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The National Churches Trust is the leading national charity promoting and supporting churches of historic, architectural and community value across the UK. It advocates:

- The use of church buildings by congregations and the wider community not just as places of worship but as venues for social, cultural and educational activities.
- The conservation of places of worship of historic value for the use and enjoyment of future generations.

The Trust, which is independent of government and church authorities:

- Provides grants for the restoration and modernisation of church buildings.
- Supports projects that integrate churches into their local communities and enable buildings to be kept open.
- Collaborates closely with the County Churches Trusts and local volunteer networks across the UK in their support for local churches.
- Encourages good management and regular maintenance of church buildings by providing practical advice, support and information.
- Works to increase awareness by the public and among decision-makers and opinion formers of the value of places of worship.

For more information, see www.nationalchurchestrust.org and follow the Trust on Facebook and on Twitter @NatChurchTrust.

This report is available on the Trust’s website. Technical enquiries about the survey and its data can be made to Charlotte Walshe at charlotte@nationalchurchestrust.org.
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The findings of the National Churches Trust’s UK-wide survey highlight the invaluable contribution that church buildings make to society, to the heritage of our nation and to the vibrancy of its community life. The results show that without these buildings, the country would be a poorer place, socially, culturally and architecturally. Equally, they reveal the future potential of church buildings still to be realised.

The complexities and challenges faced by hard-pressed individuals and volunteer groups who care for these buildings are not well understood. This report brings some much needed clarity to the issues they face by providing factual information. It also shows how the sharing of success stories can help those tasked with keeping churches in good repair, and inspire and encourage new approaches.

This research demonstrates the value of church buildings, and illustrates the reasons why we all must work to ensure that the nation’s churches, chapels and meeting houses are kept in a good state for the benefit of future generations.
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INTRODUCTION

This survey, looking at the current state of the UK’s churches, chapels and meeting houses – how they are maintained, funded, managed and the contribution they make to communities – is the first of its kind. It establishes up-to-date data on a consistent basis across Christian denominations and places of worship in the UK.

The UK’s estimated 47,000 Christian places of worship are important in the life of the nation. They form part of the traditional iconic imagery of towns and villages and are some of the most architecturally and historically significant buildings in the country. 19,500 – 40% – of them are listed, with churches comprising the biggest single category at grade I or equivalent.

However, many people have only a hazy idea – if one at all – of how these buildings are run and paid for, and of their wider role beyond that of their use for worship. Furthermore, assumptions can and have been made about the operation and contribution of church buildings to society. This survey hears directly from those on the ground about the facts of their experiences, successes and challenges.

The survey, which originated from discussions by the National Churches Trust with heritage organisations, Christian denominations and those that look after church buildings, was conducted primarily through an online questionnaire. Developed with the support of McKinsey & Company, it was piloted with groups of potential respondents before being conducted from April-July 2010.

The survey sought information from respondents in four main areas:

- The building and how frequently it is used
- The physical state and care of the building, and its future needs
- The value of the building to the local community and how it is used
- How the building is managed and financed

The representatives of approximately 17,000 places of worship were contacted directly by email, and 26 denominations, representing a further 13,000, agreed to contact their church buildings on our behalf. A further 3,200 places of worship were contacted by post. At the same time a media campaign was carried out to encourage potential recipients to participate.

The representatives of more than 9,000 church buildings engaged with this survey, providing more than 7,200 responses for use in analysis, making it the largest project of its kind. Responses came from all four corners of the UK, from the Shetland Islands to the Channel Islands and from Suffolk to Northern Ireland, from buildings over 1,300 years old through to those that opened in 2010. The responses received appear generally representative of the wider UK picture, both in terms of denominational and geographical spread.

---

1 Throughout this report, the term ‘church buildings’ should be taken to refer to any Christian place of worship – church, chapel or meeting house.
At a time of increasing focus upon the value of volunteering, the survey clearly identifies the important role churches play as community buildings. They allow local people both in the congregation and beyond to be involved with an array of activities, from concerts and counselling to post offices and youth groups.

Whilst the majority of church buildings are in good or fair condition, this does not obviate the need to recognise that caring for these buildings can be burdensome and costly. The necessity for regular maintenance and the potential for major repairs drive the need for continued financial and practical support. UK church buildings do not benefit from the levels of state assistance seen in some other European countries, and the task of both raising finance and managing the building often falls to small numbers of dedicated individuals or groups of volunteers.
The findings in this report are based on the responses to the survey. These are either presented directly or, where stipulated, as estimations for the UK's church buildings, calculated using a sample balancing process outlined in Appendix I.

- **Church buildings are open and being used, for both regular worship and other purposes.** It is estimated that more than 90% of the UK's church buildings hold a service at least once a week and that nearly 80% are used for other purposes, including community activities. It is estimated that more than half are regularly open to the public beyond their worship services.
- **Church buildings are significant venues for volunteering.** It is estimated that a fifth of the UK's church buildings have more than 50 people volunteering in the building, and even in less populated rural areas more than a third have more than 20. If the sample is representative nationally, an estimated 1.4 million members of church congregations volunteer in any capacity in their church building along with an estimated further 200,000 people from the wider community.
- **Church buildings are important cultural venues.** It is estimated that nearly half of the UK's church buildings are used for arts, music and dance activities.
- **Church buildings are key locations for supporting children and young people.** It is estimated that more than half of the UK's church buildings facilitate activities such as nurseries, youth groups and additional activities for young people.
- **Church buildings are significant places for support and counselling.** It is estimated that more than two-fifths of the UK's church buildings are used for support and counselling services on issues such as homelessness, drug and alcohol misuse, finance and debt, parenting and mental health.
- **Church buildings are important in the administration of the democratic process.** More than 4,600 church buildings served as polling places at the 2010 general election, around one-sixth of the total number of locations used for this purpose.
- **Church buildings could offer more to their communities with improved space and more volunteers.** Lack of a suitable space and lack of volunteer time are the main barriers to further provision of community activities – less than 1 in 10 respondents said they felt restricted by a decision to preserve the building solely as a place of worship.
- **Sharing best practice in supporting community activities could benefit other church buildings.** Respondents indicated that access to, or sharing of information on how other churches have been able to provide greater support to the local community would be of greatest benefit.
- **Many church buildings have key facilities, but there is room for improvement.** It is estimated that more than two-thirds of the UK's church buildings have toilets, but that would leave nearly a third without provision. Listed buildings are generally less well equipped. Buildings with adequate heating, toilets or tea/coffee-making facilities are more likely to offer additional community activities.
Most church buildings are in good or fair condition – though a critical number need help. 92% of respondents said their building was in ‘good’ or ‘fair’ condition – 8% said that it was poor or very poor.

Urgent repairs would cost an average of £80,000 to those buildings in the sample in need of them. The three most commonly required repairs identified as urgent were to rainwater goods, roofs and heating.

‘Friends’ groups that support churches are a good demonstration of community involvement and provide additional funds for church buildings. The results suggest that there are a significant number of Friends’ groups in existence, involving thousands of people, of whom more than half are not members of the local congregation. The Friends’ groups cited by respondents contribute an average of more than £2,000 a year for regular repairs and maintenance to their building, and almost £4,000 a year for new or major works.

Church communities often fund the majority of their repairs themselves. On average, church buildings in the sample meet 85% of urgent repair needs from their own funds. Where urgent repairs exceed £50,000, this reduces to just over two-thirds of the total cost. The completion of such major works therefore relies on attracting other funding. In respect of support received, the specified national funding source mentioned by the largest number of respondents was the annual ‘Ride and Stride’ event organised by the County Churches Trusts with the support of the National Churches Trust.

Regular maintenance matters. In the sample, maintenance has a direct positive impact on the condition of a church – roughly a quarter of churches which do little or no maintenance are in poor or very poor condition. Church buildings which do not have regular services are more likely to be in a poor or very poor condition.

Church buildings are playing their part in tackling climate change. Approximately 25% of respondents have undertaken an energy audit, almost a third have improved the efficiency of their heating system, and those undertaking renovation work are more likely to use energy efficient materials and systems.
BACKGROUND

The National Churches Trust Survey is the first ever exercise of its kind – a national online survey of the UK’s Christian places of worship, with a particular focus on the buildings themselves – how they are maintained, managed, funded and used by their communities.

The survey has its origins in a series of meetings which started in 2004 when senior representatives of heritage and church bodies concerned with caring for church buildings came together to form the ‘Hoare’s Bank Group’. These meetings – which eventually led to the creation of the cross-sector body Places of Worship @ The Heritage Alliance – provided a forum for those involved with places of worship to explore areas of common interest and identify potential future actions. One of the issues identified at an early stage was the need for current factual information.

Whilst there have been a number of significant pieces of research conducted in recent years by heritage bodies, regional faith forums and other research bodies into some of these issues, in most cases these have focused either on particular geographical areas, denominations or types of building. As an organisation concerned with supporting and promoting all types of Christian places of worship throughout the UK, the National Churches Trust has a particular interest in seeking comparable information across denominations, geographical areas and types of building. This is the gap into which this exercise seeks to inject new information.

Following initial discussions in 2008, the Trust began work on the project with the support of McKinsey & Company on a pro bono basis. A working group was established in early 2009 to provide advice and feedback as the project developed.

2. Named after the group’s initial meeting place.
Parameters
Estimates of the number of Christian places of worship in the UK vary significantly. Due to a number of factors involved in the definition, it is not possible to arrive at an agreed total figure. Churches are both closing and opening each year, and terminology is not clear – for example ‘church’ can be used to denote a ‘congregation’, rather than a building.

As some groups of worshippers hold services in buildings that have a different primary function, this can also inflate the overall figure. The following definitions were used for the survey:

- UK was taken to include England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, and also the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands. This is consistent with the geographical organisation of the major denominations.
- ‘Christian’ was taken to be a denomination that is a member of Churches Together in Britain and Ireland.
- Place of worship was defined as a building whose primary function is for Christian worship. For some of the questions, respondents were asked to include other buildings linked to their place of worship (e.g. a church hall) but that was made clear in the appropriate section of the survey.
- Private chapels and places of worship situated within other facilities – such as hospitals, prisons, military bases, universities and schools – were not included, and neither were cathedrals due to the distinct nature of the issues surrounding their maintenance, funding and use. Those places of worship closed for regular services were able to complete the survey, but few did so.

On this basis, we estimate a total church building population of **47,000**.

