

# CHRISTOPHER DOWNS, B.ARCH., RIBA. CHARTERED ARCHITECT

CONSULTANT ARCHITECT TO  
DURHAM CATHEDRAL

ECCLESIASTICAL AND HISTORIC  
BUILDINGS CONSULTANT

THE CATHEDRAL ARCHITECT'S OFFICE, THE GREAT KITCHEN  
THE COLLEGE, DURHAM DH1 3EQ

TELEPHONE/FAX: (0191) 384 7010

## QUINQUENNIAL REPORT

INSPECTION OF CHURCHES MEASURE 1955

CARE OF CHURCHES AND ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION MEASURE 1991

### CONTENTS:

PREAMBLE	to the Quinquennial Report on the Church: Introduction; Terms of Appointment; Scope of the Report; Form of the Report.	
THE REPORT	Brief Description of the Church.	Page 1
	Previous Inspections and recent repairs.	Page 2
	Limitations of the Survey.	Page 2
	<b>Appraisal and Recommendations.</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
	<b>Summary and Priorities :-</b>	<b>Page 11</b>
	i. Of Utmost Urgency.	
	ii. Essential within the next Six Months.	
	iii. Essential within the next Year.	
	iv. Necessary within the next Two Years.	
	v. Necessary within the Quinquennium.	
	vi. Future, i.e. desirable repairs or improvements.	
APPENDIX	Architect's Inspection Notes.	
APPENDIX 'B'	General and Technical Notes.	

NOTE: This report can be read at three levels of detail:

The SUMMARY AND PRIORITIES give a brief overview and checklist.

The APPRAISAL AND RECOMMENDATIONS give a fully reasoned report sufficient for most purposes.

The ARCHITECT'S INSPECTION NOTES give a finely detailed record of the inspection observations on which the report is based, for future reference.

# **PREAMBLE TO THE QUINQUENNIAL REPORT ON THE CHURCH**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Inspection of Churches Measure 1955 and the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991, both of which have statutory force, require each Diocese to establish a scheme for the inspection of every church at least once every five years. Over the years Commissions of General Synod and Working Parties of the Council for the Care of Churches have made recommendations on the establishment of Diocesan Schemes, the selection and terms of appointment of the inspectors, and the scope, form and content of the reports. The current recommendations are contained in 'A GUIDE TO CHURCH INSPECTION AND REPAIR', Second Edition, 1995, published for the Council for the Care of Churches by Church House Publishing, Church House, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3NZ. The following is intended to conform with those recommendations.

## **TERMS OF APPOINTMENT**

Attention is drawn to the Terms of Appointment of the professional adviser included in Appendix B.

## **SCOPE OF THE REPORT**

A thorough inspection of the structural condition and state of repair of the Church has been made, covering all parts visible from ground and floor levels, readily accessible roofs, galleries or stagings, and where applicable from ladders provided by the PCC. Inaccessible and hidden roofs and valleys are excluded, and ceilings have been examined from floor level only unless otherwise stated.

IT IS EMPHASISED THAT THE INSPECTION HAS BEEN PURELY VISUAL, and parts of the structure which are inaccessible, enclosed or covered such as boarded floors, roof spaces or hidden timbers at the wall heads have not been opened up for inspection (unless otherwise stated in the report). Such woodwork or other parts of the structure which are covered unexposed or inaccessible have not been inspected and therefore it cannot be reported that any such part of the building is free from defect. It is possible that any concrete used in the construction, alteration or repair of the church between 1923 and 1975 contains High Alumina Cement and/or Calcium Chloride additives. No investigation has been carried out to determine whether these substances are actually present and therefore it cannot be reported that such parts of the building are entirely free of risk in this respect. Where concrete of that period is persistently damp the risk of failure becomes significant and the appropriate investigations should be carried out.

Chimney flues were not inspected, nor were inaccessible flat roofs. Manhole covers were not lifted and none of the services, including the drainage, were tested. Damp meters were not used. Unless otherwise stated the inspection was carried out in dry weather, when it was not possible to ascertain whether the rainwater goods or gullies or surface water drains were watertight.

