

GROVE

 ChurchArmy
www.churcharmy.org.uk

Ev 99

evangelism

SERIES

Church Planting in the UK Since 2000

Reviewing the First Decade



George Lings
Stuart Murray

Church Planting in the UK Since 2000

Reviewing the First Decade

George Lings

Director of Church Army's Research Unit

Stuart Murray

Trainer and Consultant with the Anabaptist Network

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED
RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Contents

1	Ten Years On	3
2	Classifying Church Planting.....	4
3	Counting New Churches.....	11
4	Continuities and Changes	16
5	Prospects and Partnership.....	24
	Notes	28

Church Army Supports the Grove Evangelism Series

Church Army trains and equips around 300 evangelists to share faith through words and action in a variety of contexts across the UK and Ireland. You can find more information and films about our work on our website at www.churcharmy.org.uk

Wilson Carlile Centre, Cavendish Street, Sheffield S3 7RZ Tel: 0300 1232113
Email: info@churcharmy.org.uk; Web: www.churcharmy.org.uk;
Twitter: <http://twitter.com/churcharmy>

Registered Charity numbers: 226226 and SCO40457

The cover image is iStock copyright © Günay Mutlu

Copyright © George Lings and Stuart Murray 2012

First Impression August 2012
ISSN 1367-0840
ISBN 978 1 85174 839 6

1

Ten Years On

In December 2001 we participated in a consultation with representatives from denominations and networks to review church planting in the 1990s. Drawing on information provided then and in subsequent conversations, we wrote up our findings in *Church Planting: Past, Present and Future*.¹ We reported on the number and success rates of new churches planted, the experiences gained and the lessons learned. Responses indicated that many found it helpful.

During the past decade we have continued to share insights, enjoy conversations and periodically collaborate. We are an odd couple—an Anglican and an Anabaptist who are often surprised to discover how alike we think as we survey what is happening. Perhaps in post-Christendom western societies old labels mean less than they did as we all wrestle with mission on the margins.

So we decided to undertake a fresh review of church planting since 2000. We appreciate that other terms, especially ‘fresh expressions of church’ and ‘emerging churches,’ have usurped ‘church planting’ in some circles, but no other term is accepted across the range of denominations and other groups. Many of the dynamics are similar, even if the culture, expectations, models, methods and outcomes are more diverse.

In March 2011 we welcomed representatives from denominations, networks and mission agencies to a consultation in Birmingham. We invited them to share about church planting in their contexts and to reflect on their experiences. By no means univocal on some issues, this warm and lively event prompted calls for further gatherings, and contributed hugely to our research. There were gaps, so this report does not claim to be comprehensive, but we believe it is representative.

We hope it will be helpful—to practitioners, strategists, researchers, permission-givers, funders, coaches, mentors, leaders of existing churches and others concerned about the missional engagement of the British churches with our diverse and changing culture. We are grateful to those who have provided information, stimulated our thinking, challenged or confirmed our suspicions and encouraged us in this task. We believe the insights and experiences of diverse sections of the Christian community offer both commonalities and diversity that can encourage and enrich us all—if we will listen to each other. So we offer this report as an incomplete but unusual opportunity to learn together.

2

Classifying Church Planting

An immediate observation from the consultation in March 2011 was that it was going to be much less straightforward than ten years ago to count or classify instances of church planting. A further observation was that many people were less interested in counting or classifying.

We found this neither surprising nor disturbing. Already in 2001 it was clear that church planting was moving away from dependence on church growth ideology and its penchant for measuring everything, and from the mid-1990s contextualization and creativity were challenging any attempt at classification. We continue to think that some attempt to count and classify is worthwhile and instructive, but we recognize the limitations imposed on us by the data we have gathered and the significance of many other factors that do not lend themselves to precise measurement or a complete taxonomy.

Methods of Classification

The consultation provoked us to consider various ways of classifying the church planting that has taken place since 2000:

Denominational

Although many emerging churches are post-denominational in that they are neither officially connected to historic denominations nor do their members think in denominational terms, denominations (including the newer church networks) continue to play a significant role in church planting. They are involved in strategic planning, the accreditation and deployment of pioneers, providing housing and funding, offering training and support, gathering data and sharing good practice. This interdenominational consultation demonstrated the potential for learning across denominational boundaries but also indicated that denominations remained the primary source of information about what is happening.

Geographical (and Denominational)

More church planting is occurring in some regions of the United Kingdom than others. In Ireland, where church involvement is higher than elsewhere and the impact of post-Christendom less apparent, few churches have been planted and fresh expressions of church have not taken off,

although interest is growing as recent decline has been sharp. In Wales, where decline in church involvement is greatest, despite the large number of church buildings, the failure rate of church planting initiatives has been high. Some denominations are represented (both in terms of existing churches and church planting) more strongly in some areas than others. Anglican planting is variable, affected by the attitude to growth within each diocese. Most Baptist initiatives are in the southern half of England. The Brethren are planting mainly in small towns and large villages. The Salvation Army have focused on the M62 corridor and some urban priority areas. Most church planting by Black Majority churches is in large cities. Newfrontiers, whose strength is in and around the cities, are now planting international churches in major cities. We came across intriguing anomalies. The fastest growing new Brethren and Salvation Army churches are both in the Forest of Dean—not an area usually associated with church planting initiatives or rapid church growth. Further research into the spread of church planting could help to identify gaps and indicate opportunities for partnership and cooperation.

Tribal

In 2008 we hosted another consultation in which we presented for scrutiny a tentative classification we had developed. This identified ‘five tribes’ involved in church planting—whom we called ‘evangelical pragmatists,’ ‘revivalist believers,’ ‘alternative emergents,’ ‘mission-shaped-church initiators’ and ‘post-Christendom explorers.’ Different understandings of Scripture, theology, spirituality, mission, tradition and ecclesiology characterize the various tribal approaches. The document giving details of this is available online.² We welcome criticisms of this document and acknowledge its limitations but offer it afresh as another way of interpreting the increasingly diverse practice of church planting since 2000. One particular tension point is that some emerging churches are questioning many inherited theological, ethical and ecclesial perspectives, which is causing concern in more conservative church planting networks.