Survey design and implementation
The content of the survey was based on extensive consultation with individuals and organisations from the church and heritage sectors. We considered the sorts of data it would be useful to collect, what information was in need of updating, and what might not have previously been collected on a consistent, uniform basis. A ‘long list’ of potential questions was compiled based on these discussions.

---

4. Churches Together is a body which enables Christian denominations in the British Isles to co-ordinate the work that they each do separately. There are subsidiary versions of the organisation in each of the parts of the UK and in most towns and cities. The membership of the CTBI can be found on its website at http://www.ctbi.org.uk/227.

5. Defined as the at least 450 former places of worship declared closed for regular worship and now within the care of specific bodies such as the Churches Conservation Trust, Friends of Friendless Churches, the Historic Chapels Trust, the Scottish Redundant Churches Trust, the Welsh Religious Buildings Trust, the Norfolk Churches Trust, the Norwich Churches Trust and the Ipswich Churches Trust.
The questions were structured around four key sections:

- **A: Categorisation** – questions to gain basic information about the building and how frequently it is used
- **B: Your Buildings** – questions to understand both the current state and care of the building, and its possible future needs
- **C: Community Activities** – questions to assess the value of the building to the wider community and how that community interacts with the building
- **D: Managing and Funding your Church** – questions to understand how the building is managed and financed

In addition, questions were included to gather opinions of the survey itself and to determine whether respondents wished to be contacted in the future.

Particular attention was given to ensuring that the terminology used throughout the survey applied as far as possible to different denominations and types of church building. Whilst this was generally achieved, the significant variation in approach and language meant that this was not possible in all cases.

Following its compilation by the end of September 2009, the ‘longlist’ version of the survey questions was then subjected to testing with potential users. Two focus groups were held, one in London and one in Worcestershire, involving representatives of church buildings from five major denominations. On the basis of this feedback, the survey was rephrased and condensed where appropriate and put to a further level of testing via a pilot sample. The pilot took place in December 2009-January 2010 and involved 123 places of worship drawn from those who had previously received grants from the National Churches Trust. The pilot provided feedback on the content of the survey, and also on the practical aspects of the online operation and general user experience.

The survey was launched on 16 April 2010 and closed for analysis on 28 July 2010. The dates were determined by the readiness of the survey and feedback from those responsible for churches that it should neither commence during the run-up to Easter, nor continue over the school summer holidays.

**Contacts and response**

In order to contact and gather data from as many church buildings as possible, it was decided to conduct the survey primarily online. Potential respondents were invited to participate via a personalised email link to a website designed for the survey by specialist providers SurveyLab.

To this end, a publicly-available email address associated with each place of worship was sought. These were principally sourced via denominational websites and contact directories and the websites of individual churches. In this way, we were able to establish
approximately 17,000 direct contact details. In a number of cases, the individuals we contacted had responsibility for more than one church building, and so this total underestimates the number of church buildings that could be contacted via this method.

A number of denominations either provided us with individual contact details, or agreed to contact their churches on our behalf. 26 denominations agreed to contact their churches in this way. These represent approximately 13,000 further buildings.

In order to reach places of worship for which we were not able to obtain an email address and which were not being contacted by their denomination, we also created a hard copy version of the survey, which was posted to an additional 3,200 places of worship. These were selected on the basis of geographical location and/or denomination. This was to ensure UK-wide coverage as far as possible and to provide groups with limited email access the opportunity to participate. A Welsh language version of the survey was also produced.

Finally a media strategy was implemented to raise awareness of the existence of the survey, and to encourage those churches that might not have heard of the exercise to participate. This focused on denominational and local media, including regional media interviews and a significant number of relevant hard copy and online publications.

A series of reminder e-mailings were sent to those we had either contacted directly, or who had registered themselves but only partially completed the survey online. A follow-up letter was sent to those who did not initially respond to the paper survey. The representatives of more than 9,100 individual places of worship engaged with the survey, either online or by post. This provided a very encouraging 7,200 responses for use in analysis.

The responses received are generally representative of the UK picture in terms of denomination, attendance and building age and location, based on relevant independent data. There are no current UK-wide figures for community use so we have, in the process of analysis, utilised such independent data as is available to make estimates for the wider UK picture. This process enables us to draw the best estimates possible in the context of the available data at the time of analysis.

A personalised report summarising aggregated responses from comparable churches has been made available to each participating place of worship that requested this information.
CONCLUSIONS

“Our churches are important to our communities and we must do all we can to preserve and maintain them.”

The Daily Telegraph, 21 August 2010

The National Churches Trust Survey establishes new and up-to-date facts about the state of the UK’s Christian places of worship. Thousands of church communities generously gave of their time to respond.

Church buildings are essential both to the UK’s heritage, and the vitality of towns and villages up and down the country.

The survey shows that these buildings bring together thousands of people in a variety of ways that benefit local communities, with church buildings being used extensively for purposes beyond worship. It also reveals that many communities are keen to facilitate wider activities. Open, accessible church buildings provide their communities with a significant resource, which the National Churches Trust’s programme of community grants and easily accessible advice helps to develop.

The survey also reveals that a significant number of buildings are in urgent need of help, and provides quantitative information of the costs associated with maintaining these often challenging buildings. Although many are in good or fair condition, churches still require external support to undertake major projects, and the National Churches Trust provides this support in the form of both money and advice.

Good maintenance practice is fundamental to the Trust’s support and advice for churches. The evidence of the survey backs our assertion that formal maintenance plans are vital to sustaining buildings and preventing major structural problems.

Friends’ Groups attract many non-worshipping individuals to support church buildings, and the survey shows both the value these groups bring and the opportunity there is to develop this form of support. The National Churches Trust encourages places of worship to welcome those who are not regular worshippers by providing support to existing Friends’ Groups and helping in the creation of new ones.

The survey underlines the remarkable contribution of volunteers both in the provision of community activities and maintaining the church fabric. The Trust is committed to supporting and strengthening local volunteer organisations, particularly local Churches Trusts, whilst also seeking to sustain this support over the long-term.

The survey raises some important issues relating to the role and contribution of listed and unlisted places of worship. Listed churches understandably receive the greatest attention and are able to attract specific funding as a result. They are a tremendous asset
to our national life, local identity and the historic environment, but may be limited in the extent to which they can be utilised for other purposes. By contrast, nearly two-thirds of the UK’s church buildings are unlisted and it is often these that are at the forefront of facilitating wider community activities. Further debate is needed about how best to assess the ‘value’ a church building provides to its community – including religious, historical, architectural, social and economic aspects. The National Churches Trust campaigns for increased support both for historic places of worship and for unlisted buildings when these can be shown to provide real community benefit.

This survey does not seek to be the final word on the matter. Given the encouraging levels of participation, the National Churches Trust believes that the information gathered should be updated in the future, with the aim of increasing levels of participation, strengthening the fact base, identifying possible trends, and closer examination of subjects not included in this survey, such as church tourism.

Exercises such as this are essential to a better understanding and appreciation of church buildings across the UK. The National Churches Trust hopes that this and future studies will stimulate further debate on the issues raised in this report. This includes both how to encourage a wider audience to appreciate their very real value to society and how best to ensure that these buildings are handed down in a good state of repair to future generations.
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DETAILED SURVEY FINDINGS

The following sections illustrate the aggregated responses to the survey. The findings are organised along the following themes:

I. The building and its use

II. The people involved

III. Repairs, maintenance and facilities

IV. Community activities

V. Fundraising and factors for success

To take account of the profile of the overall church building population, the results have been balanced where necessary. The use of balanced data in the following sections is indicated as appropriate, using the term ‘estimated for the UK’s church buildings’. Appendix I outlines the methodology used for analysing the survey responses in this way.

Four categories are used throughout the analysis to define key types of church buildings. These topics are widely held by those consulted during the preparation of the survey as being pertinent in defining a church building, and featured in the first section of the survey questionnaire:

• Listed status
• Rurality
• Date of construction
• Denomination
I. THE BUILDINGS AND THEIR USE AS CHRISTIAN PLACES OF WORSHIP

The National Churches Trust is concerned with supporting church buildings so that they continue to serve their local communities. Its remit covers all Christian places of worship through the UK, whether listed or unlisted, urban or rural.

Understanding the condition of today’s churches and how this might vary was therefore a key building block of the survey. It is also important to understand any relationship between this and the building’s primary function as a place of worship and how often it is used for this purpose.

In order to gain an initial overview from those directly caring for these buildings, we asked participants ‘How would you describe the overall condition of your church?’

- **Good** – no obvious problems
- **Fair** – some minor problems and general wear and tear
- **Poor** – widespread problems
- **Very poor** – serious problems which require urgent attention

Charts 1 to 3 illustrate how condition, estimated for the UK’s church buildings, can be affected by listing, location or date of construction.

*Chart 1: Overall condition with regard to listed status estimated for the UK’s church buildings*

![Chart 1](chart1.png)

Chart 1 shows that buildings are significantly more likely to be in ‘good’ condition if unlisted, whereas listed churches are proportionately more likely to be in ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’ condition.
Chart 2: Overall condition with regard to location estimated for the UK’s church buildings

Chart 2 indicates that, with the exception of those in ‘Town/Fringe’ regions, where the number of buildings in ‘good’ condition exceeds those in ‘fair’ condition, location has little significant impact on the overall condition. The urban/rural distinctions are those in use by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Chart 3: Overall condition with regard to date of construction estimated for the UK’s church buildings
Chart 3 shows that the date of construction is a contributing factor to the condition of the building. This is most evident for the construction period 1300–1699, when the low point for good condition and the peak for fair condition are reached. Other factors, such as the cyclic nature of repairs, will also contribute to a building’s overall condition over time.

Nevertheless, in all cases the percentage of those in good or fair condition does not significantly deviate from the sample (92%).

The geographical range of participants was notably diverse.

- **Whalsay Church in the Shetland Isles** was the most northerly respondent. A mid-eighteenth century building which is grade B listed; the church facilitates campaigning and informal meetings, with 25 volunteers – despite its remote location meaning that they have no water supply.

- The most southerly response came from **St Martin de Grouville’s Church, Jersey**. Built in 1000, this unlisted church is open everyday to receive visitors and is undertaking major renovations to make the building even more user-friendly.

- **North Lowestoft United Reformed Church, Suffolk** was the most easterly respondent. A grade II building, constructed in the mid-nineteenth century, it has good facilities with toilets and a kitchen area. Steps have also been taken towards achieving energy efficiency, with conversion to a green energy tariff.

