

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
	Appraisal and Recommendations.	Page 3
	Summary and Priorities :-	Page 11
	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 2008 QUINQUENNIAL INSPECTION
of the Parish Church of
S A I N T C U T H B E R T , R E D M A R S H A L L

Diocese of Durham
Archdeaconry of Auckland
Deanery of Stockton
Historic Buildings Listing: Grade I
Conservation Area: None
Civil County and District: Cleveland, Stockton-on-Tees
Ordnance Survey Map Reference: NZ 386 212
Date of Inspection: 14th November 2008
Date of Report: 28th September 2009
Report by CHRISTOPHER DOWNS, B.Arch. R.I.B.A.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION

An attractive church of ancient origin retaining much Norman and medieval work in its fabric, despite rather over-zealous 19th-century restorations. Walls are of the mixture of limestone and sandstone typical in this locality; the timber roof structures are covered with lead in the case of the Nave, Chancel and Tower; Welsh or Lake District slating elsewhere.

The building comprises Nave and Chancel, south Chapel, west Tower (at a slight angle to the main axis) and south Porches to the Nave and the Chancel. The Tower and Nave are essentially Norman work, including the splendid archway connecting them, though the Tower parapets are 15th-century and all the Nave windows are later - mostly 19th-century renewals to late medieval designs. The Chancel arch and the re-used south doorway are also genuinely Norman, though much restored. The Chancel dates from around 1200, as witnessed by the Easter Sepulchre recess in the east end of its north wall, though the sedilia in the opposite wall are in the late medieval Perpendicular style. The south Chapel is thought to have been added around 1300 and, like the Chancel, has had its windows renewed or inserted in the 19th century. The Porch on the south side of the Chancel is of indeterminate date, possibly 18th-century. The church contains a variety of interesting fittings, including the 17th-century (?) balustraded box pews and communion rail, late Norman font of Frosterley marble, and fine monument with recumbent effigies of Thomas de Langton and his wife.

The churchyard, like the church, is of ancient origin and considerable archaeological significance.

A plan of the church is included on the buff-coloured sheet 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. The 1996 and 2003 reports were available on the architect's file for reference in compiling the present one. The 1990 report by L.D. Rooker was available for reference during the 1995 inspection but not retained on file.

These and other previous reports, where they survive, will form a valuable record of the condition of the building and of the work carried out over the past thirty five years and all copies should be kept.

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

Installation of new heating system (2003).

Repairs to churchyard boundary walls (2006 - by Local Authority).

Replacement of timber Belfry louvres (2008).

Provision of safety rails around access openings in upper floors of the Tower.

Provision of internal ramp in Nave to facilitate access for disabled.

Testing and checking of electrical installation (2006).

Renewal of churchyard entrance gates and posts (2009).

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 the suspended timber flooring.
 - ii) Any concealed voids in roofs.
 - iii) Interior of the Organ.
 - iv) Roofs were examined internally from floor levels and externally from ground levels and from the top of the Tower.
- 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 generally, 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 is of traditional construction with substantial stone walls supporting simple timber roof structures. As commented in previous reports, it has evidently suffered structural distortion and settlement over the years due to foundation movement, with various minor crackings and easings evident in several parts of the building. Of these, the main cause for concern in recent years has been the cracking at the west end of the Nave - in the west wall to either side of the Tower arch and in the west end of the south wall. What appears to be happening is slight separation along the original joint lines where the Nave walls abut the Tower, together with slight distortion of the Tower itself - it shows a considerable westward lean and twist which has evidently developed over a long period of time, and minor crackings show in the walls of the Vestry which occupies the ground floor. The movement seemed to have stabilised prior to the 1996 inspection and this is partially confirmed in that only very limited cracking has re-appeared in the Nave walls since the internal decoration carried out in 1998 and the crackings in the Vestry seem no worse now than twelve years ago. However, the external crack on the north side seems to have widened noticeably since 2002 so the movement is continuing, albeit slowly. It may be related to climatic conditions - long dry summers in particular - so the symptoms should be kept under observation and reviewed in future inspections but no other action seems necessary for the foreseeable future.