Structural

Some churches planted in the past decade are deliberately modelled on existing churches in relation to their style, ethos and structure. Although attention is paid to their context, firm theological and ecclesial convictions limit adaptation. This approach characterizes church planting in Newfrontiers and the Federation of Independent Evangelical Churches (FIEC). By contrast, Anglican and Methodist fresh expressions of church are intentionally different from, but complementary to, inherited forms. Some new models, such as messy church, café church and clusters, have proliferated; many others are specific to their contexts.

An interesting feature of the consultation in 2011 was the participation of representatives of mission agencies and church planting networks. Some of these are directly involved in planting churches; others provide support, training and encouragement. Some are linked to particular denominations; others are independent or interdenominational. We know of other agencies that were not represented at the consultation. Our composite list includes Fresh Expressions (Anglican/Methodist), Emerging Ministries (Church of Scotland), Co-Mission (independent), Venture FX (Methodist), the Incarnate Network (Baptist), Acts 29 (independent), Anglican Church Planting Initiatives (Anglican), Urban Expression (independent), the 614 initiative (Salvation Army), Waleswide (independent), North West Gospel Partnership (independent) and Church Planting Initiatives (Brethren).

Most of these agencies have been formed since 2000, indicating renewed enthusiasm for church planting after the decline in interest evident at the end of the 1990s. Some are the means by which denominations plant churches; others are assisting congregations to plant churches; and others again are planting churches themselves.

This overlaps with the resurgence of 'sodality' and 'modality' thinking first aired in Seoul by Ralph Winter in 1973.³ It argued and briefly demonstrated that throughout church history God has raised up two forms of mission, both of which are ecclesial. The modal is settled, place-based, minimalist in demands, easy to join and does mission through 'come.' The sodal by contrast tends to be mobile, more task-centred, asks for higher commitment, deploys people to higher risk contexts and the mission shape is 'go.' Both are valid and both are needed. Winter repudiated his own inherited Protestant division between church and mission societies whereby the latter were deemed not church. He praised Catholic understanding that saw both as church, operating in different ways, and included monastic movements as prime examples, bringing both mission to outsiders and renewal to insiders. Thus some mission societies are in the process of considering a future identity as Orders, and a number of new monastic groups, within and beyond the historic denominations, are now interpreting themselves within this framework.

Fresh Expressions of Church

The influential *Mission-Shaped Church* report,⁴ to which Stuart contributed a little and George very much more, began as an update on *Breaking New Ground*, a report of 1994 on church planting in the Church of England.⁵ The working group were already aware of a rise in church planting activity and still more of a much greater diversity of missional initiatives, many of which were not in the familiar church planting mode. They chose the phrase 'fresh expressions of church' to describe these. The phrase 'mixed economy,' first used by

Archbishop Rowan Williams, was also welcomed as a helpful way of affirming these new initiatives without denigrating traditional forms of church. Not all of the new initiatives were likely or even intending to become new congregations (and the language of ‘fresh expressions’ was less threatening to Anglicans than the language of ‘church planting’). But many represented efforts to contextualize the gospel into neighbourhoods or relational networks by developing ecclesial communities. A good number of these were not congregational planting in the more prescribed sense, as this was understood in the 1990s, but most were much more than mission activities and contributed to the re-imagination of church in the decade by providing diverse working examples.

Many fresh expressions aim to contextualize the gospel by developing ecclesial communities

Since 2004 the *Mission-shaped Church* report has sold widely in western societies. Its message has proved accessible to different national churches and other denominations. This may be because of a shared post-Christendom context and because it moved away from ‘how to’ thinking to urge contextualization of missional and ecclesial principles. Yet, during the past few years, there has been ongoing debate (within and beyond the Church of England) about the missional significance of these initiatives and the ecclesial status of these communities. But many, from regional leaders to local church members, have enthusiastically endorsed this approach and there has been substantial financial investment through the Fresh Expressions organization.⁶ This has produced a plethora of training resources, which have been accessed by several thousand people, encouraging and nurturing many hundreds of fresh expressions of church.

The terminology has proved at least elusive in definition and somewhat problematic, partly because *Mission-shaped Church* itself allowed it to mean both planting and the re-imagining of existing churches. However, this looser meaning did encourage more groups to start something. It has not helped that the term is often shortened to ‘fresh expressions,’ omitting ‘of church’; this has widened a gap between it and ‘church planting.’ In retrospect, clarity was also fudged by the organization’s website, which allowed anyone to register a fresh expression of church with minimal quality control. Since 2009 definitions have been used rather more rigorously after the list was handed on to the Sheffield Centre. Clearer parameters are now in place, bogus entries have been pruned out and a process begun to work nationally, and with sample dioceses, to obtain harder data.⁷ The Methodists commendably already have an effective digital national system to register their fresh expressions of church.

The lasting impact of these initiatives—on church and society—cannot yet be assessed with confidence, but they have already helped congregations and

mission teams to build relationships and share the gospel with many people previously beyond their reach, by moving outside their churches. They have prompted the recognition of a new category of 'pioneer minister,' the creation of legal instruments to recognize the new communities, and a more creative and missional mindset in many church members. They have encouraged greater ecclesial flexibility, believing it to be legitimate and possible to hold to core values of being church while at the same time pursuing contextual forms. It is this change which is both celebrated and disputed.

These initiatives have already helped congregations share the gospel with people previously beyond their reach

Other denominations have recognized the potential of fresh expressions and have either become full ecumenical partners (Methodists, United Reformed Church, Congregational Federation and the Ground Level network—some of these supplying staff members), or have developed similar initiatives (such as the Emerging Ministries of the Church of Scotland), or have been inspired by examples they have come across (Brethren, Elim, Nazarenes, Baptist Union of Scotland). But some have chosen not to adopt this approach—either because it does not fit their ecclesiology or because they are unconvinced by what they have seen. Familiar as the terminology is now in Anglican and Methodist circles, in some denominations it is not understood or almost unknown.

Emerging Church

Alongside these fresh expressions of church, and to some extent overlapping with them, other new ecclesial communities have been forming in the past fifteen years. The popular term 'emerging church' is as slippery as 'fresh expressions,' embracing communities whose theology, spirituality, ethos, focus and structure are as different from each other as from the 'inherited churches' with which they are often contrasted. Precipitate attempts to classify and interpret this disparate phenomenon have necessarily been flawed and soon become dated. What the 'emerging' terminology helpfully indicates, however, is the *organic* and *developmental* nature of what is happening; it is not coordinated, authorized or settled. The lasting significance of emerging church communities is even harder to assess than fresh expressions. Nor is there any reliable estimate of how many there are or how many people are involved in or impacted by them.