Recommendations for further investigation are included where suspicions have been aroused during the inspection but problems of access or the need for special equipment or opening-up have prevented full exploration. Where it is suggested that some part of the building be kept under observation this is for the attention of a future professional adviser as well as of the Church Council.

## **FORM OF THE REPORT**

This is a general report only, as required by the Inspection of Churches Measure 1955, the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991 and the Diocesan Scheme. It follows, in broad terms, the form recommended in 'A GUIDE TO CHURCH INSPECTION AND REPAIR' 1995 (mentioned above) and the requirements of the current Diocesan Scheme.

This report is the COPYRIGHT OF THE PROFESSIONAL ADVISER and is provided to satisfy the statutory requirement for a quinquennial report ONLY. It is confidential to the Church Council, the Diocesan Authorities and their respective professional advisers. It describes defects observed, is NOT A SPECIFICATION for execution of any work and MUST NOT BE USED FOR OBTAINING BUILDERS' ESTIMATES. An indication of likely repairs costs is included, but it must be understood that the scope of repair work is undefined and no measurements have been taken, so the figures are no more than 'educated guesses' and should not be relied upon beyond the purpose of indicating the likely spending commitment to maintain the property to a high standard.

THE CHURCH COUNCIL IS REMINDED THAT IT MUST NOTIFY THE DIOCESAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND/OR OBTAIN A FACULTY BEFORE PUTTING ANY REPAIR WORK IN HAND. In most cases specifications, schedules and descriptions of the proposed repairs will be required. This report is not a substitute for such documents but it may be cited in support as identifying the need for repairs.

One copy of this Report should be kept with the Church Log Book and Records, for future reference. The Architect will send the requisite number of copies direct to the Diocesan Office.



**REPORT ON THE 2009 QUINQUENNIAL INSPECTION**  
**of the Parish Church of**  
**S A I N T   P A U L ,   H A R T L E P O O L**

Diocese of Durham

Archdeaconry of Durham

Deanery of Hartlepool

Historic Buildings Listing: Grade II

Conservation Area: None

Civil County and District: Cleveland, Hartlepool

Ordnance Survey Map Reference: NZ 503 325

**Date of Inspection: 12th June 2009**

**Date of Report: 3rd May 2010**

**Report by CHRISTOPHER DOWNS, B.Arch. R.I.B.A.**

---

**BRIEF DESCRIPTION**

Built in 1885/86, the church is one of the most ambitious and successful designs by Charles Hodgson Fowler, in a nineteenth-century interpretation of the medieval Early English style given unusual vertical emphasis especially in the slender north-west Tower. It is built of red brick with moulded brickwork and buff sandstone dressings to the architectural features and green Lake District slates to the timber roof structures.

The tall clerestoried Nave and Chancel are under one roof, with an octagonal flèche externally above the Chancel arch. The Nave is flanked by aisles and the Chancel by the Organ Chamber and Clergy Vestry to its north, Lady Chapel and Choir Vestry to its south. An ambulatory across the east end connects the vestries. The entrance Porch is in the base of the Tower at the west end of the North Aisle.

Drawings of the plan and section of the church together with a copy of Hodgson-Fowler's original plan held in the archive of the Incorporated Church Building Society are included on the buff-coloured sheets following the Summary and Priorities section of this report.

## PREVIOUS INSPECTIONS AND RECENT REPAIRS

This is the third time the present writer has reported on this church. As well as those prepared in 1995 and 2003, previous reports dated 1973 (Hayton, Lee & Braddock), 1979, 1984 and 1989 (all Ian Curry) were available on the architect's file for reference in compiling the present one. These and any other previous reports, where they survive, should form a valuable record of the condition of the building and of the work carried out over the past fifty years and should be kept.

Repairs and works carried out since the last inspection have included:

Replacement of both heating units with similar gas-fired warm air type.

Installation of sound reinforcement & induction loop system.

Overhaul/repainting of eaves guttering and downpipes on lower-level roofs.

