

Jessica Cheadle

From: James Bate
Sent: 23 September 2019 13:15
To: SDDC Planning Applications
Cc: Teresa Turner
Subject: RE: Planning Application Consultation DMPA/2019/1050 - St. Wilfrids Church, Church Road, Egginton, Derby, DE65 6HP

Teresa,

I have considered this application for re-roofing of part of the north aisle roof at St Wilfreds, a grade I listed building.

I note that the work has already Secured a conditional Church of England faculty (meeting dated 22nd July 2019) and as such a separate application for listed building consent is not required.

The proposed works follow an incident of lead theft, not the first such incident of this church where a smaller section of roof above the organ loft was targeted several years ago. There has been a recent resurgence in lead theft incidents affecting East Midlands churches and past experience suggests that where lead is reinstated churches are often re-targeted. Security measures such as roof alarms, security lighting and marking systems are helpful but not infallible.

The proposal is to re-roof the area from which lead has been stolen, a small section at the north west of the north aisle which was not removed will be retained alongside a new roof covering in turne coated stainless steel. The use of turne coated stainless steel is increasingly common following lead thefts as the material has relatively little scrap value as well as being far more difficult to cut of fold for transport away from a site.

Any historic value that old lead had has already been lost as a result of its removal from site. The proposal utilises a different material but replicates the bay sizes and rolled joints of the former lead covering to provide an aesthetic treatment similar to that which previously existed.

Whilst the sue of lead would be preferable in conservation terms it is appreciated that it would be difficult to fully eliminate risks of further thefts, and the long term conservation of the church as a listed building cannot be helped by either the harmful physical impact of sitting without a proper roof covering whilst repair is organised or the costs of reinstatement and the impact they have on the ability of owners and communities to fund other works.

The proposal would retain to a large degree the aesthetic character of a lead roof, replicating bay joint detailing and sizes. In addition the roofslopes of the church are relatively shallow and mostly hidden by parapet walls. Relatively little of the roof covering can be seen from ground level from the churchyard and its environs. Whilst the work would have an impact upon the external appearance of the building this is minimised by the replication of lead detailing and further limited by the lack of easy vantage points, public or private, from which the roofslope in question is prominent.

In my view the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to a listed building by virtue of the change in material, this would engage a statutory presumption against granting planning permission under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, however there is a test to be applied via paragraph 196 of the NPPF weighing wider public benefits against harm. In my view the wider public benefit of a secure roof covering unlikely to be further targeted by thieves would be significant in securing long term conservation of the building. In my view these benefits would be substantial and would significantly outweigh the harm to the listed building arising from the change in material, sufficient to justify a departure from the statutory presumption under section 66 of the 1990 Act and to grant planning permission.

Yours,

James Bate

Conservation Officer

T: 01283 595983

www.southderbyshire.gov.uk



People | Place | Progress

www.southderbyshire.gov.uk



**South
Derbyshire**
District Council

Any advice is given at officer level only and does not prejudice any formal decision the Council makes in the future.