While it may be legitimate to describe fresh expressions of church as a movement, participants in the emerging church prefer to describe this as a conversation. However, after more than a decade of development, some movements are identifiable. Among these are 'alternative worship' communi-

ties⁸ and ‘new monastic’ communities.⁹ The annual Greenbelt Festival is an important meeting place for members of these communities. But many other groups have emerged as a result of missional reflection on their context or the search for culturally meaningful ways of worshipping or building community. They may participate in online conversations, but their influence and exposure is often very limited beyond their own locality or constituency. This is why it is difficult even to estimate the number of emerging church communities.

Unlike fresh expressions of church, many emerging church communities have no formal connections to networks or denominations, nor are they seeking authorization or approval from them. Most value relationships with inherited churches, although some are highly critical of an institution perceived as oppressive, moribund and wedded to a fading culture. Not all are missional. Some are preoccupied with ecclesial issues or theological reflection. Others function as recovery groups for members who have left after having been hurt by inherited churches. But many are—or eventually become—missional, and some prefer the language of ‘missional church’ to ‘emerging church.’

Indeed, the term ‘emerging church’ has internal and external critics. Some regard terms like ‘emerging’ and ‘inherited’ as too broad to be meaningful. There are multiple forms of inherited church, with differences as significant as any distinction between inherited and emerging churches. Others reject the distinction between inherited and emerging: all churches combine inherited and emerging features. And many of those involved resist being badged, pigeon-holed or co-opted.

Church Planting, Fresh Expressions and Emerging Church

There is no settled borderline between church planting, fresh expressions of church and emerging church. Many of the same dynamics are evident whatever these initiatives are called, and those involved face similar challenges. But there are significant differences in emphasis, ethos and expectations, and these factors can cause practitioners to identify strongly with one approach or another, and at times to critique sharply the perspectives and practices of others. Emerging church practitioners, for example, found the *Mission 21* conferences in Sheffield in 2006 and Bath in 2009 redolent of old-style church planting and uncongential. Some church planters criticize the emerging church for prioritizing ecclesial innovation over missional effectiveness and recycling disaffected Christians rather than evangelizing their communities. Some who identify with fresh expressions of church consider some church plants

Many emerging church communities have no formal connections to networks or denominations

so deficient in contextual engagement that they lack missional effectiveness and purvey an ossified way of being church. They also worry that some in the emerging church have thrown the baby out with the bathwater. And in church planting and emerging church circles there is suspicion that many fresh expressions of church are inhibited by their institutional links and unwilling to confront deeper missional and ecclesial issues. Our 'Five Tribes' conference was one attempt to help the different groups understand and respect each other and showed how complex this process is.

The literature of the past decade suggests that fresh expressions and emerging church are in vogue. Very few books on church planting have been published, but there have been many on the emerging church, fresh expressions and 'mission-shaped' subjects. New websites have resourced, simulated and connected emerging church pioneers and people involved in fresh expressions. Courses at some theological colleges have also followed this trend, replacing church planting modules with modules on missional church, pioneer ministry or emerging church.

But the differences between these approaches, though real, should not be overplayed, and there is much to be gained from moving beyond mutual critique to learning together. We value our engagement with all three groups and have tried to encourage conversations across perceived divides. George launched *Encounters on the Edge* in 1999 and, although these quarterly booklets primarily reflect on Anglican initiatives, examples of church planting, fresh expressions of church and emerging church can all be found in this series.¹⁰ Since 2004 Stuart has been involved in the *Crucible* course, which has equipped pioneers of various kinds and has enabled participants to meet other people involved in fresh expressions of church, church planting and the emerging church.¹¹ And we detect convergence between the different approaches. Most church planting now is contextually sensitive and ecclesially creative; mission has a high priority in many emerging churches; and fresh expressions of church are facing the missional and ecclesial implications of what is developing.

Counting New Churches

We asked representatives of denominations, networks and mission agencies to tell us how many churches had been planted since 2000. As we report on what we learned, several cautions are necessary:

Not All Denominations Keep Records

Elim and Pioneer both responded that they had no data; the Seventh-Day Adventists (SDA) had incomplete information; and a representative of the Simple Church network had 'no idea' about numbers. We were also unable to obtain information from the Assemblies of God, although we know they are planting churches, and some smaller networks and denominations.

Not All Denominations Count in the Same Way

The Churches of Christ record all new initiatives; the Nazarenes note which are thriving, struggling or have closed; Vineyard reported the failure rate of initiatives and the size others had achieved; Newfrontiers do not include a new church in their statistics until it has developed into quite an established congregation; the FIEC interprets a church as having a minister and a constituted membership; the SDA regard any group larger than 25 as no longer a newly planted church.

Different Approaches to Planning

Some denominations, such as the Salvation Army and Newfrontiers, plan church planting centrally and know about everything that is happening; other networks, such as the FIEC, initiate some centrally and discover others happening locally; others again, such as the Baptists and Elim, rely on entrepreneurial activity and gather information from time to time; while Anglicans work through dioceses, only a quarter of which have any serious record of how many fresh expressions of church they have.

Diverse Nature and Unclear Status

The diversity and uncertain ecclesial status of fresh expressions of church presents further difficulties. The Methodists in 2010, for example, reported that 941 fresh expressions of church met at least monthly but only one of these had been formally constituted as a church (a

worshipping community with a church council). We were informed that there were well over 600 registered messy churches, over 80 café churches and nearly 200 examples of clusters or missional communities. Not only are these initiatives variously interpreted by those involved but they are linked with churches from several denominations, so they may be double counted in any analysis. And some churches planted by mission agencies, such as Urban Expression, are also counted by the denomination they eventually join.

With these cautions in mind, rather than attempting to present a comprehensive analysis, we offer the following sample of church planting activity since 2000.

Baptists and Newfrontiers are planting new churches at a rate of roughly one a month, but Newfrontiers are doing this from a much smaller base of churches (and Baptists are also closing older churches). Neither has embraced the methodology of fresh expressions, but there are some Baptist emerging churches. Baptists are planting at much the same rate as in the 1990s.