Repainting of boundary railings and external doors.

It is understood that, following a lapse arising from change of ownership of the firm, the maintenance contract with Taylor Hastwell Steeplejack Services has been reinstated and routine repairs to roof coverings, clearing and checking of gutters, etc., were to be resumed shortly after this inspection.

At the time of the inspection the window in the west wall of the South Aisle was awaiting repair following vandalism. Preliminary consideration was being given to improving the toilet and kitchen facilities.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE SURVEY

- a) Attention is drawn to the recommendations of the **Preamble** to this report, and to the **General and Technical notes** given in **Appendix `B'**.
- b) The following inaccessible parts were not included in the inspection:-
  - i) Voids below floors.
  - ii) Roof voids above Nave and Chancel ceilings.
  - iii) Interior of the Organ.
  - iv) Interiors of the flèche and the upper parts of the spire.
  - v) Ceilings were examined from floor level and roofs from ground levels.
- c) The Architect's detailed inspection notes are given in the following appendix, with descriptions of various parts of the building where appropriate, and comments on the condition of the fabric. These notes are an important part of the report, and should be read by the Parish (PCC officers, etc.), for the appraisal, recommendations and priorities in this report have been prepared from them. They are not a specification for repairs, and are unsuitable for obtaining builders'

estimates. When the PCC is ready to proceed with any part of the recommended repairs, it is advised to contact the professional adviser for recommendations as to the appropriate course of action and ask him to prepare any necessary specifications and schedules.

## APPRAISAL AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following remarks inevitably concentrate on the defects noted during the inspection but it must be emphasised that the church is in reasonable condition overall, and this report is intended to help direct the efforts of those responsible towards an orderly programme for the work needed in the foreseeable future.

### A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION OF THE FABRIC:

The building remains structurally stable with no significant movement in the old crackings through the masonry recorded in previous inspections. For the record, these occur in the east walls of the two vestries, in the arches between the Lady Chapel and the South Aisle and the Chancel respectively, in the head of the doorway at the west end of the South Aisle, at the west end of the north wall of the North Aisle where it meets the Tower, and in the eastern jamb of the main entrance portal in the north face of the Tower. These easings should merely be reviewed in future inspections although it would be helpful to have the various crackings pointed up so as to give a base date and ready indication of any future movement.

Previous reports have noted that the high Chancel arch, abutted adequately by the Organ Chamber to the north, has a relatively weak southern abutment with only a shallow buttress at clerestory level and no buttressing at all to the Chapel archway which takes the lateral thrusts at a lower level (and which, as mentioned above, shows evidence of old movement). Tie rods have been inserted - reputedly after the church was completed - to overcome the problem, and there is understood to be a system of ground ties across the church below the Chancel steps. The form and extent of this system cannot be ascertained without specialist investigation but it appears to be serving its purpose. Plates and tie-rod ends exposed externally on the south side of the South Aisle need to be kept well painted. This is all as recorded in the 2003 and earlier reports.

The outbreak of dry rot in the Choir Vestry and Lady Chapel floors and fittings discovered during the 1995 inspection was subsequently eradicated and there is no obvious sign of any recurrence although the groaning of the floorboards underfoot in the area between the Lady Chapel altar and its east wall should be kept under observation. The dormant growth of this fungus identified at the west end of the North Aisle roof during the 2001 inspection is understood to have been dealt with shortly afterwards but the dried-up fruiting body remains and this area should be kept under observation in case the fungus revives.

As and when access is provided for other purposes it would be worth having the ceilings and roof timbers inspected from close quarters to check for signs of decay or beetle

infestation, and inspection of the Chancel roof void remains a recommendation - there appears to be no access to that above the Nave ceiling.

Following the recommendations of the 1995 report the corroded straps and collars restraining the central columns of the Belfry openings were replaced with stainless steel and the stonework of the upper parts of the Tower generally was checked and made safe as far as could be ascertained. The signs of old slippage at the joints of the tracery in the heads of the openings are still evident but all remains as seen in 2001 and there is no suggestion that further movement has occurred. However, it would be worth having the joints pointed up so as to give a base line for future assessment and in the longer term it may be desirable to add straps to tie this stonework together.

