

**AN ASSESSMENT
OF THE NEEDS OF
LISTED PLACES OF WORSHIP
IN USE
ACROSS THE UK**

Undertaken on behalf of
Heritage Lottery Fund
and
English Heritage

SUMMARY

Jeremy Eckstein Associates
December 2001

The evidence that it has been possible to present in this report, represents the result of an enormous amount of laborious work undertaken carefully and conscientiously by church treasurers and secretaries, by the secretaries of the County Historic Churches Trusts and by the staff of a number of other foundations and trusts. Without their support, none of this would have been possible. To them, and to others who gave enthusiastic assistance throughout, I extend my grateful thanks. Hopefully their efforts will help to ensure that the listed places of worship around the country which are the "jewels in the crown" of our built heritage, will continue to be enjoyed by future generations as architectural treasures, at the same time as playing a central role in the lives of the communities they serve.

Jeremy Eckstein

December 2001



This document is the summary of a fuller report prepared for the Heritage Lottery Fund & English Heritage in September 2001.

Table of Contents

Sections:

1.	Summary; Observations & Principal Findings	-----	page	1
2.	Background & Remit	-----	page	5
3.	Structure & Methodology	-----	page	5
4.	Findings; Churches' Needs	-----	page	7
5.	Findings; Provision of Grant-Aid to Churches in Need	-----	page	10
6.	Estimating Global Needs	-----	page	13
7.	VAT	-----	page	13

Tables:

[Note: Because not all of the tables in the full report are reproduced in this Summary, the numbering of the tables is not always the same in the two documents.]

1	Sample of Churches drawn from the <i>Churches Needs Survey</i> ; Distribution of Aggregate Costs of Repair Needs	-----	page	15
2	Sample of Churches drawn from the <i>Churches Needs Survey</i> ; Distribution of Repair Costs of Work Assessed as being "Urgent Major"	-----	page	15
3	Sample of Churches drawn from the <i>Churches Needs Survey</i> ; Distribution of Repair Costs of Work Assessed as being "Medium Term"	-----	page	16
4	Selected Data from "VAT & the Church" Survey: Distribution of Total Annual Repair and Maintenance Costs per Church for Listed Churches for Selected Denominations (all Grades of Listing together)	-----	page	17
5	Selected Data from "VAT & the Church" Survey: Comparison of Total Annual Repair and Maintenance Costs per Church, by Denomination and Grade of Listing	-----	page	18

6	Joint Scheme Applications; Ranges of Project Costs and Amounts Sought, by Application Grant Stream	-----	page	19
7	County Historic Churches Trusts: Distribution of Grant-Aided Churches, by Grade of Listing	-----	page	20
8	County Historic Churches Trusts: Analysis of Grants, by Category of Work and Grade of Listing	-----	page	20
9	County Historic Churches Trusts: Analysis of Grants, by Size of Grant and Classification of Work	-----	page	21
10	County Historic Churches Trusts: Analysis of Grants, by Size of Grant and Nature of Work	-----	page	22
11	Churches Grant-Aided by the County Historic Churches Trusts: Principal other Sources of Project Finance	-----	page	23
12	General Grant-Making Trusts: Distribution of Grants to Churches, by Size of Grant	-----	page	23

1. Summary; Observations & Principal Findings

1.1 By and large, the balance between financial need and funding opportunities appears to be holding up reasonably well at the present time. However there are a number of issues which need to be kept under review, the principal themes of which are outlined in the paragraphs below.

1.2 A number of the observations may be traced back to a degree of confusion among applicants and recipients of grant-aid, with regard to precisely what constitutes “heritage”. The Heritage Lottery Fund and the principal agencies all contain the word “heritage” in their titles, yet to many observers their funding policies take into account criteria which appear to have little if anything to do with “heritage” *per se* (in the generally accepted use of the word) but more to do with meeting politically correct notions of deprivation or wider social use. While accepting that funding derived from the Lottery should properly be for the benefit of the largest number of people, there is a groundswell of opinion that believes that the nation’s built heritage deserves to be rewarded on the basis of its own architectural merits alone, and should not have to seek justification on the grounds of wider community use.

1.3 The situation is being exacerbated by the fact that many rural areas suffer from dwindling populations and economic bases which are being further eroded by the ongoing crises in farming of which the foot and mouth outbreak is just the latest in a long succession of disasters.

