

7. FULL APPLICATION: CONVERSION OF REDUNDANT WATER TREATMENT WORKS INTO 16 APARTMENTS, CONVERSION OF STONE OUTBUILDING INTO A STUDIO APARTMENT AND FOUR NEW COTTAGES AT FORMER TREATMENT WORKS, MILL LEE ROAD, LOW BRADFELD. (NP/S/0914/1007, P.7042, 22/09/14, 426261/391743, JK)

APPLICANT: Bradfield Water Works Ltd

Introduction

This application was last presented to the June 2017 Committee with a recommendation of refusal on grounds that the additional development over and above the conversion of the 1913 building had not been demonstrated to be necessary to achieve conservation and enhancement of the original building. Members however wished to see a conversion of the whole treatment building (original 1913 building and later 1950's additions) as part of the comprehensive redevelopment of the whole site to maximise the opportunity for enhancement. The Committee therefore deferred the item to enable this to take place and for officers to also consider with the applicant the opportunity for the inclusion of affordable housing on the site. Since the deferral a local housing need survey has been conducted and further discussions between officers and the applicants have resulted in an amendment to the scheme to designate two of the apartments as affordable dwellings.

Site and Surroundings

The Bradfield Filter Works is a 1.3ha site located on the west side of Mill Lee Road at the southern edge of Low Bradfield village. It was built in 1913 to purify water from Strines, Dale Dyke and Agden Valley reservoirs, serving Sheffield until it closed in 1995. It comprises the original 1913 Treatment Works building which is built in typical local Water Board style in natural gritstone under a double pile pitched Welsh slate roof with patent glazed lantern ridge lights. In the 1950's the original building was extended with a number of stone faced, flat roofed extensions to the south and west elevations.

The application site, comprising the main filter works and its associated curtilage, is rectangular in shape, with a 140m frontage to the road and is around 88m deep. It wraps around the former Bradfield Methodist Chapel which fronts onto the road, being a dwelling in separate ownership. To the north, the site is bounded by Dale Dyke stream. The western boundary abuts open countryside with the southern boundary defined by Plumpton Lane, an unsurfaced track and public footpath, with open countryside beyond.

The main access into the site is directly off Mill Lee Road between the Treatment Works building and the converted Methodist Chapel. To the rear of the Methodist Chapel there are two settlement ponds beside the Dale Dyke Brook.

There is a detached two storey dwelling, Filter Cottage, to the rear of the Filter works building. This was the former caretaker's dwelling and although it is within the applicant's ownership, it is excluded from the application site area. To the south of Filter Cottage there is a detached single storey stone garage/outbuilding which straddles the western boundary wall.

A large mound on the southern part of the site conceals an earth sheltered concrete water storage tank covered in soil and grass.

Although the Filter Works have been redundant for some time, the water main from Dale Dyke Reservoir still passes under the site on its way to the new Loxley Water Treatment Plant. This main has a minimum 4.5m easement either side. Close to where it passes under the Mill Lee Road, a small area of the land above is excluded from the application site as it houses a low stone equipment box containing water company operational infrastructure. There is also an electricity sub-station currently sited between the filter building and the covered water tank.

The majority of the site, apart from the settlement ponds, lies within the Low Bradfield Conservation Area which also includes the adjacent Methodist Chapel. The Conservation Area includes most of the village to the north and was specifically extended in 2010 to include the Water Treatment Works. This was in recognition that public water supply is an important integral part of the National Park which has shaped its landscape, as well as the fact that the original 1913 building is a fine example of the Victorian/early twentieth Century Neo-Classical stone buildings constructed for water treatment. The Works is therefore defined for these reasons as an 'important unlisted building' in the Conservation Area Appraisal. This also noted that the works are in a poor condition and that repair and renovation of the building should be encouraged as it is in a very visible gateway position.

Unfortunately, all the internal water works pipework and equipment related to the former filter use has been stripped out, eroding much of the interest in the site. The empty rooms are of no interest in the 1950's section, compared to the main 1913 section which comprises an impressively large two storey open hall lit from above by patent glazed ridge lanterns running down each ridge. The site has stood empty for many years and has been the subject of vandalism and anti-social activity. As a result of its increasing dereliction and prominent location beside the main street it is having a significant adverse impact upon the special quality of the Conservation area, the street scene and the local community, and has done so for a long time.

The nearby Bradfield Council Office building to the north-east of the site is a Grade II listed building and marks the southerly limit of the Conservation Area on the opposite side of Mill Lee Road.

A narrow section of the site lying between the settlement ponds and the Dale Dyke Brook is designated flood zone.

Proposal

The amended proposal has three main elements; Firstly, the conversion with extensions and alterations of the Filter Works building to provide 16 market apartments one of which, No 11, which is a two bed 91m² ground floor unit at the rear of the building, would now be restricted to local needs.

Secondly, there is the removal of the large earth covered water tank and the construction of a terrace of 4 two storey, four bed, open market houses facing Mill Lee Road.

Thirdly, it is proposed to convert the stone garage at the back of the site into a one-bed studio apartment. This studio apartment would form the second affordable dwelling now offered by the applicant in the amended proposal.

Associated external works include the landscaping of the outside space with a communal garden together with the provision of 36 car parking spaces, 2 of which would be disabled spaces. Plans also propose the erection of a building housing a bin store, a cycle store and a biomass boiler. They also provide for the relocation of the existing electricity substation over to the southern boundary. The current vehicular access into the site between the Filter works building and the Methodist Chapel would remain as the entrance into the site.

The application has been the subject of extensive discussions between the applicants and officers. Prior to the June Planning Committee these mainly focussed on officer concerns over the financial viability case put forward by the applicant as justification for the inclusion within the scheme of the later 1950's flat roofed sections, the new build houses and the garage conversion.

Following the clear steer given to officers at the June Committee the negotiations have focussed on the gable width of the new build houses and how the scheme could accommodate affordable

units. An updated financial viability appraisal has been received, the applicants have offered the two affordable units and an amended site plan has been received resolving an access width issue where the drive passed between the works building and filter cottage.