As recommended in previous reports, the iron straps at the base of the spire on the main Tower should be painted to inhibit the rust before it becomes more than superficial.

The present access arrangements within the upper part of the Tower and leading to the external parapet walkway at the base of the spire fall short of current health & safety requirements so should be used by steeplejacks only. It would be worth improving safety by adding guard rails, etc., to facilitate more frequent checking by churchwardens or other volunteers.

## B) WALLS AND MASONRY:

The church is built of a darkish red brick, exposed internally as well as externally, with a sparing use of buff sandstone dressings to the architectural features. In general the walling appears to remain in fair condition but, as recorded in previous inspections, there are a few limited areas where exposure or dampness has caused efflorescence, surface erosion of the brick or stone, or loss of the mortar from the joints.

Internally, rising dampness is affecting the bases of some of the walls and of the columns and piers of the arcades. In general this is causing superficial erosion of the masonry and is a only a minor nuisance hardly warranting remedial action for the time being. Earlier attempts at combatting the problem by rendering over the affected walling (for example, in the main entrance lobby) are proving short-lived as the damp is simply being pushed higher up the walls and the render is coming loose and falling away in places. Occasional brushing-down of the powdering stone and salt deposits, together with removal of the loose areas of render, may be desirable from time to time.

As recorded in the last two reports, minor consolidation is desirable to the brickwork forming the arch above the external door in the lobby beside the W.C. at the west end of the

South Aisle, and where the brickwork has been loosened by cutting through for the waste pipe for the sink inside the Clergy Vestry.

The brick walls of the interior of the Heating Chamber need pointing in places, particularly in the arched heads to the various openings.

The internal wall faces in the Tower show quite a lot of efflorescing salts brought through by damp penetration, and some erosion in the stone band immediately beneath the timber wall plate at the base of the spire (which latter may be the result of past leakages from the parapet gutters). However, as commented in 2003, the deterioration seems to be very gradual and no action is needed for the foreseeable future apart from possibly some limited re-pointing of the worst-affected areas. Externally, weeds should be removed from the joints of the bottom string-course of the parapet on the north face, and from the sill of the south-facing Belfry opening. The brickwork immediately below Belfry sill level and the panel of the upper intermediate stage beneath on the east face could do with re-pointing. The springer stone above the central shaft to the Belfry opening on the south side of the Tower appears to be delaminating badly, but being above the Nave roof this does not constitute a danger to the passing public and hardly warrants attention for the time being. Renewal will become necessary in the foreseeable future.

As mentioned in the last two reports, both the main gable of the Nave and the lean-to gable of the South Aisle need re-pointing of bands of brickwork approximately half a metre deep beneath the watertablings on each slope. This needs to be continued to some extent down the north and south corners of the Nave and around the northern corner onto the short return of the Nave wall up to its junction with the Tower. Open joints in the plate tracery of the windows could do with filling at the same time.

On the north gable of the Organ Chamber the chimney stack appears to need filling of cracks or open joints, and possibly more fundamental consolidation where the brickwork seems to be disrupted at the west end of the stack. The mortar flaunching around the base of the pots is cracked and needs renewal. This should be examined from close quarters by the steeplejacks.

On the east elevation of the building, the bottom step of the set at the external door of the ambulatory has moved away from the wall and needs re-setting.

On the south side of the Choir Vestry and Lady Chapel, the brickwork suffered quite extensive saturation by the leakage from the rainwater goods which caused the outbreak of rot in 1995 and this still awaits re-pointing as recommended in the last report. A small area at the extreme east end of the eaves of the Choir Vestry and rather more extensive open-jointed brickwork round on its east face should be dealt with at the same time.

The top of the south-east corner pinnacle of the Chancel blew down in a gale some months ago and at the time of this inspection was awaiting reinstatement - the apex stone had

been retrieved and appeared re-usable but the top knot had not been salvaged. This is something the steeplejacks could attend to, if not dealt with already.