1.4 **Priority Areas.** There is clearly a need for some form of rationing when the demand for grant resources greatly exceeds the supply, but there is considerable “grass roots” discontent at the manner in which Priority Areas have been designated as a means of achieving the desired result. The concern is that the Priority Areas almost exclusively represent areas of urban deprivation, and effectively fail to recognise the concept of rural deprivation. This seems at odds with the Joint Scheme’s stated objective regarding wider community benefit. It is also difficult to reconcile with the fact that a disproportionate number of grade I and II* listed churches are in rural (frequently deprived) areas.

1.5 **Size of Grant-Aided Projects.** In terms of their cost, the profile of “typical” projects grant-aided by the Heritage Lottery Fund (in conjunction with its funding partners) is significantly different from that of the projects undertaken by the large number of places of worship without

the benefit of such grants. It seems quite proper to ration finite agency grant resources by reserving them for the finest “jewels in the crown”. However when assessing the needs of listed places of worship as a whole, it is important not to lose sight of the very large proportion of churches undertaking work at the lowest end of the spectrum which, even so, is often beyond their immediate financial resources.

1.6 Timely Intervention. Inevitably with old buildings in daily use, unexpected emergency repairs will frequently play havoc with the most carefully planned work programmes. There is a strong body of evidence to suggest that this is indeed happening, and that this is resulting in the deferral of planned necessary repairs. Even with no intervening events to throw their budgets off track, many churches nonetheless find it difficult to meet the cost of repairs agreed as part of a 5-year rolling programme.

1.7 Fast Track Low-Value Grants. In view of the needs of smaller churches seeking to finance largely smaller scale but none-the-less urgent repairs, there is good reason to believe that a “fast-track” low value grant-aid programme would be well received, to supplement the present predominantly “heavyweight” grants. The evidence of the data collected for this report suggest that the ceiling figure for these grants could well be set at no more than £10,000 – or perhaps even lower.

1.8 Block Grants. A larger number of smaller value grants inevitably puts a strain on the funding body and adds to the cost of the administrative process. A number of individual private Charitable Trusts have responded to this problem by effectively delegating the responsibility for assessing applications and making awards to other funding bodies (especially where the originating trust does not have the necessary expertise). Such trusts therefore do not make awards themselves, but instead make block grants to other responsible grant-making bodies who are better able - or better placed geographically - to assess and monitor individual applications.

1.9 The Heritage Lottery Fund has a commitment to retaining control of the grant-making process. Nevertheless a strong case could be made for annual block grants to be made to one or more responsible bodies such as the Historic Churches Preservation Trust or the Council for the Care of Churches. Block grants to such organizations could presumably be “ring-fenced” to ensure that the ultimate awards complied with HLF / agency funding criteria. This would be an effective way of spreading HLF money wider – and more equitably - without adding to the administrative burden.

1.10 Matched Funding. The need for congregations to find matched funding towards a repair project – on however modest a basis - is becoming an increasingly problematic issue. Many congregations are facing “donation fatigue”. The problem is especially bad in rural areas with dwindling (and ageing) populations and declining economic activity. It is likely to become worse as diocesan finances come under increasing pressure for a variety of reasons, as is happening at present.

1.11 Repairs vs. Maintenance. It tends to be easier to attract grants for high profile repair work than for routine maintenance work, yet the fact remains that a significant proportion of the work necessary to keep a church in sound condition and open for community use, comes under the heading of “maintenance” rather than “repair”.

1.12 If more grant-making bodies were ready to consider grants towards the cost of ongoing maintenance work, this might prove to be an extremely cost-effective measure over the medium to long term. Perhaps a “ring-fenced” block grant to an established grant-giving trust might be the most administratively efficient means of delivering such support.

1.13 Social and Community Use. The HLF has sound reasons for taking issues of social and community use into account as criteria for assessing grant eligibility. This clearly works to the benefit of those churches seeking funding to improve the use of the building as a focal point of community activity. However given the formal remit of the Community Fund (as the National Lottery Charities Board is now known) which is “to help meet the needs of those at greatest disadvantage in society and to improve the quality of life in the community” perhaps there might be some merit in establishing a formal joint HLF / CF Scheme to help support repair programmes to listed churches which have this as their principal objective.

1.14 In conclusion, it is easy to complain about inadequate levels of funding for repairs to churches. However on the evidence of this survey, the funding agencies and private trusts are doing a good job, considering that the budgets for government spending departments are carefully controlled by the Treasury, so that more money for one inevitably means less for another, in a “zero sum” game. All things considered, there are grounds for optimism that the listed places of worship which are rightly regarded as among the “jewels in the crown” of our built heritage, will continue to be enjoyed by future generations as architectural treasures, at the same time as playing a central role in the lives of the communities they serve.

