 1963-1967), York Minster (restored 1965-77), and St Paul’s Cathedral (restored 1969-77); all overseen by the architectural practice of Feilden and Mawson.\(^3\) Elsewhere, modernist architects contending with historic churches in urban contexts appropriated principles more closely associated the eighteenth century-picturesque movement in order to temper misgivings towards modernist planning.\(^4\) One
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2. Ibid, p. 284.
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example was Sir William Holford’s 1956 scheme for St Paul’s Cathedral, which made the building a focal point in the surrounding landscape; an approach consistent with the ‘townscape’ concept publicised by the AR in a series of articles from the late 1940s and into the 1950s (Fig. 4.01).5

![Model of William Holford’s scheme for St Paul’s Cathedral (1956)](source: The Town Planning Review, July 1956, plate 5.)

More often than not, however, the widespread enthusiasm for modernisation and urban change within planning authorities meant that many historic urban churches were viewed unfavourably compared with the newly-erected modern churches. Bereft of congregations due to population migration, many faced demolition. However, by the late 1960s, economic difficulties combined with rising inflation saw programmes of modernisation falter.7 Planned housing and infrastructure projects were held back, whilst conflict with trade unions brought about industrial

7 Hopkins, p. 99; Wannop, p. 154.
unrest and strike action.⁸ As the economic crisis grew, the conservation movement’s calls for retaining historic buildings grew stronger; shifting the focus from new build to rehabilitation. Arguably, the advent of ‘community architecture’, an architectural phenomenon of the post-1945 period, was premised on this new-found desire for making good old buildings.

Community Architecture

Given the economic difficulties of the 1960s, the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (MoH) began to consider alternatives to the comprehensive redevelopment schemes prepared by modernist planners.⁹ Its findings were published in The Deeplish Study in 1966.¹⁰ This pilot study considered how to deal with older residential properties in Deeplish, Rochdale, which did not meet the criteria for slum clearance, but also did not ‘give the same impression of progress and improvement’ as the new housing being erected.¹¹ Its authors attempted ‘to get away from the old, over-simplified assumptions about what is and what is not unfit for habitation ... [and to] assess the situation in human as well as physical terms’.¹² This required consideration of ‘the whole neighbourhood and its setting, [whilst] seeking to find out what the people who live there like and dislike about it’.¹³ In the survey that followed, most residents cited proximity to the town centre and other local amenities as the most commendable features of the existing neighbourhood.¹⁴ Only around 10 per cent were ‘dissatisfied’ with their surroundings.¹⁵ Acknowledging that Deeplish was unlikely to be redeveloped at any point in the next twenty years, the study concluded that limited improvements should be carried out instead. Crucially, this was to be done in consultation with local residents.¹⁶

In 1968, as the rehabilitation or ‘improvement’ of existing housing stocks started to be favoured over comprehensive redevelopment, a government White Paper recommended that funds be made available to support such initiatives. This policy was later enshrined in the 1969 Housing Act, and schemes receiving financial aid were known as General Improvement Areas
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⁹ Harwood and Powers, p. 11.
¹⁰ Ministry of Housing and Local Government.
¹² Ibid, p. v.
¹³ Ibid.
¹⁴ Ibid, p. 27.
¹⁵ Ibid.
¹⁶ Ibid, p. 72.
Concurrent with the introduction of the 1968 White Paper, a government committee chaired by Lord Skeffington was set up to consider how the public might become more involved in the creation of local development plans. This was, in part, a response to the belief that the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act had created a system which excluded the participation of affected communities. However, when the findings of the Skeffington Committee were published in 1969, it failed to define to what extent the public should be allowed to participate, and who exactly should be consulted. Nonetheless, projects such as the Shelter Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP) in Granby (1969-72) and the redevelopment of Byker Estate, Newcastle (1969-1982) by the architects Ralph Erskine and Vernon Gracie had allowed for some degree of public involvement (Fig. 4.02).
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Fig. 4.02. Ralph Erskine’s Office: consulting user-groups at Byker
[Source: Copyright of Bengt Ahlqvist. Available at: kulturpunkt.org.]
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18 The Skeffington Committee.
19 The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act was amended in 1968 to give local amenity groups a consultancy role in matters of proposed redevelopment.
In both cases, the architects were embedded within the community for which they were designing, enabling residents to drop in and voice their opinions as they wished. To what extent the architect was able to act in response to the views of residents, given financial and client constraints, is questionable, but this change in relationship between architect and user became a defining characteristic of ‘the community architect’.22

In 1974, in recognition of a failure within the architectural profession to embrace the collaborative environment promised by the Skeffington Report, the architect and planner Brian Anson led a group of students at the AA in an attempt to bridge the divide with the general public. Together they formed the Architects’ Revolutionary Council (ARC) in the belief that ‘creative architecture should be available to all people in society, regardless of their economic circumstances’.23 According to the ARC, the RIBA was guilty of imposing ‘middle-class values on a [working class] culture entirely different and worlds apart from their own’.24 Conversely, just as the architectural establishment was coming under attack from the ARC, one architect was about to bring to completion England’s first GIA scheme since the policy was introduced in 1969. Following a campaign by Rod Hackney and the Black Road Area Action Group, thirty-four workers’ cottages in Macclesfield, previously earmarked for demolition by the local authority, were saved and residents were offered grants to carry out upgrades to their properties (Fig. 4.03 and 4.04).25 At Swinbrook Road, London, too, community participation in planning matters was taken seriously. Community involvement was becoming frequent enough to draw attention, although not always welcomed, as noted in one contemporary trade journal: ‘Participation in the planning process has become almost a shibboleth, a ritual to which every local authority seems obliged to indulge’.26 Whilst such developments may appear unrelated to historic places of worship, the increasing focus of architects and planners upon community, at this time, chimed with the more socially-engaged stance adopted by the Church of England (see Chapter Two). The provision of secular accommodation within church buildings, both old and new, has been discussed in previous chapters from a socio-religious viewpoint, but it has not been investigated within the context of the community architecture movement in Britain.

Fig. 4.03. Black Road, Macclesfield (1969): before improvement

[Source: Ekistics, March-April, 1981, p. 115]

Fig. 4.04. Black Road, Macclesfield (1969): after improvement

[Source: Ekistics, March-April, 1981, p. 115]
New Churches for the Community

As discussed in Chapter Two, church architecture in Britain after the Second World War underwent something akin to a revolution; albeit belatedly by comparison with mainland Europe. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the clamour for liturgical change affected all of the main Christian faiths; ‘most vocally in the Church of England, most profoundly in the Catholic Church, and with some of its effects imparted also to the [nonconformists]’. It was through the endeavours of the New Churches Research Group (NCRG), an inter-denominational group founded in 1957 to study the relationship between the liturgy and built form, that the new liturgical thinking was given architectural expression. Influenced by the work of the Swiss architect Rainer Senn, the NCRG’s focus on liturgical matters meant that they afforded less attention to the wider benefit that church buildings could offer communities. The architect and Methodist Edward Mills, however, had begun to explore such benefits as early as 1945 with his unbuilt ‘all purpose community church’ for Morden, Surrey. Restaurant, library, and clubroom combined with religious space in what might be considered an early example of a church centre (Figs. 4.05 – 4.07).

Fig. 4.05. Model of Proposed Church, Morden (1948) by Edward Mills
[Source: The Architects’ Journal, 1 April 1948]

29 For more on Rainer Senn see: anon, ‘The Churches of Rainer Senn’, Architects’ Journal, 28th April 1960, 646–51. The influence of Senn is evident in several church designs by Maguire and Murray.
Fig. 4.06. Ground Floor Plan of Proposed Church, Morden (1948) by Edward Mills

[Source: The Architects’ Journal, 1 April 1948]

Fig. 4.07. Proposed Upper Floor Plans of Proposed Church, Morden, Surrey (1948) by Edward Mills

[Source: The Architects’ Journal, 1 April 1948]
Although Mills’ more functional, community-orientated approach was dismissed by the NCRG for being ‘concerned far more with the exclusion of draughts and the provision of spaces for umbrellas and overcoats than with the relationship between word and sacrament’, it had its supporters; namely that other significant voice of the 1960s liturgical movement, the Birmingham Institute established by the clerics John Gordon Davies and Gilbert Cope in 1961 (see Chapter Two).32 Thus, the tension between the liturgical arrangements and community provision can be observed even in this period of innovation in church design. Whilst Mills’ proposed church for Morden was, perhaps, only identifiable as a place of worship owing to the campanile, both camps faced the challenge of defining a new aesthetic for church buildings. Yet the liturgically-focused position adopted by the NCRG has, arguably, underpinned a reticence towards– or denigration even – of community-orientated ecclesiastic architecture to date.

In 1964, the Birmingham Institute was invited by the Reverend Dennis Ede to help develop plans for a new church on the Hodge Hill estate in the Anglican Diocese of Birmingham.33 A dual-purpose church initially erected to serve the estate was, according to Ede, ‘alien’ to the existing ‘worship conscious’ congregation.34 Nonetheless, local church policy was one of outreach to the wider community: ‘However we alter and mangle Evensong, it seldom pleases the congregation. Perhaps a growth in worship will take place through house groups to which young people should be invited’, Ede mused.35 Advice was sought as to how community facilities might be incorporated into the new church, prompting the establishment by the Institute of two Research Fellowships. Lasting between 1964 and 1967, these positions were taken up by Martin Purdy and Peter Bridges, and supervised by the lecturer and architect Denys Hinton.36 Purdy and Bridges proposed a multi-purpose church whereby a centrally-located lounge area offered access to the other functions housed within. These included a games hall, coffee bar, and congregational space; the latter of which could be put to various uses throughout the week, with the altar and lectern covered by dust sheets and a set of sliding doors opening to reveal a stage and playroom. The aim was one of inclusivity for groups of all ages. A stark change for the Church which, in

34 Gilman, p. 312.
36 See: ‘Martin Purdy Obituary’. Available online at <http://www.apec.ac/martin-purdy-obituary/> [accessed 10/01/17]. Hinton himself was noted for St George, Rugby (1962), a church he designed in consultation with its local community.
preceding decades, whereby provision for children, for example, centred upon the religious education offered at Sunday School (Figs. 4.08 and 4.09).37

Fig. 4.08. Plan View of Ss Philip and James (1968) by Martin Purdy and Peter Bridges

Fig. 4.09. Interior View of Ss Philip and James (1968) by Martin Purdy and Peter Bridges

37 The decline of the Sunday School in England is discussed: Naomi Thompson, Young People and Church Since 1900: Engagement and Exclusion (Routledge, 2017), pp. 39–50.
The new church at Hodge Hill was opened on 5 October 1968 by Dr John Leonard Wilson, Bishop of Birmingham, and dedicated to Ss Philip and James. Subsequently promoted by the Institute through its own publications, and that of the wider architectural press, the experimental church was widely regarded as a success. The architect Nigel Melhuish described the church as: ‘humming with activity: women and children were having tea in the Games Room, tables were being laid in the lounge and people were playing table tennis on the stage’. Indeed, other faith groups learned from Hodge Hill in planning their own buildings; St Thomas More Roman Catholic Church in Sheffield (1969), designed by Anthony Tranmer of John Rochford and Partners, for example. After setting up practice in the early seventies, Purdy and Bridges also designed The Ecumenical Centre, Skelmersdale (1973) and Ormskirk Street United Reformed Church, St Helens (1976) (Figs. 4.10 and 4.11). The work of the Institute influenced not only the design of new churches, but also prompted wider consideration of the future use of historic churches too.

39 Melhuish.
40 Proctor, p. 302.
Fig. 4.10. Exterior View of The Ecumenical Centre, Skelmersdale (1973) by Martin Purdy and Peter Bridges
[Source: Courtesy of picturenewtown.org.]

Fig. 4.11. Exterior View of Ormskirk Street United Reform Church, St Helens (1976) by Martin Purdy and Peter Bridges
[Source: Courtesy of APEC Architects.]
Historic Churches for the Community

In 1970, the Institute published an article in its Research Bulletin in which Hinton questioned contemporary attitudes of the architectural profession towards historic churches.\textsuperscript{42} According to Hinton, the main concerns for architects working on such buildings were typically the maintenance of an existing fabric, or making practical improvements such as adding heating and lighting systems. However, Hinton suggested, architects should be ‘exercising not only their knowledge of building construction, but ... using their imagination about the prospect of future change’.\textsuperscript{43} He continued: ‘The time has passed when the care of church buildings can be left to so-called specialists who ... adhere to the view that the sacred is so different from the secular’.\textsuperscript{44} Rather than maintaining historic churches for secular usage only, the sub-division of their interiors into smaller compartments would offer the potential for a ‘diversity of [secular] activity ... [and reduce] the problems of heating and of acoustics’.\textsuperscript{45} In what could be read as a thinly-veiled criticism of the conservationist movement and listing inspectors, and reflecting the user-orientated views of many architects of the period, Hinton concluded that this was ‘a way of producing useful space at low cost, using existing buildings as an investment ... relieving us of the anxiety of retaining buildings just for their appearance or historic associations’.\textsuperscript{46} Taking Hinton’s lead, this raises the following question: should sacred and secular buildings be treated differently by architects if their shared purpose is to serve the community?

Hinton’s ideas were more fully explored by the architect Kenneth H. Murta in a subsequent edition of the Institute’s Research Bulletin. Murta suggested that there had ‘been a movement [away] from the concept of the church as an altar-centred worship room, to a building serving the pastoral needs of a Christian Community’.\textsuperscript{47} Thus, whereas mission settlements were regarded as novel in the late-nineteenth century and, even, in the interwar years, such an approach would become, for Murta, the norm in future. The success of the Hodge Hill experiment had demonstrated the need for churches to make secular provisions, and it was expected that its influence would be ‘found in the design of new [churches], probably associated with new housing developments’.\textsuperscript{48} Furthermore, according to Murta, to not make similar provisions in parishes

\textsuperscript{43} Hinton, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
with historic churches would ‘reveal an intolerable weakness in any strategic development of these ideas in the church as a whole’.

In inner city areas, historic churches had been facing the prospect of redundancy as former congregations took up residence on new housing estates in the suburbs. However, the passing of the 1968 Town Planning Act and the 1969 Housing Act provided the impetus to improve older housing not yet subject to slum clearance. This was an initiative brought about owing to the economic difficulties of the 1960s, and underpinned by the findings of *The Deeplish Study* published by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (MoH) in 1966. Murta saw this as an opportunity for the religious groups to be part of a ‘regenerative process’ by contributing to the social infrastructure of inner-city areas. Close to the recently constructed Park Hill estate, Sheffield, for example, Murta collaborated with the architect Jim Hall on a scheme which aimed to provide ‘pastoral advantage’ to the Grade II listed Anglican church of St John the Evangelist (1838). This was achieved through the partial subdivision of the nave, rooms for use ‘in connection with children’s work’ were created, whilst a substantive side extension, accommodating two separate halls, offered further community benefit (Figs. 4.12 and 4.13).
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50 Ministry of Housing and Local Government.
51 Murta, p. 4.
52 Ibid, pp. 6–8.
53 Ibid. Further subdivision of the nave was not possible due to the size of the congregation; hence the creation of a side extension. See The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of St John The Evangelist’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1246708. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1246708> [accessed 29/04/18]
Fig. 4.12. Plan View of St John the Evangelist, Park Hill, Sheffield (1971)  
by Ken Murta and Jim Hall  
[Source: Research Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of Worship and Religious Architecture, 1971, pp.3-10, Fig. 3]

Fig. 4.13. Exterior View of St John the Evangelist, Park Hill, Sheffield (1971)  
by Ken Murta and Jim Hall  
[Source: Copyright of Picture Sheffield, Sheffield City Council. Ref: s35727]
Another example provided by Murta stemmed from the reorganisation, in 1970, of the Grade II* Anglican church of St Mary, Bramall Lane, Sheffield (1830), which was overseen by the architect Stephen Welsh. The formation of a new entrance on the north side of the church allowed for the subdivision of the nave at ground floor level to provide a kitchen, office, hall and stage, and separate worship area. Further rooms provided at first floor level meant that the church could be used by several groups on different days, and for a variety of uses (Fig.4.14).

![Fig. 4.14. Plan View of St Mary, Bramall Lane, Sheffield (1970)
By Stephen Welsh
(Source: Research Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of Worship and Religious Architecture, 1971, pp. 3-10, Fig. 7)](image_url)
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Meanwhile, new uses were also being found for abandoned historic churches: for example, St Andrew, Chichester, a Grade II* listed medieval church was deconsecrated and reopened as an Arts Centre in 1976 having stood empty since suffering bomb damage during the War.\(^{55}\) Such initiatives followed the 1968 Pastoral Measure, whereby the Church of England, aided by the Redundant Churches Fund set up in 1969, was obliged to seek alternative uses for its abandoned churches (see Chapter Two).\(^{56}\) Public awareness of the plight of historic churches – with many facing redundancy and demolition – was heightened by the exhibition Change and Decay: The Future of Our Churches, which was held at the Victoria & Albert Museum in London in 1977, and a book published under the same name.\(^{57}\)

**Consolidating Community Architecture**

In an attempt to establish broader support from within the architectural profession, the ARC organised a conference in 1975 from which a new group, known as the New Architecture Movement (NAM), emerged and quickly attracted a membership of over one hundred architects; many of whom wished to remain anonymous given their desire, opposed by the RIBA, to unionise the profession.\(^{58}\) Although broadly in agreement with the ARC’s aim of making architecture, and architects, more accessible to the wider public, the NAM also criticised the practice of designing buildings without properly consulting the intended user.\(^{59}\) The activities of both groups were soon being widely reported in the architectural press with, for example, an alternative proposal to the comprehensive redevelopment of Ealing town centre put forward by the ARC.\(^{60}\) Stung by the growing popularity and criticisms of these oppositional groups, the RIBA responded in 1976 by setting up the Community Architecture Working Group, later known as the Community Architecture Group (CAG), to discuss the merits of public participation in design.\(^{61}\) Answerable to a separate committee led by Hackney, the establishment of the CAG marked the beginning of the
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\(^{59}\) Awan, Schneider, and Till, p. 177. See also: anon, ‘Dissident Architects’ New Movement.’, Building, 28th November 1975, p. 33.


\(^{61}\) Jenkins and Forsyth, p. 31.
assimilation of community architecture, and the community architect, into the mainstream of the architectural profession.\textsuperscript{62} When the findings of a sub-group of CAG were published just over a year later, alongside recommendations for raising an awareness of community architecture amongst the general public, there was a call for changes to the way in which architects were trained. If, as was anticipated, the demand for community architecture continued to grow, it was suggested that the training of architects should provide ‘a more thorough knowledge of building law’, and that students be involved in live projects to experience first-hand the difficulties that could arise when working with communities.\textsuperscript{63} From 1979 onwards, facilities such as Manchester’s Community Technical Aid Centre (CTAC) and Liverpool’s Community Technical Services Agency (COMTECHSA) were established to offer community groups free guidance on planning matters.\textsuperscript{64} In addition, monetary support for communities seeking professional services came from the RIBA’s Architectural Aid Fund, set up in 1982 and financed by the Department of Environment (DoE) Special Grants Programme.\textsuperscript{65} It was during this period that the RIBA oversaw an architectural competition, held in 1980, for the redesign of the Grade II listed Anglican church of St Columba, Southwick to encourage wider community use.\textsuperscript{66} The winning entry by Napper Collerton Partnership, though never implemented, proposed the insertion of a mezzanine to create two levels of secular space with the existing building (Fig. 4.15).