The proposal shown on the amended plans comprises of the following detailed elements:

Main Filter Works Building

Conversion with extension and alterations to the whole filter works building to provide 15 open market apartments and 1 affordable apartment (2 bed unit) which comprises 11 x 4 bed units, 2 x 3 bed units and 3 x 2 bed units. The units would be arranged as follows:

- 6 x 4 bed two storey units would be accommodated within the original 1913 pitched roof building and take up the northern half and the front, road facing section of both gable ends facing the street. This leaves the majority of the southern part of the 1913 structure, forming one half the former large open machinery/filter hall, as a full height open internal courtyard/atrium space for shared residential amenity use, lit from above by the patent glazing ridge lights.
- 3 x 2 bed units would be accommodated within the 1950's single storey flat roofed section to the rear of the 1913 section.
- 7 units, 5 x 4 bed and 2 x 3 bed units, would be sited within the southern 1950's flat roofed addition, the main section of which would be raised by 1 metre to give space to accommodate a first floor, making each of these units two storeys in height.

Detached Garage Conversion

Plans show a simple conversion to a one-bed studio style affordable apartment, with a mezzanine forming the bedroom space. The alterations would comprise replacing the existing garage door with a 3-light glazed screen, re-glazing an existing side window and supplementing these with two new roof lights. To the front would be a single designated parking space.

New Houses

The four 4 bed houses would be constructed in stone as a single terrace of four under a double pile (i.e. two parallel gables), blue slate roof to accommodate the deep plan form. The site slopes up to the south so the terrace would be formed with a single step down in the middle of the roof ridge. The windows and doors would be timber. Boundary walls would be stone and each plot would have front and rear gardens with two designated parking spaces in the rear curtilage.

Bin/Cycle Store/Biomass boiler Building

This would be a simple rectangular building constructed from stone under a slate roof divided internally into three bays accessed by external timber planked doors. It would be sited beside the parking area and could accommodate six large bins in one bay, eight bikes in another, with the third for the accommodation of a CHP biomass boiler.

Supporting information

An updated Development Financial Viability Appraisal with supporting cost plans and sale valuations was submitted after the last meeting.

The application is also supported by a Historic building assessment, Heritage Report, Ecological survey and report, a Flood Risk Assessment and Archaeological walkover survey and assessment, a Planning Statement and a Design and Access Statement.

RECOMMENDATION:

That, subject to the prior entry into the Authority's standard affordable housing section 106 agreement controlling the occupation and affordability of unit 11 and the studio apartment, the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions;

1. Commence development within 3 years.
2. The development as a whole shall be proceed to completion in one phase, with the Studio apartment being developed and made available for occupation concurrently with the apartments in the main building. Furthermore, other than the laying of the floor slab, no work shall proceed on construction of the new build houses until the external envelope of the main building conversion has been completed in full accordance with the approved plans and all internal apartment walls are constructed and clad with plasterboard (or equivalent).
3. Carry out in accordance with defined approved plans.
4. Submit and agree revised plan increasing no of parking spaces within the site for residents.
5. Submit and agree full details of the proposed new raised roof elements to the 1950s extensions, including external finish.
6. Withdraw permitted development rights for external alterations, extensions, porches gates, walls and other means of boundary enclosure, satellite dishes, ancillary buildings (with the exception of those sited within the rear gardens of the new build terraced houses).
7. Submit and agree details of walling (materials, coursing etc.) and roofing materials to the new houses and sample panels of new stonework, pointing, roofing materials for all of site.
8. Submit and agree full details of all new windows and doors (including details of lintels, sills, etc. to any new openings), to all buildings. Details to include the precise obscure glazing detail to the windows on the first floor of the filter works north elevation.
9. Submit and agree minor design/architectural details e.g. window finishes, rainwater goods, external vent details,
10. No work to commence until details of the means of disposal of foul and surface waters (to include Suds) have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Authority.
11. Submit and agree details of the biomass CHP system.
12. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with an approved non-mains drainage assessment including the following specific mitigation measures:
 1. Soakaways to be constructed to BS6297:2007
 2. No connection to watercourse or land drainage system and no part of the soakaway system is within 10 metres of any ditch or watercourse.
 3. No siting of the package sewage treatment plant within 50 metres or upslope of any well, spring or borehole used for private water supply.

13. Submit and agree full details of external hard and soft landscaping works including a timescale for implementation and aftercare programme including a scheme to secure the long term management of the shared spaces.
14. Submit and agree a scheme of external lighting.
15. All the boundaries of the gardens of the new build houses shall be formed with natural stone walls laid dry with half round coping stones to a height of 1.2m. All pedestrian gateways onto the main road shall be fitted with stone gate posts and timber gates in accordance with a scheme that shall be first submitted to the Authority for approval in writing.
16. All new steps and any retaining walls within the site shall be faced with natural stone.
17. Submit and agree details of means of disposal of all waste/spoil/unused demolition materials arising from the site works.
18. All parking spaces and associated turning and manoeuvring shall be provided, laid out and surfaced to final finish before any of the dwellings are occupied.
19. Electricity sub-station shall be relocated within main site only as shown on the approved amended site plan and screened by a dry stone wall to a height no lower than 450mm above the highest piece of equipment within the compound.
20. Prior submission and agreement over the provision of a private outside amenity area for affordable studio apartment in the area immediately SE of the building.
21. Submit and agree precise details of the first floor apartment partitions at the junction with the glazed roof lantern and detailing how the metal trusses will be accommodated.
22. Submit and agree the details of the walling and ground surface treatment within the internal courtyard of the 1913 building.
23. Submit and agree scheme to maintain the timber boarding to the underside of the roof, at least within the southern open courtyard section.
24. No building or other obstruction, including landscape features, shall be located over or within 4.5 metres either side of the centre line of the water mains i.e. a protected strip width of 9 metres, that enters the site. If the required stand-off distance is to be achieved via diversion or closure of the water main, the developer shall submit evidence to the Authority that the diversion or closure has been agreed with the relevant statutory undertaker.
25. "No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for a program of historic building recording, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The Written Scheme of Investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and
 1. The program and methodology of site investigation and recording
 2. The program and provision for post-investigation analysis and reporting
 3. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation

- 4. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation**
- 5. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation"**

- a) "No development shall take place until all on-site elements of the approved scheme have been completed to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority."
- b) "The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation analysis and assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a) and until the provision to be made for publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured."