1.15 That said, funding sources are being squeezed, while the repair needs of churches are continuing to increase. A backlog of pending necessary work and the emerging difficulties in the Church of England's financial situation also add weight to the likely burden over the coming years. All in all, there is certainly no room for complacency.



2. Background & Remit

2.1 This assessment of the needs of listed places of worship in use across the UK was devised as part of a planned broader-based review of the delivery of grants to the sector. The work was designed to be broadly ecumenical in its approach, covering listed buildings used as places of worship by all religious denominations. The remit did not extend to unlisted buildings.

2.2 The new data which was gathered, related principally to the most recent two-year period, thus avoiding any distortions which might have occurred as a result of Millennium year work. The study was carried out during summer 2001, and the report was submitted at the end of September.

2.3 The formal remit was principally to provide an assessment of needs rather than a “snapshot” of expenditure at a given point in time. The analysis is therefore principally based on averages and distributions of expenditure, to provide a profile of “typical” needs. However some broadly-based estimates of grossed-up “global” needs were also calculated (see Section 6 below).

3. Structure & Methodology

3.1 The study approached the subject from two distinct standpoints: (i) that of the churches in need of financial assistance and; (ii) that of the funding bodies providing the assistance.

3.2 The study was divided into five principal strands. Strands 1, 2 and 3 analysed the needs of churches carrying out repair work. Strand 4 drew information from the bodies providing funding support. Strand 5 drew together a variety of ad hoc material from both perspectives.

- **Strand 1** involved sending questionnaires to a sample of some 50 (approx. 1 in 3) of the churches originally surveyed by the *Churches Needs Survey* in the mid-1990s. The questionnaire sought to determine: (i) the accuracy of the original needs assessment; (ii) how much of the work assessed as being necessary was actually carried out; (iii) what work was not carried out as recommended, and why; (iv) the likelihood of outstanding work being completed; and (v) details of unplanned emergency work which was not anticipated by the earlier assessment. The response rate to the questionnaire was good – around 64%.

- **Strand 2** analysed recent or current applications to the HLF / EH Joint Grant Scheme. A sample of 50 was drawn from a total of some 1,200 such applications – making a sample of approximately 1 in 25.
- **Strand 3** re-analysed the responses from some 800 churches to the *VAT & the Church Survey* in 2000; in 250 cases additional previously unrecorded information was drawn from the original questionnaires.
- **Strand 4** involved sending questionnaires to each of the 33 County Historic Churches Trusts in England, and to a sample of more than 50 general grant-making trusts around the country which included the built heritage among their stated funding objectives. In each case the questionnaires sought information regarding: (i) the number of churches to which grants were made during the period; (ii) the Trust's funding priorities; (iii) details of individual grants, including classification and priority of the work and; (iv) other known sources of funding. Here too the response rate was good - approximately 75% of the Historic Churches Trusts and over 60% of the general grant-making trusts.
- **Strand 5** gathered a variety of *ad hoc* information from various bodies which did not fit neatly into any of the four principal strands of the research programme.

3.3 The five strands of research were distinct, parallel elements of the overall investigation. Taken on their own, each gives an insight into the subject matter of the review from its own particular perspective. Taken together, they help to give a composite picture of the needs and problems faced in meeting the repair and maintenance costs of listed places of worship in use across the United Kingdom at the present time.

3.4 Wherever possible, the hard data provided by quantitative survey findings was supplemented by “soft data” in the form of anecdotal evidence by the individuals and bodies responding to the questionnaires. This provided useful evidence from both sides of the funding equation as to how churches’ repair needs were actually being met in practice.

3.5 In the event, in spite of the broad ecumenical intent of the study, the large majority of the information processed was either derived from or related to the experience or needs of Anglican churches. The information received in respect of other denominations or faiths was in most cases neither as extensive nor as robust, allowing significantly less detailed analysis to be undertaken. For this reason, unless stated to the contrary, the findings presented in this summary relate just to the Church of England’s churches. It would not necessarily be

appropriate to assume that the findings applied equally to other denominations or faiths.