\textsuperscript{64} Towers, Building Democracy: Community Architecture in the Inner Cities, p. 113.
Meanwhile the Design Co-operative, a collective set up in 1982 specifically to undertake projects on behalf of local communities, converted Birchcliffe Baptist Chapel, Hebden Bridge, for community use after the building was saved by the Pennine Heritage Trust from demolition. Similarly, COMTECHSA worked with the Hindu Cultural Organisation in converting a historic former Welsh Presbyterian church in Liverpool, a scheme which incorporated a community hall. With community architecture now receiving the tentative backing of both government and the RIBA, some architects resisted, believing it to be ‘demeaning work, which they were not trained for’. Such sentiments, however, were soon subsumed by the furore which followed Prince Charles’ address to the RIBA in May 1984. At a banquet organised to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the RIBA’s founding, the Prince criticised modern architecture, particularly the then-proposed extension to National Gallery by Ahrends Burton Koralek - ‘a monstrous carbuncle’ - and gave his backing to the community-orientated approach of Hackney and other architects, including Edward Cullinan. Although principles of community engagement were later adopted by Cullinan in his rebuilding and reordering of the Grade-II* listed church of St Mary, Barnes (see
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Chapter Six), he did not consider himself to be a community architect; or, for that matter, a Romantic Pragmatist as the writer and major advocate of community architecture Charles Knevitt claimed. Indeed, Cullinan commented, ‘I am happy for historians to connect me, by umbilical cord, to the past, but I am much more aware of being taught by Peter Smithson, working for Sir Denys Lasdun and therefore being greatly influenced by Berthold Lubetkin’; all architects who believed in the socially-transformative powers of modernist architecture.

The impact of the Prince’s speech was twofold, however. Firstly, it strengthened the hand of community architecture’s advocates within the RIBA and secondly, it placed community architecture firmly in the national spotlight. In 1985, a report by the Commission on Urban Priority Areas, titled Faith in the City: A Call for Action by Church and Nation was published. Chaired by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Runcie, the report highlighted the decentralization of new industries and rising unemployment in former manufacturing industries as key factors in the decay of Britain’s industrial cities; growing economic disparity, it warned, could split the nation in two. With similar fears of a ‘divided Britain’ being attributed to Prince Charles in the national press later that year, interest in community architecture came to the fore once again. A private meeting between the Prince and Hackney was arranged to discuss whether community architecture could help alleviate the problem of inner city deprivation; much to the chagrin of the RIBA who felt marginalised from the debate. The RIBA’s president, Larry Roland, subsequently refused to support Hackney’s candidacy to head the International Union of Architects, opening up a rupture within the organisation and prompting Hackney, with the support of his CAG colleagues, to bid for the presidency of the RIBA instead. Evidence of Hackney’s growing influence came with the ‘international’ conference on community architecture he presided over in November 1986, which attracted over 1,000 delegates as senior government
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71 Charles Knevitt, ‘Popular Acclaim For The New Vernacular’, The Times, 18 May 1984, p. 31. The term ‘Romantic Pragmatist’ referred to an exhibition curated by Gillian Darley and Peter Davey whereby the term was defined as ‘a pragmatic meeting of Modernism and the picturesque’.
76 Hill, p. 67.
ministers joined Prince Charles in addressing the gathered audience. Unsurprisingly, in 1987, Hackney was successfully elected as the RIBA president and, for those advocating community architecture, there were grounds for optimism.

Concurrent with Hackney’s ascendency to power was the re-election of the Conservative Party in June 1987. In her victory speech, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was resolute in her intention to tackle the problems of inner-city deprivation, as previously highlighted by the Archbishop of Canterbury’s Commission and brought to wider attention by Hackney and his royal patron. Having dominated contemporary debate within the architectural profession, it appeared that community architecture was well-placed to influence the political sphere and, perhaps, help shape future national policy. For example, since Michael Heseltine was appointed Secretary of State for the Environment in 1979, there had been purposeful moves away from the provision of state housing; the 1980 Housing Act, for example, gave existing tenants the ‘Right to Buy’ their council property in order to encourage in people ‘a personal desire to improve and modernise one’s own home’. This chimed with the objectives of community architecture. However, as was noted in the Architectural Review ahead of the Conservative’s recent re-election: ‘The Thatcher Government ... has pursued one consistent social and political policy since its election in 1979: privatisation’. The suggestion was that government’s withdrawal from ‘large areas of public policy’ would allow the private sector to take over, with profit being the driving motivator. Indeed community architecture, with its do-it-yourself ethos, faced accusations that it ‘represented a triumph of Thatcherism’. The mechanisms introduced by Thatcher’s government to alleviate economic disparity across the regions, including Urban Development Corporations and Enterprise Zones, had failed to address the problem of inner-city deprivation. Thus, Hackney’s presidency of the RIBA did not usher in the golden age of community architecture expected, and by 1989 Hackney’s successor as president of the RIBA, Maxwell Hutchison, was able to declare,
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82 Ibid.
'Community architecture is dead; long live architecture': an assertion that, in Hutchinson’s view at least, suggested community always had been a consideration of the architectural profession.84

Towards the end of the 1980s, as community architecture faded in popularity, it faced accusations of having been nothing more than ‘a PR exercise masquerading as a crusade’.85 Coming to prominence in the wake of the modern movement’s retreat, and having contributed to a renewed appreciation of, or nostalgia for, vernacular architecture, community architecture’s legacy could be described as a mere footnote in the history of the conservation movement or, more fancifully, a portent of post-modernism in Britain. However, such criticisms ignore its influence on architectural practice, if not stylistics, and the very real concerns for community welfare which lay behind the movement’s initial popularity; albeit the ‘community’ it sought to benefit was an ill-defined one.86 Its legacy, therefore, lies in the wider questions posed to social scientists and, indeed, architects in the ensuing years, such as how to identify different member groups, or stakeholders within a given community, and how to establish what priority each should be ascribed in the design process.87 More commonly referred to as ‘participatory design’ today, community architecture did not disappear; rather, it was absorbed into the everyday practices of the architectural profession. For example, in 1997, following on from a 1994 DoE report on the effectiveness of community involvement in planning and development, the CAG announced that a number of local authorities had signed up to its ‘Percentage for Participation’ scheme - an initiative launched, in 1995, to provide clear guidance, and confidence, to community groups engaging with professionals on participatory design processes.88 Furthermore, in recent years the 2011 Localism Act was introduced with the aim of reducing government control and empowering ‘those who know most about their neighbourhood – the people themselves’.89 In response to the Act, the RIBA published further guidance documents outlining how it anticipated the role of the architect would change in the coming years, and how architects could better assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood plans.90 Similarly, with respect to church buildings, the legacy of community architecture and other participatory approaches is, perhaps, evidenced by

85 Quoted in: Hutchinson, p. 145.
86 Hill, p. 63; Malcolm Miles, p. 155.
87 See, for example, Henry Sanoff, Participatory Design: Theory & Techniques (Henry Sanoff, 1990).
the setting up of Ecclesiastical Property Solutions; an initiative run by the Reverend Andrew Mottram between 2004 and 2010 to help church owners and users plan strategically for their futures. Further, since 2007 ChurchCare, the online resource of the Church of England’s Cathedral and Church Buildings Division, has offered guidance on the preparation of ‘Statements of Significance and Need’ for those managing and looking to adapt church buildings in order to help ‘inform decisions and identify areas of conflict’.\textsuperscript{91} In turn, this presents a challenge to the architectural profession which requires a sharing of knowledge between conservation architects, who appreciate historical significance, and those architects with community-focused or participatory design skills; two strands of practice, hitherto, seen as separate. As such, formative accounts of the crossover between community architecture and other participatory design practices in relation to the adaptation and conservation of historic churches are lacking in the academic literature. The following chapters address this omission through detailed case studies.

\textsuperscript{91} Available online at: \langle www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/guidance-advice\rangle [accessed 20\textsuperscript{th} June 2016].
Chapter Five: St Matthew, Brixton - Redundancy or Reordering

This chapter considers the case of St Matthew, Brixton, a Grade II* listed Anglican church which was dramatically re-ordered between 1976 and 1983, in order to provide an insight into the relationship between community architecture and historic places of worship. In this instance, the architect played a prominent role in directing events and, in doing so, determining the needs of the wider community in Brixton. Thus, whilst St Matthew is an example of an architectural engagement with a historic place of worship that is community-focused, the extent to which the design process was fully participatory is questioned. In the following account, factors in the history and development of St Matthew are explored.

It seems quite wrong that a comparatively small number of dedicated people should have the responsibility of maintaining this large building.¹

These were the words of Reverend Norman Hill, rector (1962-67) following an act of vandalism on the Grade II* listed Greek Revival church of St Matthew, Brixton, in 1966. Underused since its opening, the future of this historic church, erected between 1821 and 1824 to celebrate victory at the Battle of Waterloo, appeared somewhat bleak by the 1960s.² Frustrated by both a dwindling congregation and shortage of finance, Hill even advocated that the church be closed and torn down. However, its listed status bestowed in 1951, meant that this was an unlikely outcome.³ Alternatively, opening up the church to Brixton’s wider community, as had first happened in 1965 when The Mount Carmel Pentecostal Church, a West Indian Christian sect, was permitted to meet in the crypt of St Matthew, hinted at a viable solution to Hill’s woes though not considered at the time.⁴

¹ See ‘St Matthew’s, Brixton: Our Church History’. Available online at: <www.stmatthewsbrixton.org/our-church-history/> [accesses 20/10/17]
³ The ‘Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest’, which gave St Matthew its Grade II* status, was an initiative introduced under the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 to protect historic buildings.

An agreement was reached in 1977 for the New Testament Church of God to lease the redundant Church of St Saviour in Brixton from the Anglicans. See: The National Archives (hereafter TNA): ‘Saint Saviour, Brixton Hill: Lambert Road, Lambeth’, Ref: P85/SAV 1
St Matthew and Brixton

The church of St Matthew (1821-24) was designed by the architect Charles Ferdinand Porden.\(^5\) With a seating capacity of 1,926, building a church of such magnitude was indicative of Brixton’s transformation from a rural village to a burgeoning suburb of London’s historic core by the early part of the nineteenth century.\(^6\) The 1806 Rush Common Act, an enclosure act which allowed common land to be split up and sold into private ownership, saw ribbon development take place along the Brixton Road from London; a process which was accelerated with the opening of Samuel Bentham and James Walker’s Vauxhall Bridge over the River Thames in 1816.\(^7\) Concomitant with such development was the building of churches, chapels, and meeting houses as nonconformist denominations competed for worshippers amongst the new suburban population.\(^8\) In the London Borough of Lambeth, new nonconformist places of worship included Chapel Road Congregational Church, West Norwood (1821); Elm Park Methodist Chapel, Brixton (1824, rebuilt 1857); and Trinity Congregational Church, Brixton (1828). Ensuring the Church of England’s presence in Lambeth was a task which fell to The Church Building Commission.

Established under the 1818 Church Building Act, and financed by Parliament, the Church Building Commission set out to increase the number of Anglican churches across England, particularly in the expanding cities; a move, it was hoped, that would help the Church of England reassert its primacy over the nonconformists.\(^9\) In Lambeth, for example, the Commission provided £64,000 for the erection of four churches; partly to satisfy its own objectives, but also to commemorate victory at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815.\(^10\) The ‘Waterloo’ churches, as they became known, were St Mark, Kennington (1822-1824) designed by David Riddall Roper, St John, Lambeth (1822-24) and St Luke, West Norwood (1822-1825), both by Francis Octavius Bedford, and Porden’s St Matthew.\(^11\) Built at a cost of just over £15,000, externally St Matthew shared several similar characteristics with its fellow Waterloo churches; all four being rectilinear Greek revival temples of brick or stone, of traditional liturgical form and, other than St Luke, of
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\(^5\) Sutcliffe, p. 80. See also The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of St Matthew’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1080532. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1080532> [accessed 20/10/17]

\(^6\) London’s expansion into the suburbs, which began as early as the seventeenth century, is more fully described in: Elizabeth McKellar, Landscape of London: The City, the Country and the Suburbs 1660-1840 (London: Yale University Press, 2013), pp. 1–27. Of the 1, 926 seats provided at St Matthew, Brixton, 1,022 were available free of pew rents. See: Thomas Allen, The History and Antiquities of the Parish of Lambeth, and the Archiepiscopal Palace, in the County of Surrey, Including Biographical Sketches (London: J. Nichols, 1826), p. 413.


\(^8\) Bebbington, Dix, and Ruston, p. 2.

\(^9\) Brooks and Saint, p. 166; Snell and Ell, pp. 22 & 88. The 1818 Church Building Act initially provided the Committee with £1 million; a sum extended by a further £500,000 in 1824.


\(^11\) Gilley and Stanley, p. 106.
conventional orientations. One distinguishing feature of St Matthew, however, was the placement of the bell tower, which rose above the east end rather than the porticoed west entrance as was typical (Fig. 5.01).

Fig. 5.01. Exterior View of St Matthew, Brixton (1821-24) by Charles Ferdinand Porden
[Source: Unknown photographer, not dated. Copy held at St Matthew, Brixton.]

Another key difference was the treatment of the portico itself. The closed sides, or antae, at St Matthew’s produced a tetrastyle arrangement which differed from the open hexastyle porticoes of the other Waterloo churches; a difference which drew criticism from some quarters. In 1829, writing in the periodical The Gentleman’s Magazine, the writer Edward John Carlos commented: ‘In approaching the Church by the high road in either direction, the portico is lost, in consequence of the sides being closed ... the best view of the Church is but little seen’.12 Beneath the portico, three large doorways provided access to a vestibule from which, in its original form, stairs on either side led upwards to the galleries on the north, south, and west sides; the organ occupying much of the west gallery.13 Supported by slender columns with the nave, views of the altar and the stained glass window adorning the east wall were mostly unhindered.14 Dedicated on 22 June 1824 by George Pretyman Tomline, Bishop of Winchester (1820-27), attendance records suggest that, despite the growth in the local population, the church was over-sized. A census of religious worship undertaken in Lambeth in March 1851, for example, reported a

13 Allen, p. 411.
14 Ibid.
combined average attendance across three daily services at St Matthew’s of just 1,700 persons. Thus, even in an era of supposed religious piety, St Matthew was rarely more than a third full.

Initially, the increase in Lambeth’s population in the nineteenth century was due to the affluent middle-classes who, looking to escape the impact of industrialisation on the City of London, built their suburban villas along the Brixton Road. By the turn of the twentieth century, this southward drift had produced clear demarcations within the Borough; to the south resided the wealthy, central Lambeth was occupied by ‘artisans and bohemians’, and in the dockland areas to the north were the working classes. Many of those living in the north occupied cramped basement rooms with ‘the only admittance for light and air [being] through a low grating’, but which also permitted rain and dirt from street-level. However, following the Housing Act of 1919, local councils were required to provide new municipal housing, and to do so in accordance with the recommendations of a report prepared by a government committee chaired by the architect and politician, Sir John Tudor Walters; the Tudor Walters Report (1918).

The report embraced the ideals of the garden city movement, and recommended that houses be built at not more than twelve to the acre and on undeveloped land on the outskirts of cities; a prospect made possible through improved public transport. In Lambeth, new housing included: the St Louis Estate, West Norwood (completed 1923); the Holderness Estate, Norwood, (completed 1925); and the Bloomfield Estate near Gypsy Hill (completed 1927). Such endeavours encouraged the working classes to migrate south from the docklands, thus changing the character of Lambeth in the interwar years. However, the bombing of Lambeth during the Second World War, and subsequent Government policy on immigration, had an ever greater impact upon the Borough’s demography in the twentieth century.

In 1949, shortages in the labour market prompted a Royal Commission to report that immigrants should be welcomed in Britain. Coming soon after the passing of the 1948 Nationality Act, which granted Commonwealth subjects full British citizenship, these labour demands were soon being met by migrants from the West Indies and Indian sub-continent. This was the case in Lambeth where an abundance of bomb-damaged houses meant inexpensive accommodation could also be found. Typically, available work was of the semi or unskilled
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18 Sir John Tudor Walters, ‘Report of the Tudor Walters Committee’ (H.M.S.O., 1918).
21 Sanders, p. 30.
24 Sanders, p. 30.
variety, but as the country slowly recovered from the devastation of the Second World War, the need for such labour lessened and high unemployment predominated amongst migrant communities.25 Further, although attempts had initially been made by church organisations to assimilate West Indian Christians, they were not made to feel welcome by existing congregations.26 Consequently, members of the New Testament Church of God (NTCG), the most numerically significant of the West Indian Christian sects in fifties Britain, generally opted to meet in rented secular accommodation.27 In Lambeth, for example, a property on Offley Road, Kennington, served the NTCG from 1961.28 The economic deprivation and social isolation prevalent amongst Britain’s migrant communities would, in time, have serious consequences; notably, in Lambeth. Meanwhile, for existing Christian churches such as St Matthew, Brixton, the effect of a changing demography, and a failure to entice new members, was diminished congregations. Allowing The Mount Carmel Pentecostal Church, an affiliate of the NTCG, to meet in the crypt of St Matthew in 1965 hinted at the building’s potential to serve Brixton’s wider community.29 The appointment to St Matthew of Reverend Robert Nind in March 1970 by the avowedly socialist Bishop of Southwark, Mervyn Stockwood, (1959-80), proved fundamental in fulfilling this promise.