Anglicans and Methodists have concentrated on encouraging fresh expressions of church. Methodists have made more rapid strides in counting these and use the definition devised early in the life of the Fresh Expressions team: 'a form of church for our changing culture established primarily for the benefit of people who are not yet members of any church.' Their 2010 returns have 1257 examples, but (as noted above) only 941 meet at least monthly. The distribution is that 67% of their circuits have at least one example. They also have tried to simplify matters by identifying four predefined types: messy church (27%), cells (11%), café churches (21%) and 3rd place (10%). The difficulty of counting and overlap is entertainingly raised in that 37% of their 3rd place churches meet in cafés while 74% of their Café Churches meet in churches.

The Church of England attempted a national count for its 2010 synod but found the data was too general and impossibly varied in quality. The nearest to any nationally accepted definition might be what appears on the Fresh Expressions website, which gives four defining characteristics:

- Missional—serving people outside church
- Contextual—listening to people and entering their culture
- Educational—making discipleship a priority
- Ecclesial—forming church.

Church Army's Sheffield Centre works with a more precise version of these, and their research thus far shows many dioceses claim to have over a hundred examples. It is certain that there are many more fresh expressions of church

being started than there were church planting initiatives ten years ago. It is also clear that not all that are claimed should qualify.

In the 1990s the Church of Scotland planted 12 times using a 'new charge development' model from the USA, based around stipendiary minister, manse and building for a dedicated area. Its fine 2001 report, *Church without Walls*, and the impact of the English report *Mission-shaped Church*, together with noted attendance decline and less money available, helped loosen and diversify the approach, and led to the appointment of a full-time development worker. The Emerging Ministries Task Group has overseen 27 new funded initiatives, now generically known as 'emerging churches' and widely distributed around the nation. They are classed in four types: children and youth; church planting; community development; networks and people groups. These have had an effect on their local area, but less on the national church, whose governmental structures, like the General Assembly, favour continuity and stability, not change. The decade ended with another promising national report, by John and Olive Drane, which tracks the changes since 2001 and commends further evolution within a version of mixed economy known as 'lake and river.'¹²

Church planting persists in smaller denominations and networks. The Nazarenes have planted 8 new churches since 2000, Ground Level 18, the Baptist Union of Scotland 6, the Churches of Christ 10–15, Vineyard 53, the Brethren 11, and the Baptist Union of Wales has planted its first Welsh-language church for 100 years! Of the denominations for which data was available, only the United Reformed Church reported no church planting at all. We should add to these figures churches planted by mission agencies and communities associated with the emerging church.

Vibrant church planting activity has been taking place among African churches

Vibrant church planting activity has been taking place among African churches. This was true during the 1990s too, but we were unable to assemble much evidence of this in our previous report. The Redeemed Christian Church of God is the outstanding example. A mainly Nigerian denomination, they have planted at least 300 churches since 2000 and are currently planting 50 churches a year. Their goal is to plant a church within ten minutes' walk of each other everywhere in the world! There are now so many RCCOG churches in London that nearby congregations can hear each other singing. Many other African churches have also been planted in the past decade, some networked together, others operating independently.

But African church planting is part of a wider picture. The proliferation of many different mono-ethnic churches has been a prominent feature of church planting since 2000. At the consultation we heard of Malawian, Zimbabwean

and Ghanaian church planters among the Churches of Christ; Korean and Bangladeshi churches joining the United Reformed Church; Russian, Romanian and Ghanaian SDA initiatives; Portuguese and Brazilian Baptist churches; and a Nigerian church in the Ground Level network. And some of the Caribbean denominations, such as the New Testament Church of God and the Church of God of Prophecy, which planted churches in the 1960s and 1970s, are recovering this practice. Accurate assessment of the numbers is problematic. Some are independent and hard to locate; many belong to denominations and are counted in their general statistics (which skews the figures, as Elim and SDA representatives acknowledged).

Turning the Corner

Our investigations appear to show that church planting has recovered substantially from a period of relative inactivity towards the end of the 1990s, even if it is not yet at the level of the first half of that decade. Unrealistic goal-setting and hyped expectations are largely absent. Church planting is taking longer but there seem to be fewer failures. Most of the denominations and networks that were planting churches vigorously in the 1990s continue to do so, with some investing heavily in developing fresh expressions of church, and church planting now is generally, though not always, more creative and contextual. The emerging church is at present quite limited numerically, but its ethos and approach are influential—not least in print and on the web.

Church planting must be set in the context of church closures and continuing decline in church attendance / membership if we are to assess its contribution and impact. Some denominations are still closing more churches than they are opening, and the proportion of the population involved in any way in church life has continued to diminish during the past decade, albeit at a reduced rate.

Interpreting the 2005 English Churches census (carried out halfway through the decade), Peter Brierley noted that the rate of church planting between 1998 and 2005 was lower than in the previous decade (three a week rather than four a week), but that the rate of church closures was also slowing. The title of his book—*Pulling Out of the Nosedive*—indicated his overall assessment. He concluded: ‘the *rate of decline* is not quite as great as it was in the 1990s but is still considerably more than it was in the 1980s. We are coming out of the nosedive, but no U-turn is yet in sight—we are still dropping.’¹³ A report by Christian Research in September 2010 suggested that this persistent decline had ended and early signs of growth were appearing. Martin Robinson, who networks widely in his work with Together in Mission, is also optimistic about the level of church planting he detects.¹⁴ We await more evidence. Part of the data collection problem is that measurement by weekly attendance masks the possibility that more people are involved but less often.

Undoubtedly, though, church planting, fresh expressions and the emerging church are making a significant contribution—not only by offsetting closures but by encouraging contextual and creative engagement with a changing culture and stimulating missional discipleship in newer and older churches alike.

4

Continuities and Changes

Innovation and Theological Reflection

We both consult widely with pioneers and new churches, sometimes following the stories as they unfold over several years. A transition we often observe is from innovation and frenetic activity to more settled patterns of church life and the re-appropriation of more traditional models and practices. This transition can attract criticism and be disappointing to the pioneers themselves, whose vision was for a radically new expression of church. In some cases this may indicate loss of nerve, overt pressure from the institution to conform to established norms or the more insidious influence of ‘the way things should be done.’ In other cases pioneers discover that constant innovation, especially if this places huge demands on people and resources, is unsustainable. Some also gain new appreciation for consistency and traditional patterns they had initially discarded. And, in some situations, reverting to older approaches results from careful attention to the surrounding culture and the rhythms of the local community.