C) ROOF COVERINGS AND RAINWATER DISPOSAL:

All the roofs of the church, including the spire and the flèche, are covered with green Lake District slating, apparently dating from the original construction of the building. At the time of this inspection the regular maintenance contract with a firm of steeplejacks had just been reinstated, following a lapse caused by change of ownership of the company, and their first visit was awaited. As a result of the lapse, a backlog of slating repairs had built up but even so, the number of missing, slipped or broken slates is relatively modest and none of the roof slopes appear to have reached the stage where re-slating has to be considered yet.

Though the red clay ridge tiles on the main Nave/Chancel roof appear to be sound their mortar pointing needs extensive patching if not total renewal.

The lead flashings at the abutments of the slating with the gable upstands, and the aprons at the heads of the aisle roofs, etc., appear to be in good order except that at the time of the inspection a short length of the apron flashing at the head of the Lady Chapel roof was slipping out and needed re-fixing and pointing back in. At the same time, the triangular piece of lead flashing which has disappeared at the bottom of the abutment of the South Aisle roof with the upstand at its eastern end needs replacing.

The valley gutter between the Nave roof and the Tower and the little back-gutters behind the north-east corner pinnacle of the Chancel and where the west slope of the Organ Chamber roof meets the buttress abutting the Chancel arch will presumably be checked regularly as part of the reinstated maintenance contract.

The low-level eaves gutters to the aisles and vestries all appear to have been overhauled and repainted since the last inspection, but despite this there is a break in the westernmost section of gutter on the North Aisle and this should be repaired promptly. The rainwater goods at high level on the Nave, Chancel and Organ Chamber have yet to be attended to and are clearly suffering corrosion and leakage so should be similarly treated within the next twelve months, along with their downpipes - again, this is probably a task for the steeplejacks. The gutter joints should be re-sealed as part of the operation. At the time of the inspection weeds could be seen growing in several of the gutters, both high and low-level. These should be cleared out if not dealt with already and the downpipes and gullies should also be checked. Any defects in the guttering and downpipes should be dealt with at the same time.

Replacement of the short length of gutter at the extreme west end of the north side of the Nave - west of the Tower - is still needed to prevent rainwater spillage down the brickwork.

Presumably the original gutter simply threw the water clear of the building, as there is no sign of a downpipe, so the replacement should follow suit.

#### D) WINDOWS AND DOORS:

The church contains a good range of stained glass, notably that in the east window which dates from the turn of the century but is apparently unsigned. As noted in previous inspections, this glazing shows distinct signs of bowing. However, it seems no worse now than in 2001 so should merely be reviewed in future inspections. The west windows of the Nave have stained glass dating from the 1970's in a predominantly tinted glass background, in fair condition. Like the east window of the Chancel this suffered vandalism prior to 1995 and as well as being repaired these windows were provided with polycarbonate overglazing. The stained glass of the windows in the south wall of the South Aisle is of two periods - the 19th century and the 1950's, the latter including a fine design by Leonard Evetts. The North Aisle also has glass from the 19th century, as well as designs from the 1920's and 30's. The Lady Chapel windows are a mixture of stained and uncoloured glazing, apparently fairly recent. All this glass remains in fair condition. However, as mentioned in the last three reports, the external wire guards to the South Aisle and Lady Chapel windows are perishing (one has disappeared altogether) and new guards are needed as soon as possible - either of polycarbonate sheet (as used since 1995 on the North Aisle and Choir Vestry windows) or powder-coated stainless steel wire grilles.

The wheel window at the west end of the South Aisle has been provided with external polycarbonate protection - not in an ideal form of installation but adequate to the task. Unfortunately the glass was damaged before the protection was fitted and at the time of this inspection was awaiting repair.