- The most westerly response came from Northern Ireland, from **Rossorry Parish Church (St Fanchea’s), Enniskillen, Co Fermanagh**. The current building was constructed in 1841, continuing a dedication which began in 1084. It is a listed building, in good condition and well-maintained. Rossorry is a lively and thriving parish and provides regular Sunday Services in addition to social and recreational activities for its local community.
Relationship between building age and location
Participants were asked when the main part of their current church building was constructed, and were able to enter a date in a free text box on the survey. Construction dates for the buildings in our sample range between the years 654 and 2010.

These particular responses demonstrate how these buildings are emblematic of the broad sweep of the nation’s history.

- The oldest non-Anglican building to respond was the Abbey Chapel in Devon, built in 960. Now owned by an Evangelical congregation, the building is grade II* listed.
- The earliest constructed building overall in the sample is the Chapel of St Peter on the Wall in Bradwell, Essex. Built in 654 on the wall of old Roman fort the building is grade I listed and believed by some authorities to be the oldest church in England.
- Conversely, the urban church of St Andrew’s in Crawley was just concluding its construction when they filled in their questionnaire. Services are held several times a week and many activities for young people are also facilitated.

Chart 4: Date of construction with regard to location
Chart 4 illustrates that rural churches tend to have earlier construction dates. However, the sample provides several examples which go against this overall trend. Two respondents from hamlets, one in Northern Ireland and one in Scotland, had constructed new churches as recently as 2005. In contrast, 43 responding urban churches cited a construction date of 1200 or earlier.

**Ownership, Services and Access**

We were keen to understand the relationship between a congregation and its place of worship and how that might impact on the building.

Those using primarily secular buildings or holding services in a place of worship owned by another congregation were not invited to complete the survey beyond its first section. We welcomed responses from buildings closed for regular worship, but few participated in the survey. The overwhelming majority of respondents (98%) have responsibility for, or ownership of their building. Of these, nearly 10% allow other congregations to use the space.

*Chart 5: Regularity of services with regard to denomination estimated for the UK’s church buildings*

Chart 5 shows that over 90% of church buildings hold a service at least once a week, with this figure rising to 97% amongst non-Anglican churches.
Chart 6: Overall condition with regard to regularity of services

Chart 6 shows the correlation between buildings where less regular or no services are held, and those in poor or very poor condition. The role of people – whether as congregants, volunteers, staff or participants in community activities – is explored in more detail later in the report.

Opening of churches

Participants were asked how often their church building is open to the public outside services and community activities, and had six options from which to choose.

More than half of these church buildings are regularly open beyond specified services, with nearly three-quarters of these open for daylight hours or longer. Interestingly, these churches are divided quite evenly between rural and urban, indicating no greater tendency for urban or isolated churches to remain open or closed. There is no discernable link between how ‘open’ a building is and its general state of repair.
In our work supporting churches, the National Churches Trust deals every day with the dedicated individuals and groups – many of them volunteers – who are tasked with caring for these buildings. Along with the national network of County Churches Trusts, we seek to help them with advice, support and information. We also support the role and activities of local Friends’ Groups, which can bring together members of the congregation and non-churchgoers in support of their local church building.

This section therefore provides insight into the numbers of voluntary and paid staff working in church buildings, to which areas they most readily lend support and how their time impacts on the uses and condition of the building.

**Volunteers**

The majority of respondents answered our questions regarding how many people volunteer in any capacity at their church. Individual responses ranged from zero to over 200 volunteers. In the vast majority of cases (85%), volunteers tended to be members of the worshipping congregation as well.

*Chart 7: Numbers of volunteers per building estimated for the UK’s church buildings*

The average church building has 33 people volunteering in any capacity, of which 28 are from the congregation. The responses we received identified a striking 22,781 people who are not members of the congregation volunteering in any capacity. Assuming relative uniformity given the sample size, we can estimate for the UK as a whole some 1.6 million volunteers, 200,000 of which are not members of congregations. Even just considering the identified non-congregational volunteers from the responses, these numbers compare favourably with other major sources of volunteering, for example in conservation.

---

Chart 8: Number of volunteers with regard to location estimated for the UK’s church buildings

Chart 8 confirms that rural churches have fewer volunteers than urban churches, but does highlight that 38% of rural churches have more than 20 volunteers.

Chart 9: Overall condition with regard to volunteer numbers estimated for the UK’s church buildings

Chart 9 shows the strong link between the number of volunteers and the building’s overall condition with a tendency for those buildings with fewer volunteers to be in poor or very poor condition. Conversely, as the number of volunteers increases so does the likelihood of the building being in good condition.
Chart 10 demonstrates that whilst the number of volunteers may affect the condition of the building, it should not be assumed that caring for the fabric of the church is the main activity of volunteers. In fact, this comprises less than a third of the time given by the volunteers in our sample, who focus their efforts on the mission of the church and community activities.

**Paid Staff**

Whilst clergy are the most recognisable paid employees associated with church buildings, other full-time and part-time staff are employed. In our sample, 515 respondents identified themselves as having at least one full-time, paid member of staff, excluding clergy. The number of respondents with part-time staff is significantly higher at 2,196. Many identified the employment of professional cleaners or maintenance workers on a part-time basis. Of those in our sample with paid staff, the average number of staff was two, both full time and part time respectively.
Within our sample, 2,363 buildings benefit from the employment of paid staff. Chart 11 shows that urban churches are more likely to employ paid staff of any kind. However, for part-time staff there is less variation between urban and rural churches.

Chart 12 highlights that paid staff tend to focus on different kinds of work to volunteers. Activities associated with the building – such as cleaning, administration, repairs and maintenance – take up a far larger average amount of time (almost half) for paid staff. In contrast, volunteers may spend four times longer than paid staff in fundraising. Faith and community activities take up about half for both groups.
Chart 13: Volunteer numbers with regard to staffing levels

Chart 13 confirms a correlation between the number of volunteers and the likelihood of paid staff being employed. For those without staff, there is a greater tendency to have a smaller number of volunteers. For those with paid staff, nearly a third have more than 50 volunteers. This correlation holds for buildings of all sizes.

**Friends’ Groups**

Friends’ Groups provide a means for local people, whether part of the worshipping community or not, to be involved in supporting what is an important building for them. This is reinforced by the nearly 5,000–strong response we received to this section of questions in the survey. Participants had two methods of identifying an existing Friends’ Group, via a question regarding the successful management of their building, and a direct question about Friends’ Groups. From the results of these two questions, our sample provides a total range of 688 to 805 Groups.

Based on those who answered these questions, we can estimate that 9-18% of UK church buildings already have a Friends’ Group. A further 25% recognise how such a Group could contribute to a building’s success and 6% are actively considering establishing one.
Chart 14: Membership size of Friends’ Groups by location

Chart 14 indicates that a greater proportion of urban churches have larger Friends’ Groups. However, the chart also indicates that for our sample, the majority of Friends’ Groups overall have fewer than 50 members. Analysis suggests that location affects the likelihood of having a Friends’ Group, with 70% of those in our sample being in a rural location, 30% in an urban location.

For all UK church buildings, we estimate two-thirds of those with Friends’ Groups are Church of England, 7% are Methodist and 9% are Roman Catholic.

Our findings confirm Friends’ Groups’ ability to engage with non-congregational members of the local community – they have an average of 52 members, of which 28 are from the congregation. Assuming relative uniformity given the sample size, we can estimate a total of at least 22,000 non-congregational members aiding the UK’s church buildings through Friends’ Groups.

Chart 15: ‘Age’ of Friends’ Groups
Chart 15 shows that over half of Friends’ Groups in the sample are more than ten years old. It is also encouraging to see that they are still being founded and that the rate of establishment is increasing i.e. more have been set up in the last five years (1 to 5 years) than in the five years preceding that (6 to 10 years).

Lastly, we look at the financial contribution of these Groups. We asked participants to provide the average, annual contribution for ‘regular repairs and maintenance’ and ‘new works or major changes’.

Average annual contribution for regular repairs and maintenance .................................................. £2,278

Average annual contribution for new works or major works ........................................................... £3,783

These figures clearly emphasise the impact such Groups can have.

**Successful Management**

In order to better understand which factors ensure the successful management of a church building, we asked respondents to identify those that they felt they already had, and those which they believed would be beneficial to instigate.

Of those practices which communities already employ to ensure the successful management of their building, an active body of volunteers was the most commonly cited. An effective leader or management team is the next most common. Encouragingly, nearly one in five of our sample already employs paid staff, in addition to any paid clergy.

We can also consider the importance placed upon those factors these buildings do not currently have. Participants were also asked to select one of the two options; ‘we do not have this and it is important’ or ‘we do not have this and it is not important’. The three which were considered most important, and not currently employed were: an active body of volunteers, good management of finances and a focus on prevention of repairs including a regular maintenance schedule.

It is worth noting that in all cases, a substantial number (more than quarter in all cases) of respondents viewed each item as significant in contributing to the overall success of their community’s building.
The work of the National Churches Trust is focused on repairs and maintenance to church buildings through the provision of grants for repairs; support and advice to those caring for these buildings; and strong emphasis on the need for regular maintenance. Therefore, questions regarding these issues were a key feature of the survey.

**Regular Inspections**

Many churches are subject to regular building inspections. These inspections tend to be carried out every five years and are therefore often named Quinquennial Inspections (QIs). The majority of the larger Christian denominations recommend that their buildings undertake these inspections, and for many this is compulsory for their listed buildings.

Participants were asked about the timing, content and utility of their QIs. For those denominations where inspections are required, the vast majority (70–95%) of each have successfully carried out QIs in the last five years.

Of those who have had a QI in the last ten years, more than half indicated that the most recent report prioritised key maintenance and repair needs for the building. However, it is a concern that less than one in three of this group was provided with estimated costs for the works. Furthermore, only just under half of respondents received a full explanation of the report’s content. Encouragingly however, 92% of those who answered the question indicated they would be using their inspection report to plan future works.

Our questionnaire also highlighted a significant group of 1,593 respondents, who have carried out regular inspections but feel this is not sufficient. They agreed with the statement that ‘The report itself is useful but we do not have the resources to follow the recommendations made’.