Born in Burford, Oxfordshire, in 1931 to white middle-class parents, Nind attended Balliol College Oxford (1951-54) and Cuddesdon Theological College (1954-56) before accepting an invitation from Reverend Brian Wright, in 1960, to become an assistant curate at the Anglican Church of St Peter in Vere, Jamaica.30 After seven years in Jamaica, Nind returned to England to serve as vicar at St Bartholomew, Battersea. En-route to take up his new position, Nind stopped off in New York where he paid a visit to St Clement Episcopal Church; a former Presbyterian church built in 1872 and designed by Edward D. Lindsey.31 The simple Gothic brick facade, blending innocuously into the streetscape, belied the religious purposes of the building; a forerunner in this regard, perhaps, to the multi-purpose Central Halls erected by the Methodists in Britain in the early twentieth century.32 Under the guidance of Reverend Sidney Lanier, St Clement had operated as a ministry to the theatrical arts since 1962; the central worship space had been cleared to make way for a stage and seating, and a temporary altar was set up amongst the stage-sets for worship each Sunday (Fig. 5.02).33
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26 Panayi, p. 103; Taylor.
28 Discussed in: Selwyn E. Arnold, From Skepticism to Hope (Maitland, FL: Xulon Press, 2010), p. 35.
29 Bridget Walker, p. 6. An agreement was reached in 1977 for the New Testament Church of God to lease the redundant Church of St Saviour in Brixton from the Anglicans. See: The National Archives (hereafter TNA): ‘Saint Saviour, Brixton Hill: Lambert Road, Lambeth’, Ref: PBS/SAV 1
30 Biographical details provided by Reverend Robert Nind in correspondence with the author, 3rd February 2018.
32 See, for example: Angela Connelly, ‘Methodist Central Halls as Public Sacred Space’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Manchester, 2011)
What Nind saw at St Clement affirmed his ‘growing ideas that sacred and secular spaces should not be separated’; the covertly religious nature of the building, perhaps, a factor in making this observation.\(^{34}\) Having seen the ease with which secular and church life co-existed in Jamaica, and inspired by what he had seen in New York, Nind determined to pursue these ideas when later appointed to St Matthew, Brixton; a black population majority area. When, in July 1970, Lambeth’s Parochial Church Council (PCC) ‘passed a resolution not to maintain [St Matthew, Brixton]’, Nind saw an opportunity to open up the church in a similar fashion to St Clement.\(^{35}\) How Nind was to achieve his ambitions for St Matthew came through a chance encounter with Raymond Hall, a recent graduate of the Architectural Association, London.

Raymond Hall studied architecture at the Architectural Association (AA) between 1969 and 1971, before enrolling on the planning course that would eventually lead to him meeting with Nind in Brixton. Whilst at the AA, Hall was tutored by the architects Richard Rogers and Marco Goldschmied. Rogers was himself an AA alumnus, and his approach to design was greatly influenced by Cedric Price, architect and co-author of the seminal magazine article ‘Non-Plan: An Experiment in Freedom’ (1969).\(^{36}\) Reacting to the problems associated with modernist planning, Price et al had called for ‘a plunge into heterogeneity’ whereby people planned for themselves and used indeterminate spaces as they saw fit.\(^{37}\) This went much further than simply involving
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\(^{34}\) Nind, 2018, op. cit.

\(^{35}\) Bridget Walker, pp. 6–7.


members of the public in planning processes, as had been the focus of the Skeffington Committee set up one year previous (see Chapter Four). It was this approach to design that Rogers and Goldschmied would pass on to their students at the AA. In 1970, Hall began working on his final year student project; a conceptual building, square on plan with facilities on three levels, which he named ‘Meeting Place’ (Fig. 5.03).³⁸

A sound insulated room for ‘very noisy activities’ occupied the basement, whilst the ground floor was mostly given over to a double height central meeting space around which other rooms were grouped.³⁹ Flexibility was aided by moveable partitions supported from a gantry, and by storage areas integrated into the perimeter walls: rooms could be either open or closed to the central space, and furniture could be cleared away as desired. Even the flat roof, accessed by either of two internal staircases, was intended to be flexible in use with a garden and play area proposed. The method of construction was, according to Hall, a nod to Rogers’ earlier work as part of Team Four architects: ‘…a steel frame with modular concrete planks as floors, it was to be clad in highly insulated prefabricated panels’ (Fig. 5.04).⁴⁰
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³⁹ Ibid.
⁴⁰ Ibid.
However, more apparent in his design was the influence of the Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris (1971-77), designs for which Rogers and Goldschmied were then finalising in collaboration with the Italian architect Renzo Piano (Fig. 5.05). A clear homage to Price’s unbuilt Fun Palace (1961) (Fig. 5.06), Rogers later remarked of their competition winning design: ‘We want our architecture to be adapted and changed by the people who use it’.41 Such sentiments lay at the heart of Hall’s own design work and, having embarked on a two year planning course in 1971, he began to wonder how such an approach might benefit economically-deprived inner-city areas.42 Of particular interest to Hall was how in somewhere like Brixton, with its transient population, his own version of Price’s Fun Palace might engender a sense of belonging.


Fig. 5.05. Centre Georges Pompidou: competition drawing (1971) by Richards Rogers and Renzo Piano

Fig. 5.06. Fun Palace: interior perspective (1964) by Cedric Price
[Source: Copyright of Cedric Price Archives, Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal. Ref: DR1995:0188:517]
**Brixton’s Meeting Place**

To familiarise himself with Brixton, Hall began spending his spare time in local shops, bars, and cafes, striking up conversations with vendors and customers. Through these interactions he became of aware of the high regard with which Nind was held by the local black community; for example, having become vicar of St Matthew in 1970, Nind had opened up the church crypt for use by local youth groups. Meanwhile, Hall had begun to engage more fully with his own religious beliefs, and established an informal group of architectural students, drawn from colleges and universities around London, who were also Christians. In the early 1960s, a general concern had been expressed by those employed in the arts regarding the compatibility of maintaining their Christian belief with a successful career; Sunday morning worship, for example, was problematic for artists who often performed late into the evening at the weekends. This was, of course, what St Clements, New York, had set to achieve to in 1962. This led the actor Nigel Godwin to establish the Arts Centre Group (ACG), initially located at Hornton Place, Kensington, to enable fellow artists to meet, debate their faith, and pray. Hall’s student group soon became involved with the ACG; an involvement which emboldened Hall to approach Nind with his Meeting Place concept in the autumn of 1972. With Nind already keen to engage with the wider community of Brixton by opening up St Matthew to secular use, Hall’s conceptual design resonated with him. He subsequently invited Hall to a meeting, held in 1973, to discuss the proposals with prominent figures from the local community, including members of Lambeth Borough Council. At the meeting, Hall presented the model of his Meeting Place, and explained the potential benefit such a facility might have in Lambeth (Fig. 5.07). The Meeting Place was described as a flexible building ‘whose overall purpose ... [was] to enable communication, relationships, and belonging by providing a facility that can respond to the activity needs of individuals as well as groups of people’. Although it was nothing more than an idea at this stage, it was agreed that Hall should attempt to apply his ideas to St Matthew, Brixton and prepare plans for further discussion. Accordingly, by 1975, plans had been drawn up to transform the church into a multi-purpose building. It is worth noting that in drawing up the plans with community use in mind, the exact form of plans were derived from Hall’s earlier concept and, in preparing the scheme, all decision-making resided with the architect.
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43 Ibid, p. 77.
44 Ibid.
46 Discussed by Raymond Hall in conversation with the author in Manchester, 4th October 2017.
49 Bridget Walker, p. 6.
Hall’s design, which he referred to as St Matthew’s Meeting Place, was an attempt ‘to combat transience [in Brixton] by providing an environment that [could] respond to change, and enable the building up of positive relationships between people and the place they work and live in’.\(^{50}\) Rather than have specific activities taking place in dedicated areas, his ambition for the building was flexibility. To this end, he identified three categories of space: ‘Category One’ was for large groups engaged in formal worship, exhibitions, conferences, and musical or theatrical performances; ‘Category Two’ was for small and medium groups wishing to meet in a more controlled environment for community forums, legal aid and advocacy planning clinics, or simply for food and drink; and ‘Category Three’ which was aimed primarily at youth groups and was to accommodate activities ‘of a more dynamic and intense nature’ such as discotheques.\(^{51}\) It was proposed that the existing crypt of St Matthew be given over to Category Three uses, with a central drop-in area allowing youths to ‘gather informally without necessarily being committed to activities in other spaces’ (Fig. 5.08).\(^{52}\)

---


\(^{51}\) Ibid, p. 38.

\(^{52}\) Ibid, p. 39.
Additional rooms, accessed from the central drop-in area, were to be of varying size, and accommodate activities such as craft workshops and games; a separate sound insulated zone was proposed for the discotheque.\footnote{Ibid.} Also accessible from the drop-in area was a spiral staircase and lift which, rising up through the whole building, connected the crypt to perhaps the most important element of Hall’s proposal, the ground level ‘Central Meeting Space’ (Fig. 5.09). Alternatively accessed from the main entrance foyer, the Central Meeting Space was intended to function as ‘the very heart and hub, not only of the ground floor, but of the whole building’, providing access not only to the crypt and the upper levels, but also lounge areas for informal meetings and refreshments, and an area dedicated to local community-based organisations providing Category Two services.\footnote{Ibid, pp. 39–40.} However, occupying the ground floor in this manner meant the displacement of worship to the upper levels. Indeed, it was Hall’s intention that worship, as with any other Category One activity, would take place wherever space was available on any given day. The upper levels were comprised of a ‘lower gallery’ and ‘upper gallery’ (Fig. 5.10). The extent to which the worshipping congregation may have objected to the displacement of the worship space is not documented, though given the paucity of attending church-goers it would likely have been minimal in this case. It is worth noting, however, that in another instance tensions might have arisen had the congregation been more actively involved in the preparation of the plans.
Fig. 5.09. St Matthew, Brixton: proposed remodelling of ground floor level by Raymond Hall
[Source: Research Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of Worship and Religious Architecture, 1976, pp. 37-44. Fig. 7]

Fig. 5.10. St Matthew, Brixton: section showing proposed galleries by Raymond Hall
[Source: Research Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of Worship and Religious Architecture, 1976, pp. 37-44. Fig. 4]
The lower gallery spanned the entire ground floor area, with balconies overlooking the Central Meeting Space. Light wells along the north and south walls provided natural lighting to partially double-height lounge areas beneath, and to the east end of the church one could access a 200-seater amphitheatre intended for ‘recitals, lectures, drama productions, liturgical celebrations, and other forms of worship’. The ‘upper gallery’ was mostly taken up by a large hall with a stage area, though one could also access the amphitheatre from here: linking the upper and lower galleries via the amphitheatre offered the potential for larger functions to be accommodated if needed. Consequently, if Hall’s plans for St Matthew’s Meeting Place were realised, the building would serve not only the existing congregation but also youth and community groups in and around Lambeth and, potentially, attract users from outside the Borough. Widening the potential for use in this manner made commercial sense, and arguably would have made the project more financially viable long-term. Assuming permission to make the substantive alterations to the church was granted by the local church authorities, funds to carry out the works had to be sourced. Once identified, however, such funding carried stipulations on community-use which, as we will see, mitigated any potential commercial gain.

St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Phase One

The first obstacle to realising Hall’s Meeting Place in Brixton was obtaining permission to make the proposed changes at St Matthew’s from Southwark’s Diocesan Advisory Committee (DAC), the local church authority. Each Diocese within the Anglican Church maintains such a committee, typically comprised of clergy, architects and conservation experts, to advise its Chancellor of any proposed works which affect its churches. Such works may only proceed if permission, known as faculty, is granted by the Chancellor. In Brixton, the application for faculty made by Reverend Nind to carry out Hall’s proposals was not met favourably by the DAC, and they recommended to Chancellor Garth Moore that it be should denied. It must be noted that whilst the use of new Anglican churches for secular purposes was increasingly common, as seen at Hodge Hill, traditional attitudes prevailed amongst DACs in relation to existing historic churches in the early 1970s. Furthermore, despite the Grade II* listed status of St Matthew’s, the plight of historic churches had yet to be brought to the fore. Change and Decay: The Future of Our Churches, the exhibition held by the Victoria and Albert Museum in London did not take place until 1977, for example (see Chapter Four). Thus, it was due to the lack of attention given to this at-risk building type that one can begin to understand how such irreversible changes to a historic church were possible.

Invoking an archaic ecclesiastic rule, Reverend Nind wrote ‘to crave the Bishop’s judgement’ on the proposals, in effect bypassing Chancellor Moore. In this instance, the Bishop was Mervyn Stockwood; the man who had appointed Nind to St Matthew’s, and himself a noted reformer in ecclesiastical matters. In 1959, Stockwood had set up an Ordination Course in Southwark which allowed priests to train for the ministry whilst living amongst the local
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56 For more information, see: anon, Church Extensions and Adaptations, 2nd edn (London: Church House Publishing, 2002), pp. 10–11.
community rather than be sent to theological college. Unsurprisingly, Stockwood was sympathetic to Nind’s efforts to put St Matthew’s at the centre of community life, and approval was given in 1975 to progress with the proposals. Nonetheless, funding remained an issue. The economic difficulties of the 1960s had led to many comprehensive redevelopment plans being postponed or abandoned by local authorities, whilst policies of environmental improvement, particularly in relation to inner-cities areas, were alternately pursued by central government.\(^{58}\) Along with the passing of the 1968 Town Planning Act and the 1969 Housing Act, the Local Government Grants (Social Need) Bill brought forward in December 1968 was intended ‘to deal with the problems of some urban areas of acute social need’.\(^{59}\) Enacted in 1969, ‘every grass-roots community group, self-help group, voluntary organisation, and so on [were encouraged] to submit applications to the urban aid programme funds’.\(^{60}\) Initially, a sum of £25 million was made available covering the period 1968 and 1972, though this was extended by a further £40 million from 1972 to 1976.\(^{61}\) It was through funding provided by the urban aid programme that the transformation of St Matthew’s would finally begin. During a visit to Brixton in February 1975, the-then Home Secretary Roy Jenkins was made aware of the proposals for St Matthew’s when copies of the architect’s plans were ‘surreptitiously’ placed in his jacket pocket by ‘one of the schemes (sic) lobbyists’.\(^{62}\) Jenkins, whose department was responsible for approving urban aid grant applications, is said to have taken a personal interest in the project thereafter, and a grant of £175,000 was subsequently made available.\(^{63}\)

Due to the scale of the proposed alterations to St Matthew’s, and therefore the costs involved, it was decided by the parish council that the works must be phased. The sum provided by the Home Secretary was merely a contribution, albeit a significant one, towards the costs of the first phase; additional funding to meet the overall cost of £217,000 was to come from the Diocese of Southwark and Lambeth Borough Council.\(^{64}\) The first phase of works, which commenced in June 1976, was aimed at bringing the crypt and ground floor of the church into wider use. Walls beneath the vaulted ceiling of the crypt, which had formed a series a family tombs, were removed along with 120 bodies housed within; a new concrete floor was cast 300mm lower than previous to increase the headdrum; and a new entrance was formed on the north side providing access directly from Brixton Town Park (Figs. 5.11 and 5.12).\(^{65}\)
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58 Glendinning, pp. 301–3.
60 Anthony Steen, former Conservative MP, quoted in: HC Deb 04 December 1975 vol. 901 cc2032-64.
61 HC Deb 04 December 1975 vol. 901 cc2032-64.
64 Bridget Walker, p. 6.
65 Raymond Hall, ‘St Matthew’s Meeting Place, Brixton: Phase One’, pp. 67–69.
Fig. 5.11. St Matthew, Brixton: casting the new floor slab in the crypt

[Source: Image from the personal collection of Raymond Hall]

Fig. 5.12. St Matthew, Brixton: new entrance formed providing direct access to crypt

[Source: Author’s own image]
New facilities created in the crypt included the envisaged ‘drop-in area’, male and female toilets, and a kitchen. Meanwhile, at ground-floor level, a lady chapel and vestry were removed along with box pews and side balconies; the existing floor was lifted, exposing the brick vaults beneath; and concrete beams were formed to support a new floor comprised of concrete planks. By removing the structural role of brick vaults in this way, it was also possible to form an octagonal hole through which a spiral staircase would eventually rise (Figs. 5.13 and 5.14). The works were completed in early March 1977 and, once re-opened, the newly renamed St Matthew’s Meeting Place was placed under the administration of a community trust on a ninety-nine year lease from the Church of England.

Fig. 5.13. St Matthew, Brixton: structural alteration to allow installation of spiral stair from crypt
[Source: Image from the personal collection of Raymond Hall]

66 Ibid.
67 Aldous, p. 114.
68 Bridget Walker, p. 6. Retention of the freehold by the Church negated St Matthew being declared redundant, and enabled it to retain its status of Parish Church.
Under the chairmanship of Nind, St Matthew’s Meeting Place Trust was comprised of twelve trustees: three from Lambeth Borough Council; three from the Lambeth Council for Community Relations; three from the Church (one nominated by the Diocese of Southwark and two by Lambeth’s PCC); and, finally, three members put forward by local user groups. Supported by six full staff members, local user groups were also responsible for the everyday running of the building through a Management Committee. Initially, there were sixteen such groups, though within two years of the Meeting Place opening this had risen to twenty eight, with many others unable to be accommodated due to limitations of available space. The success of the first phase of St Matthew’s Meeting Place was documented in a short film commissioned by Thames Television. Titled *Faith In Place: Matt’s Place* (1977), the film was written Murray Watts and directed by Adrian Cooper; both AGC colleagues of Hall. 

---

69 The initial twelve trustees of the St Matthew’s Meeting Place Trust were: Rev Robert Nind, Clyde Mayers, Rev Canon Charles Finder, George Greaves, Antony Rampton, Maurice Styles, Cllr Anthony Bays, Cllr Elizabeth Parcq, Cllr David Stimpson, Alan Piper, Astel Parkinson, and Edward Critchlow.

70 anon, ‘St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Annual Report April 1979 to March 1980’.

71 *Faith In Place: Matt’s Place*. Thames Television (1977). The role of Hall’s connection with the AGC in bringing the film to fruition was discussed in conversation with the author in Manchester, 4th October 2017.
Wandering into a partially converted St Matthew’s, Harold Wilco, a postman played by the actor Joe Gladwin, encounters a series of ghosts from both his and the church’s past including a homeless couple disallowed from entering ‘such a fine place’. A meeting with a mother scolding her child for skipping whilst en-route to church serves to highlight the sombre attitude towards worship prevalent since the Victorian era: ‘Why can’t someone have a caper round on Sunday?’ Wilco asks. The response is provided by the ghost of Reverend John Vaughan, vicar of St Matthew’s (1841-55): ‘the Sabbath day is a snare, a temptation to bowls and skittles in the tea garden, the gin parlour, the football pitch and other such vain amusements’. Unimpressed, Wilco questions how such an authoritarian stance will sit with the diverse community of Brixton’s future. Wilco’s final encounter is with St Matthew’s organist: ‘I played the organ here when this was really a church ... before people like you came along to set up their ridiculous St Matthew’s Meeting Place project ... Everything is being changed ... Anyone can come here’. When Wilco suggested this is ‘marvellous’, the organist retorts: ‘It’s monstrous, you idiot! There’s no telling who’ll start coming to this place’. Pointedly, the film concludes with Wilco, much to the dismay of the organist, throwing open the doors of St Matthew’s to welcome in Brixton’s diverse community; an acknowledgement of the twenty eight groups who had come to use the church in real life (Fig. 5.11). Indeed, despite the initial scepticism that St Matthew’s Meeting Place would succeed in bringing together the people of Brixton, Ted Hollamby, Director of Planning and Development for Lambeth Council, was now convinced of project’s community value.72 How beneficial the increased usage was to the Trust was another matter: providing community space for people with acute social need did not generate any significant income. Nonetheless, discussions regarding a more ambitious second phase of works began.