For the most part the windows of the Vestries and Ambulatory retain their original tinted diamond-pattern leaded glazing, as do those at high level in the side walls of the Chancel and in the clerestories of the Nave. In general the glazing of this type is in relatively poor condition and appears to need of cleaning even where more radical action is not yet warranted. At the time of the inspection one of the windows in the Clergy Vestry, a couple of those in the Ambulatory passage, that in the Choir Vestry and the easternmost window in the north wall of the Chancel needed renewal of damaged panes, though this is not urgent as the low-level windows have polycarbonate overglazing and the damage is much as recorded in previous inspections. The buckling of some of the glazing in the opening vents in the Nave clerestory windows was also mentioned in the last report and some of these may need re-glazing within the next five years as there is a risk of the glass being blown or sucked out by high winds. Several holed panes in the clerestory windows also need replacement. The iron-framed ventilators, none of which appear to be in use, should be painted to inhibit rust and in the longer term should be removed whenever the surrounding glazing has to be re-lead.

Minor repair remains desirable to the leaded glazing of one of the windows in the north wall of the lower intermediate stage of the Tower and that to the window of the chamber above, but in this location there is no urgency about either.

The timber louvres in the Belfry openings on the Tower were treated prior to the last inspection but now need doing again and the hatches giving access to the parapet at the base of the spire are likely to need repainting. The same goes for the louvred stage of the flèche on the main roof and the two dormer housings for the roof access hatches either side of it.

The main external doors to the church have been included in the recent external repainting and are in good order. the only slight matter arising is that the top bolt on the Ambulatory doors could do with adjustment to make it easier to operate.

#### E) FLOORS AND INTERNAL FITTINGS AND FINISHES:

The floors are a mixture of solid construction to the Nave, aisles and much of the Chancel, with suspended timber construction to the choir stall areas, the vestries, Lady Chapel and Organ Chamber. Generally speaking the flooring seems sound, but at the east end of the North Aisle and west end of the South Aisle the cement screed or its concrete base is lifting very noticeably. This could be the result of a reaction with sulphates in the underlying fill. Although quite badly cracked the concrete is not so badly damaged as to warrant replacement as yet. However, the tripping hazard is not insignificant and some minor measures may have to be taken to minimise the risk pending review in future inspections.

The linoleum covering to the Clergy Vestry floor is breaking up, particularly at the door through into the Chancel, and could do with renewal. At the same time the springiness in the underlying suspended timber should be investigated and minor repair is desirable where defects in the timber boarding have contributed to the failure of the covering. It might be better to replace the linoleum with a breathable material such as carpet (not rubber-backed) to minimise the risk of decay in the timber.

The stone steps and paving in the Choir and Sanctuary areas is showing quite pronounced erosion, particularly at the south end of the last two steps up to the altar, and some careful filling is desirable to eliminate the tripping hazard.

Evidence of significant water penetration from the Belfry to the lower levels of the Tower has been recorded in previous inspections, and serious consideration should be given

to providing a waterproof covering to the Belfry floor as recommended in the last two reports.

Consideration might also be given to providing a simple form of raised drained floor in the Heating Chamber so that it can be used for storage without fear of damp damage.

Throughout the interior of the building the brick walls are unplastered, and painted only in the Vestries. As mentioned in previous reports, accumulated surface grime gives the church a rather dingy aspect overall and consideration might be given to having the brickwork cleaned by a specialist firm - trials on sample areas should be carried out first and care will have to be taken to avoid removing the surfaces of the bricks themselves. The stone used for architectural features should be cleaned at the same time.

The hinges of the door to the spiral stair up the Tower should be painted to inhibit the rust that has taken hold and it would be worth providing a more worthy handle to the inner entrance door.

The furnishings, fixtures and fittings, some of which are very fine indeed, remain in good order generally.

#### F) INSTALLATIONS:

Previous reports record that the **electrical** installation was re-wired between 1978 and 1984, to a good standard, and no specific defects were noted in the course of this purely visual inspection. Routine testing should be carried out by a qualified electrician every five years and it is understood that this was being arranged for shortly after this quinquennial inspection in 2009, but the resulting report has not been seen.