Overall, inspections tend to be informative to those responsible for these buildings. Only 46 respondents claimed their report is ‘too complicated to understand’.
Urgent repairs
In addition to considering the overall condition of the building, the survey also asked participants for more detail about the condition of specific parts of the church building and its grounds. Participants were asked to assign one of three conditions to each of 18 areas of the building:

- **Good**: No expected need for repair for at least 5 years
- **Potentially at risk**: Needs repair with 1–5 years
- **Urgent**: Needs repair within 12 months

*Due to varying levels of response for the different parts of this question, rows do not total 100%.*

**Chart 17: Areas of the building by state of repair**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Potentially at Risk</th>
<th>Urgent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graveyards</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater Goods</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls (External)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spire/Tower</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring (Internal)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls (Internal)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paintings</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrics</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monuments</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bells</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of those repairs identified as urgent, the three most common were:

- Rainwater goods
- Roofs
- Heating

Conversely, of those areas in ‘Good’ condition, the three most common were:

- Building foundations
- Internal Flooring
- Electrics

We can examine whether these urgent repairs are universal, or whether the type of repair most needed is affected by other factors:

**Listed status**
For all respondents, the two most common urgent repairs are Rainwater Goods and Roofs respectively. However, listed buildings identify the spire/tower as the third most likely area in need of urgent repair. Unlisted buildings declare heating repairs are the third most common urgent repair. This may simply be because listed buildings are more likely to have a spire or tower, as heating is still the fourth most common for that group.

**Use of the building**
Use of the building for purposes other than regular worship has no noticeable impact on the order of urgency for repairs. The three most common, in descending order are: Rainwater goods, Roofs, Heating.

In our sample just over a quarter of respondents indicated one or more urgent repairs. More than 1 in 10 of our participants require urgent repair to their rainwater goods and/or their roof. It is this sub-group we shall now consider in more detail.
Chart 18: Analysis of respondents needing urgent repairs to rainwater goods and/or roofs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor to consider</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Proportion of overall survey sample</th>
<th>Proportion of those requiring urgent repair to rainwater goods and/or roofs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed status</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of building</td>
<td>Pre 1300</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300-1699</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1700-1899</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900+</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town/Fringe</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (pop&gt;10k)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All percentages are based on those who provided sufficient information to determine each factor

Chart 18 clearly shows the significant effect of listing upon the key types of urgent repair. This is endorsed by the corresponding shift regarding the age of the building and its denomination, within this sub-group. This is because a large proportion of the listed churches in the sample are Church of England and built prior to 1700. Location appears to have no bearing on this sub-group, with 50% of both the overall sample and this sub-group being urban and rural respectively.
Urgent Repair Costs
We asked participants to estimate the total cost of their urgent repairs and to indicate if VAT was included in their estimate. For those buildings in need of them, the average cost of urgent repairs is just over £80,000, including VAT. Assuming relative uniformity given the sample size, we can estimate a total urgent repair bill for the UK’s Christian places of worship of around £1 billion including VAT.

Recent renovation projects
Following feedback from our pilot study, we included a tick-box option to our question regarding funds already spent on repair projects: ‘We have recently completed/ are undertaking a major renovation project’. Nearly a quarter of the buildings that responded had recently, or were still undergoing major structural repairs or improvements.

Charts 19 [i, ii, iii]: Analysis of respondents declaring recent renovation projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Overall sample %</th>
<th>Recent renovation %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These percentages show that denomination type does not play a significant role in a building’s likelihood of undertaking major renovations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed Status</th>
<th>Overall sample %</th>
<th>Recent renovation %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A greater proportion of listed buildings have undertaken recent renovation works. This could be due to either greater repair needs of such buildings or more easily accessible funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Overall sample %</th>
<th>Recent renovation %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Fringe</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rurality alone does not impact a building’s likelihood to undertake larger repair/improvement projects.

8. VAT for these figures was calculated at the current rate at the time of the survey.
**Maintenance**

Participants were asked which activities formed part of their normal maintenance schedule, with a list of tasks suggested. Only 2% of respondents carry out none of the maintenance suggested. The four most common maintenance tasks being carried out (in descending order) are:

- Checking electrics
- Checking for signs of internal leaks, damp or infestation
- Clearing rainwater goods
- Checking the heating system and boiler

Less than three-quarters of respondents check their smoke alarms and fire safety equipment. This is either an oversight, or an indication that not all churches have such fire safety equipment. It is also interesting to note that for those who identified their roof as in need of urgent repair, only 60% check the roofing materials and clear the area of moss, birds’ nests or other materials as part of their maintenance schedule.

The survey confirms a positive relationship between formal maintenance and general building condition. When looking at all UK church buildings, for those in good condition, we estimate more than 80% carry out regular maintenance, 13% in accordance to a formal maintenance plan agreed with a qualified professional. Conversely, for those in poor or very poor condition, barely more than half carry out regular maintenance.

When we consider the relationship between overall condition and maintenance more closely, we can see why the benefit of maintenance is not more prominent. For the majority of grant giving bodies in this sector, there is a substantial deficit between the funds required and the funds available. Many bodies are consequently forced to consider only those buildings in the greatest need of structural repair i.e. those in poor or very poor condition. For those buildings which receive grant aid, this is often accompanied by a request to employ a formal maintenance programme. Potentially as a direct result, we find that a surprising proportion of those in poor or very poor condition (9%) have a formal maintenance scheme. We can only imagine how the number of those in good condition would increase if all buildings were to adopt such a scheme.

**Facilities**

It is generally held that certain factors may affect a building’s likelihood to have particular facilities. There were nearly 6,000 responses to the question concerning the basic facilities available in the church. It was greatly encouraging to see that only 31 respondents had none of the facilities listed, 28 of which were based in hamlets or villages.
Chart 20: The presence of facilities with regard to the buildings’ listed status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Column A: Proportion of overall sample with the specified facility</th>
<th>Listed status of those with the specified facility (column A)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sample</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible entrance</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing loop</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servery</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea/Coffee facilities</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby-changing facilities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets in the building</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These percentages are based on those who provided sufficient information, in all cases more than 99% of the sub-group identified in column A.

Chart 20 provides a clear indication that more recently constructed churches tend to be far more likely to have these selected facilities. This is as true for all of the facilities this survey listed, from those that are relatively simple to install e.g. adequate signage, to the more complex options e.g. full kitchens/serveries or toilets.

Chart 21: The presence of facilities with regard to the buildings’ locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Column A: Proportion of overall sample with the specified facility</th>
<th>Location of those with the specified facility (column A)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sample</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible entrance</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing loop</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servery</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea/Coffee facilities</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby-changing facilities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets in the building</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These percentages are based on those respondents who provided sufficient information, in all cases more than 99% of the sub-group identified in column A.
Chart 21 shows that town/fringe and urban churches are more likely to have these facilities. As with listing, this is most noticeable for signage, full kitchen/servery and baby-changing facilities.

Estimates for the UK’s church building suggest that just fewer than 70% have a hearing/audio loop fitted, whilst only 14% have adequate signage for the visually impaired. Likewise, 70% are estimated to have toilets in their church or attached buildings, while less than half have baby-changing facilities.

Energy Efficiency

Reducing a building’s carbon footprint is a relatively new but increasingly important topic, and is the focus of some recent efforts on the part of denominations. Participants were asked if they had undertaken any of the following measures:

- Carrying out an energy audit
- Switching to low energy light bulbs
- Switching to a green energy tariff
- Improving the efficiency of the heating system and controls
- Carrying out energy saving work to the fabric e.g. secondary glazing or roof insulation
- Installing energy generating technology e.g. solar panels or wind turbine

With the exception of fitting low-energy light-bulbs, the most common change was to the heating system. Despite this, heating systems still stood out as one of the key areas in need of repair in section B of the survey.

Chart 22: Overall condition with regard to energy efficiency measures in place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy efficiency measure</th>
<th>Good (%)</th>
<th>Fair (%)</th>
<th>Poor (%)</th>
<th>Very Poor (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy audit</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light bulbs and/or green tariff</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient heating, glazing and/or insulation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy generating technology</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note that the figures for 'Energy Generating Technology' are based on a sample of <100.

Chart 22 indicates that for all UK church buildings, it is estimated that energy efficiency measures benefit the building overall i.e. a greater proportion of those undertaking significant changes are in good condition. This may be because they have recently undergone work to install these new and improved technologies.

We must be careful not to ignore the financial requirements for such works. The initial cost of installing energy-generating technology such as solar panels may currently be beyond a good number of communities.

---

9 For instance, see the Church of England’s Shrinking the Footprint campaign: http://www.shrinkingthefootprint.cofe.anglican.org/
Chart 23: Energy efficiency measures taken and the proportion as a result of undergoing renovation works

Accepting the financial limitations many buildings have with regard to implementing energy efficiency measures, it is encouraging that a significant proportion of those who have undertaken these measures have done so as part of a general renovation project. The use of ‘green’ materials and choices when undertaking renovations is a proficient way of incorporating these measures into a building.

It is also encouraging to see that the energy efficiency measures in chart 23 are not limited to unlisted or more modern buildings. For example, of those buildings which have installed more efficient heating, glazing, insulation and energy generating technology, more than half are listed, with 30% of those being grade I.
The National Churches Trust believes that church buildings represent vital community assets and that their future is, in part, dependent upon demonstrating this to the wider public.

The 47,000 churches in the UK represent one of the largest networks of actual and potential community buildings. These numbers compare favourably with the 12,000 post offices\(^\text{10}\), 10,000 English village halls\(^\text{11}\), 52,000 public houses\(^\text{12}\) and 4,500 local social clubs\(^\text{13}\) across the country.

**Overview of Activities**

Survey participants were asked about the purposes for which their buildings are used other than regular worship. They were also asked to consider various factors which might affect the frequency and extent of these uses. For the purpose of the survey, “non-worship faith activities” have been taken to be those activities with a focus on faith or mission, but not the main regular services.

**Chart 24: Purposes for which the buildings are used other than regular worship**

![Chart 24](chart.png)

Chart 24 provides an overview of the purposes to which the buildings are put, rather than their frequency or extent. Estimating for the UK church building population as a whole, nearly 8 in 10 are used for purposes other than regular worship.