26. Ecological mitigation measures

27. Archaeological mitigation; recording of the site

Footnotes Re:

1. Highway drainage proposals.
2. Contact with relevant drainage authorities re suitable watercourse for the disposal of surface water.
3. Developer to seek advice/comments from the Environment Agency/Land Drainage Authority/Internal Drainage Board, with regard to surface water disposal from the site.
4. The public sewer network is for domestic sewage purposes. Land and highway drainage have no right of connection to the public sewer network.
5. Encouraging the installation in an agreed location of a public interpretation panel at the front of the site which explains the history of the site and its importance to the water industry and landscape of the valley.
6. The Coal Authority's Standing Advice (site lies within the defined Development Low Risk Area. This means that there is no requirement under the risk-based approach for a Coal Mining Risk Assessment).
7. Under the terms of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010, the applicant will need to apply for an Environmental Permit to discharge treated sewage effluent into the receiving watercourse, the Dale Dyke. The Agency's preferred discharge point would be downstream of the of the picnic area by the confluence of the Dale and Agden Dykes.
8. Storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be provided with adequate, durable secondary containment to prevent the escape of pollutants and where relevant, comply with the Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) (England) Regulations 2001 and the Control of Pollution (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) Regulations 1991 and as amended 1997.
9. Site occupiers intending to purchase or install pollutant secondary containment (bundings) should ensure that the materials are not vulnerable to premature

structural failure in the event of a fire in the vicinity.

10. Environment Agency recommendations for developers when dealing with land affected by contamination.

Key Issues

1. The principle of redevelopment of the redundant water works building for housing.
2. Whether the conversion with extension of the later flat roofed 1950's extensions to the south and west elevations along with the converted garage and new build houses are necessary to achieve a viable development to conserve the valued character and interest of the 1913 building as a non-designated Heritage Asset as well as delivering the enhancement of the site and the Conservation Area.
3. Whether the design, layout, and landscaping of the proposal is appropriate to its setting within Bradfield Conservation Area.
4. The impacts of the development upon the amenity of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to converted Methodist Chapel
5. Highway/Access issues.
6. The impact of the development in respect of Ecology, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology, and the Water Environment.

Planning History

2013 – Application withdrawn before determination for the conversion of the Filter works into 16 apartments and a fish farm plus five new cottages following officer objections to the scheme. Although the proposal to repair and renovate the original 1913 building and to improve the site as a whole was welcomed, the submitted scheme fell short of this aim because of concerns relating to the removal of fabric, the impact of proposed alterations and the retention of the 1950's extensions which were felt not to make a positive contribution to the character or appearance or historic interest of the Conservation Area and have a negative impact on the original 1913 building. There were also objections to the use of the former garage for the studio apartment as this is of no architectural interest so there was no value in its retention and conversion. Other concerns related to the car parking location and the wholly unacceptable design of the new-build cottages.

Consultation Responses

These are summarised below, with the originals available to view in full on the Authority's website.

Bradfield Parish Council – Reply awaited on the change to incorporate 2 units as affordable dwellings.

Objected to the submitted scheme on the following grounds;

The Council acknowledge the revised costings but note they do not address their original concerns, which still stand. The Council draw attention to residents' concerns and also reiterate their own further concerns regarding a lack of affordable housing.

The Parish Council's initial response was that it would support some redevelopment of the site but object to this proposal as it is over-development of the site. The Parish Council also have

concerns regarding lack of parking with reliance on a rural bus service, traffic congestion, the overlooking of close neighbours and the situation with local fields which have recently changed hands which could bring potential residential spread. Also concerned over possible location of a new septic tank facility, current over-capacity in local schools, a lack of amenities for children and the lack of affordable housing.

The Council also note that the history of the building should be recognised and reflected somewhere in the development. They also query the reference to the trout farm on the amended plans, which was understood this is no longer part of the application. The drawings show a gate way to be installed from the site to the adjoining community orchard. The Parish Council currently lease the community orchard site from Yorkshire Water and as part of the lease there should be no encroachment or easements on to the land without the prior permission of Yorkshire Water.

Historic England - No objection to the application on heritage grounds.

Consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our previous advice letter (comments set out below) need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 58, 84, and 132 of the NPPF. Refers the Authority to the statutory duty of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Previously commented by offering the following general observations:

The Conservation Area was specifically extended in 2010 to include the area around the former water treatment works. This highlights the importance of the site to the history and character of the conservation area; the water treatment plant is a key unlisted building, and the site is associated with the surrounding reservoirs whose construction contributed to the growth of the village from the mid-nineteenth century onwards.

The site is currently redundant and detracts from the appearance of the conservation area when entering from the south. We are therefore supportive of a sensitive redevelopment of the site. This revised proposal retains more of the existing water treatment building thus retaining more of the significance of the undesignated heritage asset, along with the contribution it makes to the conservation area.

Detailing is important to ensure any development integrates well with its surroundings and contributes to local character and distinctiveness, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 58 and 64). If the Authority is minded to accept the principle of development, suggest details and materials for the conversion and new-build, landscaping and boundary treatments be agreed with the Authority's specialist conservation adviser.

Urge the Authority to address the above issues, and recommend that the application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

Natural England - Lengthy comments provided under the following headings:

Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection

This application is in close proximity to the Dark Peak Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI - forms part of the South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and South Pennine Moors Phase 1 Special Protection Area (SPA))

The proposal is not likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA has been classified. Therefore the Authority is not required to

undertake an Appropriate Assessment.

In addition, the proposed development will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the Dark Peak SSSI has been notified. We therefore advise your authority that this SSSI does not represent a constraint in determining this application.

Protected species

We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species and have published Standing Advice on protected species. The Standing Advice includes a habitat decision tree which provides advice to planners on deciding if there is a 'reasonable likelihood' of protected species being present. It also provides detailed advice on the protected species most often affected by development, including flow charts for individual species to enable an assessment to be made of a protected species survey and mitigation strategy. PDNPA should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications.

Local sites

If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site, e.g. Local Wildlife Site, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Site (RIGS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application.

Biodiversity enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application.

Landscape enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts

The Coal Authority – No objections - recommend informative on standing advice.