The **Lightning Conductor** was tested and upgraded in 1996/7 in conjunction with the other repairs on the Tower so will have been due for re-testing in 2007. If not already done this is another job for the steeplejacks, who would also be able to repair the attempted theft or vandal damage to the downtape on the north side of the Tower.

The **Heating** installation consists of two fan-assisted gas-fired burners feeding warmed air into the church through floor grilles. The two burner units were replaced shortly after the 2001 inspection after one of them failed and was declared unrepairable. The new units are by Garbutt, each rated at 87.9 kW, and are reported to be perfectly adequate to heat this large building.

As recommended in the last two reports, consideration should be given to removing the disused heating chamber ventilator which stands to the north-west of the steps. The grille to the vent out to the east should be painted to inhibit rust. The metal cage over the steps themselves is in very poor condition and should either be thoroughly overhauled or replaced by something easier to maintain and visually unobtrusive such as a series of hinged plates or grilles at ground level as used successfully at a number of other churches - this would also supersede the existing door whose bottom hinge has failed.

The church has a limited **plumbing** installation, with a W.C. at the west end of the South Aisle and a sink in the Clergy Vestry. The waste pipe from the latter discharges into the enclosure of the Boiler House steps, and consideration should be given to modifying this drainage arrangement to comply with current standards. The gully at the foot of the Boiler House steps needs a new grating, and the vent pipe rising through the South Aisle roof needs a new balloon cage in its top.

The **Organ** is a substantial instrument by Peter Conacher and Company of Huddersfield, with splendid casework of which at least part was given at a later date. Despite reports over the last thirty or forty years from the organ tuners (Harrison & Harrison of Durham) that it needs major overhaul, it remains in working order and is in occasional use. Its blower motor is not maintained by the organ tuners and should be checked by a competent person at least once a year.

The single **bell** remains in good condition but as recommended in the last two reports its iron clapper could do with painting to inhibit the rust, along with all the other ironwork of the bell fittings, frame and fixings.

The church is well provided with **fire extinguishers**, serviced annually.

#### G) MONUMENTS AND MEMORIALS:

There are a few wall-mounted commemorative tablets within the church, including two artistically distinguished plaques on the east end of the south wall of the south Aisle by Jones and Willis, dating from the 1890's. All appear to remain in good and stable condition.

#### H) CHURCHYARD:

The church occupies virtually the entire site, leaving only narrow strips of ground on all four sides. The surrounding railings, gates and low walls are included in the listing of the building. The railings and gates have been painted since the last inspection but are likely to need doing again within the next two to five years. As noted in previous inspections, in places the feet of the railings have corroded to the extent that they have burst the stone coping into which they are set. Mortar repairs carried out in the past are now failing so further repairs are needed. At the same time the joints between the stone copings need filling in places and some of the underlying brick walling needs re-pointing, together with re-bedding of the occasional loose brick.

## SUMMARY AND PRIORITIES

The church is basically sound and well looked after. Some good work has been done since the last inspection, following on from the excellent efforts in the years before that.

The main areas for concern now are the need to overhaul the high-level rainwater goods together with routine maintenance tasks at high levels, the ever-present threat of dry rot recurring and the condition and protection of some of the window glazing. Improvement of the Heating Chamber access protection also remains highly desirable.

Most of the other recommendations of this report comprise little more than routine maintenance. The following order of priorities sets out, in broad terms, the relative urgency of foreseeable repairs over the next five years. However, it is not a definitive programme of work and items further down the list could be brought forward if desired.

An indication of the range of likely cost, at present-day prices, is shown for each priority category. However, in many cases the scope of repair work is undefined and no measurements have been taken. The figures are no more than 'educated guesses' and should not be relied upon beyond the purpose of indicating the likely spending commitment to maintain the property to a high standard. V.A.T. is not included but is likely to be incurred on all repair work. No allowance has been made for inflation or for any professional fees.

### I. OF UTMOST URGENCY:

None required.