---

10. The Post Office states that it has “around 12,000” branches: [http://www.postoffice.co.uk/portal/po/content2?catId=20000192&mediaID=103103763](http://www.postoffice.co.uk/portal/po/content2?catId=20000192&mediaID=103103763)

11. According to Action with Communities in Rural England, there are around 10,000 village halls in England: [http://www.acre.org.uk/eur-work/community-assets/village-hall-information-service/village-hall-research](http://www.acre.org.uk/eur-work/community-assets/village-hall-information-service/village-hall-research)

12. According to the British Beer and Pub Association, there are 52,000 pubs but in 2010 around 28 closed each week: [http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2010/apr/12/general-election-labour-manifesto-pub-closures](http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2010/apr/12/general-election-labour-manifesto-pub-closures). Were this closure rate to continue, the number of pubs would fall below the current number of Christian places of worship within four years.

13. As of 2008, there were around 4,500 local social clubs represented by the Committee of Registered Club Associations – whose membership includes the Working Men’s Club & Institute Union, the Association of Conservative Clubs, the Coal Industry Social Welfare Organisation, the National Union of Labour & Socialist Clubs, the National Union of Liberal Clubs, the Royal British Legion, the Royal British Legion Scotland, the Royal Naval Association and the Royal Air Forces Association Branch Clubs: [http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmccumeds/492/8102803.htm](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmccumeds/492/8102803.htm)
The extent of other activities is dependent on people being willing to facilitate them, people being able to attend them and a building able to accommodate them. Factors that might affect this are considered in Charts 25-28.

Church buildings facilitate a diverse range of activities. These two cases illustrate what is already being achieved:

- **St Aidan’s Church in Kingston upon Hull** is an unlisted, twentieth-century building. With the help of three part-time staff, they provide a multitude of community activities, including the running of farmers’ markets and facilitating the mobile library.
- **St Andrew’s United Reformed Church in Ealing** provides a home for around 100 hours of community activities a month, ranging from support and counselling, to youth groups, cultural events and informal meetings.

**Chart 25: Occurrence of additional activities with regard to listed status estimated for the UK’s church buildings**

Chart 25 suggests a strong correlation between the listed status of the building and the occurrence of additional activities, all types of which are more likely to occur in unlisted buildings.
Chart 26: Occurrence of additional activities with regard to location estimated for the UK’s church buildings

Chart 26 indicates generally that the more urban a church building, the more likely it is to perform any of the types of activities listed. The more rural a church, the more likely it is that community activities will be organised by the congregation, rather than through the use of space by the local community.

Chart 27: The presence of facilities estimated in those UK church buildings used for community activities

Chart 27 indicates that, for those buildings which are already used for community activities, the vast majority have key facilities in place. For the purposes of this chart, we have taken community activities to include non-worship faith activities, private events and community activities provided by either the congregation or others.
Chart 28: Occurrence of additional activities with regard to volunteer numbers

Chart 28 shows, for each of four ranges of volunteer numbers, the occurrence of additional activities. It indicates that as the number of volunteers increases, occurrence of all activities also increases. In all cases, there appears to be an emphasis on providing space for the community as a whole – as indicated in the first two bars of each group – rather than for private events.

Charges, Fees and Leasing of Property
An additional income stream for many churches is the rental of space and charging fees for activities. We estimate that just under half of all UK church buildings charge a fee for at least a proportion of their community activities.

Based on actual responses received to this question, we have estimated the following average charges (excluding anomalous answers):

For respondents who charge for all activities
Community activity: £12.84/hr
Private event: £17.08/hr

For respondents who charge for some activities
Community activity: £17.58/hr
Private event: £15.93/hr

We asked participants to estimate the number of hours per month that their church buildings are used for community activities. Overall, the average was just under 70 hours per month. 55 of these were for activities organised by external individuals or groups.
Based on the average charges above, we can speculate that these buildings could be gaining between £8,500 and £11,600 per year through this provision.

In addition, over 1,000 respondents indicated they have a long term lease or rental agreement in place with an external organisation. This brings an average of more than £8,000 per annum to each building with this arrangement.

**Use of church buildings for community activities**

The questionnaire suggested 25 specific activities which may occur within church buildings. This list has been grouped for analysis as outlined in Chart 29, and used in the subsequent charts 30 and 31.

**Chart 29: Summarised community activity categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarised category</th>
<th>Activities from the full list included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support or counselling</td>
<td>Personal financial support/debt counselling/credit union, housing and homeless support, drug/alcohol support, support for people with mental health problems, other forms of counselling/advice, parenting support, healthy living support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community improvement</td>
<td>Crime prevention/youth offender programmes, campaigning, social enterprise/community business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>Adult education, church educational visits, genealogical research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular services</td>
<td>Mobile library, post office, polling station, shop/café, farmers’ market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young peoples groups</td>
<td>Nursery, youth groups, activities for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal meetings</td>
<td>Informal meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, music, dance</td>
<td>Arts, music dance, theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church activities</td>
<td>Flower festivals, bell ringing/organ playing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 30: Estimated use of UK church buildings for community activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated percentage of UK church buildings used for these types of activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young peoples groups</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, music and dance</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of counselling</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal meetings</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community improvement</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular services</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church activities</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 30 illustrates the high proportion of the UK’s church buildings estimated to be already engaging with their local communities through the types of activities.
listed. These noteworthy percentages indicate both a need from communities for these types of activities, and a desire from those responsible for church buildings to meet this need.

*Chart 31: Breakdown of activities held in church buildings in the last year*

Chart 31 shows the number of individual occurrences of the specified activities recorded by our respondents, and indicates that activities for young people and various forms of counselling and support are the most commonly occurring overall, with a low ranking for ‘secular services’, such as post offices, polling stations and cafes. The latter finding may be due to the more significant organisational requirements for the provision of such services and that some of these activities are relatively recent initiatives.
There is clear focus for church buildings to facilitate activities for young people.

- St John’s Methodist Church in Bangor, Wales is a Victorian building which is well facilitated and maintained. There are plans to use the open space for concerts, exhibitions and the like, and more than 60 hours of youth activities take place each month.
- Eaglesham Parish Church just south of Glasgow is a grade I listed church with a strong congregation and some 60 volunteers. The building makes more than 200 hours of youth activities possible each month.

**Beneficiaries and Local Relationships**

We asked participants to identify any groups they felt directly benefited from the community activities that their buildings made possible. We also asked them to identify those groups within the local community with which they had an existing relationship.

**Chart 32: Beneficiaries of community activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% age of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly people</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/toddlers</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed people</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with learning difficulties</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with drug/alcohol addictions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families under stress</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users of mental health services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless people</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers/refugees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-offenders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 32 shows that elderly people, young people and parents and toddlers are those most frequently identified as benefiting from these activities. This is a similar finding to other research into the social and community action of faith communities operating from church buildings. 14

---

When asked to identify any regular contact, connections or relationships with local organisations, local schools, colleges and universities were the most common. Interestingly, nearly a third of churches identify a relationship with their local authority, and one in five with their local political representative.

Factors affecting use of buildings for community activities

Participants were asked to select from a list of possible limitations, to indicate key reasons why further community engagement may be hindered.

Chart 33: Possible limitations to holding more community activities in church buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of volunteer time</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of suitable space available</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of suitable facilities available (e.g. toilets, parking for the disabled)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial limitations</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of volunteer skills and knowledge</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest in community to partake in activities</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest from other organisations to co-run activities</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuitable access</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision made to preserve the building solely as a place of worship</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 33 shows that key limitations to further community engagement appear to be a lack of suitable space and volunteer time. Remarkably, only 8% of the sample indicates a need to preserve the building solely as a place of worship. Approximately 60% of this particular group are either Church of England or Roman Catholic, comparable to the 69% of our overall sample. The remaining 40% is roughly proportional to the other specified denominations. This would appear to indicate that the decision for many is taken at the level of individual places of worship.
Chart 34: Activities estimated to be taking place in UK church buildings by denomination

Chart 34 demonstrates that a significant proportion of buildings across all denominations are being used for community activities and other purposes.

Chart 35: Activities estimated to be taking place in UK church buildings by location

Chart 35 confirms that urban churches are more likely to be used for other purposes. It is worth noting that nearly half of churches in hamlets are used for community activities to some degree.
The role of the National Churches Trust and other organisations

We asked participants ‘What practical assistance would be of greatest help to your congregation in supporting your local community more?’ and provided a list of options. Participants were asked to select up to three answers.

**Chart 36: Practical assistance of greatest use to congregations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of assistance</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information on how other churches have achieved this [supporting their local community]</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on assessing local needs</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on how to finance events</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in maintaining and improving space</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer training</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in making facilities more available</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on how to organise events</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 36 demonstrates a need for clear information and assistance with available space. The National Churches Trust is committed to promoting best practice and working with volunteer networks to ensure that support, advice and information are available at both a national and local level.

**Additional information on community use of church buildings**

In addition to the survey questions we contacted the national offices of 25 organisations operating in fields including cultural activities, volunteering, health care and promotion, youth organisations, sport and physical fitness, social care and community groups. The decentralised and local nature of many of these organisations meant that they did not all centrally hold accurate information on the use of church buildings by their members, but we were provided with some useful insights and feedback:

- Alcoholics Anonymous estimate that of the 4,174 venues they use nationwide, 2,104 are church buildings, or 50.4%.
- All but 50 of the 1,502 Boys’ Brigade units use church buildings.
- The majority of the 1,245 Girls’ Brigade units use church buildings.
- The majority of the approximately 5,000 Mother’s Union groups use church buildings.
- 596 of the 658 choirs that are members of the National Association of Choirs use church buildings for practice or rehearsal, representing 90%.
- Responses from half of St John Ambulance regional associations indicate that 1 in 8 of their meeting places are in church buildings.
• The Women’s Institute estimates that around 40% of their 7,000 weekly meetings occur in church buildings.
• 15 of the 105 Women’s Royal Voluntary Service units (14%) use church buildings, mostly for kitchen use in order to, for instance, supply ‘meals on wheels’ services.

We are grateful for the assistance of these organisations in providing this information.

**Use of churches for polling stations**
The 2010 general election took place during the period that the survey was live and we asked participants whether their building was used as a polling station. Taking advantage of the timing, we also took the opportunity to obtain electoral administration details from the local authorities responsible for organising the locations of polling stations. We were able to gain information for 92% of the relevant local authorities15. Of the records we obtained:

• In England 4,060 of 23,978 polling places were church buildings, totalling 17%
• In Scotland, 203 of 2,036 polling places were church buildings, totalling 10%
• In Wales, 305 of 1,819 polling places were church buildings, totalling 17%
• In Northern Ireland, 67 of 624 polling places were church buildings, totalling 11%

Overall across the United Kingdom, 4,635 of 28,457 polling places were church buildings, totalling 16%.