The application site falls within the defined Development Low Risk Area meaning that there is no requirement under the risk-based approach that has been agreed with the LPA for a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be submitted or for The Coal Authority to be consulted. Therefore, if this proposal is granted planning permission, it will be necessary to include The Coal Authority's Standing Advice within the Decision Notice as an informative note to the applicant in the interests of public health and safety.

PDNPA Conservation Officer – Considers application represents overdevelopment particularly in relation the additional new cottages and conversion of the garage but, if a decision is made to approve the application suggests conditions covering agreement over precise detailed design matters and the landscaping of the site.

The original 1913 building is of historic interest as an early C20th, purpose-built plant for the pressurised filtration of raw water– only the second such plant to be built around Sheffield; the building itself includes a number of features of architectural interest, internally and externally. The 1950s extensions are of limited historic interest and have no features of architectural interest. As stated previously, therefore, it would have been preferable to retain and convert only the original 1913 building, and to demolish the 1950s extensions.

Assuming that the viability assessments require the retention of the 1950s extensions, the revised proposals are an improvement on the earlier proposals. However, this is still an overdevelopment of the site, in particular the additional new cottages and conversion of the garage.

Comments on submission:

Retention of 1950s flat-roofed extensions:

Unfortunately the proposal still retains and extends the later flat roofed elements of the building *“which in our view detract from the building”* as advised in pre-application advice. This asked the applicants to look at alternatives to convert just the original building and demolish the later flat roof extensions, *“tested with sketch schemes and backed up with viability evidence to test the financial and physical viability of this option.”* If this demonstrated that a conversion retained within the main building would not be viable, only then *“should an assessment move on to look at options for further enabling development”*.

I can see no strong justification for the retention of the 1950s extensions. As the 2 reports produced by The Jessop Consultancy conclude, *the “total loss of all of the internal plant, pipework and machinery has had a dramatic impact upon the understanding of the former function of the building”*. The original 1913 building is of historic interest as an early C20th, purpose-built plant for the pressurised filtration of raw water– only the second such plant to be built around Sheffield; the building itself includes a number of features of architectural interest, internally and externally. Without the machinery which they were constructed to house, the 1950s extensions are of limited historic interest and the buildings themselves have no features of architectural interest (the Cultural Heritage Team are in unanimous agreement on this).

The Officer then outlines a large number of comments regarding concerns over the proposed details under the following headings. *(Planning officer’s comment: These are not all recorded here as some have been resolved by the amended plans and had the proposal been recommended for approval then either, further plans would have been requested or the detailing reserved by condition).*

Detailed Design issues re. alterations to the original building:

Design issues re. the altered 1950s extensions:

Design and detailing of the New cottages:

I think that if the flat roof extensions are retained and extended, and with the number of flats proposed for the entire former Water Works building, then to add an additional four houses to the site is over-development.

Conversion of Garage:

Cannot see the justification for converting this to living accommodation and then constructing a totally new bike shed on the site. Couldn’t the existing garage be used for this purpose? Converting the garage seems like over-development and removes the only potential storage facility already on site.

PDNPA Archaeologist – No objections in principle subject to conditions to secure the archaeological monitoring set out in the submitted desk based survey and historic building report.

PDNPA Landscape Architect – Generally happy with the landscape response subject to minor comments below;

Some concerns over grass mixes chosen. The new hedgerow structure is generally positive but it should be noted that low stone walls are the typical boundary features in this landscape. I note

the existing tree has been removed from the plan. As this is a Conservation Area the applicant needs to clarify the species / condition of this tree, if this tree is proposed to be retained and any protection measures to BS 5837 or if this tree is proposed to be removed.

Yorkshire Water Ltd – No objections but make the following comments;

If permission is granted, a condition should be attached in order to protect the YW existing live water mains located within the red line site boundary:

No objection to the conversion of existing buildings, however, the proposed new cottages may be affected. If this is the case, then the water main can be diverted under s.185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. These works would be carried out at the developer's expense. The cost of these works may be prohibitive.

The public sewer network does not have the capacity to accept any additional discharge of surface water. Sustainable Systems (SUDS), for example the use of soakaways and/or permeable hardstanding, may be a suitable solution for surface water disposal that is appropriate in this situation. The use of SUDS should be encouraged and the LPA's attention is drawn to NPPF. The developer and LPA are advised to seek comments on the suitability of SUDS from the appropriate authorities.

The developer must contact the Highway Authority with regard to acceptability of highway drainage proposals.

The developer is advised to contact the relevant drainage authorities with a view to establishing a Suitable watercourse for the disposal of surface water. It is understood that a pond/watercourse is located adjacent the site. Restrictions on surface water disposal from the site may be imposed by other parties.

Environment Agency - No objections, in principle, recommends if planning permission is granted the following planning conditions are imposed regarding;

- 1. Development carried out in accordance with an approved non-mains drainage assessment including specified mitigation measures:*
- 2. Development not be commenced until a scheme to dispose of foul and surface water has been submitted and approved in writing by the Authority.*

Informatives are also suggested re;

the need to apply for an Environmental Permit to discharge treated sewage effluent into the receiving water course, the Dale Dyke.

Bunding of any storage tanks/facilities for oils, fuels or chemicals.

recommend that developers should follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination and refer to the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination for the type of information that the Agency would require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health.

Representations

There have been one letter of support and 14 letters objecting to the proposal.

Supporters points summarised as:

- The site has been an eyesore for a number of years and the proposed development would be an enhancement.

Objectors points summarised as follows:

- The proposal is over development of the site.
- The proposal is insensitive to the heritage and architectural merit of the building.
- The buildings were included within the Low Bradfield Conservation Area for specific reasons: as an integral part of The National Park and a fine example of Victorian and early 20thC Neo-Classical stone buildings. Conversion to a range of apartments poses a great threat to its integrity.
- The flat extension was a later addition to the existing building and therefore should not be included in the renovation.
- The proposed cottages are too close to the road, spoiling the open aspect of the road junction.
- This area is designated as light industrial usage and not housing.
- The proposal would result in a significant increase in the population of Low Bradfield.
- The proposal would create a large number of traffic movements and on-street parking. Residential development generates on average 6 additional vehicle movements per day per dwelling, and the rural location with poor public transport services suggests the traffic generation will be greater than this; so we can expect in the region of 130-150 additional vehicle movements per day, plus exacerbation of parking congestion. This would be unsustainable and detrimental to local environmental quality.
- On-street parking on Mill Lee Road will cause congestion and reduce visibility for drivers at the junction with New Road and the access to the site. This poses a greater risk for cyclists using this route who come down Mill Lee Road at pace.
- There is insufficient parking provided on the site.
- There is only one access onto the site which is single car width with no passing areas.
- The development brings no benefit to local young people who cannot afford to stay in the area or older local people who would like to downsize.
- New build houses should not be allowed on the west side of Mill Lea Road as this is expanding the village un-necessarily and creating precedent for future development applications.
- The proposal would result in pressure on local schools which are already full.
- Children living at the development would be in danger from traffic and no adequate provision appears to have been made for them within the development.
- There is insufficient private garden space within the development
- The development would create noise and disruption to the neighbouring property.
- There would be over-looking from the development towards the dwelling called Holly Chapel to the north. This would result in a loss of privacy to the occupants of the dwelling. The proposed fence / hedge planting would not resolve this issue.
- The proposal could result in sewerage and drainage problems.
- No proposal has been made for the old filter beds which need to be an integral part of any redevelopment proposals.
- The site and buildings have been allowed to deteriorate for many years and no application should be considered until the site has been improved.
- The proposal would lead to significant light pollution and would spoil the village.

Planning policies and Legislation

Legislation

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require the Authority to determine planning applications in

accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Section 72 of the Listed Building Act 1990 contains a requirement for the Authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Development Plan Policy

Major Development in a National Park

Major Development is defined by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015/595. The relevant parts of the definition meaning that this application for is classed as Major Development are that for 21 dwellings it exceeds the threshold of 10 and at a site area of 1.3ha it exceeds the 1 ha threshold.

Whether a proposed development in the Park should be treated as a major development, to which the policy in paragraph 116 of the Framework applies, is stated by the National Guidance to be a matter for the relevant decision taker, taking into account the proposal in question and the local context. In this case the current proposals have been treated as major development by officers because of the overall scale and impact of the development upon the village.

GSP1(D) in the Authority's Core Strategy says in securing National Park purposes major development should not take place within the Peak District National Park. Major development will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the criteria in national policy which is set out in paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF ('the Framework') says planning permission should be refused for major developments in National Parks except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

1. the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
2. the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
3. any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

These tests and the provisions of Paragraph 116 are supported by the provisions of the preceding paragraph, Paragraph 115 of the Framework, which states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in a National Park. Paragraph 14 of the Framework also cross refers to the English national parks and the broads: UK government vision and circular 2010 which provides further policy guidance on development in National Parks.

The Authority's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted in 2011

This provides, along with saved policies in the 2001 Local Plan, the policy starting point for considering the development. The following list of policies are those of which account has been taken in the consideration of the application:

Core Strategy - GSP1, 2, 3, 4, DS1, L1, L2, L3, CC1, CC2, CC5, HC1, T2, T3, T6, T7.

Saved Local Plan Policies - LC4, LC5, LC8, LC15, LC16, LC17, LC18, LC19, LC21, LC22, LC24,

LH1, LH2, LT11, LT17, LT21, LT22.

In summary, General Strategic Policy GSP1 requires all new development in the National Park to respect and reflect the conservation purpose of the National Park's statutory designation and promotes sustainable development. GSP2 supports development that would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park and sets out the criteria upon which proposals intending to enhance the park must meet and states that they must demonstrate significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area and not undermine the achievement of other policies. Furthermore, work must be undertaken in a manner which conserves the valued characteristics of the site and its surroundings. Policy GSP3 sets out the principles and finer criteria for assessing impact on valued characteristics stating that development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposal. Policy GSP4 covers the use of Planning conditions and/or legal agreements to achieve the spatial outcomes in the plan.

GSP3 is supported by the provisions of saved Local Plan policy LC4 (a), which says where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, conserves and where possible it enhances the landscape, built environment and other valued characteristics of the area. Local Plan policy LC4(b) goes on to say, amongst other things, that particular attention will be paid to scale, form, and mass in relation to existing buildings, settlement form and character, landscape features and the wider landscape setting along with design matters, landscaping the amenity of nearby properties and any nuisance or harm from lighting schemes

Local Plan policy LC5 also seeks to preserve and enhance the National Park's historic built environment and respectively address development that would affect the special qualities of a designated Conservation Area and its setting. Local Plan policy LC5 requires that development within Conservation areas should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced. Proposals involving demolition of existing buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance or historic interest of the Conservation Area will not be permitted unless the demolition is to remove an unsightly or otherwise inappropriate modern addition to the building.

Core Strategy (CS) Policy DS1 sets out the development strategy for the park and states that the majority of new development (including about 80 to 90% of new homes) will be directed into Bakewell and named settlements like Low Bradfield. In all settlements it states that the following forms of development (relevant to this case) will be acceptable in principle; extensions to existing buildings; conversion or change of use for housing, preferably by re-use of traditional buildings; other development and alternative uses needed to secure effective conservation and enhancement.

Policy DS1 further states that where there is pressure for development and the National Park Authority is uncertain about the capacity for this in a named settlement, an assessment of site alternatives will be required to demonstrate the extent of development which may be permitted. This process should involve the Parish Council or Parish Meeting and demonstrate that the proposed development complements the settlement's overall pattern of development; the character and setting of nearby buildings and structures; and the character of the landscape in which the settlement sits.

L1 requires that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, and other valued characteristics. L2 requires that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate, their setting. L3 seeks to ensure the National Park's historic built environment is conserved and enhanced for future generations and set out three criteria under which the current application should be assessed because of the potential

impacts proposed development on cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, and historic significance:

- A. Development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings, including statutory designations and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest;
- B. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance or its setting, including statutory designations or other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest;
- C. Proposals for development will be expected to meet the objectives of any strategy, wholly or partly covering the National Park, that has, as an objective, the conservation and where possible the enhancement of cultural heritage assets. This includes, but is not exclusive to, the Cultural Heritage Strategy for the Peak District National Park and any successor strategy.

Policy CC1 seeks to build in resilience to and mitigate the effects of climate change and requires all development, amongst other things to; make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and resources, take account of the energy hierarchy and achieve a minimum sustainability standard in all new housing. CC2 and CC5 cover low carbon and renewable energy development and flood risk and water conservation respectively.