Fig. 5.15. Opening the doors of St Matthew’s Meeting Place to Brixton’s community

[Source: Movie still from Faith In Place (Thames Television, 1977) directed by Adrian Cooper]
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72 Scott, p. 11.
St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Phase Two

By the time the second phase of works at St Matthew’s Meeting Place came under discussion, the urban aid programme which had helped fund the first phase of works, had ended. In its place, a series of ‘Partnerships’ between local and central government were established under the White Paper, Policy for the Inner Cities (1977).73 Partnerships were set up in Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester and Salford, Newcastle and Gateshead, London’s Docklands, Hackney and Islington, and Lambeth. It was through the Inner City Partnership (ICP) and its budget of £125 million per annum that capital expenditure for projects such as St Matthew’s Meeting Place would, in the future, come.74 Running costs at this time for St Matthew’s were also largely met by grants from the ICP, albeit around ten per cent of overheads were met though renting space to user groups. Other costs, such as the wages of a community liaison officer, were paid for through donors including the British Council of Churches, the Northmoor Trust, and Christian Action.75 Despite the apparent reliance on external funding, and the demands of serving the poorest part of the community, St Matthew’s Meeting Place Trust remained committed to its ambitious second phase plans: ‘there remains a demand from community groups for a place to meet; a demand which St Matthew’s Meeting Place in its current half-completed state is not able to satisfy’.76 Drama had become an important activity at the Meeting Place, with the Brixton Art Theatre, one of the building’s users, staging two productions during the Brixton Art Festival in Sept 1979.77 Likewise the youth club, which met three times a week, had also grown in importance owing to the alleged harassment of young West Indians by the local police Special Patrol Group (SPG).78 As commented upon by St Matthew’s community liaison officer, a Jamaican named Amstel Parkinson who also ran the youth club: ‘When the SPG is in Brixton ... the kids rush home at 8’oclock. They’re safe at home and they’re safe here, but on the streets they’re totally exposed ... I’m trying to teach the kids not to be hostile if they get stopped. I want them to say “I’ve come from St Matthew’s, go check”’.79

Despite £100,000 being committed by the ICP for the future development of St Matthew’s Meeting Place, it was estimated that a sum of around £650,000 was needed to complete the next phase of building which included a 300-seater amphitheatre, an upper-level meeting hall, and the extension of the stair and lift core.80 Again, although a need for facilities had been identified, the scale of the proposals were determined by the Trust and the designs developed by the architect on behalf of the community without consultation. Owing to the substantial costs in implementing the scheme, the works were undertaken incrementally as and when funding was made available.81 In the short term, the aim of the Trust was to commence with the basic structure of the amphitheatre and bring into use a ground floor area which ‘in its present state, cannot be heated’ and was ‘virtually unusable throughout the winter months by all
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75 Bridget Walker, p. 6.
76 anon, ’St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Annual Report April 1979 to March 1980’.
77 Ibid.
79 Malcolm, p. 56.
80 Aldous, p. 116.
81 Ibid.
except the most hardy and energetic’. In practice, however, the redevelopment of the building continued in ‘fits and starts’ owing to ‘uncertainty over the Inner City Partnership, inflation in the building industry, and limited resources’. Worse still, although the £149,500 committed by the ICP committed was enough to cover ‘one quarter of the cost of the original Phase 2 scheme’, this money would be forfeited if the works did not commence before the end of March 1981. A decision was taken, therefore, to further revise the plans with only half the first floor, namely the amphitheatre, now to be constructed. Nonetheless, a fundraising campaign was required, which entailed applications ‘to nearly 100 grant making bodies’ and the securing of a loan, before these reduced works could commence. Contracts for the second phase of works were finally signed in March 1981, and a completion date of March 1982 was set.

Social Unrest in Lambeth

In New Cross, Lambeth, on the 18 January 1981, several black youths died in what the police insisted was an accidental house fire, although it was widely suspected to be a racially-motivated arson attack. A belief that the authorities were ambivalent towards Lambeth’s black community only served to reinforce the sense of marginalisation it had felt since the 1950s. When, in early April, London’s Metropolitan police launched Operation Swamp ’81, a citywide initiative targeting street crime, this was further interpreted as a slight on migrant communities. It was assumed that the name was in reference to an interview in which Margaret Thatcher stated: ‘If we went on as we are then, by the end of the century … this country might be rather swamped by people with a different culture’. The fraught relationship between the authorities and the local black community peaked when riots broke out in Brixton over the weekend of 10-12 April 1981. A police van and car were ablaze, shop fronts were smashed, and looting was rife. Yet, despite the widespread vandalism, no damaged was inflicted upon St Matthew’s Meeting Place, underlining its significance to the local community. Reflecting upon the purpose of the Meeting Place following the Brixton Riots, the Trust asked in its annual report of 1982: ‘What exactly is St Matthew’s Meeting Place? In the aftermath of that troubled weekend in April the Meeting Place was just that – a meeting place for the large numbers of people wishing to meet to talk out the

82 anon, ‘St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Annual Report April 1979 to March 1980’.
83 anon, ‘St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Annual Report April 1980 to March 1981’.
86 Bridget Walker, p. 7.
situation and discuss action away from the cameras and microphones. We were reminded that freedom of assembly is an important human right’.89

Although events and activities at St Matthew’s Meeting Place had been curtailed that year, owing to the social unrest and commencement of the second phase building works, the crypt was ‘in great demand for Saturday night dances ... that this facility ha[d] now been extended to Friday so that groups wishing to start late ... can go on until the small hours of Saturday morning’.90 The closure of the ground floor, to allow the construction of the amphitheatre overhead, however, meant that it was ‘not possible to stage any plays’ and the drama workshop was temporarily suspended.91 Groups using the building during this period continued to ‘ebb and flow’, pointing to the continued transience of the Brixton community. ICP funding, scheduled to end in March 1982, was, however, renewed for a further three years.92 By this time the new amphitheatre was almost complete, whilst additional funds provided by the ICP had enabled the Trust to continue with the installation of ‘showers, lavatories and kitchen and a gallery at mezzanine level’ (Fig. 5.16).93 The installation of a lift to connect the crypt, ground floor, gallery and amphitheatre levels was jointly funded by the ICP and Marks and Spencer; the latter having previously sponsored the summer holiday play scheme hosted at St Matthew’s Meeting Place (Fig. 5.17).94

Fig. 5.16. Matthew’s Meeting Place: new amphitheatre
[Source: Building, 15 March 1987, p.38]
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89 anon, ‘St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Annual Report 1981 to 1982’.
90 anon, ‘St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Annual Report 1981 to 1982’.
91 Ibid.
92 Ibid.
93 Ibid.
94 Ibid.
With all the building works completed by the end of the following year, the Trust felt that "in the new phase of development there should be a conscious expansion of educational activities and the performing arts". The St Matthew’s Meeting Place was now seen by the Trust as somewhere that could serve not only the community of Lambeth but also enable 'offer a wide range of arts activities' in the South London area, attracting 'productions which might otherwise not come to the area'. At meetings held with the London Association of Arts Centres and the Greater London Arts Association, it was suggested that St Matthew’s could act as a 'multi-functional and multi-funded centre' able to 'accommodate a mix of professional and amateur programmes'. The desire to make optimum use of the facilities on offer at St Matthew’s must, as least in part, have been financially motivated. The main source of the Trust’s revenue remained the ICP which, if withdrawn, meant staff members would go unpaid and running costs could not be met thus threatening the future viability of the entire project. However, such strategic decisions appear to have been taken without consulting the local community and, although the Trust stood to benefit financially from wider use of the church, what effect this might have on continued provision for the poor wasn’t seemingly considered.

In an attempt to expand its appeal beyond the local community, by May 1987 St Matthew’s Meeting Place had been renamed Brixton Village. Despite being in regular use by
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95 anon, ‘St Matthew’s Meeting Place: Annual Report 1982 to 1983’.
96 Ibid.
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around sixty local organisations, funding remained uncertain.98 Pressure came from factions within the Church of England who were keen to resume full control of St Matthew’s having opposed its adaptation from the beginning, and from Lambeth Council who, according to David Bryan, the Trust’s new director, was pressuring the organisation ‘to bring in commercial lettings which pay good money’.99 However, many years of community involvement had made this approach unpalatable for the Trust and, perhaps inevitably, the organisation collapsed in 1990.100 St Matthew’s was declared redundant by the Church of England one year later, and remained closed. In 1993 a new charity, The Brix at St Matthew, was established on 14 December. Somewhat different in its ambitions for the building, its stated objective was ‘to raise revenue to maintain the historic building of St Matthew’s by letting out space to tenants at a commercial rate’.101 One of example of such an arrangement entered into by the new charity was the leasing of the crypt in 1996 to host regular nightclub events; a move was possibly inspired by the commercial use of the twelfth-century crypt at the Grade I listed St Mary-le-Bow, London. A restaurant, originally known as The Place Below, had occupied the crypt since 1989, providing much need revenue for the church (see Chapter Seven).102

However, operating between 1996 and in 2012, the arrangement entered into at St Matthew eventually ceased due to the non-payment of rent and overheads.103 In April 2016, Reverend Steven Sichel, the incumbent vicar of St Matthew stated: ‘In very recent years … we have not been satisfied with the way in which the building has been managed, neither have we seen the values we might have wanted to see flourish reflected amongst the activities of some of the building’s previous tenants’.104 Accordingly, The Brix at St Matthew charity was wound up in September 2016, and the building came ‘back under the traditional authority of the Vicar and church council’.105 Since coming back under the control of the PCC, the former Central Meeting Space has been re-occupied by the Anglican congregation, whilst present day visitors to the church are greeted by the following message: ‘The interior of [St Matthew] was unsympathetically reordered in the 1970s. There isn’t much to look at of particular architectural or historical interest’ (Fig. 5.18 and 5.19). However, in bringing to fruition architectural ideas which owed much to the likes of Cedric Price and Richard Rogers, Sichel’s evaluation of Hall’s work is, perhaps, unfair. It is also unfortunate that Hall was unable to replicate his Meeting Place concept elsewhere.

99 Director of the Brixton Village Trust, David Bryan, as quoted in: Weatherhead, p. 36.
102 Johnson, pp. 48–50. The crypt was cleared during restoration work overseen by the architect Laurence King (1956–64).
104 From an address given on Sunday 24th April 2016 by Reverend Steven Sichel, Vicar of the Parish of Brixton, St Matthew with St Jude. Available online at: <www.stmatthewsbrixton.org/apcm/new-future-st-matthews-church> [accessed 22/02/2018]
105 Ibid.
Fig. 5.18. Central Meeting Space at St Matthew, Brixton, 2017: now re-occupied by the congregation

[Source: Author’s own image]

Fig. 5.19. Notice to ‘Tourists & Visitors’, St Matthew, Brixton, 2017

[Source: Author’s own image]
After Matthew’s Meeting Place

At a RIBA ‘Regional Special Category’ competition held in May 1977, Hall’s proposal for the redevelopment of Canning Town’s Mayflower Family Centre which – as with St Matthew – utilised an existing structure was overlooked in favour of a scheme by Stillman and Eastwick-Field that included a substantive new build element.106 According to a report by the judges of the competition, ‘All the entries met the general requirements of the brief with inventiveness, but were generally lacking, apart from the winning scheme, in establishing a sense of order’.107 Stillman and Eastwick-Field placed a new community building at the centre of its scheme. At the same time they retained the existing church of St Helena and St George (1930), and proposed converting a swimming pool into a sports hall, remodelling the hostel, and erecting new residential accommodation (Fig. 5.20). To be developed in phases, not unlike St Matthew’s Meeting Place, the first round of works involved building the new community building, and was funded through the Docklands Urban Aid Programme.108 At ground-floor level, a games hall, designed to accommodate a variety of sports, was to double as a meeting room for 300 persons, whilst changing facilities and a workshop for bicycle and vehicle maintenance were also incorporated. First-floor level provision was aimed at evening activities, and included a coffee bar, a club room for snooker and table tennis, and a ‘disco space with sound system’ (Fig. 5.21).109 Work on the new community building was completed in December 1979, and it was opened to the public the following March.110 The second phase of works commenced soon after. The remodelled hostel involved creating a new dining room and kitchen at ground-floor level, which was to be used by elderly people as a ‘lunch club’ and by residents of the second floor ‘study-bedrooms’ at other times, with offices at first-floor level.111 Upon completion of the works in 1981, Stillman and Eastwick’s scheme was praised for allowing the Mayflower organisation ‘to play a full part in the design process’.112 Despite graffiti being a widespread problem in the area, it was noted that the Mayflower had been left ‘virtually unsoiled’.113 Echoing the experience of Brixton, whereby St Matthew’s Meeting Place was untouched during the riots, this was thought to be because ‘the locals feel it is theirs, and an extension of the church’.114

107 anon, ‘Scheme Wins On Its “Sense of Order”’, Building Design, 13th May 1977, p. 6. The other participating practices in the RIBA competition were Frederick Gibberd and Partners; Chrystal and West; Kirby Nash and Adair; Scarlett Burkett Associates; and the Stevens Partnership.
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Fig. 5.20. Mayflower Family Centre: proposed site plan (1977) by Stillman and Eastwick-Field

[Source: Building, 27 November 1981, p. 45.]

Fig. 5.21. Mayflower Family Centre: interior view of youth club (1982) by Stillman and Eastwick-Field

Although unsuccessful with his competition entry for the Mayflower Family Centre, Hall was later approached to carry out the more modest adaptation of St Mark, Kennington; another of Lambeth’s four Waterloo churches. Steps had previously been taken to open up the church a greater diversity of functions by Thomas Ford in his post-1945 restoration of the church (see Chapter Three), but the nave had been reinstated in a liturgically conservative manner. Hall’s proposals saw the existing pews removed from the nave, six non-structural columns between the nave and side aisles taken out, the floor including aisles boarded over, and a green coloured carpet was laid throughout [Fig. 5.22].\footnote{Raymond Hall, ‘Project XXI: St Mark’s Kennington’, Church Building, Winter 1986, pp. 71–72.} The aim was to unify the main worship area as a single space which might be used for other purposes. New under-floor electrical and audio installations were to aid both worship and community functions.\footnote{Ibid.}
Setting aside St Matthew, Brixton, adaptations of functioning historic places of worship throughout the 1970s and 1980s were mostly modest endeavours. Flexible seating along with facilities such as kitchens, toilets, and separate meeting rooms were seen as one way to increase wider community use; particularly in inner-city areas of ‘acute social need’. Within the Church of England, this modest approach to the adaptation of historic churches was typically decided upon by the relevant PCC in consultation with its worshipping congregation; rarely including other members of the public who might reside within the parish boundary. Various schemes were embarked upon through a nationwide network of architectural practices known as Keystone Initiatives (later Keystone Domain), of which Oxford-based Hall was an affiliate.117 Established by the London based architect John Marsh of MEB Design, a student colleague of Hall, participating practices through the years included Byrom Clark Roberts in Manchester, John Niven of Bishop Auckland, and latterly, Arch:Angel based in Cambridge. Whilst not as ambitious as Hall’s St Matthew’s Meeting Place, projects completed by the group nonetheless sought to better situate places of worship within their respective communities. One example was Byrom Clark Robert’s adaptation in the early 1980s of the interior of St Peter, Levenshulme (1860), a Grade II listed church designed by Alfred G. Fisher, where project architect Paul Vipond replaced the old pews with movable chairs, and carpeted over the nave and aisles to create a single flexible space. From 1985 onwards, Keystone Domain regularly promoted their work at the National Christian Resources Exhibition, an annual event held at Sandown Park in Esher which brought together church leaders and service and product suppliers. By the late 2000s, however, the retirement of key individuals, along with economic difficulties and reduced workloads across the practices involved, effectively brought the collaboration to an end.

In summary, the case of St Matthew’s is instructive in that it is an example of a reordering that benefitted from new public funding arrangements to circumvent redundancy, but in doing so was required to make secular provision for the wider community. The case demonstrates the beginnings of a more community-focused approach to church adaptation, therefore, but also highlights the modest amount of active community participation as the work was primarily architect-led. The case also shows resultant tensions in the spatial relationships between sacred and secular use as noted in Chapter 4; these tensions remained apparent in the ebb and flow of St Matthew’s perceived success. The merits of any proposal for adaptation can hinge upon how narrow or wide the architect and church authorities define the community to which the design must respond. In a secular context, architects continued to develop participatory models (see Chapter Four). A more participatory model than seen in Brixton had started to develop whereby eventual outcomes were negotiated between client, architect and user; Ralph Erskine’s Byker Estate, Newcastle (1969-82) being the exemplar of the period.118 This was to similarly affect the approaches taken in the rebuilding and reordering of Anglican churches. The rebuilding and reordering of the Grade II* listed Anglican church of St Mary, Barnes, overseen by the architect Edward Cullinan between 1982 and 1984, was pioneering in a religious context for the more participatory approach taken, and is the focus of the next chapter.

117 Information pertaining to the establishment of Keystone Initiatives (later Keystone Domain), participating practices, and subsequent history was provided by Andrew Hawksworth, formerly of Byron Clark Robert (1984-2016), in conversation with the author on 4th January 2018.
118 Jenkins and Forsyth, pp. 25 & 33.
Chapter Six: St Mary, Barnes - Reconstruction or Renewal

In this chapter, the rebuilding and reordering of the medieval Grade II* listed Anglican church of St Mary, Barnes, is examined. Rather than simply consulting with the local community as to their amenity requirements, as was the case in the adaptation of St Matthew’s in Brixton, at St Mary a more participatory approach was taken to rebuilding and re-ordering the church after it was devastated by fire in 1978. This led to various designs being produced, each aimed at satisfying practical needs as well as architectural preference, as local opposition was encountered by the appointed architect Edward Cullinan. Negotiating these competing visions provided fertile ground for bringing recent architectural thinking on a participatory approach into the ensuing debates; albeit the inherent problems with such an approach, as discussed in Chapter Four, came to the fore in a manner not evidenced at Brixton.

The early evening of the 8th June 1978 was warm and sunny, with a cloudless sky and a light southwesterly breeze. I was riding my Honda C90 bike back from a hot City office, [when] I noticed a large pillar of smoke. This seemed to be in the general direction of Barnes … We were very soon aware that the smoke was pouring from St. Mary’s church … [Bystanders] had formed a human chain to rescue the contents of the vestry, and were frantically passing bibles, copes and chalices to safety. In a seemingly short time the roof began collapsing, sending columns of sparks shooting into the air. The rector, Basil Whitworth, was watching the destruction, wringing his hands and looking utterly alone amidst the crowd.¹

This description, provided by local resident Giles Dimmock, of the fire which devastated St Mary, Barnes, in the summer of 1978 is interesting in two regards.² Not only does it document, in part, the destruction caused to the fabric of a church, some of which dated to the twelfth century, but it also provides testimony to the proprietorial instincts those living within the parish felt towards the building through their efforts to salvage whatever they could from the burning church. It was this sense of ownership, however, that would divide the community of Barnes in the ensuing discussions regarding the rebuilding of St Mary.