4. Findings; Churches' Needs

4.1 The broad picture to emerge from the research is one of relatively modest, but none-the-less problematic, needs. Thus for example, the largest part of the total cost of the repair needs identified in the original *Churches Needs Survey* related to medium term, deferrable and minor work (Table 1); less than 10% related to urgent high level and other urgent work. Among the sample of churches which were re-visited for this latest study, fewer than half had been assessed as requiring work which could be classified as being "major and urgent" and in a significant proportion of cases the work in question was estimated to cost £5,000 or less (Table 2). Among those cases assessed as being in need of urgent major work, the cost was estimated to be in excess of £25,000 in only one in six cases, while only one in 25 required urgent work estimated at more than £40,000.

4.2 A far higher proportion of churches (83% - Table 3) had been assessed as being in need of "medium term repairs". Further, the estimated costs of such repairs tended to be higher, with one in three of the repairs estimated to cost in excess of £25,000 and one in five estimated at more than £40,000. These figures given an uncomfortable indication of what is in store over the coming years.

4.3 The further analysis of responses to the *VAT & the Church Survey* showed broadly the same pattern (Table 4). According to that survey, between 60% and 70% of listed churches in the UK had spent £10,000 or less on repairs during the year.

4.4 The *VAT & the Church* data covered expenditure on ongoing maintenance as well as on repairs. The figures in Table 5 show that ongoing maintenance typically accounts for a significant proportion of total expenditure on upkeep and it cannot be ignored when assessing the needs of churches. Apart from anything else, "today's maintenance is tomorrow's repair"; modest expenditure now can certainly save the need for more extensive costly repairs at a later date.

4.5 With few exceptions the assessment of needs indicated by the earlier *Churches Needs Survey* has proved to be generally accurate, although the earlier survey frequently underestimated the cost of carrying out the work. However it must be a matter of some concern that a significant proportion of churches had not yet carried out work which had been assessed by the earlier

survey as being urgent. And in spite of the generally low costs involved, as often as not the principal reason given was lack of money, especially when other unanticipated urgent work had to take priority.

4.6 It is clear that financial problems are endemic. Even the relatively modest cost of church repairs poses a serious problem for a large number of the smaller parish communities. The result is that all too often congregations adopt a “knee jerk”, reactive response to the fabric needs of their churches, rather than a more considered pro-active approach. The concept of a “stitch in time” approach to repairs may be fine in theory, but is difficult to put into practice when there are insufficient funds readily available even to undertake essential immediate work. Recommended timetables for repairs are an irrelevance when work can only be carried out as and when funding becomes available.

4.7 Some individual comments from respondents to the questionnaires paint a particularly bleak picture, typically:

“The state of the church has been discussed on a number of occasions, and attempts made to secure funding for modifications / repairs, but with limited success.”

4.8 Others show a perhaps naïve faith in the future, in spite of the evidence of the past, eg.

“Main reason for postponement was lack of available funds. The intention is that this will be attended to in the near future”.

4.9 The present state of diocesan finance is causing concern in some parishes, to the extent that a number of respondents believed that diocesan support for repair schemes was likely to come under increasing pressure in coming years. This may well mean that churches will have to look elsewhere for support for their building repair work in the future.

4.10 The broad mass of mainly small parish churches, for the most part struggling to find even the relatively modest sums needed to fund small scale repairs, are at one end of the spectrum as regards both size and needs. At the other end are a very much smaller number of larger churches undertaking correspondingly larger repair projects, as typified by the sample of recent applications submitted to the Joint Grant Scheme by churches in England. The analysis of recent applications to the Scheme undertaken as Strand 3 of this study shows a strong concentration of project costs in the £25,000 - £50,000 range (Table 6) with an average of a little over £105,000.

4.11 Although the issues were on a larger scale, the difficulty of financing necessary repairs provided a common link between the two groups at opposite ends of the spectrum. On average, the grants sought by the sampled applicants to the Joint Scheme amounted to approximately 66% of the corresponding total

project costs. This left a considerable monetary gap to be funded from other sources and only around 60% of the applications were able to give any clear indication of what they hoped to raise from other sources. Even where additional funding sources were named, they did not always include definite amounts of money, and fewer still were able to report that the funding had already been secured. Clearly as far as some applications were concerned, the raising of money from other sources was still very much an aspiration rather than an expectation, let alone a secured commitment at that stage of the application process.

4.12 Where additional funding sources were mentioned by name, the two most common sources by a wide margin were the Historic Churches Preservation Trust and / or the local Historic County Preservation Trust. Together these accounted for almost half of the specific mentions of other sources.