Policy HC1 sets out the Authority's approach to new housing in the National Park. The supporting text to policy HC1 clearly sets out at paragraph 12.18 that new housing in the National Park is not required to meet open market demand. However, paragraph 12.19 goes on to acknowledge that the provision of open market housing is often the best way to achieve conservation and enhancement or the treatment of a despoiled site.

Policy HC1 states that exceptionally new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) can be accepted where it A) addresses eligible local needs B) provides for key workers or C) in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2 it is required to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in DS1 like Low Bradfield. For schemes like this which propose more than one dwelling they must also address identified eligible local needs and be affordable with occupation restricted to local people unless a) it is not financially viable, or b) it would provide more affordable homes than are needed in the parish and adjacent parishes, in which case a financial contribution will be required towards affordable housing elsewhere in the park.

In respect of affordable housing (although none is proposed as part of this development) Local Plan policies LH1 and LH2 are relevant as they set out the requirements in terms of the occupancy of affordable housing units.

Policy T1 aims to reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means. Paragraph 15.25 of the Core Strategy states that the Landscape Strategy and the Design Guide give a design context for infrastructure projects and complement the Manual for Streets for settlements. Streets should be places where people want to live and spend time, rather than just being transport corridors. Nationally, high standards of urban design are expected in towns and villages with transport infrastructure contributing positively to the quality of the street scene. In a national park nothing less is acceptable. T3A therefore states that Transport infrastructure, including roads, bridges, lighting, signing, other street furniture and public transport infrastructure, will be carefully designed and maintained to take full account of the valued characteristics of the National Park.

Policy T7B states that residential parking and operational parking for service and delivery vehicles will be the minimum required for operational purposes, taking into account environmental constraints and future requirements.

Local Plan Policies LC16, LC17 and LC18 refer to the protection of archaeological features; site features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance; and safeguarding nature conservation interests respectively. All seek to avoid unnecessary damage and to ensure enhancement where possible.

Transport policy LT11 refers to minimising the impact of car parking.

Other Relevant Documents

Landscape Strategy and Action Plan

The Peak National Park Design Guide and its technical supplement The Building Design Guide

Climate Change Action Plan

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in 2012. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered to be a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. The Authority has considered the relationship between the Core Strategy and the National Planning Framework and resolved that they are consistent. This application does not raise matters that suggest otherwise.

As a material consideration in planning decisions, the NPPF recognises the special status of National Parks and the responsibility of National Park Authorities, as set out in the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended). In line with the requirements of primary legislation, paragraph 14 of the NPPF recognises that in applying the general presumption in favour of sustainable development, specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted, for example policies relating to National Park.

Along with the need to give great weight to considerations for the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage, paragraph 115 of the Framework confirms the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty, reflecting primary legislation, whilst paragraph 116 sets out guidance on major developments in designated areas (this application is for "major" development):

"115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.

116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- *the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;*
- *the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the*

need for it in some other way; and

- *any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated”.*

It also points out (footnote 25) that further guidance and information, including explanation of statutory purposes, is provided in the English National Parks and the Broads Vision and Circular 2010.

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies to achieve sustainable development and sets out the three dimensions to sustainable planning with the planning system needing to perform an economic role in building a strong economy support growth, a social role in supporting strong healthy communities by providing housing to meet needs and creating a high quality environment with services that reflect a communities needs and support its health social and cultural well-being and an environmental role to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment and mitigate and adapt to climate change. The plan contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Chapter 11 of the framework covers conserving and enhancing the natural environment with Chapter 12 containing policies covering conserving and enhancing the historic environment

The National Planning Policy Guidance was published in 2014 to support the framework.

Officer Assessment

The Principle of Development of the site

The conversion of the filter works building:

The site lies within the village of Low Bradfield, a named settlement identified in Core Strategy policy DS1. This states that new development in the village will be acceptable in principle if it comprises conversion or change of use for housing, preferably by re-use of traditional buildings. Housing Policy HC1 states that provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. However, exceptionally, new housing (whether newly built or from the reuse of an existing building) can be accepted where it addresses eligible local needs for affordable homes or it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings (HC1CI) or designated settlement like Low Bradfield.

NPPF paragraph 111 states that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.

Development is therefore acceptable in principle on this brownfield site, subject to compliance with national and local planning policy considerations and provided the normal scale, layout, design and landscaping considerations are all satisfied.

The original 1913 section of the filter works is clearly a valued vernacular building and a non-designated heritage asset. The advice from the Authority's Cultural Heritage Team was that the later 1950's extensions are not of the same quality to warrant conserving on their own merit especially now since all equipment inside has been stripped out. However, in deferring the item at the June Planning Committee, members gave officers a clear steer that they wished to see a comprehensive redevelopment of the whole site including the 1950's section, which they valued as part of the historical development of the site for water treatment. Members also wished officers to explore the opportunity for inclusion of affordable housing within the scheme to meet local needs.

The conversion of all the Filter building to housing is therefore considered acceptable in principle under current housing policy provided the amount of affordable housing provision in the scheme is

maximised within viability constraints (to accord with HC1C) and subject to the normal design, layout, access and landscaping considerations being satisfied.

The principle of New build housing:

As a named settlement Low Bradfield is also considered, in policy terms, to have additional scope to maintain and improve the sustainability and vitality of the community via new build development for affordable housing (as well as community facilities and small scale business and retail development). Therefore whilst new build housing on the site in accordance with policies HC1 and LH1 and LH2 would be acceptable in principle if it were to meet local needs for affordable housing, the policy is clear that new build market housing will not be permitted other than in exceptional circumstances. The case put forward by the application is that the 4 new market houses are justified, together with the conversion of the 1950s flat roofed extensions and the garage conversion, to achieve a viable development that would conserve and enhance the 1913 building, which is acknowledged to be a heritage asset.

Consequently, the acceptability or otherwise of the principle and scale of open market housing proposed on the site therefore turns on the evidence provided by the applicant's development viability appraisal.

Following receipt of an updated appraisal and the clear steer from members regarding the possibility of the scheme accommodating affordable housing on the site, the Director of Planning and the case officer met the applicant and their financial advisor to discuss this within viability constraints. Following this updated evidence and that meeting your officers accept that the 4 market houses are necessary to achieve a viable redevelopment of the whole site to accord with members wishes and that with a maximum level of two apartments offered by the applicants for affordable dwellings represents an appropriate and acceptable mix within viability constraints.