¹ Giles Dimmock, 'The Fire - St Mary Barnes (A Personal Testimony)', 1991. This document can be found on p.3 of a scrapbook compiled by local historian Maisie Brown and held at the Church of St Mary, Barnes, (referred to, hereafter, as Scrapbook).
² See: The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of St Mary’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1358083. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1358083> [accessed 22/04/18]
A Brief History of St Mary and Barnes

Up until the tenth century, the area now known as Barnes had been comprised of agricultural land and, owned by the Archbishop of Canterbury, formed part of the Manor of Mortlake.³ With a population numbering little more than fifty or sixty persons, and possibly as few as fourteen, in the mid to late eleventh century, it is thought unlikely a church existed in Barnes until the following century.⁴ Archaeological records suggest that the first church of St Mary was built in the first half the twelfth century with a simple rectangular building constructed from flint and hewn stone and accessed through an arched doorway in the middle of the south wall.⁵ A chancel was added in the thirteenth century: the three lancet windows are in an Early English style typical of the period.⁶ The next significant development occurred in the late fifteenth century to early sixteenth century with the construction of a square red brick tower at the west end of the church.⁷ Little else changed over the course of the next two centuries until the Hoare family, leading parishioners and patrons of the church, built a family chapel and burial vault extending north of the nave (Fig. 6.01 and 6.02).⁸

Fig. 6.01. Exterior View of St Mary, Barnes: prior to the fire of 1978
[Source: Copyright of English Heritage. Ref: CC72593]

³ Maisie Brown, ‘Over 1000 Years of Barnes History’ (The Friends of St Mary’s Barnes and Barnes & Mortlake History Society, 2015).
⁵ Ibid, pp. 10–11.
⁷ Ibid, pp. 26–27.
Along with the ongoing alterations to St Mary’s, the village of Barnes also underwent a transformation in the first half of the nineteenth century. The opening of the Hammersmith Bridge across the Thames in 1827, designed by the architect William Tierney Clark, had a similar effect on Barnes as the opening of Vauxhall Bridge in 1816 had on Brixton; from around 1840 onwards, the middle classes erected villas along Castelnau Road, the southerly approach road to Barnes.9 The opening of Barnes Railway Station in 1846 meant London was now ‘within twenty minutes ride’ by train ensuring Barnes’ continued expansion.10 The attendant increase in population prompted discussions regarding rebuilding St Mary anew, but with costs deemed prohibitive, further extensions were decided upon.11 The architect George Legg, appointed in 1852, proposed enlarging the north aisle in an early-Perpendicular Gothic style to accommodate an additional 270 seats, adding a small vestry which was to protrude from the north wall, and rebuilding the entrance porch.12 Further enlargement of the church, between 1904 and 1908, saw the overall seating capacity increased to 950.13 Overseen by the architect Charles Innes, until his

---

11 Ibid. Although the 270 additional seats to be accommodated by Legg’s proposal are noted in vestry minutes, the total number is not.
12 Cowie and others, p. 39.
death in 1907, and completed by Edgar Sefton Underwood, the nineteenth-century east, west and north walls were removed, and a larger nave and north aisle created with chancel and apsidal vestry to the east. Accessed via a new turret and staircase to the northwest corner of the church, a west gallery overlooked the new nave. Meanwhile, the medieval parts of the church were retained to form a south aisle, and the former chancel became a morning chapel. Thus, prior to the fire of 1978, St Mary, Barnes, could be considered a composite building comprised of elements dating back to the twelfth century. Yet, despite the apparent lack of regard for Legg’s nineteenth-century additions in undertaking the final enlargement works, it was the proposed demolition of further Victorian elements, alongside those by Innes and Underwood, which proved so controversial when it came to rebuilding St Mary after the fire.

Barnes, in common with Brixton, formed part of the historic county of Surrey before being absorbed into one of Greater London’s 32 Borough Councils in 1965; the former into the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames and the latter into the London Borough of Lambeth. However, the development of Barnes throughout the early part the twentieth century, and its resulting demography, was very different from that of Brixton. Firstly, being home to large areas of historic parklands, including Kew Gardens and Richmond Park, Richmond-upon-Thames was not so dramatically affected by the Housing Act of 1919 under which local councils were required to provide new municipal housing. Secondly, although subject to comparable levels of bombing during the London Blitz of 1941, less interwar development and copious green spaces meant that Richmond-upon-Thames did not suffer an abundance of bomb-damaged houses during the Second World War unlike Lambeth. The corollary to this was that neither did it attract migrant communities looking for inexpensive accommodation, as had happened in Lambeth. Thus in the post-1945 period, the demography of Richmond-upon-Thames has been predominantly white and mostly affluent. The need to alleviate the ‘acute social needs’ of migrant communities through urban aid grants was not an pressing issue within the Borough and, given that the threat to St Mary’s continued existence had come about through fire not potential redundancy, the desire for a radical architectural response in rebuilding the church was tempered. Many felt that the most sensible thing would be to spend the insurance money on a wholesale reinstatement of the church to its pre-fire state. However, whilst this was the prevailing view amongst a significant number of people living within the parish boundary, many of those who actively used the church felt differently. These competing views came to the fore in subsequent meetings between community members, the parish church council and their anointed architect. Not only did these meeting demonstrate the difficulty in identifying what comprises the community which is associated with a church, but also that communities should not be regarded as a homogeneous entity. Additionally, the point at which a community becomes involved in a project is germane: at St Mary, the architect was appointed without consultation.

---

15 One exception is the Castelnau Estate, erected in 1926, which consisted of 640 ferro-concrete cottages and was intended to ease overcrowding in Fulham and Hammersmith. See: Maisie Brown, Barnes and Mortlake Past, pp. 49–50.
16 1,005 high explosive bombs were dropped on Richmond-up-Thames in the London Blitz of 1941, compared to 1,215. Statistics available online at: <www.bombsight.org/explore/> [accessed 15/06/18]
17 According to the 2011 Census, 71.4% of the population of Richmond-upon-Thames are White British. This compares to 40% in Lambeth, and the London average of 44.9%.
Rebuilding St Mary, Barnes

The fire which tore through St Mary, Barnes, on 15th June 1978 caused tremendous damage to the historic fabric, not least the complete loss of its fifteenth-century roof; a series ‘of coupled rafters with collars, and braces to the collars, but no purlins’.18 The ‘great height of the ceiling and the enormous amount of wood’ contributed to the severity of the blaze which, it was reported, ‘took 90 firemen two hours to bring the 60ft flames under control and a further four hours to put them out completely’ (Fig. 6.03).19 Arson was quickly ruled out, with faulty electrical wiring in the organ later identified as the cause of the fire.20 Yet, despite the widespread damage, preliminary inspections suggested that ‘the tower, bells and outer walls [were] in good shape and [could] almost certainly form part of the rebuilt church’ (Fig. 6.04).21 Early estimates for the compete restoration of the church were put at around half a million pounds; an expected shortfall of at least £250,000 between the sum gained from insurance and the rebuilding costs.22 An appeal to the parish for additional funds was inevitable, but it was decided by the PCC that a strategy for rebuilding had to be formulated and approved by the Diocese of Southwark before such steps were taken.23

Fig. 6.03. St Mary, Barnes: fire rages, June 1978
(Source: private owner, scrapbook of local historian Maisie Brown, p. 2)
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18 Cowie and others, p. 20.
20 Cowie and others, p. 40; Maisie Brown, Barnes and Mortlake Past, p. 5.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
Accordingly, a public meeting was organised by the Rebuilding Committee which, under the chairmanship of Barnes resident and authority on Victorian church architecture Dr Roger Dixon, was held in the nearby church hall, hereafter known as Kitson Hall, in early October 1978 (Fig. 6.05).24 At the meeting, a consensus was reached that the rebuilt church should be ‘a place of worship religious in character, but with mystery and warmth’.25 Further, the Rebuilding Committee felt that it ‘should seat 450 people, as it did before the fire, but flexibly, and with room for more on special occasions’; additional facilities desired included toilets, a kitchen, a Sunday School, crèche and small meeting room.26 Committee member Alan Chubb told the meeting: ‘We would be missing an extremely valuable opportunity if we tried to restore the whole church exactly as it were’, and called for ‘an imaginative design’ to replace the central and north aisles whilst retaining the medieval west tower and south aisle.27 Reflecting the conservative character of Barnes’ residents, Maisie Brown of the Barnes and Mortlake Historical Society sounded a note of caution, however: ‘This is Barnes, not Milton Keynes or Harlow new town. The church must blend with the listed buildings on either side and we don’t want anything too imaginative’.28 Early on in the process, therefore, the sense was that Rebuilding Committee had firm ideas of which they only needed to convince the local residents were valid to proceed.
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25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
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It was agreed that the Committee would formalise a brief and draw up a list of potential architects. Dixon, however, happened to be tutoring at the Brixton School of Building at this time alongside a young architect by the name of Edward Cullinan. It was Dixon who recommended that Cullinan be appointed to oversee the rebuilding of St Mary, Barnes. No other architects’ names were mentioned as possible candidates, and the matter of Cullinan’s appointment was not done in consultation with community members. Had consensus been achieved, ensuing problems of competing vision may have been alleviated.

Born in London in 1931, Edward Cullinan was raised in what has been described as a ‘comfortable, distinctly artistic, middle class world’. Family connections, for example, had brought Cullinan into contact with the abstract painter John Piper at an early age. In 1951, having received a scholarship to attend the Cambridge University School of Architecture – since described by Cullinan as ‘very archaic’ and rooted in traditions of the Arts and Crafts movement – he soon fell under the influence of his first year tutor, David Roberts; ‘a bit of a modern’ who encouraged Cullinan to read Le Corbusier’s polemic Vers une architecture (1923). Increasingly, Cullinan began to look towards America and the work of the architects Mies Van Der Rohe and

---


30 Powell, Edward Cullinan Architects, p. 7.

31 Dillon, op. cit. (Ref:C467/93; 3 of 15). Available online at: <www.sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives/021M-C0467X0093XX-0003V0> [accessed 03/05/16].

Frank Lloyd Wright for inspiration, though he continued to enjoy the ‘craft side’ of his education. The Grade I listed Anglican church of St Andrew, Roker (1907), designed by the Arts and Crafts architect Edward Schroeder Prior being very much admired by Cullinan (Fig. 6.06). Like Raymond Hall, however, it was his years spent at the AA, between 1954 and 1956, that had the most profound effect on Cullinan. Taught by modernist architects including John Killick, Leonard Manasseh, Arthur Korn, Denys Lasdun and Peter Smithson, Cullinan developed an interest in the early pioneers of the Modern Movement; Korn and Lasdun had worked in the offices of Erich Mendelsohn and Wells Coates respectively. Yet, whilst the Scandinavian aesthetic of Britain’s post-1945 modern architecture, as seen in New Towns such as Stevenage, were held with little regard by his tutors, Cullinan did not entirely reject such stylistic affectations. Owing to his Art and Crafts training in Cambridge, how a building ‘felt’ was equally important to him as how it was constructed. For example, in September 1955 a visit to Le Corbusier’s modernist church, Notre Dame du Haut at Ronchamp, France, induced feelings of ‘ecstasy’ in Cullinan (Fig. 6.07).

Fig. 6.06. Interior View of St Andrew, Roker (1907) by Edward Schroeder Prior
[Source: Copyright of David Allan at www.flickr.com]

33 Dillon, op. cit. (Ref:C467/93; 1 of 15). See: The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of St Andrew’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1207113. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1207113> [accessed 22/04/18]
35 Dillon, op. cit. (Ref:C467/93; 4 of 15). Available online at: <www.sounds.bl.uk/oral-history/architects-lives/021M-C0467X0093XX-0004V0> [03/05/16]
36 Dillon, op. cit. (Ref:C467/93; 3 of 15).
Having graduated from the AA, Cullinan accepted a scholarship to study at Berkeley, University of California, after which he spent time working for various architectural practices including assisting Denys Lasdun on his schemes for Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, and the University of East Anglia (UEA).\textsuperscript{37} Shortly before construction got underway at UEA, Cullinan left to set up his own practice taking two commissions, gifted by Lasdun, with him: the Law House, Beacon Hill (1968) and Minster Lovell Conference Centre, Oxfordshire (1969).\textsuperscript{38} In addition, Cullinan took up teaching posts at the Cambridge School of Architecture and the Brixton School of Building; the latter of which brought him into contact with Dixon, chairman of the St Mary Rebuilding Committee. At Minster Lovell, an adaptation of an existing watermill complex, Cullinan feared he would be ostracized by his contemporaries for designing a ‘cat’s cradle of timbers … supporting a large flowing stone slate roof’ at the ‘height of minimalist concrete construction’.\textsuperscript{39} Yet his blend of old and new convinced Dixon of Cullinan’s credentials to oversee the rebuilding of St Mary, Barnes. One of the buildings actually visited by the Rebuilding Committee before awarding Cullinan the commission, in early 1979, was Minster Lovell (Fig. 6.08).\textsuperscript{40}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item [\textsuperscript{37}] Powell, Edward Cullinan Architects, pp. 10–11.
\item [\textsuperscript{38}] Ibid, pp. 17; 65 & 66.
\item [\textsuperscript{39}] Dillon, op. cit. (Ref:C467/93; 8 of 15). Available online at: <www.sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives/021M-C0467X0093XX-0008V0> [accessed 03/05/16]
\item [\textsuperscript{40}] Ibid.
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\end{footnotesize}
Scheme for St Mary, Barnes: Plan A

To the incumbent the church is a workshop, To the antiquarian it is relic, To the parish it is a utility, To the outsider a luxury. How to make these compatible?  

This task, perfectly summarised by Thomas Hardy writing in the nineteenth century was one now faced by Cullinan having been commissioned to oversee the rebuilding of St Mary, Barnes. With a brief having already been formulated by the Rebuilding Committee, following the public meeting held in October 1978, the difficulty of Hardy’s conundrum was not immediately apparent to Cullinan. Indeed, progress was such that the Rebuilding Committee were able to display the initial designs, subsequently referred to as ‘Plan A’, at Kitson Hall for eight days, ‘culminating in a public meeting on 15th July [1979]’ (Fig. 6.09). As had been the Rebuilding Committee’s wish, Cullinan’s Plan A proposed the full restoration of the medieval west tower and the south aisle. However, the nave and north aisle, enlargements undertaken in the Victorian and Edwardian periods, were to be demolished and replaced with ‘a new nave running off the medieval nave at right angles, ending in a new high altar at the north end’ above which a triangular lantern was to offer ‘light

---

42 anon, ‘Prospect: Newsletter of the Barnes Community Association, September 1979’.
Reorienting the nave in this way meant that worshippers could be seated on three sides of the altar which, as church warden John Wale remarked in reference to recent liturgical change, was ‘in the way now generally preferred’. As for the non-traditional orientation, this also was not as radical as it seemed according to Wale: both ‘Liverpool and Coventry [Anglican] cathedrals face north’. Additional facilities, as requested by the Rebuilding Committee, were to be housed in two-storied wings either side of the nave, and included ‘two vestries, four lavatories, a small kitchen, a flower room, a Sunday school room, two counselling rooms, a chair store, and a crèche which could be a meeting room during the week’.

Fig. 6.09. Sketch of Proposed Plan A for St Mary, Barnes, by Edward Cullinan: before (above) and after (below)

[Source: Architects’ Journal, 25th April 1985, p. 4.]
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Whilst satisfying the requirements of the Rebuilding Committee brief, Plan A was not universally well received. In Hardy’s terms, the need for a workshop and utility may have been met, but one unhappy ‘antiquarian’ declared the proposals as ‘[f]ine for the South bank (sic) but not for leafy Victorian Barnes’.47 Another complained that ‘comparative newcomers to Barnes have taken it upon themselves to ride roughshod over the feeling of the village’, whilst Cullinan himself was criticised by Greater London Council (GLC) member for Richmond-upon-Thames, Edward Leigh, ‘for failing to rebuild a church in its beautiful gothic and [inflicting] on us all a modern monstrosity’.48 As a portent of the difficulties ahead, ‘Astragal’ of the Architects’ Journal wrote: ‘I hope Cullinan does not abandon his guns entirely and produce a gothic-style confection. Building a modern church in a Victorian suburb is difficult to do well, but there must be an answer other than pastiche’.49 This perfectly highlights the contradictions which arise from community expectations versus the rarefied discussions between professionals. Is it reasonable for community members to make decisions which can affect the heritage value of a historic church? Heritage value is, arguably less contentious in considering the regeneration of old housing stock raising questions about the suitability of participatory design in adapting historic churches. Beyond stylistic concerns, there was also the matter of cost. It was estimated that Cullinan’s Plan A would cost at least half-a-million pounds. Although ineligible for urban aid funding, around £330,000 was expected from the insurers whilst unsolicited donations for rebuilding the church already totalled £33,000.50 The planned official fundraising campaign was thought likely to make up any shortfall in finances but, in light of the other objections, the Rebuilding Committee agreed to reconsider its proposals: ‘We shall soon be asking for a substantial sum of money, and if what we propose isn’t generally acceptable we just shan’t get the money’.51 Not only did this highlight the problem faced by a committee wishing to incorporate secular functions, it also brought to the fore aesthetic prejudices as to what a church should look like.

Scheme for St Mary, Barnes: Plan B

Generally, Cullinan’s aim to incorporate additional facilities within the new church had been well received by those who attended the public meeting in July 1979; as was his plan to restore the medieval parts of the old church. Less popular, however, was the reoriented nave and the tower which was to support a lantern above the new altar. Thus, it was agreed that a second version of the proposal, known as Plan B, be prepared which had ‘a more discreet lantern’ and, on the grounds of cost, omitted the separate rooms for a crèche and a Sunday School (Fig. 6.10).52 In addition, an alternative eastward-facing scheme, described by church warden Wale as a ‘within-
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49 Astragal, p. 165.
50 anon, ‘Church Scheme Is To Be Revised’, Barnes, Mortlake and Sheen Times, 18 August 1979, p. unknown, Scrapbook p.12.
52 Ibid.
the-walls scheme ... with three pitched roofs running east and a single space below and no inside pillars’, was to be prepared (Fig. 6.11).53

Fig. 6.10. Model of Proposed Plan B for St Mary, Barnes, by Edward Cullinan (1979)

[Source: Architects’ Journal, 5th December 1979 p. 1187.]

Fig. 6.11. Model of ‘within-the-walls scheme’ for St Mary, Barnes, by Edward Cullinan (1979)

[Source: Architects’ Journal, 5th December 1979 p. 1187.]