Innovation has been a feature of church planting since 2000 (and was already emerging in the years before this). The terms ‘fresh expressions’ and ‘emerging church’ indicate this, of course—the one suggesting intentional creativity, the other openness to unpredictable developments. But most church planters, even those operating within a fairly definite set of ecclesial assumptions, are more sensitive to their local context and more attuned to the wider culture shifts that seem to require adaptation and innovation. The interplay of fresh thinking about church and engagement with a pluriform culture has galvanized missional and ecclesial creativity. We find this encouraging.

Some fear ecclesial creativity is sometimes at the expense of missional effectiveness, or even theological orthodoxy

But we also note the concerns of those who fear that ecclesial creativity is sometimes at the expense of missional effectiveness, or even theological orthodoxy, and we pay tribute to those pioneers who have chosen to prioritize contextual sensitivity and concern for the community beyond the church over their ecclesial preferences. *Mission-shaped Church* called for this attitude to be normative, using the term ‘dying to live,’ rooted in Jesus’ teaching in John 12.

orthodoxy, and we pay tribute to those pioneers who have chosen to prioritize contextual sensitivity and concern for the community beyond the church over their ecclesial preferences. *Mission-shaped Church* called for this attitude to be normative, using the term ‘dying to live,’ rooted in Jesus’ teaching in John 12.

Conversations with church planters during the past decade have often involved reflection on several interconnected features of contemporary society (all of which were mentioned in the consultation in 2011):

- The influence of postmodernity
- The implications of post-Christendom
- The ongoing contest between secularity and spirituality
- The significance of both networks and neighbourhoods
- The role of new technologies
- The widening gulf between church culture and wider society

The overarching theological framework for most church planters is now *missio Dei*, the conviction that mission originates in the character and purposes of God, rather than in the church. For church planters this means recognizing that God is already present and active before they arrive in a community; less dependence on strategies, goal and programmes; prioritizing missiology over ecclesiology, while valuing both; and adopting a holistic approach in which church planting is only one aspect of contextual mission. Closely related to this is widespread commitment to *incarnational mission*, which church planters may interpret as long-term embedded engagement with a neighbourhood; identification with the needs, concerns and priorities of the community; learning how to understand and communicate the gospel contextually; doing things with, rather than for, the community; embracing ‘go’ rather than ‘come’ approaches to mission; or prioritizing people over programmes and community involvement over starting meetings.

So there have been changes in the theory and practice of church planting, in the language used, the tone of the conversations and the expectations of pioneers and their supporters, but there has also been continuity. Two significant legacies of the 1990s were resources on church planting (books, articles, websites, reports, training manuals) that the previous generation had lacked and ten years of unprecedented interdenominational cooperation. Whatever changes there have been since 2000, we encourage pioneers today to draw on this legacy, and we regret that our experience suggests this advice still needs to be given. Many lessons learned in the 1990s are applicable to church planting, fresh expressions of church and the emerging church.

Fresh Approaches and Lessons Learned

Participants in the consultation and our other conversation partners identified changes in their thinking and practice during the past decade. Lessons had been learned, not only from experience in the 1990s, but from ongoing reflection on practice.

Some lessons were specific to particular denominations or networks, but several were more widely acknowledged:

The strategic significance of both networks and neighbourhoods—recognizing that in many contexts people interact through social networks rather than with those they live nearby, so that church planting may be into networks and subcultures, rather than geographical locations; but realizing also that, in poor urban and many rural communities, locality and neighbourhood are still primary.

The priority of building community and engaging in mission rather than starting worship services. Many church planters, in our view rightly, resist for much longer than before the temptation to start thinking about and offering public worship, investing their time in community activities and building relationships.

The use of third spaces. While some are still using church buildings and recognize the attraction of traditional sacred spaces, many others are using ‘third spaces’ (places where people relax and interact) or creating their own alternative sacred spaces.

The need for patience. Church planting is taking longer, partly because ecclesial creativity and careful listening to the context requires more time than imposing a ready-made model of church, partly because we are now increasingly engaging with non-churched rather than de-churched communities. Those who deploy and support church planters need to think in terms of a decade rather than three years. Salvation Army, Methodist and SDA representatives all said that their ministers were moved too often. Church Army now deploys its evangelists for at least five years.

The need for balance between entrepreneurial local initiatives and more strategic thinking. Excessively centralized and hierarchical approaches are unhelpful, but regional partnerships, priorities established by mission agencies and light-touch ecumenical cooperation are promising developments. The FIEC has discovered the value of ‘hub churches’ from which new churches can be planted, but has struggled to sustain centrally planned initiatives. Pioneer are developing into a network of ‘hub churches’ from which to plant churches, and Anglican and other denominations are providing similar resources for missional clusters. Some Baptist Associations are developing regional strategies; and ecumenical Fresh Expressions Area Strategy Teams (FEASTs) are encouraging fresh expressions of church across regions.

The wisdom of separating support and accountability structures. More attention generally was paid to providing pastoral support for pioneers (and learning what kind of support different kinds of church planting required), and there were now various contexts in which pioneers could receive peer support. It was agreed also that the dual functions of support and accountability should not be confused, but there is still some way to go, with stories of 'advisory' groups doing too much 'steering.' Some progress had been made in helping institutions to develop more appropriate forms of reporting and accountability for pioneers.

The importance of 'succession planning'—how to discern when pioneers need to move on or remain; how to develop indigenous leaders; when to bring in a new leader from elsewhere; what happens when the leadership of a sponsoring church or agency changes; how to handle changing financial arrangements. Revisiting one of the lessons we identified in 2003, many recognized that it was much harder to sustain a new church than to start one.

There is considerable diversity in the church planting models used and the kinds of teams deployed, but some denominations reported significant changes in their approach. After many years of relying on pioneer couples, the Salvation Army are now deploying teams, but the Brethren, FIEC, Venture FX and Ground Level continue to use pioneer couples. Only half of Baptist initiatives are now daughter congregations, whereas in the 1990s this was the dominant approach. Elim have abandoned large crusades in favour of 'strawberry runner' and daughter congregations. Newfrontiers are developing an approach they call 'planting pregnant'—using an experienced planter with a team with a view to planting out again within five years. Pioneer are exploring alternatives to planting congregations, including a developing partnership with the Methodists that involves planting into their church buildings. Anglican patterns are very varied, from sending one pioneer minister to the transplant of a team of 50-plus. And the prevalence of fresh expressions and clusters means that multi-congregational approaches are more common than planting independent congregations.

Other influences that appear to be of increasing significance are:

Simple church and church planting movements. Some consultation participants, especially those from the Churches of Christ, are exploring and advocating the feasibility of catalyzing a self-replicating movement of simple churches, relying on the use of homes, identifying 'people of peace' in the community, relationships rather than programmes, and unpaid pioneers. Such networks are more developed in other nations

but are beginning to appear here.¹⁵ There is an overlap to the next point in the values and intentions of the Sheffield-originated Order of Mission.

New monasticism. Especially in the emerging church, but also among pioneers of fresh expressions, there is considerable interest in drawing on the resources of the monastic tradition, reworking these for a different cultural context. Church Army and Church Mission Society, both supporters of pioneer ministry, have embraced this emphasis; Urban Expression has many features of a monastic mission order whilst not formally embracing this structure; and many pioneers have forged links with new monastic communities.

Training

One aspect of church planting in which there has been only patchy progress since 2000 is the provision of training. We suggested in our previous report that this was crucial, but what we have learned from the consultation, and conversations with others, suggests that this is still inadequate and is perceived as one of the main reasons why church planting ventures fail.

There have been some encouraging developments:

- The *mission-shaped intro* and *mission-shaped ministry* courses developed by the Fresh Expressions organization, and their online learning resource, *Share*.¹⁶
- Post-graduate courses at Cliff College to equip pioneers and mission strategists.¹⁷
- Missional training courses offered by Together in Mission through Springdale College.¹⁸
- The *Crucible* course run by Urban Expression and partners (mentioned above).
- The annual *Breakout* conference for pioneers across some denominations.
- Courses at some ministerial training colleges designed for prospective pioneer ministers and church planters.
- An increasing emphasis in some denominations on coaching and mentoring. All church planters in Newfrontiers and Vineyard now have coaches.

Another significant initiative is *Innovision*, an annual church planter assessment centre developed by Momentum, the Nazarenes' church planting

agency, in Manchester.¹⁹ Open to all denominations, this is already being used by the Churches of Christ. Although the basic structure has been imported from North America, the process has been carefully contextualized and offers a helpful resource to those with responsibility for assessing the suitability of potential pioneers. Newfrontiers also run a 'base camp' annually to help potential church planters explore their calling.

There is widespread discontent among pioneers about the kind of training offered

But there is widespread discontent among pioneers in many denominations about the kind of training offered, especially to men and women training for ministry. Despite efforts by training institutions to develop appropriate modules and courses, most remain locked into assumptions, priorities and patterns that do not equip students adequately for their 21st-century mission context or their role as pioneers. We have evidence that subsequent deployment can also be problematic, with many pioneers too tied to maintaining existing work, supervisors who do not understand them and no long-term planning for what should happen if they 'succeed.' Many denominations also need to give fresh attention to training volunteers as well as professionals (an Anglican consultation participant said Anglicans were 'clueless' about this); training apostles, prophets and evangelists as well as pastors and teachers; and especially training teams rather than individuals.

The Language of Reproducing, Emerging and Planting

The diversity of language in our field offers the chance to evaluate what may be most helpful, and how the images the varied vocabulary evokes tend to shape how matters are understood.

Paul Minear showed how the New Testament is full of images of the church, but never offers any definitions, heightening the sense of elusive divine mystery in what church is. Yet he was not afraid to choose four master images around which to group his book: the people of God; the new creation; the fellowship of faith; and the body of Christ. This group of images explores how the life of God, with a Christological focus, is being formed by the Spirit in the church.²⁰ The master images he chose are human, relational and personal. Even the new creation contains humanity as the pinnacle of a loving creative process. This seems to be in sharp contrast to some of the ways the process of planting, or emerging, or creating fresh expressions, is talked about. 'Let a thousand flowers bloom.' 'If 30% of the fresh expressions of church die, it doesn't matter.' 'We must be like entrepreneurs who welcome the culture of risk.'

Do these attitudes fit those biblical master images? Some who plant gardens can shrug their shoulders if the seeds rot in the ground and buy another packet. They would not take that view if they had a cot death on their hands. Some who value emergence seem to have the patience of Job about the pace and are content to deconstruct the past. Would they think like that if they were raising a child? Some entrepreneurs can seem more fired by risky adventure than concerned for the people they call to embody their idea. Surely followers are not expendable, or their demise mere collateral damage? The language used in some circles in relation to this discipline has unintentionally fostered a less-than-human view of the church, which is out of keeping with the New Testament images. While there are building images, like the temple and the city, these are social spaces, intended to be inhabited. This is not interest in architecture, but in where social and sacred space meet. There are also horticultural images, but they are not the master ones.

Consider another historical correlation. George has tracked four successive overlapping paradigms that have developed since 1950. Could it be that the best paradigm within which to comprehend church is unreservedly an interpersonal one?²¹

It is infinitely superior to the paradigm of seeing the church primarily as an institution, a view that today is clearly fossilized, bureaucratic, too often self-serving and held at a distance by younger generations. Institutions love rules and definitions, but the interpersonal goes deeper than the presence of practices such as the sacraments.

It outstrips the managerial paradigm that now looks fatally modernist and was historically derived from American church growth understanding. Its dangers include a mentality of moving chess pieces around, delusion about controlling an essentially voluntary and vocational body, and arrogance in planning outcomes that only the Spirit can deliver.

It is better even than its immediately prior model, the horticultural one, spawned by the advent of young churches, termed 'plants,' which coined an attendant vocabulary and images of trees, fruit, vines, transplants, seeds and grafts. While there is biblical warrant for this imagery and analogy, deeper theological strands beckon us beyond that. The relations within the Trinity, biblical anthropology based on humans in the image of such a God, covenant theology, the incarnation of God the Son, atonement as reconciliation or theosis, co-operation with the person of the Spirit, ecclesial master images and patterns of discipleship all point us toward an ecclesiology viewed through the lens of interpersonal relations.

The other paradigms and measures of church may serve the relational view but not subvert it. So the horticultural has value to teach seasons and dependence on God who alone gives growth. Managing its resources well still matters, but is a means, not an end. Good practices nourish the church, but do not define or explain it. And institutions are to serve like bones in a living body, without which they are but a skeleton.

Sadly, not everything that begins survives or flourishes. That is true of church too. But the initiatives that are starting (whether termed fresh expressions of church, emerging church or church plants) are not floral decorations like daffodils, or expendable as foot soldiers used to be regarded. They are young, vulnerable ecclesial communities. They are fragile gatherings of the people of God, demonstrations of his new creation, ways of the Trinity's life growing within them, and glimpses of the body of Christ. As such they need valuing so none die unnecessarily, and nurturing so they have a better chance to live up to the high calling that all images of the church hold out. We need to learn to talk of them in human and divine terms, rather than in agricultural, business or governmental metaphors. So perhaps churches are born more than planted; in mission the church reproduces non-identically with an ecclesial DNA, not merely grows. And churches do not just grow, they should mature. Imagine, for example, two leaders in dioceses, associations or districts that both contain new work. One says to the other, 'We have some interesting experiments.' The other says, 'These are our children.' Is it not clear that these are utterly different perspectives and also which ones will most likely thrive?

5

Prospects and Partnership

Prospects

Although some of the emerging features of church planting since 2000 were becoming visible when we wrote our previous report in 2003, there were many things we did not foresee. Given the complexity of what has been happening in the past decade, we are not confident about any predictions we might make about the future. Furthermore, prospects for church planting are integrally connected to a much deeper and broader analysis of church and culture than we can attempt here.

By 2020, despite the pioneering initiatives already underway and planned, the proportion of the population involved in any kind of church may have fallen to the predicted 4% and the resources available to church planters might be significantly reduced. Institutions may by then have given up on church planting and be concentrating, as some already are, on institutional survival.

Alternatively, the next ten years could see the thousands of current and future emerging missional initiatives giving birth to many new churches and bringing renewed vision, energy and resources to many existing congregations. Fresh expressions may no longer be fresh but might have matured into vibrant, contextually sensitive communities able to sustain themselves over the long haul. A new wave of emerging churches, less reactive than the first wave, might be far more effective in reaching a post-Christendom society.

What we want to do in this final chapter is to continue reporting on contributions to the consultation in 2011 and reflect on what we heard there and in other conversations. We acknowledge that these reflections are selective, representing what we believe to be of particular strategic significance.

As we ponder prospects for the coming decade, we cannot avoid the question of what 'success' means for church planters today. This question, and indeed the language of 'success,' is deeply unpopular with many pioneers, who are wary of being judged too soon, against inappropriate criteria or by critics with institutional agendas. Most, in our experience, welcome accountability but struggle with the assumptions and mechanics of this. They raise pertinent questions. Who judges success? Against what criteria? Within what time-frame? How important are numbers, and who should be counted? Is financial independence a desirable ambition, especially when linked to the

costs of stipendiary ministry? How important is sustainability, how does this link with maturity, and how is that measured?²²

There is work to be done—by denominations, mission agencies, congregations and church planters—if a helpful process is to be developed that addresses these concerns and helps all involved to assess the prospects of missional initiatives. At the end of the consultation several people asked whether we might meet again (before the end of the next decade!). Perhaps this is an issue worth exploring at a future consultation. By listening to those whose primary measure of success is the conversion of unbelievers, to those who think the heart of the matter is discipleship, and to those who are more concerned about the development of culturally sensitive forms of church in a changing culture (these different perspectives emerged in the consultation), we might together find ways of assessing progress.

Partnership

Running throughout this section is the conviction that partnership is essential if we are to accomplish all we can over the coming years. Competition and isolation are luxuries we cannot afford. There were divergent views when we met together. We did not all agree on every theological, ecclesial or missional issue. But we valued the ethos of friendship and respect, we appreciated a modest and humble tone not always apparent at church planting events, and we dare to hope for increasing partnership.

In three areas, especially, partnership may enable us to move forward more effectively.

Strategy

We noted earlier that some denominations are stronger in certain areas than others. Some mission agencies also focus deliberately on particular kinds of communities. The FIEC, for example, plant into white middle-class areas where their churches are already strong, where support is readily available (although this may be changing). Urban Expression and the 614 initiative of the Salvation Army plant into poor urban communities, where churches are weak. Greater cooperation in research and deployment might enable all of us to be more effective in our use of resources. And in new housing developments, cooperation in church planting is more feasible now that heavy ecumenical agreements have been replaced by light-touch partnerships and 'lead denomination' arrangements.

Crossing Cultures

The Black Majority Church representative at the consultation pleaded for partnership between black and white Christians. In multi-ethnic urban Britain

(and increasingly in non-urban areas), mono-ethnic churches are thriving but most are struggling to make any impact across ethnic boundaries. Partnership in forming multi-ethnic teams to plant multi-ethnic churches might open up many new possibilities, as well as living out the reconciling power of the gospel.

Training

The concerns we expressed earlier about the training of pioneers are not related to the number of courses available. There are too many courses competing for too few students. Some have ceased to operate; others are struggling; attempts to launch new courses have been unsuccessful. Partnership and pooled resources would make much more sense and could produce much more effective training.

Emerging Issues

In conversations during and after the consultation, a number of issues were highlighted as priorities for further reflection.

Evangelism

Two different concerns about evangelism surfaced. In emerging church circles there is deep disquiet about inherited forms of evangelism—its assumptions, methodology and ethos—and about formulations of the gospel that seem contextually inappropriate and theologically truncated or ossified. And in conservative church planting circles there is equally deep disquiet that in the emerging church, and in some fresh expressions, the gospel is being watered down or distorted and that little evangelism is actually taking place. Although discussion of this issue was respectful and restrained, there are tensions here that may warrant further exploration.

Impact

Closely related to the above issue is the question, 'Who are we reaching and not reaching?' There is rarely much information about whether those joining new churches or fresh expressions are new Christians, lapsed Christians, already Christians, or have much, little or no previous experience of church. Nor are there any statistics on age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, socio-economic status or other characteristics. Individual churches may know what is happening, but there appears to be little interest in researching this issue or sharing information. This may also warrant further exploration so that we can assess more accurately where the gaps are in our church planting endeavours. The Sheffield Centre has begun this task in relation to Anglican Fresh Expressions through a pilot study with one diocese.