The issue of Major development in the Park

In proposing 21 dwellings, the proposed development exceeds the 10 unit threshold which is used to define major development in The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order. Furthermore, in the context of High Bradfield the proposal for 21 dwellings would in any case represent major development irrespective of the legal definition within the order.

The NPPF states in paragraph 116 that major development in the National Park should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest. It also states that consideration of such applications should include an assessment of :

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated".

In this case, conversion of the building to housing would be an appropriate reuse to conserve a non-designated heritage asset as well as bringing about major enhancement for the village, the conservation area and the Parks landscape. Such a use would meet several policy objectives and the new households in the village would boost the viability and vitality of the local community and that of the wider local economy. It would also bring wider benefits by meeting the demand for homes and thereby reducing pressures in the protected landscape of the National Park and elsewhere for new housing on greenfield sites. As a conversion of an existing building the scheme could not be relocated outside the Park and achieve the necessary enhancement of this site or the benefits to the local economy. It is therefore considered these are the exceptional circumstances

and a clear public interest which supports the principle of this 'major development' being acceptable in the Park.

In principle therefore, a development which provides an appropriate scale of housing has the potential to realise the enhancement opportunity sought by Development Plan policy and, provided the impact on landscape is acceptable, meet the 'major development test' in paragraph 116 of the framework.

As this conversion scheme proposes more than one dwelling, the application is also required by policy HC1C to maximise the opportunity to address the local needs for affordable housing, unless this is proven to be unviable. The applicant has previously evidence that for conversion of all of the treatment works building to be viable, the additional four new build houses and the garage studio are essential especially given the need to conserve the key internal space and character of the 1913 building, and achieve the enhancement of the whole site. Although previous evidence stated that this is the minimal necessary enabling development to achieve viability, after meeting officers and looking again at potential savings within the demolition works they have now proposed two of the apartments as affordable housing.

The key issue therefore in the consideration as to whether or not to grant permission remains whether the detailed proposal itself would be acceptable in terms of its impacts on the works building as a heritage asset, the environment, the landscape and neighbouring interests.

Whether all of the new build market housing is justified enabling development necessary to secure a viable development which conserves the valued character and interest of the 1913 building as a non-designated Heritage Asset and delivers the enhancement of the site.

The applicant's case:

The proposal to convert the 1950's flat roofed sections of the Filter building, convert the garage and erect four new houses is argued to be necessary enabling works to secure a financially viable redevelopment. They also point out that all three are needed to deliver a scheme which best conserves the valued internal, as well as the external, character of the 1913 section by retaining a large part of the main hall with its high level ridge lanterns lights as a full height undeveloped space. This latter objective is fully supported by officers who consider this to be essential to conserve the internal character of the building. It would also provide an interesting internal amenity space giving the units within the building an outlook from the internal facing rooms. This would be particularly important on amenity grounds for the units on the north side as it would help offset the restricted outlook of those units on the north side. This is because they would have to have obscure glazing to part of the windows facing north which would overlook directly the principal windows of the adjacent Methodist Chapel conversion.

The Authority's consultant surveyor raised a number of concerns about the figures and methodology used by the applicants in their first appraisals

Since then the applicants have responded to the consultant's points of concern, providing additional supporting evidence and amended their costs plans and conclusions accordingly. They now consider the corrected appraisals to be accurate and up to date.

Since the deferral a local parish housing needs survey has been conducted in consultation with the Parish and the Authority's policy team which has identified a small local need now of 5-7. Following these results the case officer and the Director of Conservation and Planning met the applicant with their planning agent and financial advisors over the level of affordable provision that could be provided on the site as part of this application. The outcome is the applicant's amendment to modify the proposal to provide that two of the units will affordable and restricted to local occupation, unit 11 and the studio apartment. Officers have accepted this level as being an acceptable and proportionate response to members wishes within the viability constraints of the

development. In the event of an approval this provision would need to be controlled by the Authority's standard affordable housing section 106 agreement which is included in the above officer recommendation of approval. The applicant's agent has confirmed his client's willingness to enter into the Authority's standard affordable housing S106 in respect of the 2 affordable units.

The Officers assessment and conclusions;

Policy HC1 seeks to maximise the amount of affordable housing, subject to viability constraints. In this case officers are satisfied that the level of affordable housing now offered is appropriate and proportionate to the local need and what the development can sustain.

Design layout and landscaping considerations

Access

No response has been received from the Sheffield Highways department although Authority officers consider that there should be no objections to the continued use of the current access as the main vehicular access into the site off Mill Lee Road. It already serves the existing dwelling, Filter Cottage to the rear of the site so its retention is both necessary, practical and logical. The amended plan which widens the access as it passes Filter Cottage resolves the pinch point in the submitted plans and still leaves the cottage with ample outdoor space.

Layout

There are no objections in principle to the amended layout of the site. The new build houses face onto the road as requested by officers to reflect the character of the street scene. The parking layout has 36 spaces would give two spaces within the curtilage of each new build house and a further two opposite these. However as the houses are 4 bed units the adopted standard within the local plan is 3 per dwelling so a further 2 spaces are needed for the houses. A single space is shown for the studio apartment which is acceptable for a one bed apartment. However, for the remaining 16 apartments in the main building only 28 spaces are shown which includes the two disabled spaces by the main door. This represents a shortfall of 20 spaces and in officer's experience of similar developments in traditional rural Peak villages, this would give rise to an unacceptable level of ad-hoc parking within the development and on the street outside. Space is available to increase the parking provision but it is unlikely that the full 20 additional spaces could be accommodated without losing all of the communal garden area. In the absence of any comments from the Highway Authority it is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring the submission and agreement of an amended parking plan which maximises provision with full implementation before any dwelling is occupied. A condition to this effect is therefore suggested in the recommendation above.

Design

The garage is of no architectural or historic merit to be normally considered suitable for conversion under the Authority's housing policy, however there are no objections to the design details of its simple conversion to a studio apartment and none to its swap from market dwelling to form one of the two designated affordable dwellings.