These schemes were exhibited at Kitson Hall ahead of a further public meeting held on 25 November 1979. Of the approximately 200 people who attended the meeting, it was estimated by the organisers that ‘60 per cent were in favour of the new [Plan B] with certain alterations’ as opposed to the ‘within-the-walls scheme’. However, Hardy’s antiquarians, who wished for a precise reinstatement of the old church, found their champion in a local resident named John Schute; organiser of a campaign called ‘Save St Mary’s Church, Barnes’. A petition of objection, signed by 387 people, was duly sent to the Diocese of Southwark’s planning authority ahead of a meeting to discuss the proposals on 18 December 1979. In the petition, the diocese was asked ‘to recognise that the public meeting held on November 25th [1979], was not representative of the parish and that insufficient publicity and time was given to displaying the models and plans’. These claims were denied by church-warden Wale who stated: ‘Among those who bothered to come to our three exhibitions, and three public meetings, the majority has been steadily in favour of the course we are taking’. Clearly, the Rebuilding Committee felt that those parish members who used the building on a regular basis had had their say, whereas the objectors hoped to swell their ranks by appealing to those within the parish boundary, yet who were not so engaged in church life. Thus, questions on who should have been consulted in formulating the rebuilding strategy came to the fore. Rebutting such criticisms, however, Cullinan asserted: ‘At Barnes, we are listening to a large number of people, and we are searching for a solution that they like and we like’.

Scheme for St Mary, Barnes: Plan C

Ahead of submitting the latest plans to the Diocese of Southwark’s Pastoral Committee for approval, a further public meeting was held at the Kitson Hall on 9 March 1980 at which the incumbent Rector Basil Whitworth emphasised that the pre-fire church had not, in any case, been fit for purpose: ‘We have a chance now to reorganise things so that they can be made more compatible with real family worship’. The consensus of the meeting was that restoring the church to its pre-fire condition was not possible on the grounds of cost and that, despite ongoing objections, Plan C, the latest iteration of Cullinan’s proposal, should be adopted ‘in principle as a basis for the rebuilding of St Mary’s Church’. Plan C not only retained the medieval elements of the church but, as a compromise, also incorporated elements of the later enlargements, such as the east window of 1852 and bricks from the 1905 walls. Discussed by the Diocese of

54 anon, ‘Church Plans On Show’, *Barnes, Mortlake and Sheen Herald*, 22 November 1979, p. unknown, Scrapbook p.15.
55 anon, ‘St Mary’s – Debate Goes On Over Plans’, *Barnes, Mortlake and Sheen Herald*, 20 December 1979, p. unknown, Scrapbook p.16.
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58 anon, ‘Church Plan Protest Goes To Diocese’, *Richmond and Twickenham Times*, 14 December 1979, p. unknown, Scrapbook p.16.
59 Ibid.
62 anon, ‘Setback to “as It Was” Plan’, *Barnes, Mortlake and Sheen Herald*, 28 February 1980, p. 3.
63 Ibid.
Southwark’s Pastoral Committee at a meeting which took place on 26 February 1980, the plans were subsequently approved in principle.\textsuperscript{64} James Tinto, secretary of the Diocese of Southwark, noted that: ‘Plan C ... would give considerable liturgical flexibility and meet admirably the needs of the church today while preserving and embracing the traditions of the past’.\textsuperscript{65} Despite this, the Diocese emphasised that the approval was in principle only, and that the Rebuilding Committee should continue to seek further public support. Accordingly, the Plan C proposals were to be exhibited once again at the Kitson Hall ahead of a final public meeting scheduled for 20 April 1980; after which the Rebuilding Committee hoped to seek planning permission from Richmond upon Thames Council and the formal approval of the Diocese (Figs. 6.12 to Fig. 6.15).

In the church’s newsletter that month it was claimed that the process of replanning St Mary had been ‘an exercise in participation’ and ‘local democracy’.\textsuperscript{66} Yet, in a letter to Reverend Nicholas Prayling, Chairman of the DAC who had recommended approval of Plan C, campaigner Schute continued to voice his objections: ‘Because the DAC is chiefly concerned with aesthetics I would suggest that the confrontation in Barnes has come about because a planner (ie an architect) has had far too much control – and although it may not be his fault at all, he has enraptured a PCC with ARCHITECTURE! I, and many others, are deeply saddened that the PCC was not enraptured by religion/ worship/ prayer/ and simplicity etc’.\textsuperscript{67} As highlighted earlier, such objections may have been alleviated had the appointment of Cullinan been approached more democratically and the scheme considered more objectively from all sides. Far from ignoring worship, the nave remained central in Cullinan’s proposed scheme, whilst its reordering demonstrated the architect’s appreciation of changing liturgical needs. Cullinan’s willingness to challenge liturgical convention ran counter only to the opinions of those individuals, such as Schute, who seemingly held to those principles and aesthetic ideals put forward by the ecclesiologists of the nineteenth century.

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{65} anon, ‘New Move In Church Row’, \textit{Barnes, Mortlake and Sheen Herald}, 6 March 1980, p. unknown, Scrapbook p.18.
\textsuperscript{66} anon, ‘Prospect: Newsletter of the Barnes Community Association, April 1980’.
\textsuperscript{67} Letter from John Schute to Reverend Nicholas Prayling dated 12th May 1980 (see Scrapbook p.32)
Fig. 6.12. Plan C Proposal for St Mary, Barnes, by Edward Cullinan (1980)

[Source: From the office of Edward Cullinan. Courtesy of the Parish Office, St Mary, Barnes.]
Fig. 6.13. East Elevation of Plan C Proposal for St Mary, Barnes, by Edward Cullinan (1980)
[Source: From the office of Edward Cullinan. Courtesy of the Parish Office, St Mary, Barnes.]

Fig. 6.14. East-West Section through Plan C Proposal for St Mary, Barnes, by Edward Cullinan (1980)
[Source: From the office of Edward Cullinan. Courtesy of the Parish Office, St Mary, Barnes.]
Further Appeals

Whilst formal approval from the Diocese soon forthcoming, the ‘Save St Mary’s Church, Barnes’ campaigners now hoped that the local planning authority would be more sympathetic to their cause. A new petition, which aimed to consult all the approximately 6,000 persons living within the parish boundary, was organised by Schute. The survey asked, ‘Do you want the church rebuilt within the old walls?’ and ‘Do you want the modern plans involving demolition?’ Clearly this was an emotive pairing of ‘rebuilt’ with ‘old’ versus ‘modern’ with ‘demolition’. Although the campaigners succeeded in collecting over 2,000 signatures expressing support for a ‘within-the-walls’ scheme, church-warden Wale was nonplussed noting that few of the signatories had attended the earlier public meetings whilst simultaneously highlighting the problematic nature of public surveys: ‘I doubt many knew what the plans were, or the limited extent of the proposed demolition. They did not have the plans put in front of them and were committed to say no to the church plans because of the wording of the survey’. How many might have expressed an alternative view given another wording cannot be known, thus raising questions about its validity. Regardless, the survey was submitted to the planning sub-committee of Richmond upon Thames Council ahead of their meeting on 10 July 1980, but, in the event, it made little difference. The
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68 Faculty for carrying out the proposed Plan C works were confirmed in a letter from Southwark’s Diocesan Advisory Committee to Rector Basil Whitworth, dated 16th May 1980 (see Scrapbook p.34)
69 anon, ‘Church Plans – New Moves’, Barnes, Mortlake and Sheen Herald, p. unknown, Scrapbook p.33.
70 anon, ‘2,000 Don’t like Plans For Church’, Barnes, Mortlake and Sheen Times, 27 June 1980, p. unknown, Scrapbook p.33.
plans were unanimously approved.\textsuperscript{71} Undeterred, the campaigners attempted to have the decisions of both the Pastoral Committee and the Council overturned. A consistory court hearing was arranged whereby Mervyn Stockwood, the Bishop of Southwark, would have the final say of the Church; as he had previously at St Matthew, Brixton.\textsuperscript{72} At the hearing, held on 8 August 1980, an alternative ‘within-the-walls’ scheme prepared by a local architect Robert Martin, known hereafter as the Martin Plan, was put forward (Fig.6.16). The scheme was of traditional orientations and, according to the campaigners, would cost less to build than Cullinan’s Plan C. However, the Bishop was not convinced. Concerns over liturgical orientations were dismissed as irrelevant, whilst the idea that the Martin Plan would be cheaper was thought questionable. With no further recourse to the Church, an appeal to the Historic Buildings Committee of the GLC was made in a final attempt to stop the Rebuilding Committee. The GLC member for Richmond-upon-Thames Edward Leigh, who had previously referred to Cullinan’s proposal as a ‘modern monstrosity’, continued to speak out against Cullinan’s proposals but he did not have a place on the Historic Buildings Committee. Of concern to the Rebuilding Committee, however, must have been the list of advisory members to the GLC, several of whom, such as the cartoonist Sir Osbert Lancaster, the poet and broadcaster Sir John Betjeman, and the architectural historian Sir John Summerson were prominent figures within the Georgian Group and the Victorian Society; albeit the latter of these figures derisively referred to those who championed nineteenth century buildings as ‘Bloody Victorians’.\textsuperscript{73}

![Fig. 6.16. The Martin Plan for St Mary, Barnes, by Robert Martin](source: Newsletter of the Barnes Community Association, June 1981.)


A meeting to discuss the competing Plan C and Martin Plan was arranged by the GLC and held on 16 October 1980.74 Present were ‘representatives from Richmond upon Thames Council and the GLC; the objectors and their architect and the PCC with their architect’.75 Having discussed the merits of both proposals, a final decision was expected when the Historic Buildings Committee next met on 23 October 1980. With nine members of the Historic Buildings Committee in attendance at that meeting, two in an advisory capacity only and seven to vote on the proposals put before them, three members came out in support of Cullinan’s Plan C, with two against and two abstentions.76 Thus, the plans were narrowly approved. After over two years of debate and dispute, the rebuilding of St Mary, Barnes, could finally begin. Alas, Rector Basil Whitworth would not be around to see the work completed. Having been in poor health for some time, no doubt exacerbated by the ongoing dispute, Whitworth passed away in March 1981.77 His successor, Juergen Simonson, was formally instituted on 8 October 1981.78 With all approvals now in place, an official fund-raising appeal was launched on 21 April 1982 and, in just one year, over £160,000 of the Rebuilding Committee’s £200,000 target was reached. Building work had commenced the previous November with the laying of foundations, and with the appeal nearing its target, it was expected that the new church would soon be ‘rising on the site’ with a rehallowing anticipated for early 1984 (Fig. 6.17).79
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The final design, developed by Cullinan and his assistants, Mark Beedle and Alan Short, saw the southern medieval portions of the church, including the former chancel and west tower retained to create a narthex accessed via the rebuilt Victorian porch. The nave beyond maintained the non-traditional orientation proposed during the consultation process, with the altar placed in front of the new north wall (Fig. 6.18). Beyond the western transept was a meeting room with store and toilets. The turret built during the Edwardian enlargement was retained to provide access to a Sunday School at first floor level, whilst a vestry and a parish office were accommodated beyond the eastern transept in the retained Edwardian apsidal vestry. Brickwork from both Victorian and Edwardian enlargements was used in creating the walls of the new church, and the east window mouldings were reinstated behind the new altar, as had been negotiated. Further, columns from the Victorian nave were reconstructed to provide support for the new roof which, comprised of trusses of multi-coloured steel and wood and underdrawn in softwood, was finished in red clay tiles (Fig. 6.19).

Fig. 6.18. Interior View of St Mary Barnes (1984) by Edward Cullinan: looking towards the altar and north window

[Source: Author’s own image.]
In the monthly newsletter of the Barnes Community Association, Rector Simonson reported that since the contractor Messrs. W.S. Try of Uxbridge commenced building the new church, it had ‘gone up with remarkable speed’; this despite allegations of sabotage to the contractor’s machinery by those who had objected to plans for the new church. After just 15 months of building work, the new St Mary, Barnes was re-hallowed on 26 February 1984. At the re-consecration service, Cullinan took part in the offertory procession, whilst the renowned composer and Barnes resident, Carl Davis, created a special anthem titled ‘Bless the Lord the God of Our Fathers’ (Fig. 6.20). Though dissenting voices persisted – one resident blamed Cullinan’s agnosticism for an ‘interior of which can only be compared to a loft conversion furnished by Habitat’ - the architectural press were more effusive. The architectural writer Colin Amery wrote: ‘I recommend a visit [to St Mary, Barnes] to all those who cry woe whenever modern architecture is mentioned. I went to a Parish Communion service and found a new church that retains more than a sense of the ancient one and yet works in a quiet and current manner. From the outside the great low sweeping tiled roofs promise well and will weather agreeably. Inside the timber roof is a powerful confident frame reminiscent of elaborate medieval roofs.’ Amery continued: ‘In many ways, St Mary’s is a model for architects planning to add to, or adapt, older buildings. As a church, it is less adventurous than St Paul’s Bow Common, but it is equally important as a sign of the renewal of the ecclesiastical architectural tradition.’
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82 ‘The Order of Service for the Rehallowing of St Mary’s Church, Barnes’.
85 Ibid.
important as an example of contemporary thinking on community participation applied in an ecclesiastical context. Dismissing the notion that one must be of faith to design a church, Cullinan insisted: ‘I understand what a glorious meeting place might be, and I think that history shows I understand it too.’86 Like Hall before him, Cullinan’s description of churches as meeting places, rather than temples, resonates with the nonconformist tradition of meeting houses and, indeed, the Jewish synagogue, which have community function as much as being for worship.

In summary, the case of St Mary, Barnes, demonstrates how the Church was increasingly willing to engage the wider community in making decisions about the rebuilding and adaptation of its churches. Rather than merely identifying potential users for a pre-determined scheme, as was the case at St Matthew, Brixton, the whole community was invited to participate in deciding not only what future community provision the building may offer, but also to comment on what should be retained of the surviving historic fabric. What this chapter also highlights, however, is having engaged the community how does one then mediate between any competing views. Moreover, who is responsible for making executive decisions? At St Mary, Barnes, such decisions were taken by an architect appointed and supported of the PCC without any democratic involvement from the community it sought to consult. This may not always be in the interests of the community or, indeed, the Church, and certainly can contribute to continued rancour between those with differing views. In the next chapter, the changing landscape of funding, including greater assurances on community participation, is explored through the case of the Grade II* listed Anglican church of All Saints, Hereford, and other more recent examples.

86 Dillon, op.cit. (Ref:C467/93; 8 of 15).
Chapter Seven: After Community Architecture - Historic Church Adaptation, 1990 to the present day

This chapter is primarily concerned with the adaptation of historic Anglican churches after a period in which institutional and governmental focus, both national and locally, was not on faith congregations, but on the secular community provision, the nature of the community being served, and the participation of communities those in enacting change. In the case of the Church of England, this period coincided with a re-consideration of its mission. With the introduction of alternative means of funding adaptation works, attention turned more squarely upon the potential for church adaptations to contribute to the regeneration of villages, towns and cities through community use. In turn, genuine demand had to be demonstrated by any church applying for major funds. This chapter considers the case of All Saints, Hereford - one of the first churches to take advantage of these new arrangements, and considers its possible influence on the approach to adaptation since taken by other churches.

Before 1977, with the exception of small grants available from the National Churches Trust, formerly known as the Historic Churches Preservation Trust and founded in 1953, finances for the repair and adaptation of historic churches were available from several sources but not directly from the government. In the case of the Church of England, if money was not made available by the local Diocesan Finance Council, works were either self-financed through fundraising activities or through initiatives such as the Urban Aid Grant scheme described in Chapter Five; the latter bearing the additional qualifying criterion of deprivation.¹ In addition, local dioceses were also financially responsible for the day-to-day care of the fabric of its churches and, subsequent to the Inspection of Churches Measure introduced in 1955, were required to carry out quinquennial inspections to establish priorities for repair works. However, in 1977, government funding for the repair of historic churches was introduced by the DoE; administered successively by the Historic Buildings Council and, from 1984, by English Heritage.² Grant aid was to be available for repairs works only and eligibility was premised on the church being regarded as

¹ Background to the National Churches Trust is discussed in: Anne Fornerod, Funding Religious Heritage (London: Routledge, 2016), p. 65.
‘outstanding’; later defined as having either Grade I or II* listed status.³ Although St Matthew, Brixton, and St Mary, Barnes, both met the criteria outlined, the grant scheme was introduced too late to benefit the former who, arguably, was the less well-positioned of the two to help itself.

Unsurprisingly, the DoE’s scheme proved extremely popular, and it was inundated with applications. So much so that, by 1995, it was estimated that the minimum annual grant needed to assist the repair of the Church of England Grade I and II* churches alone would cost £20 million; this compared to an actual outlay of £14.1 million for all church denominations that year.⁴ In recognition of the fact that the current arrangements were unsustainable, alternatives to direct governmental funding were sought. The solution lay in the National Heritage Memorial Fund (NHMF), enshrined in the National Lottery Act of 1993, which was established to distribute money to heritage causes. In 1994, the NHMF was set up to provide support to local and national heritage around the United Kingdom.⁵ Under the new Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) scheme, churches were eligible whether listed or not.⁶ More importantly, grants were available not only for repair works, but also for installing facilities such as toilets and offices or for adapting churches for purposes beyond worship.⁷ To avoid any administrative conflict, or indeed accusation of inconsistency in granting aid, English Heritage were brought in to work alongside the HLF in what became known as the Joint Scheme For Churches and Other Places of Worship (JPOW).⁸ The guidance notes, issued by the HLF soon after outlined to potential applicants that grants for installing new facilities would only be approved if they could demonstrate ‘a genuine demand from other sections of the community for the facilities they seek, and that the facilities [would] be properly run and managed’.⁹ Further, any additional elements had to be accommodated without causing damage to existing fabric or character of the building. Launched on the 17 October 1996, one of the first beneficiaries of the new scheme was the medieval Grade II* listed Anglican church of All Saints in Hereford.¹⁰

---

⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Fornerod, p. 58.
⁷ Ibid, pp. 7–8.
⁸ After its inception in 1997, JPOW was the subject of several policy and name changes. A summary of these is provided in: Department for Culture, Media and Sport, p. 25.
¹⁰ See: The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of All Saints’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1025105. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1025105> [accessed 02/02/19]
To continue to survive, we have to innovate. Each year we look at what we do, what else we could do, and what could be done better.¹¹

As the administrator for All Saints, Hereford, Jackie Mumford has overseen, perhaps, one of the most successful and enduring community-focused church adaptations of recent years. All Saints’ is a medieval Grade II* listed Anglican church in the cathedral city of Hereford; the oldest parts of which date to the thirteenth century. Located at one end of Broad Street, the main road leading south to Hereford Cathedral, the church is otherwise bounded on two sides by pedestrian thoroughfares – High Street and Bewell Street – placing it squarely amongst Hereford’s main shopping area and with access on either side (Figs. 7.01 and 7.02).