Gender

An issue raised quite sharply in the consultation concerned the role of women in church planting, fresh expressions and the emerging church. As with most

church planting gatherings during the past decades, the consultation was predominantly (although not exclusively) male and some struggled with the non-inclusive language used. Some networks and denominations endorse only male leaders of church planting teams; in others, such as the Salvation Army, there are more women than men planting churches; but women are under-represented at consultations and in strategic settings. The supposedly egalitarian convictions of the emerging church appear not to have ameliorated this. Most recognize that women play a crucial role in community building and other dimensions of church planting, but learning from their perspectives and experience of church planting, and investigating the impact of female pioneers on what is actually planted, could be another valuable focus for a future consultation.²³

Sustainability

We mentioned this above in connection with the issue of success. Some regard sustainability—persisting over many years, reducing dependence on a sponsoring agency or congregation and achieving financial independence—as signs of health and maturity. Others, including many involved in the emerging church and fresh expressions, are more concerned about contextual sensitivity and engaging with the present generation or a particular network. Sustainability may be unrealistic in some situations, or even undesirable if taken to mean enduring immutability where an initiative needs to be flexible enough to adapt to a rapidly changing culture. But many are interested in the ecclesial status that will be accorded to the hundreds of fresh expressions that have been pioneered. Questions about ongoing funding are deeply entwined with this issue.

Discipleship

The consultation confirmed our experience that the main question most pioneers are asking is no longer ‘What do we mean by church?’ but ‘How do we make and nurture disciples?’ In a context in which many Christian values and practices are counter-cultural and a society which effectively catechizes us into a secular, individualist and consumerist worldview, the pressing need is to discover effective and sustaining disciple-making practices. Interest in new monasticism is one indicator of this search for depth and resources, as is the growing popularity of friendship bands, accountability groups and catechesis. Pioneers are interested especially in encouraging missional discipleship; this is another issue on which we might learn together.

Church

The issue of discipleship may have risen to the top of the agenda, but questions about the meaning of church remain. Some consultation participants expressed concern about moving the goalposts, redefining church in order to claim more success than is warranted, and abandoning biblical guidelines that circumscribe what can be identified as church. They urged us to concentrate on

establishing churches that are thriving, lasting, multi-generational and reach the community through effective evangelism. Others challenged the notion that the Bible provides such detailed guidelines and urged greater contextual sensitivity and ecclesial creativity, rooted in biblical values rather than supposed blueprints. This debate looks set to continue during the coming decade.

The past decade has seen a welcome increase in contextual mission, authentic ecclesial creativity and diversity, lighter touch informal ecumenical co-operation and a promising beginning to wider church ownership. But it has been marred by inter-tribal suspicions, difficulty in agreeing terms, and a tendency to adopt popular shapes and labels without understanding values. Challenges that remain include retaining our nerve in mission, enabling counter-cultural discipleship, enhancing the chances of initiatives to mature and especially allowing discoveries at the edge to change the rest of the picture. The water in the glass is at the halfway mark. Will it go up or down?

Notes

- 1 Grove Evangelism booklet Ev 61.
- 2 www.urbanexpression.org.uk/general/resources or www.churcharmy.org.uk/ms/sc/reimaginechurch/sfc_churchpublications.aspx
- 3 *The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Mission*, <http://sheffieldcentreresearch.wordpress.com/2012/03/13/why-modality-and-sodality-thinking-is-vital-to-understand-future-church/>
- 4 Church House Publishing, 2004.
- 5 Church House Publishing, 1994.
- 6 See www.freshexpressions.org.uk
- 7 For a summary of current parameters, see *Encounters on the Edge* No 50, pp 19–20.
- 8 www.alternativeworship.org
- 9 <http://new-monasticism-network.ning.com>
- 10 www.encountersontheedge.org.uk
- 11 www.cruciblecourse.org.uk
- 12 J Drane and O F Drane, *Reformed, Reforming, Emerging and Experimenting* (Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Ministries Council, 2010).
- 13 Christian Research, 2006, p 18.
- 14 www.togetherinmission.co.uk
- 15 www.simplechurch.co.uk
- 16 www.freshexpressions.org.uk/share
- 17 www.cliffcollege.ac.uk
- 18 <http://springdalecollege.org.uk>
- 19 www.momentum-uk.org
- 20 P S Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004).
- 21 'Evaluating Fresh Expressions of Church,' *Anvil*, 2011 (accessed on internet).
- 22 S Croft (ed), *The Future of the Parish System* (London: Church House Publishing, 2006) pp 138–151 and S Murray, *Changing Mission* (London: Churches Together in Britain and Ireland, 2006) pp 121–139.
- 23 'Leading the Way: Pioneering Women,' *Pioneers 4 Life*, pp 90–101.

The landscape of reimagining and realizing new churches, Christian communities and forms of church has seen significant evolution since the church planting of the 1990s.

This study reports on the developments since 2000, analyzing the lessons that can be learned and setting out the prospects and challenges that lie ahead.

George Lings leads Church Army's research unit, which investigates church planting, fresh expressions and the western mission context. He was part of writing 'Mission-shaped Church' and fronts the 'Encounters on the Edge' series.

Stuart Murray works with the Anabaptist Network as a trainer and consultant, with particular interest in urban mission and church planting. He is founder of Urban Expression, and has written books on church planting, urban mission and post-Christendom.

The **Grove/Church Army Evangelism Series** offers concise explorations of key areas in evangelism. New titles come out every February, May, August and November.

Other titles of interest include:

- Ev78 Church Planting in the Inner City: The Urban Expression Story** by Juliet Kilpin and Stuart Murray
- Ev61 Church Planting: Past, Present and Future** by George Lings and Stuart Murray
- Ev49 Hope from the Margins: New Ways of Being Church** by Stuart Murray and Anne Wilkinson-Hayes

To buy these post-free call the Grove office on **01223 464748**, email sales@grovebooks.co.uk or visit

www.grovebooks.co.uk

**'Not the last word...
...but often the first'**

Grove Booklets are fast moving explorations of Christian life and ministry.

Nine Series
on biblical studies, education, ethics, evangelism, leadership, pastoral ministry, spirituality, worship and youth.

Accessible
Brief, clear, quality thinking that addresses the issues of the moment.

Relevant
Each series has a new title every quarter, written by practitioners, not theorists.

Affordable
Booklets are sent post-free. Save 30% by taking out a year's subscription—it costs less than many paperbacks.

ISBN 978-1-85174-839-6



9 781851 748396

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 464748

Registered Charity No. 327014

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd. Tel: 0115 973 3292

£3.95

ISSN 1367-0840