

---

**Delegated report**      Officer: Teresa Turner

**Application ref. DMPA/2019/1050**

Replacement of lead over north aisle with terne-coated stainless steel at St. Wilfrids Church, Church Road, Egginton, Derby, DE65 6HP

---

Valid date:                      30/08/2019

Consults expired:            25/10/2019

EIA development?          No

---

This decision is delegated to officers under the terms of the current Scheme of Delegation.

**Relevant planning history**

There is no planning history that is of relevance to the current proposal.

**Responses to consultations and publicity**

Historic England (HE) refer the LPA to the advice note 'Metal Theft from Historic Buildings: Prevention, Response and Recovery' (July 2017) which provides helpful guidance in determining applications. See in particular HE policy on replacement of stolen lead with alternative materials on page 6, section 2: 'Where the risk of theft is too high following a serious theft, or repeated minor attacks, it is not reasonable to expect like for like replacement of stolen lead. We would normally recommend that the most appropriate alternative would be a long-term durable material with a known standard of performance, such as terne-coated stainless steel (TCSS), zinc, slates or tiles.' With reference to stainless steel, see section 3.2 on page 10: 'Terne-coated stainless steel is the most popular long-term alternative to lead and offers advantages over other options, including a similar appearance.'

In order to maintain similarity of appearance and performance with lead, HE normally recommend that TCSS is laid with traditional round batten rolls as opposed to standing seams. We also recommend that the church architect is involved in overseeing the specification and installation of the TCSS, to ensure an appropriate standard of performance. It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals.

The Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposal.

**Relevant policy, guidance and/or legislation**

The relevant Development Plan policies are:

- 2016 Local Plan Part 1 (LP1): Policy S2 (Presumption In Favour of Sustainable Development), Policy SD1 (Amenity & Environmental Quality), Policy BNE1 (Design Excellence), Policy BNE2 (Heritage Assets)
- 2017 Local Plan Part 2 (LP2): BNE10 (Heritage)

The relevant local guidance is:

- South Derbyshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The relevant national policy and guidance is:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

**Planning considerations**

Taking into account the application made, the documents submitted (and supplemented and/or amended where relevant) and the site and its environs; the main issue(s) central to the determination

of this application is/are:

- The impact on the external character and setting of the listed building; and
- The impact on the general character and appearance of the area.

## **Planning assessment**

### The impact on the external character and setting of the listed building

It is noted that the work to re-roof part of the north aisle roof at St Wilfrid's Church, a Grade I listed building, 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 would be retained alongside a new roof covering in terne-coated stainless steel. The use of terne-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 or fold for transport away from a site.

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

Whilst the use 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 would be 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.

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. 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. 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.

The proposal is considered to be in accord with the requirements of Policy BNE2 of the LP1 and Policy BNE10 of the LP2.

### The impact on the general character and appearance of the area

As assessed above, there are limited public vantage points where the affected roof can be viewed and the proposal seeks to replicate the aesthetics of the former roof covering. As such there would be no impact on the general character of the area in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the LP1.

The proposal would conform to Policy SD1 of the LP1 in that it would not lead to adverse impacts on the environment or amenity of existing and future occupiers within and around the proposed development.

The proposal would conform to the requirements of the NPPF and the NPPG and with Policy S2 of the LP1 in that planning applications received by the Council that accord with the policies in the Local Plan Part 1 (and where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be dealt with positively and without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

## **Recommendation**

Approve with Conditions

None of the other matters raised through the publicity and consultation process amount to material considerations outweighing the assessment of the main issues set out above, noting that conditions or obligations have been attached where meeting the tests for their imposition. Where relevant, regard has been had to the public sector equality duty, as required by section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and to local finance considerations (as far as it is material), as required by section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as well as climate change, human rights and other international legislation.

---

|                      |                 |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| Recommendation made: | 25/10/2019      |
| Report agreed:       | 25/10/2019      |
| Authorised officer:  | Richard Stewart |

---