Fig. 7.01. Extract of Map of Hereford, 1757: All Saints is located at the north end of Broad Street
[Source: All Saints, 1999. The Church of All Saints, Hereford. p. 2]

¹¹ Jackie Mumford, administrator at All Saints, Hereford, quoted in discussion with the author, 12th August 2019.
Although it is said church life at All Saints’ ‘flourished’ in the early-to-mid decades of the twentieth century, by the beginning of the 1990s the building itself had become severely dilapidated. Accordingly, rallying calls were made to restore the ‘only surviving example left in the city of a medieval parish church undisturbed by the vigorous restorations of later centuries’. In truth, however, All Saints’ had, like so many historic churches, failed to escape the attention of Victorian restorers. The architect John Oldrid Scott, whose professional practice was informed by that of his father, the architect and enthusiastic ecclesiologist George Gilbert Scott, undertook significant repairs to the building’s fabric between 1892 and 1893. The younger Scott, it was said, ‘accepted his father’s architectural faith implicitly and carried it out religiously’. Accordingly, Scott lowered the church floor to its supposed medieval level and, regrettably, removed old plasterwork with the loss of several medieval wall paintings. In the intervening years, however, inadequate maintenance meant that the church roof had started to leak, and the spire and west wall had become structurally unstable; this despite the introduction in 1955 of statutory quinquennial inspections under the Inspection of Churches Measure.

---

12 ‘The Church of All Saints, Hereford’ (All Saints, 1999), p. 5.
14 ‘Obituary: John Oldrid Scott’, The Times, 2 June 1913, p. 11.
15 ‘The Church of All Saints, Hereford’, p. 5.
Indeed, there were concerns that, owing to public safety, the church could be forced to close and face redundancy. A court order issued by the City Council to All Saints Parish Church Council in December 1991 allowed the church just six months to stabilise the building and devise a long term strategy for its upkeep.  

Just three months earlier in September 1991, All Saints’ had welcomed its new vicar, the Reverend Andrew Mottram, to the parish. Mottram was eager to see through the necessary repair work needed and, in doing so, had the full support of John Keith Oliver, Bishop of Hereford (1990 -2003). Moreover, Mottram had ambitions which went beyond mere restoration: ‘[W]e have a responsibility to make space for what is of God and what is of the world to meet and interact’. Before moving to All Saints’, Mottram had, from 1984, been a vicar at the Grade II* listed medieval church of St Peter, Thurleigh, in rural Bedfordshire. It was during his time at St Peter’s that Mottram had faced a similar conundrum of restoration or redundancy. The church needed to generate funds for a new roof, but it was estimated that only five per cent of the local population regularly attended with, perhaps, ‘another 10% or so having sympathy and support which might yield hard cash’ to undertake the works. As Mottram observed, ‘[T]he church building had become increasingly irrelevant to the community’s life. The pub, village hall, and Sports and Social Club provided places to meet, the village school had taken over the role of education from the church and the presence of the Baptist Chapel ensured the Church had lost its supremacy as sole provider for religion and spirituality’. The purpose and function of the church had become solely religious, whilst the division of sacred and secular functions in the village had, according to Mottram, engendered a sense of ‘them and us’ between church-goers and non-attendees. Echoing the sentiments espoused by the Birmingham Institute in the preceding decades, Mottram felt that the solution lay in re-establishing the church as a community meeting place which combined sacred and secular activities (see Chapter Four). Indeed, he acknowledged the work of one of the Institute’s founders John Gordon Davies as a ‘significant influence’, concluding, ‘Places of worship for Christians did not have to be set apart from ordinary

17 ‘The Church of All Saints, Hereford’, p. 6.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
20 See: The National Heritage List for England, ‘Parish Church of St Peter’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1311731. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1311731> [accessed 03/02/19]
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid, p. 6.
24 Ibid.
use’.25 At St Peter’s, a succession of fund-raising parties were held, at which the non-attendees ‘discovered that Church people could be both normal and enjoy the same sort of things as themselves’, whilst the church-goers ‘discovered a way of being part of the Church, which was neither onerous nor boring’.26 Money for the new roof was quickly raised thereafter, also demonstrating to Mottram the importance of community involvement for the economic viability of church buildings; a valuable lesson for the challenges faced at All Saints’.

The immediate concern at All Saints’ was to stabilise the building and stave off potential closure. An application process for Grant Aid from English Heritage, now Historic England, had already begun when in January 1992, Harris and Sutherland, the consulting engineers appointed to inspect the spire informed the PCC that there were two possible options. The first involved the dismantling and rebuilding of the top third of the spire, and the second dismantling the top and capping it off; either, it was estimated, would cost around £300,000.27 English Heritage promised to provide two-thirds of the money needed, on condition that the spire was rebuilt and, crucially, that the church remained open as a place of worship.28 This sparked discussions at Diocesan level as to whether it would be better for the PCC to pay the total repair costs of £300,000 and then dispose of the building, or to accept the offer of Grant Aid which, despite reducing the immediate cost to just £100,000, meant committing to ongoing running costs in the future.29 There were fears that this financial burden might, at some point, fall back on the local Diocesan Financial Council. However, the PCC were inclined to accept the offer of Grant Aid provided that the Diocese considered allowing All Saints’, ‘prime commercial site [to be] utilised to generate an income for future repair, maintenance and improvement of the fabric’.30 All Saints’ was already a well-used church with services held on five days of the week. Moreover, on other days, the space under the organ loft at the west end of the church was used for charity fund-raising events, talks, music recitals and to serve refreshments. However, as Mumford recounts, refreshments were of the ‘twenty pence cups of coffee’ variety, and unlikely to help the church achieve its long-term goals.31 Experiencing an epiphany similar to that of the Reverend Bob Nind in New York (see Chapter Five), Mottram’s solution was inspired by commercial activities witnessed at churches in London; most notably at St Mary-le-Bow where, in 1987, a restaurant known as ‘The Place Below’

26 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
31 Jackie Mumford, administrator at All Saints, Hereford, quoted in discussion with the author, 12th August 2019.
was established in the crypt and opened to the general public. Thus, even before meeting with Hereford’s Diocesan Advisory Committee and members of Hereford City Council on 10 June 1992, Mottram had determined with the support of the PCC that ‘a commercial cafe’ was key to the future financial security of All Saints.33

Restoring All Saints, Hereford

Having appointed the local firm of architects Rod Robinson Associates, Mottram and the PCC began to develop plans which it was hoped would make All Saints’ financially sustainable. However, the more pressing issue of repairing the building fabric remained. Works were to be split into two phases: the first phase was to include a partial rebuild of the spire, whilst the second phase involved stabilising the west wall and repairs to the roof.34 Works on the spire began in the summer of 1992 with new stone, sourced from the Ridgeway quarry in Derbyshire, replacing the unstable upper third while the lower portion was re-pointed at a total cost of £397,267.35 English Heritage contributed £215,391 towards the repair costs, but the remaining sum of £181,876 was significantly above the PCC’s initial expectations.

Fig. 7.03. All Saints, Hereford: phase one works to repair the spire
[Source: Church Building Issue 36 November/ December 1995, p. 48.]

32 ‘The Church of All Saints, Hereford’, p. 6.
34 Rod Robinson, p. 48.
35 Ibid.
Worse still, the costs associated with phase two had not been fully appreciated prior to accepting English Heritage’s offer of Grant Aid. The problem with the west wall was due to the removal of an upper section of the stone gable in around the fifteenth century. The arch of the west window had been under-loaded and, consequently, structurally weakened requiring the west wall and window to be completely rebuilt.\(^{36}\) To proceed would cost £663,000 which, despite a contribution of around £365,000 from English Heritage, would present the PCC with a further bill amounting to just short of £300,000.\(^{37}\) As Mottram later mused: ‘[I]f the PCC or I had known of the size of the project back in June 1992, I think we would have chosen to go for redundancy. So perhaps it is a good thing we never knew!’.\(^{38}\) Fundraising activities and donations to the PCC, notably from the local cider-making firm of H.P. Bulmers, meant that all repair work could go ahead and, by the autumn of 1995 with these completed, attention could turn towards planning – and funding – the third phase of works, the refurbishment of the church interior and the establishment of a commercial cafe within.

**The Commercialisation of All Saints’**

In the mid-1990s, the proliferation of coffee shops which populate the average high street had yet to occur: for example, the first Starbucks coffee shop in the UK, on Kings Road, Chelsea, did not open until September 1998.\(^{39}\) It was in this pre-coffee shop chain era that, in 1989, the restauranteur Bill Sewell set up The Place Below (now Cafe Below) in the twelfth-century crypt of the Grade I listed St Mary-le-Bow, London.\(^{40}\) The success of the restaurant, not least the significant income generated for the church, prompted Mottram, a friend of St Mary’s vicar, the Reverend Victor Stock, to approach Sewell with a proposal that they together might establish something similar at All Saints’. Sewell was interested, but there was much work to do, and finances to be raised, before this could become a reality.

Whereas the earlier phases of work at All Saints’ had qualified for English Heritage’s Grant Aid for repairs to historic buildings, the creation of a commercial cafe did not. Fortuitously,


\(^{37}\) The overall costs of the phase two works are noted in: ‘The Church of All Saints, Hereford’, p. 7.


\(^{40}\) See: The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of St Mary Le Bow’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1064696. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1064696> [accessed 03/02/19]
however, the passing of the 1993 National Lottery Act opened up a further possible source of funds. Introduced by the government in order to ‘promote extra support for good causes in addition to existing public expenditure’, funds were made available through the JPOW scheme for essential repairs to places of worship, and to renovate existing or provide new facilities.\textsuperscript{41} It was through JPOW that All Saints’ secured a grant of £540,000 to fund its ambition for a community cafe. Initially, Mottram and the PCC thought that the cafe might occupy the organ loft and the space underneath, with a screen introduced to offer separation from the nave.\textsuperscript{42} However, with daylight from the newly reconstructed west window flooding the church interior, Mottram was keen ‘that there should be no separation of the space. The cafe had to be inside the building as part of the whole space’.\textsuperscript{43} Therefore Robinson, retained as project architect, decided against the reinstatement of the organ loft – a twentieth century addition, in any case (Figs. 7.04 and 7.05).

A scheme was produced which proposed installing a raised floor, which would run from the west end of the church up to south door allowing street level access into the church (Fig. 7.06). A ramp from the south door down to the nave would not only help to assist with wheelchair access but it would also define an area for parents with prams wishing to use the cafe; an important consideration in light of JPOW funding stipulations which encouraged inclusivity. The interior works, carried out between 1996 and 1997, also included the installation of a new floor with underfloor heating throughout; a cold floor was not compatible with the church’s ambition to create a welcoming public space (Fig. 7.07). Further, in addition to the seating area at the west end of the church, a spiral stair provided access to the south gallery beneath which was housed the kitchen and servery (Figs. 7.08 and 7.09).\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid, pp. 13–14.
\textsuperscript{44} ‘The Church of All Saints, Hereford’, p. 12.
Fig. 7.04. Plan of All Saints, Hereford: prior to phase three works

[Source: British History Online. Hereford Volume 1, pp. 90-144.]

Fig. 7.05. All Saints, Hereford: view of west wall prior to phase three works

[Source: All Saints, 1999. The Church of All Saints, Hereford. p. 5]
Fig. 7.06. Plan of All Saints, Hereford: after to phase three works
[Source: All Saints, 1999. The Church of All Saints, Hereford. p. 15]

Fig. 7.07. All Saints, Hereford: installation of underfloor heating
[Source: All Saints, 1999. The Church of All Saints, Hereford. p. 7]
Fig. 7.08. Interior View of All Saints, Hereford (1997) by Rod Robinson Associates: looking west
[Source: Author’s own image.]

Fig. 7.09. Interior View of All Saints, Hereford (1997) by Rod Robinson Associates: looking east
[Source: Church Building Issue 61 February/March 2000, p. 18.]
In addition to the practical considerations of the cafe, ancillary facilities such as customer toilets and an administrators’ office were required along with a vestry. Robinson’s solution here was to create a series of free-standing prefabricated pods. Each pod was constructed using a self-supporting steel-frame stud-partition system, with services housed in the ceilings and floor.\(^{45}\) The walls were solid, clear-glazed or opaque to allow diffuse lighting depending on their function (Fig. 7.10).\(^{46}\) Along with the proposals for the cafe, these elements were designed such that they stood separately from the historic fabric should their removal be desired in the future; again, this in accordance with JPOW stipulations. The cost to deliver these facilities was just over £700,000, with the shortfall of £160,000 raised through fundraising activities and local donations. Upon completion of the works, All Saints’ re-opened its door to public on 1 July 1997, with Sewell at the helm of the new cafe as Mottram had wished.\(^{47}\) The recipient of award from the RIBA in 1999 for its architectural merits - ‘striking, futuristic interventions ... which look like they’ve landed from outer space’ - the intervening years between the re-opening of All Saints’ and the present day provides a fair bellwether as to the direction other PCCs might take in successfully adapting their churches.

---

\(^{45}\) Rod Robinson, p. 50.
\(^{46}\) Ibid.
Equally significant was the award bestowed upon All Saints’ by the Civic Trust in 2001.\textsuperscript{48} The purpose of the Trust, founded in England in 1957, was to carry out ‘campaigns of improvement to urban areas ... help protect threatened historic buildings and to maintain standards in town centres’.\textsuperscript{49} In this respect, the contribution made to the social provision of Hereford centre, through All Saints’ adaptation, was considered more important than any aesthetic consideration. Indeed, such was the initial success of the cafe in bringing the general public into the church, Mottram reflected: ‘Normal church life seemed to end for the first two years of the new All Saints’. We ran to a standstill and could only just cope with people using the building in a ways perhaps not seen since the Reformation’.\textsuperscript{50} With reference to an advertising campaign run by the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, in 1988, to promote its cafe, he continued: ‘At times we seemed to be at risk of becoming ‘an Ace Cafe with church attached’, as everything seemed to revolve around the business and the life of the cafe’.\textsuperscript{51} Yet on Sundays, with the cafe closed, Mottram noted that ‘the building was ours, as it always had been: a ship in a harbour during a storm, huge, cavernous, re-assuring, safe and still ... [and] for the first time in living memory, perhaps ever, warm and comfortable’.\textsuperscript{52} Within ten years of re-opening All Saints’ was welcoming around 3,000 visitors a week to its church; a footfall which convinced Sewell to lease the cafe, thus providing a fixed income for the church.\textsuperscript{53} Although some congregants previously responsible for serving ‘twenty pence cups of coffee’ to infrequent visitors felt disenfranchised by the new arrangements, the income provided by Sewell ensured funds would be available to the church for any future maintenance works. Other congregants, however, embraced the changes made at All Saints’ and, in view of the increased number of visitors, saw themselves as informal ambassadors of the church; there to help, direct and answer any queries. These people, according to Mumford, have become the ‘face of church’, and assist with organising other activities which take place in the church such as the regular craft market held in the South Chapel (Fig. 7.11). Whether the commercial success enjoyed by All Saints could be replicated in a non-urban or non-suburban setting with less footfall is worth questioning.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
Fig. 7.11. Interior View of All Saints, Hereford: craft market in the South Chapel
(Source: Author's own image.)
The approach taken at All Saints demonstrated how it was possible to include new community facilities within a historic church without disturbing its fabric. When the PCC of St Nicholas, Burnage, Manchester, embarked on a HFL-funded project to incorporate community facilities within the walls of its Grade II* listed church in 1999, the scheme produced by their appointed architect Anthony Grimshaw held similarities with All Saints’ in the use of a pod to provide additional accommodation with minimal impact to the historic fabric. St Nicholas’ was originally designed by the noted interwar firm of architects Welch Cachemaille-Day and Lander and opened in 1932. It was described by the architectural Nicholas Pevsner as ‘a milestone in the history of modern church architecture in England’. The main entrance, unusually, was placed at the east end of the church, and runs parallel with the altar (Figs 7.12 and 7.13). The choir at the west end of the church was a later addition by Cachemaille-Day in 1964, and suffered from leaks to the roof.

Fig. 7.12. Exterior View of St Nicholas, Burnage (1932) by Welch Cachemaille-Day and Lander
[Source: Author’s own image.]

---

54 See The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of St Nicholas’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1219254. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1219254> [accessed 02/02/19]
As well as repairs to the fabric of the building, Grimshaw proposed to reduce the overall size of the nave, thus increasing the size of the choir. This area was to be re-purposed as a community hall (Fig. 7.14).\textsuperscript{56} Dividing the two spaces, and suspended above the ground floor, was a cylindrical

\textsuperscript{56} Anthony Grimshaw, ‘St Nicholas, Burnage: £1.1m Grant Helps Save Grade II* Listed Church’, Church Building, 79, 2003, 4–6.
pod of sand-blasted glass which was used to house a community worker’s office (Fig. 7.15). Underfloor heating was introduced, whilst new steps and ramp to the south entrance ensured ease of access for all. Although the focus of the scheme was to bring greater community usage to St Nicholas, this seems to have been delivered by the architect on behalf of the PCC without consultation of wider community of Burnage; a top-down solution to the PCC’s perceived needs. Grimshaw was later responsible for further HLF-funded church adaptations including bringing back into use the redundant Grade II listed Anglican church of St Martin, Castleton, Greater Manchester (1862) for both worship and community purposes in 2002; and installing kitchen, toilets and meeting rooms at the Anglican church of St Anne, Rossendale, Lancashire (1886) between 2009 and 2011.57 By this time new measures had been introduced by English Heritage and outlined in its *Strategy for Historic Places of Worship* (2004).58 Of significance was the commitment to train people to help congregations understand the history and significance of the buildings in their care, and offer guidance on the re-use and adaptation of historic places of worship. Such initiatives led to the advent of support officers, a role since further embedded and expanded following the *Taylor Review: Sustainability of English Churches and Cathedrals* (2017).59

![Fig. 7.15. Interior View of St Nicholas, Burnage (2003) by Nicholas Grimshaw](source: Author’s own image.)

57 See The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of St Martin’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1203230. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1203230> [accessed 02/02/19]
59 Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
Emmanuel Church, Didsbury, Manchester

Arguably also taking a lead from the success witnessed at All Saints’, Hereford, was the establishment of community cafe at the Grade II listed Anglican church of Emmanuel Church, Didsbury, Manchester; built in 1858 to designs by Starkey and Cuffley. The proposal was part of a wider scheme, begun in 2006 to 2007, to transform the church into a community hub (Fig. 7.16). Disbury, a suburb of South Manchester, has in recent decades been a predominantly white, affluent, middle-class area. Although never lacking in local amenities such as restaurants and bars, substantive space for local community groups, however, was in short supply. An earlier effort to provide a flexible space within the church, in 1986, had led to the removal of internal fittings, the chancel and transept being partitioned off, and a new entrance porch installed at the south east corner; works carried out in accordance with a scheme prepared by Nicholas Rank Associates. In 2006, a proposal was brought forward by the PCC to further re-order the church and to clear land to the rear, including the existing church hall, to enable the construction of a Parish Centre. The purpose of the latter was to create a large space for community activities such as yoga, arts and drama, and to host other events such as wedding receptions.

60 See The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of Emmanuel’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1207907. Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1207907> [accessed 02/02/19]
Jos Townend, a local architect whose previous experience included designing the Roman Catholic churches of St Paul Apostle, Leeds (1996), St Vincent, Sheffield (2001) and St Vincent de Paul, Osterley (2004), was appointed. As might have been expected, Townend’s re-ordering of the church interior drew on his knowledge of post-Second Vatican Council liturgical reform; a free-standing altar along with a fan-shaped seating arrangement of moveable, interlocking chairs was proposed (Fig. 7.17). Individual chairs were preferred so as to allow them to be cleared away should the church wish to use the nave for purposes other than worship. Unusually, as was the case with St Mary, Barnes, the altar was placed in front of the north wall, as opposed to its traditional location under the east window. Worshippers and other visitors entering the church from the south east porch would find themselves at the south end of a much truncated central aisle. Finances to carry out the works were raised in part through fundraising activities and local donors, and completed in September 2007. Income subsequently generated from the Parish Centre then allowed the church to address the matter of urgent repairs to the historic fabric of the church with the establishment of the ‘St James & Emmanuel Fabric Fund’. Additional finances came from further local fundraising activities; notably the ‘Love Emmanuel’ campaign (Fig. 7.18).

![Site Plan of Proposed Emmanuel Church and Parish Centre, Didsbury (2007) by Jos Townend](source: Copyright of Jos Townend.)

---

63 St James is the sister church of Emmanuel Church, Didsbury.
Around £100,000 was generated which allowed for remedial works to the roof and external stonework. Moreover, the PCC took the opportunity to further enhance the usefulness of the church to Didsbury’s non-worshipping community: the foyer – formerly used for concert recitals – was refurbished as a cafe, with new kitchen facilities installed and an area of the nave partitioned off to provide additional seating. These works were completed in early 2015 and from April of that year a group of community volunteers began to operate what was known as the Home Community Cafe on a not for profit basis. Over and above running costs, all income generated from the café has been reinvested in local community initiatives. This community-focused approach, along with being shortlisted by The March Award for Innovative Church Projects in 2017, helped Emmanuel Church secure funding of around £250,000 in 2017 for further repair works. As well as further roof repairs, the east window designed by SPAB’s William Morris (see Chapter One) needed restoring and protecting from possible vandalism, whilst access into the cafe was to be improved through the installation of a ramp (Fig. 7.19). With these works due to be completed by the end of 2019, it is worth reflecting whether the transformation of Emmanuel Church into a thriving community hub could have succeeded in a more diverse, economically-deprived environment or, indeed, a rural context.
A fuller examination of rural church adaptation has not been the focus of this dissertation, but it is worth mentioning the example of St Leonard, Yarpole, a Grade II* listed Anglican church of twelfth century origins. Between 2006 and 2009, the PCC raised around £240,000 from multiple sources in order to implement a scheme which included the removal of the existing benched seating, the installation of fully-insulated floor, new toilet facilities, a community shop and post office; the latter improving the long-term financial viability of the church by embedding essential amenities to serve the small local community. The complex funding mechanisms which made this project possible was navigated with the help of support officers from English Heritage. Indeed the architect for the scheme was Robert Chitham, head of the organisation’s historic buildings division. Turning to the example of an economically-deprived suburban case, All Souls, Bolton, is perhaps instructive.

All Souls, Bolton, Greater Manchester

The work recently undertaken at the Grade II* listed former-Anglican church of All Souls, Bolton, Greater Manchester (1881) took the pod concept even further than seen with All Saints, Hereford, and St Nicholas, Burnage, Manchester. The church was originally designed by the architects Paley & Austin, with its interior re-worked by the Manchester-based OMI Architects

64 Walter and Mottram, p. 294.
between August 2013 and September 2014 (Fig. 20). Unlike all the other churches discussed in this and previous chapters, All Souls’ is no longer a functioning place of worship. For this reason, it is worth considering how this church differed from others discussed, and what implications it might hold for other Anglican churches faced with redundancy.

Demographic changes in the 1970s and 1980s saw the congregation of All Souls’ dwindle, but unlike in Brixton where efforts were made to reach out to a predominantly black Christian community, in Bolton the incoming population was mostly Asian Muslim. This meant that the building was no longer viable as a Christian church. Made redundant by the Church in 1986, All Souls’ was soon subject to arson attacks and lead theft which, combined with vandalism to the stained glass windows, left the building open to the weather. Subsequently handed over to the Churches Conservation Trust (CCT), in 1987, it remained in this dilapidated state for the next twenty years. However, in 2007, local resident Inayat Omarji saw the potential of All Souls to be brought back into use as a community centre; the area then wholly lacking such a facility. With

Fig. 7.20. Exterior View of All Souls, Bolton (1881) by Paley & Austin
[Source: Author’s own image.]

66 See The National Heritage List for England, ‘Church of All Souls’ (Historic England), List Entry Number: 1387878, Available online at: <www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1387878> [accessed 02/02/19]
the help of the CCT, a plan was developed and an architectural competition held to transform the former church.68 The winning scheme by OMI took advantage of the church’s original design to propose a ‘building within a building’ solution which would leave the historic fabric largely untouched.

When All Souls was built, architects Austin and Paley were instructed to keep the nave free of obstructions; the result being one large space devoid of columns which would typically define the side aisles.69 Into this space, OMI proposed inserting two free-standing steel-framed pods, which would run almost the full length of the length of the nave. These would house offices, meeting rooms, and a kitchen. According to the project architect, Nick Berry: ‘There was little opposition to the design from the community or heritage organisations, perhaps because building standalone pods has meant that key aspects of the church can be preserved, while the inclusion of raised external walkways ... are designed to allow visitors to get closer to the original church details’ (Fig. 7.21).70

![Fig. 7.21. Model of Proposed All Souls, Bolton (2009) by OMI Architects](source: Architects’ Journal. 2 October 2009, online article.)

---

69 Misuriello.
In September 2009, OMI’s proposal helped to secure a grant of £3.3 million from the HLF, with an additional £150,000 from Bolton Council, £250,000 from the CCT, and further funds from English Heritage and other charitable trusts being forthcoming in 2011. Building work began in August 2013, and on 6 December 2014 an official ceremony was held to mark the re-opening of the building. Whilst the building is open to, and in regular use by, the community and wider public, its continued existence is more reliant on the income generated from the leasing of office space than any community function. What this suggests is that, for some churches adaptation in the face of drastic socio-religious and economic change might still not be enough to stave off redundancy, irrespective of participatory processes or community assistance. In some cases, such as All Souls, Bolton, engagement cannot occur where a community does not exist.

Fig. 7.22. Interior View of All Souls, Bolton (2009) by OMI Architects
[Source: RIBA Journal, February 2015, p.7]

Conclusion

Oh Hitchcock, Pevsner, Jordan! Oh Reverend Basil Clarke!

Our value-judgements broaden. And keep us to the mark ...

Until the year 2000. When Summerson, we pray,

his conscience will arouse and confirm they’re all O.K. ¹

This passage, taken from a poem by Peter Clarke, founder member of the Victorian Society, demonstrates that how architectural historians have approached, assessed, and categorised historic buildings is something that continues to evolve; thus raising important questions as to how we determine value or importance in architecture. That Clarke was referring specifically to historic churches only makes the quote all the more pertinent. Cataloguing and categorising, whether through architectural style or periodisation, offers only a partial understanding of a building, and prioritises aesthetic value. As this thesis has shown, broadening the scope of architectural research to include wider socio-economic and political contexts, can lead to an even greater understanding of buildings, and appreciation, therefore, of their architecture. This examination of wider contexts should not apply solely to the moment of architectural creation. As Stewart Brand argued, it is equally important to consider the ongoing life of a building and the changing circumstances within which it has existed or still exists. This may involve, as Stephen Cairns and Jane M. Jacobs have suggested, recognising the deterioration or destruction of a building. It may equally include its re-invention through adaptation. None of these later states should remove a building from a social history of architecture.

This thesis is a challenge to the architectural canon. Much research on church buildings to date has been enthralled with the moment of creation, celebrating individual architects through numerous monographs.² This has elevated the status of certain architects and their buildings; a point reinforced by the publication of compendiums of so-called ‘best’ churches.³ There has long been a tension between architecture as an art or a profession. This, perhaps, explains the

² Adler; Pace; George Edmund Street: A Victorian Architect in Berkshire, ed. by John Elliott and John Pritchard (Reading: University of Reading, 1998).
³ Twentieth Century Society, 100 Churches 100 Years (London: B.T. Batsford, 2019); Simon Jenkins, England’s Thousand Best Churches (London: Penguin, 2000).
emphasis placed by architectural historians in existing accounts of post-1945 ecclesiastical architectural practice in England on novel church forms. However, this has been to the detriment of other architectural developments of the period, such as the advent of church centres and dual-purpose churches and, as this thesis has shown, the adaptation of existing historic churches.

Faith organisations have long employed architects who were sympathetic to their aims, and the needs of the communities they serve. In the latter half of the twentieth century, the relation between these organisations and local communities grew stronger due to socio-economic circumstances as well socio-religious purposes. The influence of the liturgical movement therefore, whilst significant, has been overplayed in explaining the consideration of local communities by architects in the design and/or adaptation of places of worship in the post-1945 period. Community-focused architecture has been understood only in terms of its impact upon housing, and has ignored its impact upon other building types including places of worship. Ecclesiastical work undertaken by community architects is missing from the accepted canon. Acknowledging that most historic churches have evolved beyond their moment of creation through the changing demands of church organisations and their users, we are challenged to move away from making value-judgements on based on the architect or creator. Instead, we should understand and appreciate the various situations which have contributed to a building taken as a whole. Chapter Two demonstrated the varying socio-economic and political circumstances which influenced the Church of England and its requirements of the architectural profession. The conclusion drawn from this is that the architects’ contributions are inextricable from the contexts in which they work. In the instance of post-1945 architectural practices in relation to historic places of worship, Chapter Three highlighted the cultural and symbolic factors which entered discussions around the treatment of bomb-damaged churches. These philosophical debates harked back to the nineteenth century and, unresolved, explain the present day reticence with altering the fabric of historic churches; a matter not exclusive to religious buildings.

Whilst there were, undoubtedly, some within the Church of England who would have preferred it to have retained its power in matters of education and welfare provision, post-1945, changing socio-political circumstances saw its role in society redefined. It was commonplace for new churches on new estates, which lacked social amenities, to combine sacred and secular functions in what were known as either dual purpose churches or church centres; though as Chapter Two suggests, the provisions of the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act with respect to adjacent land usages may have been a factor here. Architects with modernist leanings often received commissions for these new churches; indicative, perhaps, of the willingness of the
Church to embrace change. Restorative reconstructions of bomb-damaged churches, however, were more likely to be entrusted to Beaux-Arts trained architects; deep historical knowledge being a defining characteristic of what, in recent years, we have come to refer to as conservation architects. This division of roles is interesting in the light of the changing socio-economic and political circumstances described in Chapter Four.

In the late 1960s and 1970s, the failings of contemporary planning and architecture prompted shifts in government policy. Housing clearances and comprehensive redevelopments were stopped, or put on hold, and grant aid was made available for the ‘rehabilitation’ of the existing housing stock; often in inner-city areas. As well as precipitating a shift from municipal to private employment for many architects, others saw it as their role – duty even – to assist local communities in the endeavour to restore their neighbourhoods. Existing literature on the phenomenon of community architecture in England is sparse and, typically, has focused upon (and been recounted by) the architects involved in those projects. Yet neighbourhoods consist of buildings other than houses; notably historic churches. The intersection of community architecture and historic churches was found to be absent from the architectural historiography; extraordinary given the continued growth of the conservation movement and the wider interest in the renewal of historic buildings in the period concerned. References to Birmingham Institute at Birmingham University are frequently found in scholarly research on new post-1945 churches. However, as this thesis has shown, the Institute’s interest in the adaptation of historic churches has been overlooked; innovative community-focused adaptations featured in its Research Bulletins from the 1970s onwards. A comprehensive institutional history of the Birmingham Institute is lacking. This thesis has started this process, but it is for another to complete it.

The major case studies included in the thesis built upon the themes identified in the Introduction. Each case marked a development in the approach taken by architects in their treatment of historic places of worship, and is posited within the wider architectural historiography. This was achieved through the provision of a biography of the various buildings and their locations, along with any socio-economic, religious and/ or political changes which affected them. To address the lack of research on the intersection of community architecture and historic churches, Chapter Five considered the case of the Grade II* listed Anglican church of St Matthew, Brixton, which in terms of its ambition, conception and funding, this thesis has identified as an early example of community architecture influencing the adaptation of a historic church. The architect Raymond Hall envisaged his own version of Price’s Fun Palace; a church without a specific user in mind, but one which was adaptable to changing circumstances. If
success is defined by use, the credentials of Hall’s St Matthew’s Meeting Place could not be questioned. It is hard to conceive, however, that the removal of significant portions of historic fabric would go unchallenged by Historic England and the plethora of amenity groups which now exist. This hints, perhaps, at where the priorities of such organisations lay in the past: was Brixton, economically deprived and populated mostly by its black community, simply off the radar of such organisations? The volume of historic buildings under threat in the 1960s and 1970s posed limits on regulatory oversight which, arguably, facilitated architectural innovation. The adaptation of St Matthew’s should be viewed as a contribution to, and important evidence of, the ongoing social life of the building; not simply an affront to its original creator. Understanding why St Matthew’s subsequently failed is also instructive. Established for community use on a charitable, rather than commercial, basis, St Matthew’s was reliant on Urban Aid Grants and could not survive without this assistance. Had it charged commercial rates for use of its space, it is likely that the project would still have failed. Building users were of an economically-deprived demographic, whilst Urban Aid Funding would not have been available to start the project if such deprivation had not existed. By contrast, Chapter Six considered the example of St Mary’s; a Grade II* listed Anglican church in Barnes, London. In the words of Edward Cullinan, the architect appointed to oversee its rebuilding, this was done ‘during a time of heated debate about ‘community architecture’’.\(^4\) He continued: ‘One form of community architecture poses no difficulty for anyone: you simply gather together a public meeting of interested parties and ask them to decide or vote for a list of ‘features’ which the building and buildings should contain. Then by a wonderful act of suppression of ego, the architect proceeds to cobble those features together’.\(^5\) Whether Hall imposed his ego in the re-ordering of St Matthew’s is debatable, but the processes he followed certainly adhered to this definition. St Mary’s, however, enacted processes which Cullinan, writing in 1995, felt were more accurately described as community engagement: ‘On occasion whole parts of imaginary schemes were question [by the community], and we would have to imagine again – at other times what we proposed enabled people to explain to us more clearly what they wanted.’\(^6\) Today we might refer to this process as a form of participatory design. It is worth considering whether the participatory processes employed by Cullinan would have made a difference in Brixton; the community there were, after all, simply grateful to have a space which they could use without costs. The local community in Barnes, however, was predominantly middle-class and relatively affluent; local association with St Mary, amongst church-goers and non-attendees, was much stronger. Visions for the church’s rebuilding interested a wider range of people and were,

\(^4\) Powell, Edward Cullinan Architects, p. 88.
\(^5\) Ibid.
\(^6\) Ibid.
therefore, more contested; thus highlighting the inherent conflict of interests which arise with participatory design in decision-making. Nonetheless, the success of Cullinan’s executed scheme is evidenced by its continued use for both worship and community events. This can be attributed to the less-transient nature of Barnes’ population compared with Brixton of the 1970s and 1980s.

In many respects, parallels exist between St Mary’s and the case of All Saints, Hereford which was discussed in Chapter Seven. Neither PCC embarked on a process of church adaptation because of declining church attendance, as was the case with St Matthew’s. Instead, both were forced to act due to serious problems with the built fabric of their churches. After an era of community-focused funding through Urban Aid Grants, the establishment of the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) provided an alternative means for church organisations to finance adaptation and repair works. Eligibility entailed engaging with the scheme’s initiatives such as consulting ‘those with project management or fundraising knowledge’ and demonstrating community need.7 Whilst some of the congregation at All Saints’ were initially resistant, the inclusion of financial planning and economic sustainability in the HLF application process has, in general, ushered in a less-contested era of church adaptation. As a condition of funding, the Church has become more open to the secular use of its historic churches; the example of Emmanuel Church, Didsbury, Manchester, supports this view.

There are several ways in which the adaptation of historic places of worship, and the architectural profession’s engagement in that process suggests a future research agenda. Firstly, many of the conclusions presented here are tentative due to the paucity of literature on the adaptation of places of worship; not only for the Church of England, but also in respect of other faith organisation in England and the rest of the United Kingdom. The methods used in this thesis would be valid in other geographical contexts, or with alternative religious organisations, and would enrich our understanding of post-1945 ecclesiastic architectural practice. Secondly, the thesis touched upon previously untapped sources on the adaptation of historic places of worship, and highlighted how the architectural profession’s engagement with congregations and communities could impact upon the success or otherwise of adaptation strategies. Within the scope of the thesis it was not possible to fully consider the impact on the wider community and congregations and their experience of involvement in the work. Detailed research could reveal much about the changing relationships between religious organisations, their worshippers, and the wider communities that they serve. Thirdly, as architectural and social theorists have started to recognise, much academic literature to date has been engrossed with moments of creativity

and innovation, particularly in architecture. Issues of ongoing maintenance and adaptation, even though these are part of architects’ day-to-day practice, are overlooked. This thesis has shown how adaptation can be a contentious issue, but one that is necessary to ensure the long-term survival of a building for community benefit. Chapters Four, Five and Six have begun to chart the educational background that stimulated architects into action. However, further research could reveal the necessary curricula and tools that architects require to engage in the adaptation of historic places of worship. Adaptation of buildings, as posited in this thesis, is not a ‘failure’ but an opportunity for renewal. It would be interesting to understand how or whether this concept has been addressed by schools of architecture. Detailed research work on the AA archives, for example, could help to reveal issues around architectural adaptation, the types of architects who responded, and how architectural education may be improved in the future.

Finally, from a religious history point of view, it is clear that transformations in the built fabric have an impact upon how communities engage with religious organisations. We are moving towards an era where modern faith spaces are multi-functional and user-friendly. This thesis has begun to document some transformations that have occurred in historic churches, whilst explaining the importance to their communities. We have to value those adaptations and move away from the accepted canon of architectural historians. We find ourselves, perhaps, in an era which may find it hard to appreciate the worth of religion and, by consequence, the centrality that church buildings can play in the wider community. What is clear, however, is that there is a will within religious organisations to continue to make their buildings relevant. As this thesis has shown, however, it is essential that any building adaptations are sensitive to the potential needs of future generations whilst emphasising the community-value provided through centuries of service.
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