### II. ESSENTIAL within the next SIX MONTHS:

- a) Implementation of any safety recommendations arising from the electrical test report, if not done already.
- b) Checking and clearing of gutters, minor repairs to roof slating and lead flashings, patching/renewal of pointing to ridge of main roof, painting of timber elements of flèche and dormers and of Tower parapet access hatches, if not all attended to already.
- c) Repair and testing of lightning conductor, if not done already.

(Range of likely cost: £1,000 - £2,000)

III. ESSENTIAL within the next YEAR:

- d) Thorough overhaul of high-level rainwater goods including sealing of gutter joints and complete repainting; fitting of replacement length of gutter to west end of north side of Nave (west of Tower); repair of west end of gutter on North Aisle.
- e) Renewal of external protection to South Aisle and Lady Chapel windows.
- f) Provision of handrails and guard rails to access walkways and ladders in Tower.
- g) Reinstatement of fallen pinnacle top, if not dealt with already.
- h) Repair of stained glass in west window of South Aisle, if not done already.
- i) Investigation, repair and re-covering of floor in Clergy Vestry; minor attention to aisle floors to eliminate tripping hazards; filling of erosion pockets in Sanctuary steps.
- j) Checking and lubrication of organ blower motor (annually).

(Range of likely cost: £10,000 - £15,000)

IV. NECESSARY within the next TWO YEARS:

- k) Re-pointing/re-bedding of stone copings and brickwork under boundary railings; painting of the railings themselves.
- l) Provision of waterproof covering to Belfry floor.
- m) Painting of ironwork of bell fittings and of straps at base of spire; treatment of Belfry louvres.
- n) Painting of hinges on Tower Staircase door; adjustment of bolt on Ambulatory doors; provision of better handle on inner door at main entrance.
- o) Attention to minor plumbing matters.

(Range of likely cost: £2,000 - £3,000)

V. NECESSARY within the next FIVE YEARS:

- p) Re-pointing and limited consolidation of specified areas of internal and external masonry, including chimney stack on gable of Organ Chamber; re-bedding of loose step; cutting grooves in watertabling of east gable of Choir Vestry; filling of structural cracks to assist future assessment.
- q) Cleaning and minor repair of tinted leaded glazing; consider re-leading of the worst of the clerestory windows; paint iron ventilator frames in windows - or remove them.
- r) Inspection of ceiling and roof voids when access is available.
- s) Consider cleaning of brick and stone wall surfaces throughout the interior.
- t) Removal of disused vent to Heating Chamber; replacement of cage and door to Heating Chamber steps with horizontal grilles/plates at ground level; painting of retained vent in east wall of Vestry; provision of raised drained floor in Heating Chamber.
- u) Keeping areas of previous dry rot outbreaks under observation.

(Range of likely cost: £10,000 - £15,000)

VI. FUTURE Repairs:

- v) Review of structural crackings and areas of erosion of masonry.
- w) Review of buckling of stained glass in east window and condition of leaded glazing generally.
- x) Review of possible need to re-slate roofs.
- y) Review of apparent heaving of concrete flooring in aisles.
- z) Overhaul and cleaning of organ.

CHRISTOPHER DOWNS, B.Arch., R.I.B.A.  
CHARTERED ARCHITECT

---

# QUINQUENNIAL REPORT

on the Parish Church of

## SAINT PAUL, HARTLEPOOL

UNDER THE INSPECTION OF CHURCHES MEASURE 1955 AND  
THE CARE OF CHURCHES AND ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION MEASURE 1991

<b>DATE OF REPORT</b>	<b>3RD MAY 2010</b>
DIOCESE	DURHAM
ARCHDEACONRY	DURHAM
DEANERY	HARTLEPOOL

**CHRISTOPHER DOWNS, B.ARCH., RIBA. CHARTERED ARCHITECT  
ECCLESIASTICAL AND HISTORIC BUILDINGS CONSULTANT**

THE CATHEDRAL ARCHITECT'S OFFICE, THE GREAT KITCHEN, THE COLLEGE, DURHAM DH1 3EQ

TELEPHONE/FAX (0191) 384 7010