Given that we were unable to obtain 100% of records, this figure is likely to be an underestimate, but it nevertheless shows that church buildings make a substantial contribution to the effective delivery and administration of public elections in the UK. In some local authorities, church buildings made up more than one third of all polling places.

15. It should be noted that the number of buildings used as polling places is not the same as the number of polling stations (which the Electoral Commission estimates to be around 40,000) – polling stations for more than one polling district can be held in the same building, or ‘polling place’.
The National Churches Trust has substantial experience over many years in giving direct support to places of worship in the form of repair grants. As a result we have a good understanding of the financial realities and pressures on individual churches. For many communities raising sufficient funds to maintain, improve and use their church building is an ongoing labour. In the survey we therefore sought to better understand where money was spent and the key sources of income for these buildings.

**Annual Expenditure**

We asked participants to identify the proportion of their annual expenditure typically allocated to seven principal costs.

*Chart 37: Overall average breakdown of annual expenditure*

Chart 37 suggests that for the average church building in our sample, the largest single regular expenditure made is that to their denomination, constituting just over a third. A similar amount is spent in total on maintenance and general upkeep. It is also worth noting the minimal expenditure towards community activities, just 4%. This is possibly thanks to the use of volunteers and the potential income from such activities.
Chart 38: Average annual expenditure with regard to denomination

Chart 38 shows the breakdown of annual expenditure for the denominations and denominational grouping indicated. It illustrates a number of key similarities and differences between the various breakdowns shown.

Chart 39: Analysis of selected annual expenditures with regard to number of volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Average number of volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs (excluding clergy)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/cultural activities</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General upkeep</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 39 shows the proportion of a building’s annual expenditure spent on key costs. The types of building considered are based upon their levels of volunteers – broken into four ranges. It indicates that volunteer levels can indeed impact upon a building’s overall expenditure. As indicated in previous analysis (chart 13), we
can see an increase in staffing costs in line with an increase in volunteer numbers. Likewise, costs for maintenance and general upkeep decrease in line with more volunteers, as previously indicated. Interestingly, we see only a very minor overall increase in costs for community activities (4–5%), despite earlier analysis (chart 31) which indicated a marked increase in the number of buildings offering community activities as the number of volunteers increases. This suggests that with a good volunteer force, buildings can increase the level of activities they offer to the wider community at minimal extra cost.

It is also interesting to note the number of those in each grouping able to provide a full breakdown of routine expenditure. Nearly twice as many of those with more than fifty volunteers were able to provide this financial information than those with up to ten volunteers.

**Funding for Repair Projects**

The results described above concern routine expenditure only. However, along with many other grant-giving bodies, we are aware that it is the expenditure outside the norm which can cause substantial difficulties for church buildings and those responsible for them.

With regard to internal funds, participants were asked to specify the proportion of total repair costs they have been able to meet with their own funds. For those who indicated repairs had taken place in the last three years, they had provided, on average, 85% of the necessary funds themselves. However, when we consider those for whom repair costs exceeded £50,000 over three years, this reduces to just over two thirds of the project cost. This would suggest that individual churches are able to accommodate the bulk of the costs of the more common, relatively small-scale repairs, but that major repair works require external financial assistance.

**VAT**

The Listed Places of Worship Grant Scheme was introduced by the government in 2001. It enables listed places of worship throughout the UK to reclaim the amount spent on Value Added Tax (VAT) on eligible repairs and maintenance. The scheme, which had been due to end in March 2011, has been renewed for the period covered by the government’s Comprehensive Spending Review (2011–2015). The renewed scheme excludes works to clocks, pews, bells, organs and professional fees, which had previously been added to the scheme’s scope. The scheme will also now operate to a fixed budget.
Chart 40 shows the breakdown of participants who benefited from the scheme, and also why those eligible may not have taken advantage of it. Over half of the listed buildings in our sample have benefited from the scheme. We know that for the period 2009-2010, just under £15 million was claimed by listed places of worship through the scheme\(^\text{17}\), emphasising its importance to these buildings and the value of its continuance.

Chart 41: VAT exemption for places of worship

In addition, all places of worship are able to negotiate VAT exemption on certain elements of various works, primarily for facilities, access or extensions. Chart 41 indicates how beneficial this has been to our sample to date.

\(^{17}\) The figure is £14,963,412.67; House of Commons Hansard Written Answers, 18 October 2010 col 562W.
Other Sources of Funding
We asked participants to identify sources of funding from a list that we provided. Participants could select as many as were applicable. Chart 42 provides the initial breakdown of funding sources for the sample, as well as indicating the impact of location upon these sources. Note that for the sample overall, the rural/urban division was 50:50.

Chart 42: Analysis of successful funding for repair projects with regard to rurality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of funding</th>
<th>Source of funding</th>
<th>Column A: % of respondents who gained funds from this source</th>
<th>Proportion of column A: RURAL</th>
<th>Proportion of column A: URBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Individual donations</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fundraising activities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legacies</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local donor (£500+)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rental income</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local organisation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends’ Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local charity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Their denomination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Churches Trusts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Development Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Other National bodies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ride + Stride event</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landfill Communities Fund</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Heritage/ Cadw/ Historic Scotland/ Northern Ireland Environment Agency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Churches Trust</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Lottery Fund</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Urban Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, we can see that individual donations and fundraising events are the most common forms of local income. For specified national sources of funding secured, the most common appears to be the annual Ride + Stride event. This annual event, held each September, is facilitated by the County Churches Trusts and the National Churches Trust and attracts more than 13,000 participants.18

Chart 42 also indicates some differences between the funding sources of urban and rural church buildings. For our sample, the urban-rural split was 50-50. Urban churches tend to secure rental income and denominational funding more successfully than their rural counterparts. Conversely, rural churches tend to be more successful with funding from national sources and the County Churches Trusts. This is likely to be connected to the prevalence of listed buildings in rural areas. There is also a greater tendency for rural churches to have received no funds from any of those on the list.

Analysis of our sample confirms that for the majority of funding sources, a greater likelihood of securing funds occurred with those buildings with paid staff working on fundraising activities. Of these, more than three-quarters secure donations from congregations and visitors, compared to just over half of those without this resource. For local donations (of at least £500) the corresponding proportions are 50% to 29% respectively.

It is greatly encouraging that both groups are highly unlikely to fail to secure any funding from those sources listed (5% for those without paid staff working on fundraising, 4% for those with). This may be because paid staff will have the time to research appropriate funding sources and complete multiple application processes. They will also have the time and skills to provide supplementary information and additional communications to those funders requiring them.

18. For more information see http://www.rideandstrideuk.org/
APPENDIX 1: SURVEY ANALYSIS AND SAMPLE BALANCING

The findings presented in the main body of this report represent the response of our sample, and where stipulated, estimations for the UK church building population as a whole. The methodology employed to make this possible was carried out following consultation with individuals concerned with this subject, and from the field of statistics.

Definitions, ranges and anomalous responses
Analysis was carried out following the closure of the survey in July 2010. The following definitions and ranges were utilised for the analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition or range</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>Reason for use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed status</td>
<td>Grade I/A</td>
<td>Grade II/B</td>
<td>Grade II/C</td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>Used by English Heritage, Historic Scotland, Cadw and the Northern Ireland Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Hamlet or Isolated dwelling</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Town or Fringe</td>
<td>Urban (pop&gt;10k)</td>
<td>Used by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of construction</td>
<td>Pre-1300</td>
<td>1300-1699</td>
<td>1700-1899</td>
<td>1900+</td>
<td>Broadly representative of the following architectural periods: Anglo-Saxon /Norman; Perpendicular; Baroque and Regency; Twentieth century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We excluded anomalous answers where it was sensible to do so. This included setting a lower limit for construction dates and realistic limits to estimated costs of repairs. The excluded answers also included a particular attendance figure which would have translated to well over 100 services per week.
Sample Balancing

Short of a total 100% response, the recognised way to approximate a population’s response is to employ a statistical balancing methodology. For the purposes of this survey, we were advised to employ a ‘sample balancing’ methodology. This process was carried out with the support of McKinsey and Company following the survey’s closure.

Sample balancing is the most appropriate method where there are certain characteristics present in the population being surveyed that may affect both the response rate and the kind of responses received. If we failed to take this into account, our population estimates would be unrepresentative. Likewise, simply multiplying figures would be equally misleading.

For this survey, the following characteristics for balancing were agreed:

- Denominational sub-groups: Church of England and Church in Wales, Roman Catholic and Other denominations
- Attendance
- Grade of listing
- Urban/Rural distinction
- Country

It is best practice to implement sample balancing on distinct sub-groups of the population separately, using reliable data for the distribution of the other relevant characteristics for each sub-group. This is outlined in Table 1:

| Variables proposed for independent sample balancing of each of the three denominational sub-groupings |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Denomination                                                 | Church of England and Church in Wales | RC church in UK | Other UK Churches |
| Attendance                                                   | Yes             | Yes             | Yes             |
| Grade of listing                                             | Yes             | Yes             | Yes             |
| Type of location (rural, urban etc)                          | Yes             | Yes             | Yes             |
| Country                                                      | Yes             | Yes             | Yes             |

We then re-balanced the weighted data sets to achieve the correct proportion of responses for each sub-group as a whole. This ensures not just that responses are correctly distributed within each sub-group, but that the overall distribution approaches the UK church building population. For each characteristic which we wished to balance in our sample, we used independent data sources available at the time of the analysis. This was derived from denominations, government bodies, heritage bodies and other specialist research.
Responses received
9,100 representatives of church buildings engaged with the survey, either online or by post. In order to analyse a response, we required the information given to be sufficient to clearly identify the building. This resulted in more than 7,200 responses to consider. The size and quality of the raw dataset meant it already closely mapped to the UK church building population, in terms of the characteristics identified for our balancing. For the purposes of our balancing, we required each response to satisfy each characteristic listed, in order to provide an accurate overall weighting factor. Thus the balanced data set consisted of more than 5,100 records – an impressive retention rate of over 70%.

The raw sample illustrates the various preferences for engaging with the survey:

- In response to a direct e-mailing ................................................................. 77%
- By post ........................................................................................................ 11%
- Self-registering online ............................................................................. 12%
APPENDIX 2: THE NATIONAL CHURCHES TRUST SURVEY

Below is an illustration of the dedicated survey website, followed by a full copy of the paper version of the survey.
The National Churches Trust Survey 2010

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. Please answer as many questions as you are able to. You can ask colleagues for help and send us partially completed responses. If you would prefer to complete the survey online, just visit http://survey.nationalchurchestrust.org.

We would be grateful to receive your responses by Friday 11th June 2010, but please do get in touch if you would like to take part but will need more time to coordinate a response.

When completing this questionnaire, please bear in mind the following:
- We use the word 'congregation' throughout the survey to refer to your worshipping community, and 'church' to refer to your church, chapel or meeting house.
- In sections A, C and D we ask about your 'church buildings'. Please include the church itself and any halls, attached rooms and outside areas. In Section B we are asking questions about your church, chapel or meeting house only.
- We have sought to provide enough space for you to answer each question, if this is not the case, please feel free to write in the free space beside the question, or on a separate sheet, indicating which question/s your answer/s correspond to.
- This questionnaire is open to church buildings closed for worship. If this is applicable to your building, please indicate this in question 2 of Section A and feel free to leave blank any questions which are not applicable to you throughout the survey.

Section A: Categorisation (10 questions)

1. Please complete the following details about your church:
   - Name of your church [e.g. St Georges Church]
   - Town [e.g. Bradlow]
   - Preferred email address
   - Postcode [e.g. KT17 1LB]

2. Which statement most accurately describes your congregation's relationship to your church building? (Please tick the one which best applies)
   - We own/are responsible for a church building and are the only congregation
   - We own/are responsible for a church building and allow other congregations to use it
   - We use a church building that belongs to another congregation *
   - We use a primarily secular building/room (e.g. a school)
   - We are currently caring for a church which is listed as closed for worship
   * What other congregations use your church building?: ________________

3. To which denomination does your congregation belong? (Please tick the one that best applies)
   - Baptist
   - Church in Wales
   - Church of England
   - Church of Ireland
   - Church of Scotland
   - Congregational Federation
   - Free Churches including the Free Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland
   - Methodist Moravian
   - Pentecostal
   - Presbyterian
   - Presbyterian Church in Wales
   - Roman Catholic
   - Salvation Army
   - Scottish Episcopal Church
   - Society of Friends
   - Union of Welsh Independents
   - United Reformed Church
   - Local ecumenical project (please specify): _______________
   - Other (please specify): _______________

4. When was the main part of your current church building constructed?
   If you are unsure of the exact year, please give an estimate (e.g. 1800).
   ___________

5. Which best describes the location of your church? (Please tick the one which best applies)
   - Hamlet or Isolated dwelling
   - Village
   - Town or Fringe
   - Urban (over 10,000 residents)

6. On average, how frequently are regular services held?
   Please count each individual service but do not include weddings, funerals, or baptisms.
   Services are any occasion of public worship, which may only involve a small number of people. Remember to count each service individually; even if two occur on the same day (e.g. on Sunday)
   - Four or more services per week
   - Two or three services per week
   - One service per week
   - Two to three times per month
   - One service per month
   - Fifth Sunday of a month
   - Less than one service every fifth Sunday
   - No services held

7. Outside of services and community activities, how often is your church building open to the public? (Please tick the one which best applies – list continues on the next page)
   - Not open other than for services and community activities
   - Open only on request
   - Open only at regular specified times; at least once a month
8. Please indicate the total attendance at this church on Sunday 11th April 2010.

If there was no service on that date, or the information is not available, please give figures for the most recent Saturday/Sunday on which the congregation met for worship.

Total number of adults (aged 15 and above) attending any service on this date: __________

Total number of children (aged 14 and under) attending any service on this date: __________

Estimated number of people attending more than one service on this date: __________

9. How many people can be accommodated for worship at your church?

Number of people: __________

10. Is your church listed?

Designated as holding national interest and heritage value: in England by DCMS; in Wales by Cadw; in Northern Ireland by NIEA; and in Scotland by Historic Scotland. Please answer with respect to the main building

☐ Yes – Grade I / A
☐ Yes – Grade II* / B
☐ Yes – Grade II / C
☐ No

If you have any further comments, please enter them in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire.

Section B: Your Buildings (10 questions)

Building a convincing case for the care of churches requires a factual understanding of their current repair and maintenance needs. Please note that in this section questions apply only to the ‘church’, and not its associated buildings.

1. How would you describe the overall condition of your church? (Please tick the one which best applies)

☐ Good – no obvious problems
☐ Fair – some minor problems and general wear and tear
☐ Poor – widespread problems
☐ Very poor – serious problems which require urgent attention

2. In which year was your last Regular Building Inspection e.g. Quinquennial?

A Quinquennial inspection is a five-yearly inspection of the church building, carried out by a qualified Church Architect or Surveyor. (Please tick the one which best applies)

☐ 2010
☐ 2009
☐ 2008
☐ 2007
☐ 2006
☐ 2005
☐ Before 2005
☐ We are not required by our denomination to carry one out
☐ Don’t know

3. Which of the following recommended content is included in your most recent Regular Building Inspection? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ It identifies necessary maintenance/repairs for the structure, exterior & interior of the building
☐ It addresses any valuable, moveable objects, ruins and any trees under a Tree Preservation Order
☐ It prioritises necessary maintenance/repairs according to urgency
☐ It estimates how much recommended maintenance/repairs will cost
☐ Don’t know

4. Was your Regular Building Inspection useful in determining urgent repairs and/or targeting areas in need of regular maintenance? (Please tick one item for each line below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The architect/surveyor explained the content of the report to our church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The architect/surveyor advised on the works required and whether additional specialist advice was necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are using it to help plan future maintenance and/or repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report itself is useful but we do not have the resources to follow the recommendations made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report is too complicated to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report does not provide enough information to help plan maintenance and/or repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. What is the current condition of the following parts of your church and its surrounding areas? (Please tick the options that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Good: No expected need for repair for at least 5 years</th>
<th>Potentially at risk: Needs repair within 1-5 years</th>
<th>Urgent: Needs repair within 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graveyards</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways and hard standings</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building foundations</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater goods (e.g. guttering and drains)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External walls</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows (inc. stained glass)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spire/ Bell Tower</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal flooring</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal walls</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall paintings</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrics</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of asbestos</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monuments</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bells</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Of those areas you identified as in need of urgent repair, what is their total estimated cost?

£ ___________

□ Please indicate if this figure includes VAT

Questions 7, 8 and 9 deal first with repairs then with maintenance. For repairs do not include scheduled maintenance, day-to-day care (e.g. cleaning) or redecoration

7. In the past three years, please estimate how much in total has been spent on repairs

- Include all money spent from both internal and external sources.
- Exclude repair work performed by volunteers

£ ___________

□ Please indicate if this figure includes VAT

□ We have recently completed/ are undertaking a major renovation project

8. Which of the following activities form part of your normal maintenance schedule? (Please tick all that apply)

- Maintaining grounds and graveyards
- Clearing rainwater goods (gutters and down pipes)
- Clearing accessible drains and manholes
- Checking and repairing the condition of the roof-covering materials (tiles, sheet metal, thatch)
- Clearing blockages on roof caused by large areas of moss, birds’ nests or other materials
- Checking damage to towers and steeples
- Checking for structural problems and damage to the walls e.g. external damp
- Keeping ventilation clear
- Checking for and repairing damage to doors, windows and their frames
- Checking for internal signs of leaks, damp or infestation
- Checking the condition of the floor
- Checking toilets, taps, basins and sinks are in working order
- Checking electrical systems and appliances are in working order
- Checking the heating system and boiler are in working order
- Testing smoke alarms and fire safety equipment (including lighting conductors where applicable)
- None of the above

9. Based on the list in the previous question, over the last ten years how frequently has maintenance been carried out? (Please tick the one which best applies)

- No maintenance carried out
- Maintenance carried out infrequently
- Maintenance carried out annually
- Maintenance carried out at regular intervals as applicable to each task (e.g. monthly lighting checks and annual servicing of the boiler)
- Maintenance carried out at regular intervals as applicable to each task, to a formal maintenance schedule as agreed with a qualified professional

10. What facilities does your church have?

Do not include toilets solely available to clergy and/or staff

(Please tick all apply – list continues on the next page)

- Mains electricity
- Mains water
- Adequate heating
- A fully accessible entrance (e.g. with a ramp or lift)
- Hearing loop/audio loop
- Signage for those with a visual impairment
- Servery/kitchen with food making/storage facilities
- Tea/coffee making facilities
If you have any further comments, please enter them in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire.

Section C: Community Activities (15 questions)

Assessing the value to the community that church buildings provide
If you have any other community activities which are due/contracted to start imminently, please feel free to include them in this section. If other congregations use your church buildings for community activities, please endeavour to include these in your answers to this section.

1. Overview of Activities:
Are your church buildings used for purposes other than regular worship? (Please tick all that apply)
- Non-worship faith activities (e.g. discipleship groups)
- Community activities organised by the congregation
- Community activities organised by the wider community (e.g. mothers and toddlers)
- Private events (e.g. Birthday parties)
- None of the above

2. Use of Space:
How many hours per month (approximately) are your church buildings used for the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas/Type of building</th>
<th>Community activities organised by the congregation</th>
<th>Community activities run by external organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worship space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. community buildings/meetings rooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you charge a fee for any of the activities identified in Question 2?
- Yes - for all activities
- Yes - for some activities
- No

4. Are any areas of your church buildings leased or rented to other organisations for regular, long-term use (e.g. a regular nursery)?
- Yes, please estimate your total annual income from this source/s: £
- No

5. Do any of your church buildings contain a flexible, open space to accommodate more than 50 people? (e.g. for exhibitions, blood donation, toddlers group, polling station)
- Yes - and we use the space for events like those listed
- Yes - we are planning to use the space for events like those listed
- Yes - but we have no plans to use the space for events like those listed
- No

6. Paid Staff:
How many regular paid staff, excluding clergy, do you have?
Please put '0' if you have no paid staff and write part-time staff as whole numbers, not the full time equivalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Part time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How many paid clergy do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Part time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Not applicable

7. How many people volunteer in any capacity at your church?
Please estimate the total number of volunteers in the first box and then the number of your volunteers who are also part of your congregation

Total number of volunteers
Number of volunteers who are also part of your congregation

8. Of those identified above, how many volunteers primarily assist with community activities?

Total number of volunteers
Number of volunteers who are also part of your congregation
9. Please estimate the number of hours spent per month on the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer Hours</th>
<th>Paid staff (excluding clergy)</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning the building</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the church for service</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building maintenance and Church repairs</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising activities (this could include hours spent researching and applying for external funds)</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith activities</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activities</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES:
In the last year, have any of the following activities been held in your church buildings?
(No need to enter details on this page. Questions 11 and 12 on the next pages ask about the activities you provide, as indicated above in question 10. Please only complete the parts of question 11 which pertain to the activities you provide.)

- Personal finance support/ debt counselling/ credit union
- Housing and homeless support
- Drug/ alcohol support
- Support for people with mental health problems
- Other forms of counselling/ advice (e.g. career/ IT training)
- Crime prevention/ youth offender programmes
- Campaigning (e.g. Fair trade)
- Social enterprise/ community business
- Adult education (e.g. language lessons)
- Church educational visits for children
- Mobile library
- Genealogical/ family history research support
- Informal meetings (e.g. coffee mornings, over 60s clubs, parent/toddler groups)
- Parenting support
- Nursery/ pre-school
- Youth groups (e.g. Scouts/ Cubs/ Beavers/ Guides/ Brownies/ Girls or Boys Brigade)
- Activities for young people (e.g. sports clubs/ holiday schemes/ after school clubs)
- Healthy living support (e.g. slimming groups, personal fitness)
- Art, music, theatre, dance (e.g. exhibitions, lessons or concerts)
- Local Post Office
- Polling Station
- Shop/ Café
- Farmers’ Market
- Flower festivals
- Bell-ringing and/or organ-playing

11. DETAILS OF ACTIVITIES
If any of the following activities are held in your church buildings, please indicate who organises them and how many hours per month they occur. If the event only happened once in the last year, please indicate who organised them but leave the number of hours per month blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By members of your congregation</th>
<th>By external individuals or groups</th>
<th>No. Hours per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal finance support/ debt counselling/ credit union</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and homeless support</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/ alcohol support</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for people with mental health problems</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms of counselling/ advice (e.g. career/ IT training)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention/ youth offender programmes</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning (e.g. Fair trade)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social enterprise/ community business</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education (e.g. language lessons)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church educational visits for children</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile library</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genealogical/ family history research support</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal meetings (e.g. coffee mornings, over 60s clubs, parent/ toddler groups)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting support</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery/ pre-school</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth groups (e.g. Scouts/ Cubs/ Beavers/ Guides/ Brownies/ Girls or Boys Brigade)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for young people (e.g. sports clubs/ holiday schemes/ after school clubs)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy living support (e.g. slimming groups, personal fitness)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, music, theatre, dance (e.g. exhibitions, lessons or concerts)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Post Office</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Station</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop/ Café</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers’ Market</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower festivals</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell-ringing and/or organ-playing</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Do any members of the following groups benefit from community activities in your church buildings? (Please tick all that apply)

- Elderly people
- Young people
- Unemployed people
- Parents and toddlers
- Ethnic Minority groups
- Asylum seekers and refugees
- Families under stress
- Homeless people
- Those with drug and alcohol addictions
- Ex-offenders
- People with learning difficulties
- Users of mental health services
- Other (please specify): ____________________

13. Does your church have regular contact, connections, and/or working relationships with any of the following? (Please tick all that apply)

- Churches Together
- Local Authority
- Local political representative
- (e.g. MP, MSP, AM, MLA, councillors)
- Local schools, colleges, universities
- Local health organisations
- Local sporting or cultural organisations
- Other faith communities
- Residents and other community groups

*Churches Together in Britain and Ireland is represented by each nation as Churches Together in England, Churches Together in Wales, Association of Churches Together in Scotland (ACTS) and the Irish Church Council (ICC). All sections work with individual places of worship and denominations to foster and promote ecumenical relationships.

14. Many churches are limited in the activities they can provide. Which of the following may pose limitations to holding more community activities in your church buildings? (Please tick all that apply)

- Decision made to preserve the building solely as a place of worship
- Lack of suitable space available
- Unsuitable access
- Lack of suitable facilities available (e.g. toilets, parking for the disabled)
- Financial limitations
- Lack of volunteer skills and knowledge
- Lack of volunteer time
- Lack of interest from other organisations to co-run activities
- Lack of interest in community to take part in activities
- None of the above

15. What practical assistance would be of greatest help to your congregation in supporting your local community more? (Please tick up to three answers which most apply – list continues on the next page)

- Information on how other churches have achieved this
- Information on how to organise events
- Information on how to finance events

Section D: Managing and Funding your church (10 questions)

Understanding how you manage and finance your church and its associated buildings

1. Which factors contribute to the successful management of your church buildings? (Please tick an option for each line below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Already contributes to our church's success</th>
<th>Do not currently have this but feel it is important</th>
<th>Do not currently have this and feel it is not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active body of volunteers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Friends’ Group</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent management team</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective leader</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid employees (especially for administrative tasks)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate training and information (e.g. maintenance, project management, claiming Gift Aid)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A focus on prevention of repairs including a regular maintenance schedule</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good internal capabilities in financial management and planning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Listed Places of Worship VAT Scheme enables VAT on eligible repairs and maintenance to be reclaimed. Have your church buildings benefited from this scheme? Further details can be found at www.lpwscheme.org.uk

- Yes
- No - We were not aware of the scheme
- No - We have not had any works that would qualify for the scheme
- No - The form was too complicated
- Don’t know
3. Has your church negotiated zero-rating or VAT exemption for any works to your building?

If your church is a listed place of worship, please only include exemptions received above and beyond the Listed Places of Worship scheme addressed in the previous question.

☐ Yes for community projects, facilities or access work
☐ Yes for alterations (e.g. extensions)
☐ We have not negotiated VAT exemption
☐ No qualifying works have been carried out
☐ Don’t know

4. Please indicate the source of any funding for repairs projects in the last five years
(Please tick all that apply)

☐ Local organisation (e.g. local business or trust)
☐ Local individual donor of £500 or more
☐ Friends’ Group
☐ Fundraising activities (e.g. cultural events, sponsored events, fêtes, jumble sales)
☐ Congregational and visitor donations
☐ Legacy/es
☐ Loans
☐ Rental income
☐ Your Denomination
☐ County Churches Trust (outside of the Ride and Stride event)
☐ Ride and Stride event
☐ Other local charity
☐ Regional Development Agency
☐ National Churches Trust
☐ English Heritage, Cadw, Historic Scotland or Northern Ireland Environment Agency
☐ Church Urban Fund
☐ Heritage Lottery Fund
☐ Landfill Communities Fund (e.g. WREN, Viridor, CEMEX)
☐ Other national Charities, Foundations or Trusts
☐ Regeneration funding
☐ None of the above

5. In the last three years, on average, what percentage of the annual total repair costs has been met by your church’s own funds?

The person responsible for your accounts should be able to calculate this figure. Please include your own fundraising but not any external grants in your own funds.

☐ 0 - 10%
☐ 11 - 25%
☐ 26 - 50%
☐ 51 - 75%
☐ 76 - 100%

6. What is the approximate breakdown of the routine annual expenditure for your church buildings?

The total should equal to 100% or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs (excluding clergy)</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy staff costs</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to your denomination (e.g. Common Fund)</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and cultural activities</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General upkeep including cleaning and utilities</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations to other projects including mission</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Does your church have an established Friends’ Group?

A Friends’ Group is a voluntary group, which devotes time to supporting specific church/es

☐ Yes - Running for more than 10 years
☐ Yes – Running for 6-10 years
☐ Yes – Running for 1-5 years
☐ Yes – Running for less than a year
☐ No but thinking of setting one up
☐ No
☐ Don’t know

8. How many members does your Friends’ Group have?

Total number of members ___________
Number of members who are also part of your congregation ___________

9. What is the average contribution of the Friends’ Group to the following projects?

E.g., If your Friends’ group contributes to specific projects please provide an estimated average e.g., £400 in 2007, £1800 in 2008, £200 in 2009 would average to an annual contribution of £800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Contribution for regular repairs and maintenance</td>
<td>£ __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Contribution for new works or major changes</td>
<td>£ __________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Many churches are taking steps to reduce their energy use, or carbon footprint. Which of the following measures have been implemented in your church buildings?

Please tick all that apply – list continues on the next page

☐ Carried out an energy audit
☐ Switched to a green energy tariff
☐ Improved the efficiency of the heating system and controls (new boiler, thermostats etc.)
☐ Switched to low energy light bulbs
Carried out energy saving work to the fabric such as installing secondary glazing or roof insulation

Installed an energy generating technology e.g. solar heating panels, wind turbine, ground source heat pump etc.

If you have any further comments, please enter them in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire.

Section E: Final questions to complete your response

Your answers will help us build a better picture of the current state of churches in the U.K. Please remember to fill in the data protection statement on the back of this booklet.

We would be most grateful if you could tell us your thoughts on the survey by ticking one box for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The survey will benefit those aiming to help church buildings and their communities (e.g., heritage organisations, grant-giving bodies)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The survey was sensitive to the specifics of my denomination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any further comments about this survey, please enter them below:

Data Protection

The National Churches Trust is gathering information on the current condition of all Christian places of worship in the U.K. The information that we gather will be aggregated, so that the publicly available results will be anonymous.

We commit to not passing on your personal details to any third parties.

- When the survey is completed we can send you a confidential report relating your church's responses to relevant averages from the survey. If you would like to receive this, please tick this box.

- The Trust is committed to providing church communities with support and advice, and engaging them more closely with our work. If you are happy for us to get in touch with you about this and our other initiatives please tick this box

Email Address: ____________________________
Your Name: ____________________________

We know that being responsible for a church, chapel or meeting house can pose many challenges - this is why we provide links to a range of resources on our own website. The information and guidance offered can be applied to many places of worship across the UK and across denominational boundaries. You should also visit your denominational website for regular updates and advice.

http://www.nationalchurchestrust.org/links.html

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Your responses will allow us to create an accurate picture of the UK’s churches, chapels and meeting houses.

Please now return this survey in the freepost envelope provided or visit http://survey.nationalchurchestrust.org to enter your answers online.