Similar but less pronounced movement had occurred prior to 1995 where the Chancel walls abut the east end of the Nave, and where the Entrance Porch meets the walls of the Nave and Chapel. Slight hints of old movements also showed in the south walls of the Chapel and the Chancel and in the east wall of the latter, generally along natural lines of weakness above window and door openings. Though slight hair-crackings have re-appeared in some of these locations since the redecoration none are any cause for concern and they should simply be reviewed in future inspections.

The Porch abutting the south side of the Chancel was taken down and re-built on a new concrete raft foundation in 1999 after it threatened to collapse. Virtually all the original materials were re-used. The minor cracking where the Porch walls abut the Chancel appears to be no more than might be expected as the re-built fabric settles down but should be reviewed in future inspections just in case.

The fungal attack in the boarding at the south-east corner of the Chancel roof mentioned in previous reports seems to remain dry and dormant, and is not as extensive as had been feared, but it should continue to be kept under observation in case it revives, particularly as

the leakages through the roof in this area are proving difficult to remedy. Otherwise, the roof structures all appear to be in fair condition.

B) WALLS AND MASONRY:

The external walls of the church comprise a mixture of sandstone and limestone, typical in this locality where both were fairly readily available in the past. Most of the window surrounds are of sandstone, having been renewed in the 19th century. As commented in the last report, both types of stone are rather prone to erosion, and as well as general but relatively superficial weathering the external masonry is suffering from severe erosion in limited areas. The worst of these, on the south side of the Chancel and around the main entrance doorway, were dealt with as part of the masonry repairs and re-pointing carried out in 2001 as the final phase of the repair programme grant-aided by English Heritage. In the course of that work the archway, tympanum and upper parts of the jambs of the doorway underwent specialist conservation treatment - the cost being justified by their early (Norman) date. In addition, the watertables to several of the gables on the church, and the copings and parts of the inside faces of the Tower parapets, were also re-pointed. All seem to remain in good order although some of the lime mortar used for the conservation work is beginning to soften and erode.

Further areas of the external masonry likely to need limited stone replacement in the foreseeable future, though not necessarily within the next five years, include:

Main (lower) stage of the north and west faces of the Tower.

South wall of the Nave above the east slope of the Chapel roof.

A couple of stones at the base of the eastern jamb of the entrance doorway and in the adjacent walling of the Chapel.

Patches of the east wall of the Chancel, especially at low level.

Isolated blocks in lower parts of the north wall of the Nave.

As noted in previous inspections, a split in the base of the central mullion of the window in the south wall of the Chapel could do with careful repair by a skilled mason, with the adhesive injected into the crack rather than smeared onto the face of the stone. The cause of this split may be a rusting iron dowel embedded in the joint and this should be investigated as part of any repair. The dowel would have to be replaced by a non-ferrous or stainless steel equivalent and the stonework pieced back into place in order to ensure long-term effectiveness of the repair.

Spallings likely to be caused by rusting of embedded iron also show in the eastern jamb and mullion of the westernmost window in the north wall of the Nave - the latter clearly caused by a corroding saddlebar. In both instances the spalled fragments have survived and could be re-fixed with a masonry adhesive, provided the rusting iron is dealt with first.

The window in the west end of the south wall of the Nave has a couple of jambstones - one badly spalled, the other delaminating - which could do with repair and renewal respectively when the glazing is dealt with, as suggested in the last report.

As noted in the last two reports, the pointing displays a wide variety of styles and dates, with a considerable amount of patch-pointing evident. Though most remains adequate for the time being, certain limited areas of general walling and some specific architectural features could do with re-pointing. As virtually none of the re-pointing recommended in the last report has been attempted since the following list of areas needing attention within the next five years remains substantially the same as in 2003:

Splayed brick plinth - all round the Tower and limited areas round the rest of the church (despite the work done on this since the last inspection). Some of the bricks may need re-bedding.

Voids and open joints just above plinth level on north side of Tower.

Patch of eroded stonework to north of window in lower stage of west face of Tower - filling of erosion pockets with small stones bedded in mortar.

Joints affected by structural movement where west returns of the Nave meet the Tower (the date when these are filled should be recorded in the Church Log Book).

Open joints in surround to small window at west end of south wall of Nave (internally and externally), isolated open joints or voids elsewhere on this face including low level at the extreme west end and the triangles above the Porch/Chapel roof.

Joints just above plinth level and also in cornice of west wall of Entrance Porch, and just above ground level to the west of the doorway in its south face.

Open joints in the tracery and surround of the south window of the Chapel - especially the wide joint under the mullion in the centre of its sill.

Lower parts of the east wall of the Chapel.

Isolated voids in south wall of Chancel - particularly behind downpipe at east end.

East wall of Chancel, area just above window head - filling of erosion pockets with small stones bedded in mortar.

Joints in hoodmould around east window of the Chancel.

Area around the back of the northern footstone on the east gable of the Nave above the Chancel roof, down behind the quoins beneath it, and a patch at Chancel eaves level.

Isolated open joints in north wall of Chancel.

Though the open joints in the Tower parapet string course need filling, unless this work is carried out by steeplejacks the cost of scaffolding is likely to be significant so it would be best to wait some years longer until more needs doing so as to incorporate this work in a general programme of restoration of the Tower. The same applies to the need to check and perhaps repair or replace the badly eroded stone spitters at the base of the parapet on the west face - all as recommended in the last report.

Previous reports have mentioned the deep erosion of the internal wall faces in the Belfry and intermediate stage of the Tower caused by the transfer of water-soluble salts through the masonry from the external faces. The north wall is particularly badly affected above and below Belfry floor level, but is still not yet to the stage where action has to be taken. It, and

other less seriously damaged areas including the mullions and jambs of the Belfry openings, should be reviewed in future inspections.

The same mechanism of salt migration is responsible for stonework erosion (and the plaster deterioration evident before the recent repairs) at the base of the external walls due to rising dampness. Some of the external erosion is becoming quite deep, and the worst areas are included in the list given above for future renewals. Little can be done to arrest this process without risking setting up adverse reactions by injecting ancient masonry with chemical solutions. The brick plinths around the building are presumably an earlier attempt at alleviating the problem and may well be of some benefit if kept well pointed, but in their present condition are likely to be helping to trap moisture in the subsoil beside the building rather than throwing it clear. The erosion has a long way to go before it becomes a structural problem, and the symptoms should merely be kept under observation for the time being - all as reported in 2003.

C) ROOF COVERINGS AND RAINWATER DISPOSAL:

The roofs of the Chancel, Nave and Tower are all lead-covered on low-pitched structures. Much of the north slope of the Nave was re-covered with new lead in 1990 (following theft) but the rest appears to be of considerable age, probably dating from the 19th century restorations of the building. Lead-burned repairs to splits, especially at roll ends, were carried out to all these roofs in 2001 and left the leadwork in serviceable condition for the foreseeable future. Occasional minor leakage is reported but there are no obvious defects to account for these, which are very intermittent and dependent upon wind direction. More persistent is that at the south-east corner of the Chancel, where repeated attempts at a cure have still not succeeded entirely and further work may be needed to prevent re-activation of the old fungal growth in this vicinity. Also, the pocket of decay in the boarding of the Tower roof mentioned in previous reports could do with repair in due course.

Sections of the lead flashings at the abutments of several of the roofs (both slated and lead-covered) were re-fixed and re-pointed as part of the restoration campaign in 2001. All seem to be holding except where a gap has opened up between the leadwork and the pointing on the inside face of the eastern half of the north parapet of the Tower, noted in 2002 but still awaiting sealing. Also as mentioned in 2003, what appears to be a split towards the lower end of the flashing where the east slope of the Chapel roof abuts the Nave may need an additional over-flashing to keep water out.

The Chapel and Entrance Porch share a slated roof. Over the Chapel this comprises green Lake District slating but on the west slope this changes to blue Welsh slates where it continues down over the Entrance Porch. The slating was thoroughly overhauled in 2001 but this merely delayed the inevitable and it has needed repeated patching as it nears the end of its useful life. At the time of this inspection it appeared to be generally serviceable but a number of slates and a piece of lead were displaced, the underlying battens seem to have decayed at the south end of the eaves of the Porch roof and the overall condition is poor. Whilst such

patching could probably keep this slating going for a while longer it would be worth considering re-slating - of the western slope at least - within the next five years. The ridge pointing needs patching but it may be as well to leave this until the re-slating is carried out.

The roof of the Porch on the south side of the Chancel was re-slatted using its original green Lake District slating supplemented by matching second-hand material as part of the reconstruction project in 1999, and remains in good order.

The cast iron eaves guttering and downpipes appear to remain in good order generally but all except that on the Chancel Porch need painting within the next couple of years. The broken gutter on the west side of the Entrance Porch, lying on the ground at the time of the inspection, needs re-fixing or replacement if not attended to already. Some minor defects should also be dealt with before the repainting, including re-setting the west end of the north gutter of the Nave to drain to its outlet. As noted in 2002, the timber fascia supporting the outer edge of the lead-lined gutter on the short length of western eaves of the South Chapel is badly decayed and needs renewal to maintain the gutter shape.

At the time of the inspection the remaining section of gutter on the Entrance Porch contained weeds including a small plant growing in the outlet, suggesting neglect of the routine clearing of all the gutters, downpipes and gullies. In view of the proximity of so many trees this should be undertaken at least twice a year.

D) WINDOWS AND DOORS:

The church has two stained glass windows, both in the Chancel: That in the south wall dates from 1904 and the north window from 1995. Both remain in good condition but provision of external protection should be considered.

Most of the rest of the windows in the church, including the north windows of the Nave and east window of the Chancel, are filled with uncoloured glazing in diamond pattern leading but with stained glass in the tracery lights displaying various leaf designs. The south window of the Chapel is similar but with rather more elaboration in the form of red and yellow borders and a series of emblems set in the main lights. As in 2002, all appear to remain in fair condition with only occasional cracked quarries, not warranting action other than perhaps cleaning of the uncoloured glass (the diamond-leaded uncoloured glass of the Vestry window in the base of the Tower could also do with cleaning). The last report mentioned the likelihood that occasional leakage occurs through the glazing in storm conditions and this should be kept under review, as these windows are of an age where the sealant between the lead comes and glass quarries could have perished and may need renewal. The iron saddlebars supporting the glass could do with painting throughout.

As noted in the last report, the uncoloured glass in rectangular pattern leading in the small single-light window at the west end of the south wall of the Nave is in very poor condition, not helped by rusting of the iron ventilator frame set within it. As suggested in 2003, this glass should be taken out and re-leaded, dispensing with the ventilator frame, or

possibly (and perhaps preferably) replaced by a new glass design. Work to the glass should be carried out in conjunction with the repairs to the stonework recommended above.

In the Belfry, the timber louvres to all four openings have been renewed (work in progress at the time of the inspection), together with the bird exclusion mesh.

The external doors remain in fair condition.

E) FLOORS AND INTERNAL FITTINGS AND FINISHES:

The flooring in the body of the church comprises stone paving to the passageways (increasingly covered by carpet) and suspended timber construction to the pew areas, choir stalls and Chapel. The areas of paving still exposed remain generally satisfactory though suffering slight erosion due to rising damp generally and in parts of the Nave and Chancel could do with pointing to some of the more open joints with a carefully-chosen mortar. The pocket of rather deeper erosion close to the pulpit may need replacement stone inserting in due course. The paving in the Entrance Porch also needs filling and pointing where it has eroded at the joints.

The suspended timber flooring feels firm underfoot throughout the Nave and Chapel - it is understood to have been checked underneath during the re-wiring of some twenty years ago. A loose board at the south end of the front of the southern rank of pews in the Nave, probably lifted in the course of electrical or heating installation work, needs re-fixing. More seriously, the springy area in the flooring of the north bank of choir stalls appears to be worse now than before and so should be opened up and repaired.

As commented in 2003 the upper floors in the Tower appear to be relatively modern renewals in preservative-impregnated timber, and all remain in good condition. However, the various steel access ladders are showing signs of rust and should be repainted within the next five years.

Plaster repair and redecoration throughout the main body of the church in 1998 obliterated the evidence of rising damp recorded previously. Other than in the Chapel there is still very little sign of it breaking back through, although it will almost certainly do so generally eventually. As commented in the last report, the lime plaster and limewash should be regarded as sacrificial, in that by allowing the harmful salts to concentrate within it the stonework of the wall itself is protected, on the 'poultice' principle. Also as recorded previously, in some areas it was not possible to remove the previous emulsion paint from the existing sound plaster so this may cause problems of compatibility, including peeling, in years to come. In the Entrance Porch the plaster has deteriorated behind the western jamb of the external doorway and in the Chapel it has been destroyed along the base of parts of the south and west walls so will need renewing at the next redecoration. As noted in 2002, the plaster (or, more likely, cement-based render) below the sill of the window in the south wall of the Chapel is cracking and sounds hollow, suggesting it is detached from the wall behind. But the fixing of the new heater on this wall seems to have helped secure it so filling of the cracking when next preparing for decoration is all that is needed.

The Vestry in the base of the Tower was not included in the last round of plaster repairs and redecoration. Its finishes are in poor condition so may need improving (ideally, using the same specification as in the rest of the church) in due course, particularly if the use of this space changes from what appears to be little more than storage.

The furnishings and fittings throughout the church appear to remain in good order, including the fine box pews with their balustraded backs, sides and doors and the communion rails, all believed to be of 17th century date. The Frosterley marble font, thought to date from around 1200, is also in good condition and so too are the oak pulpit, lectern and choir stalls, all probably dating from the 19th century. The front desk of the northern rank of choir stalls is rather loose and could do with re-fixing, and the internal door to the Chancel Porch has lost one of the curved laths forming its head on the Chancel side. As suggested in 2003, under current health & safety legislation it may be necessary to provide a handrail to the pulpit steps - a simple iron rail should suffice.

F) INSTALLATIONS:

The **electrical** installation is reported to have been completely re-wired in 1988. Ordinary p.v.c. insulated cable was used, housed in plastic conduit where it runs on the surface. As commented in previous reports, this does not sit comfortably with the uneven wall surfaces of this historic building. The light fittings date from the same time and appear generally satisfactory. The system is understood to have been tested in 2006 so will be due for re-testing in 2011. The test certificate should be filed with the church log book. As noted in 2003, the external light fitting on the north face of the Tower seems to be disused and it would be sensible to remove both it and the associated cable.

The **lightning conductor** installation is understood to have been upgraded in 1987/8. It appears to be reasonably comprehensive and in good order except for some limited re-clipping needed where the tape runs on the back of the Tower parapets. There is no record of it having been tested in the last ten years so this should be put in hand within the next six months and the re-clipping could be attended to at the same time.

The electric **heating system** was completely replaced in 2004/5 with a new central heating installation comprising radiators fed from a central gas-fired boiler mounted in the intermediate chamber of the Tower. This system has been installed very neatly and is reported to be effective. It is serviced annually. The only minor defect noted in the course of this inspection is that the hole where the boiler flue passes out through the north wall of the Tower needs packing or filling around the pipe so as to exclude birds.

The steel base plate and struts supporting the fibreglass **flagpole** on the roof of the Tower have been painted since the last inspection but rust is showing and they need repainting again to inhibit this. The same applies to the steelwork and bolts supporting the three **bells**, which are hung on deadstocks for chiming by levers attached to the clappers.

The Tower archway is filled by the simple but attractive pipe **organ** by Church & Co., installed in 1979. It is reported to be regularly maintained and in good order.

The church seems well equipped with **fire extinguishers**, upgraded or replaced as necessary in 2006 and serviced annually.

G) MONUMENTS:

The only monument of note is that in the Chapel bearing the splendid alabaster recumbent effigies of Thomas de Langton (died 1440) and his wife. This received specialist conservation treatment by Harrison Hill in 1989 but there are signs of powdering of the alabaster at the base under the male effigy, suggesting that some deterioration is occurring. Though not a high priority, it would be worth asking a conservator to examine and report on this.

H) CHURCHYARD:

The church stands in a fairly extensive ancient graveyard, which was closed by Order in Council in 1992 and is cared for by Stockton Borough Council. It is grassed, with gravel pathways, and contains a wide selection of headstones of various periods. Despite some leaning quite alarmingly most seem to be stable but there is one which is quite clearly not. This is in memory of Elizabeth Anne Hall and stands at the west end of a burial plot defined with stone edging about five metres from the western boundary and some ten or fifteen metres from the northern boundary of the churchyard. It has a rose bush growing on its eastern side which may be adding to the instability. This should be made safe as soon as possible, preferably by righting in on a new foundation or sinking it further into the ground.

In the last report it was suggested that the main approach path from the south be lowered as it approaches the Porch so as to allow the Porch paving to be lowered as well, to the level of the Nave floor. The construction of a ramp within the Nave (albeit a less satisfactory solution) has rendered this recommendation obsolete. However, the path could still do with re-surfacing to replace its present loose material with bound gravel, as this is much easier for wheels.

Some work has clearly been done on the churchyard trees since the last inspection and it is assumed that the Local Authority have a suitable inspection regime in place.

The boundary walls comprise some sections of brick and others of stone, with occasional mixing of the two. Since the last inspection the bulging and unstable brick section retaining the south-west corner of the churchyard has been rebuilt, to a good standard, and part of the brick coping to the wall at the north end of the western boundary has been renewed. Elsewhere, some re-pointing and perhaps limited re-bedding is needed to copings in various places.

As mentioned in previous reports, just north of the west end of the church there has been some slippage of the brick walling on its damp-proof course, and this has increased from 30mm to 35mm since 2002 - it seems to have increased at the rate of around a millimetre a year over the last decade or so. The presence of engineer's 'demec' pins suggests that the Local Authority is monitoring the situation.

The decayed oak gates and posts at both entrances to the churchyard are understood to have been repaired or renewed since the inspection, and the associated ironwork repainted.

SUMMARY AND PRIORITIES

The church is basically sound and evidently very well looked after. A lot of good work has been done since the last inspection, continuing the excellent effort of the preceding years.

The gradual structural movement at the west end needs to be kept under review but the main areas for concern now are the state of the slating of the Chapel/Entrance Porch roof, the condition of the westernmost window in the south wall of the Nave and the springy flooring under the north rank of Choir stalls. A significant amount of stone re-pointing and limited repair/renewal is also needed within the next five years.

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) Clearing, checking and minor repair of gutters and running repairs to roof coverings and to flashings at roof abutments.
- b) Testing and where necessary re-clipping of lightning conductor system.
- c) Investigation and repair of springy area of northern choir stall platform and securing of front desk; securing of loose board at front of southern rank of pews in Nave.
- d) Stabilisation of unstable headstone in churchyard.

(Range of likely cost: £1,000 - £1,500 excluding work in churchyard)

III. ESSENTIAL within the next YEAR:

- e) Re-pointing (and some re-bedding) of splayed brick plinths around base of external walls.
- f) Cleaning of window glazing, except stained glass.
- g) Consider provision of handrail to pulpit steps.
- h) Filling of hole round boiler flue to exclude birds.

(Range of likely cost: £1,000 - £1,500)

IV. NECESSARY within the next TWO YEARS:

- i) Consider re-surfacing main approach path with bound gravel.
- j) Re-testing of electrical installation (2011); removal of redundant external light fitting.
- k) Filling and pointing of open joints in floor paving.
- l) Repainting of cast iron rainwater goods, of iron saddlebars to windows, of ladders in Tower and the flagpole and bell fittings.

(Range of likely cost: £3,500 - £5,000)

V. NECESSARY within the next FIVE YEARS:

- m) Re-slating of roof over Chapel and Entrance Porch.
- n) Re-pointing of specified areas of external masonry.
- o) Filling and pointing between copings of boundary walling; keeping structural movement in western boundary wall under observation.
- p) Keeping dormant fungal attack in Chancel roof timbers under observation; replace decayed board in Tower roof.
- q) Minor repairs to spalled stonework of window surrounds including dealing with rusting ironwork causing the damage.
- r) Repair/renewal of glazing and stone surround of westernmost window in south wall of Nave.
- s) Replacement of missing lath from head of Porch doorway in south wall of Chancel.
- t) Checking of churchyard trees.
- u) Consider providing external protection to stained glass windows.
- v) Obtain specialist conservator's report on Langton monument.

(Range of likely cost: £12,500 - £15,000 excluding work in churchyard)

VI. FUTURE Repairs:

- w) Review of structural crackings and of eroded areas of stonework.
- x) Further re-pointing and limited stone renewal, including work to parapets of Tower along with their string course and spitters, and to walling within Belfry.
- y) Repair of plaster and decoration as and where affected by rising damp.
- z) Possible re-cementing of leaded glazing if leakage becomes unacceptable.

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

QUINQUENNIAL REPORT

on the Parish Church of

SAINT CUTHBERT, REDMARSHALL

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

DATE OF REPORT

28TH SEPTEMBER 2009

DIOCESE

DURHAM

ARCHDEACONRY

AUCKLAND

DEANERY

STOCKTON

**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