4.13 Most applicants to the Joint Scheme were heavily dependent on their own resources. A number had substantial sums (£10,000 or more) in their Fabric Funds or other resources which they were going to put towards the cost of the work, and had expectations (or at least hopes) of raising the balance by further – largely unspecified – fundraising efforts within the community and involving the community. However a small number were openly pessimistic about the prospects of local fundraising efforts, largely due to a combination of “appeal fatigue” and the problems resulting from rural deprivation / urban decline coupled with low or declining populations.

4.14 The fact that community benefit is one of the criteria used for assessing eligibility for Joint Scheme grants raises other important issues. With grant-aid for repairs already strictly limited, some potential applicants were concerned that grants from heritage sources were nevertheless being rationed according to criteria which appeared to have little to do with the merit or needs of the case in terms of their architectural heritage importance.

5. Findings; Provision of Grant-Aid to Churches in Need

5.1 The findings in respect of the delivery of grant-aid were based on surveys sent to the County Historic Churches Trusts in England and to a selection of other grant-making trusts around the country which included the built heritage among their stated funding objectives.

5.2 The County Historic Churches Trusts provided grant-aid to an average of 39 churches per Trust. Assuming that this average is representative of the whole body of such Trusts, this implies that as a whole they assisted some 1,300 churches during the period under review. This is an impressive number in

absolute terms, and demonstrates the vital role which the Trusts play in providing much needed financial support for repairs to listed churches. However, it represents a very small percentage (less than 10%) of the total number of listed places of worship in the country, indicating the crucial need which exists for financial support from other supplementary funding sources.

5.3 Overall, approximately 70% of the churches supported by the County Trusts were believed to be listed grade I or II*, 22% were grade II and 8% were unlisted (Table 7). By comparison, it is estimated that approximately 50% of all listed churches in England are grade I or II*. This suggests that the County Trusts tend to have a bias towards grant-aiding grade I / II* churches above those with lesser grades, which is only to be expected since most of them operate on strictly limited budgets. Indeed, turning the figures around, it is perhaps surprising that as many as 30% of the churches supported were only listed grade II or even unlisted.

5.4 Where it was possible to classify the nature of the work grant-aided, it was evident that it was predominantly “high level” and “fabric” work for both grade I / II* and grade II churches (Table 8). The average amount of grant-aid was approximately £2,400 per church. Some 50% of individual grants overall were for £2,000 or less, with a small but significant number of grants of up to £12,000 and a very small number up to £20,000 (Table 9).

5.5 There was a strong tendency towards higher value grants to grade I / II* churches (average £2,700) compared to grants to grade II churches (average £2,000).

5.6 No single grant made by any of the County Trusts responding to the survey was for more than £20,000 and grants for more than £6,000 were almost exclusively confined to “High Level” and “Fabric” work (Table 10). Most Trusts acknowledged experiencing greater demand for assistance than they were able to meet, so setting an upper limit to grants is a logical means of spreading their available funds as widely as possible.

5.7 Fewer than 3% by number of the almost 1,000 grants made to listed churches recorded by the survey were for more than £10,000. Even allowing for the fact that the actual total cost of the work would have been significantly greater than the amount of the grant, it is doubtful whether more than a small minority of projects would have reached the Joint Scheme’s present lower limit of £10,000 – and the figure would be even lower if reference was made to whether or not the churches were in the Scheme’s designated priority areas. In this respect, the data supports the evidence of other Strands of this research, in terms of the gulf which exists between those major projects which receive support from the Heritage Lottery Fund and the partner agencies, and the more modest needs of the majority of parish churches around the country.

5.8 The County Trusts were also asked to assess the urgency of the work which they grant-aided. It was estimated that 86% were of “immediate” urgency (within 2 years) and 14% were of medium-term urgency (2 – 5 years). Again in view of the limited budgets of most County Trusts, it is not surprising that they should concentrate their efforts on supporting work of immediate urgency. However this reinforces the need for a sustainable approach to funding longer-term repairs and maintenance work.

5.9 Listed grade I and II* churches grant-aided by the County Trusts are normally relatively well-placed to seek further assistance from parish and diocesan funds and from English Heritage and / or the Heritage Lottery Fund (Table 11). However for grade II listed churches the principal “other” source of funding is effectively “self-help” – ie. local and congregational fundraising – or assistance from general grant-making trusts which award grants on the basis of broader criteria than simply architectural heritage merit.

5.10 Turning to the evidence from the selected general grant-making trusts, although they all include the built heritage among their stated charitable objectives, many work to broader criteria than simply architectural merit when assessing grant eligibility. This suggests that such trusts are a particularly useful potential source of funding for churches which might not meet strict eligibility criteria based on purely architectural / heritage merit but which are nonetheless deserving of support in the context of broader community issues.

5.11 In those cases where the information was recorded, the large majority assessed the priority of the work being grant-aided as “necessary within the next 2 years”. This attitude towards applications for grant-aid has been noted elsewhere in this study. Limiting grants to urgent cases is one obvious and straightforward means of rationing finite resources; however it may well mean declining to assist modest work now, which could prevent the need for far more extensive work over the medium to longer term.

5.12 The distribution of grants made by general trusts shows the typical pattern of a high concentration at lower values (Table 12). However there are more grants at higher values than in the case of the grants made by the County Historic Churches Trusts; some 27% of grants awarded by the general trusts were for sums in excess of £5,000 compared to just 15% of grants awarded by the County Trusts. None of the grants in excess of £10,000 went to high level repairs, and only one to fabric repairs. This adds to the impression of the general trusts as being perhaps more ready than the County Trusts to support work which has less to do with structure and more to do with services and facilities ie. where the church is being repaired for wider community use.

5.13 The final evidence as regards the delivery of grant-aid to churches in need comes from Strand 5 of the survey. Among the more unlikely sources covered by this miscellaneous selection of material, is the Landfill Tax Credit

Scheme regulated by Entrust, whose approved environmental projects include “the maintenance, repair or restoration of a building or other structure which is a place of religious worship or of historic or architectural interest”. Support is not restricted to listed buildings.

5.14 Although it might not be an immediately obvious choice of funding partner, a number of churches within the designated catchment area of a landfill site have been successful in the past in attracting substantial financial support through the Scheme. Unfortunately recent changes in emphasis in the Government’s environmental strategy mean that the Scheme is likely to provide fewer such opportunities in the future.

5.15 A comment from one particular respondent in this *ad hoc* strand of the review deserves particular mention as it encapsulates a number of the points raised by other respondents:

“The question of anticipated essential repair work is a difficult one to answer because the building is always in constant need of repair and improvements, but the cost of these works is mostly funded by members. For example, the carpet in the main building is threadbare in many places, and is in urgent need of replacement; that will cost £15,000. A hall and staircases all need to be refurbished, which will cost another £10,000. So I fear that the list can never be finite. The main problem with the building is that superficially it looks quite beautiful, but it was built in 1878 when construction was fairly unsophisticated – for example, we had no damp course in the building – so things are always likely to go wrong. Moreover, I fear that previous managements spent virtually no money on the structure, hence deterioration became compounded and very costly when we could wait no longer.”

5.16 The final sentence in the above comment is a further acknowledgement of the importance and ultimate cost-effectiveness of timely intervention before minor problems become major ones.

6. Estimating Global Needs

6.1 The *Churches Needs Survey* assessed the total cost of major repairs to listed Church of England churches as being in the region of £90 million per annum at 1998 prices. Allowing for inflation in building costs, the figure would probably be in the region of between £105 - £110 million at current prices. The different Strands of this latest survey suggest figures of between £80 million and £113 million. Combining the results yields an estimate of around £100 million per

annum at current prices. Reliable extrapolations for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are not available.

6.2 In the context of global need, it is relevant to note that according to the latest available figures, the Heritage Lottery Fund alone has so far awarded grants totaling some £75 million to listed places of worship in England, with a further £20 million in Scotland, £11 million in Wales and £12 million in Northern Ireland – making a total of some £118 million across the UK as a whole.

7. VAT

7.1 The situation *vis-à-vis* VAT in all of this remains somewhat uncertain at present. None of the figures make any allowance for the possible impact of the recently announced reduction in VAT to 5% on repairs to listed buildings used as places of worship. In theory, the reduction in VAT should result in a corresponding reduction in total repair costs. However in practice it is unlikely that churches will feel anything like the full benefit of this reduction because: (i) typically, much small scale repair work is carried out by contractors who are not registered for VAT in the first place; and (ii) it may be expected that a number of those contractors who are registered, will take the opportunity of increasing their underlying charges.

7.2 In fact for technical reasons the scheme is more properly a VAT refund grant scheme than a straightforward reduction in VAT, since VAT will continue to be charged at the full standard rate, with eligible bodies subsequently being able to claim an appropriate refund on completion of qualifying work. This may well result in considerable project cash flow problems until the application for a refund is duly processed. On balance, it would therefore be unwise to posit any reduction in need on the basis of an eventual saving in VAT.



Table 1 **Sample of Churches drawn from the *Churches Needs Survey*;
Distribution of Aggregate Costs of Repair Needs**

(column percentages)

Minor items	1.4%
Major items	
Urgent (within 2 years)	
High Level work	6.7%
Other work	2.7%
Total	9.4%
Medium Term (2 - 5 years)	
High Level work	20.8%
Other work	13.3%
Total	34.1%
Deferrable (beyond 5 years)	
High Level work	25.6%
Other work	13.5%
Total	39.2%
Unclassified	16.0%
All work	100.0%

Table 2 **Sample of Churches drawn from the *Churches Needs Survey*;
Distribution of Repair Costs of Work Assessed as being “Urgent
Major”**

(column percentages)

None	58.5%
Up to £5,000	13.2%
£5 - 10,000	3.8%
£10-15,000	7.4%
£15-20,000	1.9%
£20-25,000	5.7%
£25-30,000	1.9%
£30-35,000	3.8%
£35-40,000	-
£40-45,000	1.9%
£45-50,000	1.9%
£50,000 and over	-
All	100.0%

Table 3 **Sample of Churches drawn from the *Churches Needs Survey*;
Distribution of Repair Costs of Work Assessed as being “Medium
Term”**

(column percentages)

None	17.0%
Up to £5,000	13.2%
£5 - £10,000	15.1%
£10 - £15,000	17.0%
£15 - £20,000	3.8%
£20 - £25,000	7.5%
£25 - £30,000	3.8%
£30 - £35,000	3.8%
£35 - £40,000	1.9%
£40 - £45,000	3.8%
£45 - £50,000	1.9%
£50,000 and over	11.2%
All	100.0%

Table 4 Selected Data from the VAT & the Church Survey: Distribution of Total Annual Repair and Maintenance Costs per Church for Listed Churches for Selected Denominations (all Grades of Listing together)

(column percentages)

Range	Church of England	Church of Scotland	Irish Council of Churches
Repair Costs:			
Up to £1,000	23.3%	15.6%	11.1%

Table 5 Selected Data from the VAT & the Church Survey: Comparison of Total Annual Repair and Maintenance Costs per Church, by Denomination and Grade of Listing

(maintenance cost as percentage of repair cost)

	Median of Percentages		
	Grades I; II*; A; B	Grades II; C	All Grades
Church of England	25%	59%	37%
Church in Wales	53%	4%	6%
Church of Scotland	56%	72%	57%
Irish Council of Churches	81%	-	81%
Roman Catholic Church	-	13%	13%
Baptist Union	-	62%	62%
Methodist Church	32%	60%	57%
Free Churches Council	-	11%	24%

Table 6 Joint Scheme Applications; Ranges of Project Costs and Amounts Sought, by Application Grant Stream

(column percentages)

	Stream					
	1	2	3	4a	4b	All
Total Cost:						
£10 - £25,000	7.9%		25.0%			8.3%
£25 - £50,000	23.7%		25.0%			20.8%
£50 - £75,000	10.5%	75.0%	25.0%			16.7%
£75 - £100,000	18.4%					14.6%
£100 - £125,000	15.8%	25.0%	25.0%			16.7%
£125 - £150,000	7.9%					6.3%
£150 - £175,000	10.5%					8.3%
£175 - £200,000						
£200 - £225,000	2.6%					2.1%
£225 - £250,000	2.6%					2.1%
Over £250,000				100.0%	100.0%	4.2%
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Sought:						
Up to £25,000	21.6%		60.0%			22.9%
£25 - £50,000	27.0%	25.0%	20.0%			25.0%
£50 - £75,000	13.5%	50.0%				14.6%
£75 - £100,000	13.5%		20.0%			12.5%
£100 - £125,000	18.9%	25.0%				16.7%
£125 - £150,000	2.7%					2.1%
£150 - £175,000	2.7%					2.1%
£175 - £200,000					100.0%	2.1%
£200 - £225,000						
£225 - £250,000						
Over £250,000				100.0%		2.1%
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 7 County Historic Churches Trusts: Distribution of Grant-Aided Churches, by Grade of Listing

(column percentages)

Grade	As	With
	Stated	"Unrecorded" Re-distributed <i>Pro - Rata</i>
I	29.5%	41.0%
II*	20.4%	28.4%
II	16.0%	22.3%
Unlisted	6.0%	8.3%
Status unrecorded	28.1%	n/a
All	100.0%	100.0%

Table 8 County Historic Churches Trusts: Analysis of Grants, by Category of Work and Grade of Listing

(column percentages)

Category of Work	Grade I or II*	Grade II	All Grant Aided Churches*
High Level Work	53.3%	46.8%	49.6%
Fabric Work	27.6%	33.1%	30.7%
Services	2.8%	1.4%	3.3%
Facilities	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
Organs / Bells	1.6%	2.1%	1.8%
Other	14.0%	15.9%	13.9%
All Repair Work	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Including unlisted and "n/k" cases.

Table 9 County Historic Churches Trusts: Analysis of Grants, by Size of Grant and Grade of Listing

(column percentages)

Size of Grant	Grade I or II*	Grade II	All Grant Aided Churches
Up to £1,000	15.8%	32.6%	21.7%
£1 - £2,000	27.7%	23.8%	27.7%
£2 - £3,000	18.8%	21.1%	19.2%
£3 - £4,000	12.0%	6.8%	9.9%
£4 - £5,000	6.8%	5.4%	6.1%
£5 - £6,000	11.4%	5.4%	8.8%
£6 - £7,000	2.6%	1.4%	2.2%
£7 - £8,000	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
£8 - £9,000	0.7%	1.4%	1.0%
£9 - £10,000	0.7%	-	0.3%
£10 - £11,000	1.8%	1.4%	1.9%
£11 - £12,000	0.4%	-	0.2%
£12 - £13,000	-	-	-
£13 - £14,000	0.2%	-	0.1%
£14 - £15,000	-	-	-
£15 - £16,000	-	-	-
£16 - £17,000	-	-	-
£17 - £18,000	-	-	-
£18 - £19,000	-	-	-
£19 - £20,000	0.2%	-	0.1%
Over £20,000	-	-	-
All Grants	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 10 County Historic Churches Trusts: Analysis of Grants, by Size of Grant and Nature of Work

(column percentages)

Size of Grant	Nature of Work					
	High Level	Fabric	Services	Facilities	Organ/Bells	Other/General
Up to £1,000	20.1%	20.6%	20.7%	16.7%	31.2%	33.1%
£1 - £2,000	23.9%	27.0%	41.4%	49.9%	37.4%	33.1%
£2 - £3,000	19.7%	19.5%	20.7%	16.7%	6.3%	11.5%
£3 - £4,000	10.2%	12.0%	6.9%	-	6.3%	7.4%
£4 - £5,000	6.9%	7.1%	3.4%	-	-	4.1%
£5 - £6,000	11.1%	7.5%	6.9%	16.7%	12.5%	6.6%
£6 - £7,000	2.3%	2.6%	-	-	-	1.7%
£7 - £8,000	0.7%	0.7%	-	-	-	1.7%
£8 - £9,000	1.4%	1.1%	-	-	-	-
£9 - £10,000	0.5%	-	-	-	-	0.8%
£10 - £11,000	3.0%	1.1%	-	-	6.3%	-
£11 - £12,000	-	0.4%	-	-	-	-
£12 - £13,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
£13 - £14,000	0.2%	-	-	-	-	-
£14 - £15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
£15 - £16,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
£16 - £17,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
£17 - £18,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
£18 - £19,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
£19 - £20,000	-	0.4%	-	-	-	-
Over £20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
All Grants	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 11 Churches Grant-Aided by the County Historic Churches Trusts:
Principal other Sources of Project Finance**

(column percentages)

Principal other Source	Grade I or II*	Grade II
Local / congregational fundraising	11.9%	25.0%
Parish / DBF Funds	34.0%	14.6%
Fabric Fund	7.7%	18.7%
English Heritage / HLF	30.2%	18.7%
Local Authority / Council etc	2.1%	14.6%
Landfill Tax Credit Scheme	1.3%	2.1%
Historic Churches Preservation Trust	6.8%	6.3%
Other named Trusts	4.3%	-
Miscellaneous	1.7%	-
All Sources	100.0%	100.0%

Table 12 General Grant-Making Trusts: Distribution of Grants to Churches, by Size of Grant

(column percentages)

Up to £1,000	4.9%
£1 - £2,000	31.7%
£2 - £3,000	19.5%
£3 - £4,000	13.4%
£4 - £5,000	3.7%
£5 - £6,000	11.0%
£6 - £7,000	3.7%
£7 - £8,000	1.2%
£8 - £9,000	1.2%
£9 - £10,000	-
£10 - £15,000	3.7%
£15 - £20,000	1.2%
£20 - £25,000	-
£25 - £50,000	2.4%
£50 - £75,000	1.2%
£75 - £100,000	1.2%
Over £100,000	-
All grants	100.0%