In relation to the design of the new build houses, the officer concerns remain over their deep plan which has necessitated the double pitched roof form rather than the simpler local tradition for a more modest single pitched roof with rear wing at 90degrees. Nevertheless, on balance these would be acceptable. There are also no objections to the design details as the houses would be built in natural gritstone with slate roofs, stone chimneys and timber windows and doors.

The proposals for the conversion and extension of the filter building into 16 apartments include two

extensions to the current envelope of the building. Firstly, a 7m x 7.5m single storey flat roofed infill extension to the rear (west) elevation to provide more space to create a useable apartment in this corner. The flat roofed form, materials and fenestration would match the existing extension it sits alongside and therefore, leaving aside concerns over the principle, there are no objections to its overall design.

Secondly, due to a lack of height within the southern 1950's extension, the amended plans propose that this section be raised by 1m to provide sufficient height to accommodate a second storey. The amended design of the extension follows the advice of officers to cut back the new work from the edges of the existing roof and treat it in a contemporary manner in terms of external cladding to complement rather than copy the existing building. Plans therefore show it clad in a lead coloured material and overall it is considered to be appropriate in design terms subject to agreement over its precise detailing and finish. A planning condition to this effect is therefore suggested.

The conversion itself uses all existing openings, with new openings confined to the north elevation. Here 20 new window openings are proposed for the 6 apartments on this side, 7 of which at first floor, would need to be partially obscure glazed in the lower half to protect the adjoining chapel conversion from harmful overlooking. All new windows would have traditional proportions with divided frames and are considered to be appropriate in this setting.

In conclusion, subject to minor detailed conditions there would be no objections to the design details of the proposed conversion and extension of the filter works, the houses or the garage conversion.

Landscape considerations

As a disused and dilapidated site, the Filter works currently has a significant harmful impact on the landscape from the immediately vicinity of the village street and particularly in views down into the village from further up Mill Lee Road. The appropriate redevelopment of the site within policy constraints is therefore welcomed to bring about much-needed improvement to the area. The overall landscape approach taken in the scheme is welcomed by the Authority's Landscape Architect, who raises no objections to the details of the proposed landscaping scheme subject to detailed matters which can be covered by planning condition. A condition would also be required to control external lighting on the site to protect the character of the area, the amenity of local residents and the National Park's dark skies.

Impacts upon the Conservation Area

The Conservation Area was specifically extended to include the Filter Works site in recognition of the importance of the building to the history of the area and for its contribution to the street scene and the significance of the conservation area. In its current dilapidated state the site is having a significant detrimental impact upon the character of the area. The conversion, extension and alteration of the filter works building for housing would clearly bring significant enhancement to the Conservation Area as would the removal of the underground storage tank. The new build dwellings would reflect closely the local tradition and would also conserve the conservation area.

Ecological Considerations

The ecological report states that bat roosts and nesting birds were found to be using various parts of the filter works building and the garage. It therefore recommends specific protection/precautionary methodology to be followed in carrying out the works together with specific mitigation and enhancement measures for each roost in the form of either retention of existing features or the provision of replacement housing (bat boxes). For birds similar specific works are suggested to protect nesting birds with mitigation measures to compensate for the loss of nesting sites. Planning conditions can be used to secure these measures.

Archaeological Considerations

The filter building is of archaeological interest as it is a good example of a purpose built plant for the pressurised filtration of water. The submitted desk based archaeological assessment notes the building fabric remains intact but that the total loss of all the internal plant, pipework and machinery has had a dramatic impact upon understanding the former function of the building. The report goes on to recommend that the demolition of the external fabric should therefore be avoided to allow the historical development of the building to be read and understood. No pre-20th Century archaeological features were identified within the site boundary, so the impact of the conversion works on any remains is considered low or negligible. It is therefore recommended that an archaeological survey to record the building and site would be an appropriate form of mitigation which the Authority's own archaeologist supports. A condition is therefore recommended to this effect to agree a written scheme of investigation/recording.

Environmental Management

The application details state that, at the time it was made, the scheme would be designed to the code for sustainable homes Level 4 (a code now abandoned), principally as a result of the proposed biomass CHP unit which would provide a district hot water supply and some electrical power, alongside, double-glazing, rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling. The agent rules out the use of solar panels on the south facing roofs on the basis that this would be in conflict with the conservation aims of the project. He further points out that cycle storage would be provided and the site is within a village with a good range of local services as well as being on a bus route with links into the nearby city of Sheffield.

The application also proposes a packaged treatment plant to deal with waste from the site which would discharge treated water into the Dale Dyke. It also states that the settling ponds could form part of an attenuation system for storm surge of surface water, although no details of a sustainable drainage system based around such a feature is detailed in the application documents.

Due to an absence of detail on the above matters, and in response to consultation returns conditions have been suggested to require these details to be submitted and agreed in due course to ensure compliance with Core Strategy policy CC1. With such conditions there would be no objections in principle to the approach taken over the environmental management of the scheme.

Overall Conclusion

The original 1913 Filter works building is a valued vernacular building and a non-designated heritage asset of some local significance arising from its associated use with the water industry. It makes an important contribution to the village street scene and the conservation area but currently this is spoiled by the increasing dereliction of building. National and local planning policy supports the reuse of the site in principle for housing and there are therefore no objections to the principle of redeveloping the 1913 works, indeed it is positively encouraged by officers.

The later 1950's flat roofed additions, although of no particular architectural interest to warrant conservation in their own right, are nevertheless an important part of the development of the site to meet the increased need for water filtration. They are therefore a key feature in the development of the site part of the significance of the works as a Heritage asset.

The clear steer by members at the June Committee meeting to see conversion of all of the filter works building as part of a comprehensive development of the whole site to maximise the enhancement opportunity has been met by the amended plans. Furthermore, the amendment to now include the two affordable dwellings meets the identified local need in the recently completed housing needs survey. The viability work furthermore supports the conclusion that the redevelopment of the filter works building in the best manner consistent with its conservation cannot be viable without the inclusion of the enabling development in the form of the conversion of

the new build houses and garage conversion.

There are also no overriding concerns over the design, layout, landscaping or in terms of any ecological or archaeological impact of the proposal subject to detailed conditions set out above. Consequently the application is recommended for approval subject to the prior entry into the S106 agreement and subject to the aforementioned conditions.

Human Rights

Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil