



Report to South Area Planning Committee

Application Number:	PL/21/1749/VRC
Proposal:	Variation to condition 2 (Approved plans) of planning permission CC/0029/18 (The proposed works includes two extensions, including; a new school hall, and new CDT/IT room and associated paths and gates. It is also proposed that a number of small internal adaptations are undertaken, including the removal of a number of existing internal walls. Additionally, it is proposed that a new 8 space car park is constructed to provide formal staff parking, replacing the existing rear hard standing, Access to this parking area is improved, by widening the path outside the school, providing greater site lines and turning circles.) to allow for alterations to the CDT/IT block elevations and an increase in size of the windcatchers on the hall roof.
Site location:	Denham Village Infant School Cheapside Lane Denham UB9 5AE
Applicant:	Buckinghamshire Council
Case Officer:	Ian Severn
Ward affected:	Denham
Parish-Town Council:	Denham Parish Council
Valid date:	28 April 2021
Determination date:	15 December 2023
Recommendation:	Conditional permission

1.0 Summary & Recommendation/ Reason for Planning Committee Consideration

- 1.1 The application seeks to vary condition 2 of planning permission CC/0029/18. Condition 2 sets out the approved plans for development of Denham Village Infant School which included internal and external works. The application seeks to vary external changes to the roofs of two approved extensions, one which forms a school hall, and the other a CDT / IT room.
- 1.2 The application is before the Planning Committee as the site is a Council owned property. As such, the application should be determined by the Planning Committee, as per the procedures of the Constitution.
- 1.3 The recommendation is to **grant the variation of condition.**

2.0 Description of Proposed Development

- 2.1 The application site comprises a school and school grounds known as Denham Village Infant School, it is located on the Eastern side of Cheapside Lane, Denham. The main school building is a Grade II Listed building. The site is bounded by a cricket ground to its rear. Residential properties are located to the North and South but buffered by a public footpath and an access road serving the site respectively.
- 2.2 The full description for the approval was: 'The proposed works includes two extensions, including; a new school hall, and new CDT/IT room and associated paths and gates. it is also proposed that a number of small internal adaptations are undertaken, including the removal of a number of existing internal walls. Additionally, it is proposed that a new 8 space car park is constructed to provide formal staff parking, replacing the existing rear hard standing, Access to this parking area is improved, by widening the path outside the school, providing greater site lines and turning circles.'
- 2.3 The proposal is part retrospective, the development has been undertaken in full in terms of the description for CC/0029/18, however, the roof and roof features of the extensions forming the School Hall and the CDT / IT room were not undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.
- 2.4 Specifically, the wind catchers the wind catchers fitted to the school hall are 14cm taller and 20cm wider than those approved. Additionally, the eaves the CDT / IT room as installed are 39cm higher than approved. Amended plans have been received to extend the lower part of the roof plane to screen some of the increased height giving the appearance of eaves which are nearer to those approved. Fenestration for this extension has also been altered.
- 2.5 The plans to be varied relate to the proposed elevations, specifically -
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| CDT / IT extension Elevation plan: | Approved 17/119-140.003 Rev. 1
Proposed 19.109-140.003 Rev. 3 |
| Elevations (full): | Approved 17/119-140.004 Rev. 1
Proposed 19.109-140.004 Rev. 3 |
| School Hall extension Elevation plan: | Approved 17/119-140.002 Rev. 1
Proposed 19.109-140.002 Rev. 2 |
- 2.6 The application is accompanied by:
- Planning Statement

3.0 Relevant Planning History

School House Cheapside Lane Denham Buckinghamshire UB9 5AE

- 3.1 PL/21/1936/HB: Listed Building Consent for: The proposed works includes two extensions, including; a new school hall, and new CDT/IT room and associated paths and gates. It is also proposed that a number of small internal adaptations are undertaken, including the removal of a number of existing internal walls. Additionally, it is proposed that a new 8 space car park is constructed to provide formal staff parking, replacing the existing rear hard standing, Access to this parking area is improved, by widening the path outside the school, providing greater site lines and turning circles. (Pending consideration)

- 3.2 CC/0029/18: The proposed works includes two extensions, including; a new school hall, and new CDT/IT room and associated paths and gates. it is also proposed that a number of small internal adaptations are undertaken, including the removal of a number of existing internal walls. Additionally, it is proposed that a new 8 space car park is constructed to provide formal staff parking, replacing the existing rear hard standing, Access to this parking area is improved, by widening the path outside the school, providing greater site lines and turning circles. (Permission granted)

4.0 Summary of Representations

- 4.1 An objection and three letters of support have been received. These are summarised in Appendix A.
- 4.2 Denham Parish Council has objected to the application, their full representation is within Appendix A.

5.0 Policy Considerations and Evaluation

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), September 2023.
- Planning Practice Guidance
- National Design Guidance, October 2019
- South Bucks Core Strategy Development Plan Document - Adopted February 2011
- South Bucks District Local Plan - Adopted March 1999 Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011;
- South Bucks District Local Plan Appendix 5 (Conservation Areas)
- Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Character Study 2017
- Chiltern and South Bucks Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule

Principle and Location of Development

Core Strategy Policies:

CP8 (Built and historic environment)

Local Plan Saved Policies:

C6 (Alterations and extensions to Listed Buildings)

COM1 (Provision of community facilities)

- 5.1 The NPPF was revised in September 2023 and whilst this replaced the previous Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes, it does not replace existing local policies that form part of the development plan. It does state however, that the weight that should be given to these existing local policies and plans will be dependent on their degree of consistency with the NPPF. Therefore, the closer the policies in the development plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given to them. With regard to this specific application, it is considered that all of the relevant policies, as highlighted above, are in accordance with the NPPF, and as such, it is considered appropriate to still assess this current application against the relevant local policies set out above.
- 5.2 Paragraph 95 of the NPPF states that:
- ‘It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should:
- a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the

preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and

- b) work with school promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.'

5.3 Paragraph 66 of The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 reads:

'In considering whether to grant planning permission (or permission in principle) for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

5.4 The principle of the extensions is established through planning permission CC/0029/18, the proposed changes from the permission therefore form the main consideration of this application.

Historic environment (or Conservation Area or Listed Building Issues)

Core Strategy Policies:

CP8 (Built and historic environment)

Local Plan Saved Policies:

C6 (Alterations and extensions to Listed Buildings)

5.5 The main building for Denham Village Infant School is a Grade II Listed building. Planning permission CC/0029/18 was granted on 12 October 2018 for extensions to the main building, along with other internal and external alterations.

5.6 During construction it was discovered that for practical reasons two elements of the extensions would need to be altered. These were the wind catchers on the school hall roof which would not be able to provide the necessary ventilation for the room, and the eaves of the additional classroom which needed to be raised to accommodate insulation measures.

5.7 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF advises that:

'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'

5.8 Core Policy 8 (CP8) of the Council's Core Policy cites that 'The protection and, where appropriate, enhancement of the District's historic environment is of paramount importance. In particular, nationally designated historic assets and their settings, for example Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Grade I, II* and II listed buildings, will have the highest level of protection.'

5.9 Two extensions were granted, the larger of these takes the form of a more modern looking school hall with wind catchers on the roof for ventilation. During construction it was calculated that the approved wind catchers would not be adequately sized for ventilation purposes. The school explored the various options available to them including increasing the size of the wind catchers and increasing the number of wind catchers at the approved size. It was decided that an increase to the size of the wind catchers would have the least additional visual impact while still achieving the necessary ventilation for the school hall.

- 5.10 The wind catchers fitted to the school hall are 14cm taller and 20cm wider than those approved. The Statement submitted with the application advises that one of the other considerations weighing in favour of the use of these wind catchers is they are designed to compliment the Listed Building which features an early form of windcatcher similar in design to those installed. Energy efficiency was also a key consideration in the decision.
- 5.11 The second extension forms provision for CDT / IT classes. Fenestration for the proposed extension has been altered. Additionally, although the original eaves were designed to best match existing adjoining walls it was found that required insulation measures for the extension and the condition of the existing built form to which the extension would join meant the approved eaves needed to be raised by 39cm.
- 5.12 In order to provide some mitigation to this increase amended plans have been provided, these show an extension to the roof overhang resulting in an impression of a lower eaves level.
- 5.13 The Council's Heritage team have reviewed the submitted information including assessment of the other options considered. With regards to the wind catchers the Heritage team conclude that '...it is considered to cause some harm to the setting of the listed building, but on balance, as there does not appear to be an alternative if this building is to function properly, this amendment is therefore accepted as the approved wind catchers do not appear to be implementable.'
- 5.14 Following the proposed amendments to the eaves on the CDT / IT classroom, the Heritage team have stated that the harm to the Listed Building from this element '...is likely to be towards the lower end of the 'less than substantial' scale, but harm none the less.'
- 5.15 The overall harm to the Listed Building is therefore considered to be 'less than substantial'. Taking into account Paragraph 199 of the NPPF, great weight is afforded to the 'less than substantial harm' identified.
- 5.16 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that:
'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'
- 5.17 In respect of the public benefits of the proposal, as noted above paragraph 95 of the NPPF advises that great weight should be given to the need to create, expand or alter schools. In terms of the need for the alterations to the originally approved scheme the applicant has advised that they have been undertaken as neither the wind catchers on the school hall, nor the eaves height to the new classroom would provide the needed energy efficiency for these or adjoining rooms. Having explored other options, the changes as proposed, are considered to be the most effective means to achieve the schools energy goals.
- 5.18 The original application was submitted in order to ensure that the building could continue to function as a school, and therefore be retained for public benefit.
- 5.19 Prior to the completion of the extensions the school was of a size where its capacity was so restrained that it allowed only a limited number of year groups, this meant that pupils would have a disrupted primary education as they needed to move schools at an earlier

stage in their education compared with pupils at other schools.

- 5.20 With parents wanting to ensure a consistent early education for their children many preferred instead to enrol at other schools further away which could provide this. This meant that Denham Village Infant School could have been at risk of closure.
- 5.21 However, the provision of the new, larger school hall and an additional classroom has allowed the school to re-use the old school hall to form additional classrooms and also gain extra facilities benefitting pupils, such as a space to prepare meals where this was previously not possible.
- 5.22 The larger hall allows more space for school assemblies, indoor physical education or wet break times, plays and other like activities. Whilst the new classroom allowed for additional pupils to attend. Because of the previously approved extensions the school has gone from being undersubscribed to oversubscribed.
- 5.23 The proposal will therefore enable the optimum use to be enhanced and continued for the foreseeable future. In this context, the public benefit would not only be substantial to existing staff and pupils, but has the potential to benefit the wider community by providing a more efficient and effective local school.
- 5.24 The provision of these facilities offers a more effective learning environment, improving the potential quality of achievement, not just for Denham Village Infant School but also with regards to future employment prospects in Denham and the wider area.
- 5.25 A clear public benefit which should be afforded 'great weight' in the planning balance, in accordance with Paragraph 95 of the NPPF, is therefore identified.
- 5.26 Overall, with regards to the considerations of Paragraph 202 of the NPPF it is considered that the proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. This harm is considered by the Council's Heritage team to be at the 'lower end of the 'less than substantial' scale'. When this harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including securing its optimum viable use, the public benefits outweigh the harm on this occasion.

Raising the quality of place making and design

Core Strategy Policies:

CP8 (Built and historic environment)

Local Plan Saved Policies:

EP3 (The Use, Design and Layout of Development)

EP4 (Landscaping)

- 5.27 Although visible from public viewpoints the proposed alterations are contextually similar to the approved development. In this regard they are not considered to impact upon the character of the street scene or wider locality beyond that previously approved.

Amenity of neighbours

Local Plan Saved Policies:

EP3 (The use, design and layout of development)

EP5 (Sunlight and daylight)

- 5.28 An objection has been raised in relation to a neighbouring property in relation to the wind catchers appearing overbearing and overshadowing neighbouring properties.
- 5.29 As previously mentioned, the principle of the extensions is established through the

previous planning permissions, as is the instillation of the wind catchers as part of the design of the new school hall.

- 5.30 The school hall is single storey with a pitched roof, pitching away from neighbouring properties. The extension itself is largely in accordance with approved plans, with only the wind catchers having been adjusted from what was approved.
- 5.31 At its nearest point the hall is set approximately 9.5m to the nearest residential property. The side elevation facing the nearest residential properties is approximately 3m to eaves height. When viewed along this side, the ridgeline is approximately 6.86-6.96m high when taking account of varying land levels. The wind catchers therefore add four points where the height is increased by a further 86cm, with a width of 1.2m. As they are set at the midpoint of the roof they are located approximately 15.1m from the nearest neighbouring residential boundary.
- 5.32 Taking account of the distance to neighbouring residential properties it is not considered that the form of the wind catchers appear overbearing or obtrusive, or would cause overshadowing which would present a detrimental harm to the enjoyment of these properties.
- 5.33 The increased eaves height is proposed to be masked by an extended roof surround which will hide any visual impact. The extension is set well away from neighbouring property being buffered by an access road. As such, there will be no additional impact in terms of light loss, obtrusiveness or overshadowing of neighbouring properties.

Other matters

- 5.34 The application seeks to vary the condition relating to plans, to replace the approved elevation plans with amended ones. The proposal is therefore not considered to impact material planning considerations in relation to parking and highways, landscaping, drainage or ecology beyond that previously approved.

6.0 Weighing and balancing of issues / Overall Assessment

- 6.1 In determining the planning application, section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In addition, Section 143 of the Localism Act amends Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act relating to the determination of planning applications and states that in dealing with planning applications, the authority shall have regard to:
- a. Provision of the development plan insofar as they are material,
 - b. Any local finance considerations, so far as they are material to the application (such as CIL if applicable), and,
 - c. Any other material considerations
- 6.2 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development which for decision taking means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

- 6.3 Although it must be acknowledged that the balance is a fine one, overall it is considered that there are no 'adverse impacts of (granting permission which) would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
- 6.4 It is considered that a fair and reasonable balance would be struck between the interests of the community and the human rights of the individuals concerned in the event planning permission being granted in this instance.
- 6.5 The following recommendation is made having regard to the above and also to the content of the Human Rights Act 1998.

7.0 Working with the applicant / agent

- 7.1 In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF the Council approach decision-taking in a positive and creative way taking a proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions and work proactively with applicants to secure developments.
- 7.2 The Council work with the applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service, and as appropriate updating applications/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.
- 7.3 In this instance:
- The applicant was provided the opportunity to submit amendments to the scheme.

8.0 Recommendation: Conditional Permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building. (SM03)
Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area. (Policy EP3 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) refers.)
2. The space laid out within the site for parking for 8 cars, a minimum of 8 cycles, loading and manoeuvring in accordance with the approved plans. shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.
Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway and in accordance with policies TR5 and TR7 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999).
3. A travel plan shall be reviewed and submitted for approval, on an annual basis, at the end of each academic year. The plan shall include a full analysis of the existing modal split for staff and pupils at the school and detailed proposals for future transport provision, with the aim of securing no increase in the number of car movements generated on the school journey. In the event of an increase in the number of car movements, the school shall undertake measures, which will have previously been identified in the travel plan, as are necessary to promote a reduction in the number of car borne trips.
Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and to promote a reduction in the number of car borne trips and comply with National and Local planning policy and in accordance with policy TR5 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999).

4. The drainage details agreed as part of the 'whole life management plan' for the full drainage system under application AOC/0057/19 shall be adhered to for the life of the development.

Reason: To ensure that maintenance arrangements are mitigated appropriately and necessarily in accordance with policy CS13 of the South Bucks Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted February 2011)

5. The development to which this planning permission relates shall be undertaken solely in accordance with the following drawings:

List of approved plans:

<u>Received</u>	<u>Plan Reference</u>
27 Mar 2018	17/119-050.001 Rev 1 - Site Location Plan
3 Sep 2018	17/119-050.003 Rev 1 - Proposed Site Plan
3 Sep 2018	17/119-100.002 Rev 1 - Proposed Ground Floor
27 Mar 2018	17/119-100.003 Rev 1 - Proposed Roof Plan
28 Apr 2021	19.109-140.002 Rev. 2 - Proposed Elevations (Hall)
6 Sep 2023	19.109-140.003 Rev. 3 - Proposed Elevations (CDT /IT)
6 Sep 2023	19.109-140.004 Rev. 3 - Proposed Elevations in Context

INFORMATIVE(S)

1. Due to the close proximity of the site to existing residential properties, the applicants' attention is drawn to the Considerate Constructors Scheme initiative. This initiative encourages contractors and construction companies to adopt a considerate and respectful approach to construction works, so that neighbours are not unduly affected by noise, smells, operational hours, vehicles parking at the site or making deliveries, and general disruption caused by the works.

By signing up to the scheme, contractors and construction companies commit to being considerate and good neighbours, as well as being clean, respectful, safe, environmentally conscious, responsible and accountable. The Council highly recommends the Considerate Constructors Scheme as a way of avoiding problems and complaints from local residents and further information on how to participate can be found at www.ccscheme.org.uk. (SIN35)

APPENDIX A: Consultation Responses and Representations

Councillor Comments

None received.

Parish/Town Council Comments

Received 09/10/23

DPC originally objected on 21 June 2021 and the views have not changed since that date and endorse the comments made by the heritage officer that the extension made to this grade II listed school do not conform to the approved plans. No public benefits of the proposed amendments to the approved scheme to balance that harm has been identified, contrary to NPPF and the 1990 planning (Listed buildings and Conservation) Act.

Received 21/06/21

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Development Plan
- Loss of View

Comment: The Parish Council has reviewed the plans and we object to this proposal. We feel that this variation is very different to the original proposal.

The Parish Council deplore retrospective planning and feel that there has been a disregard to the planning process with this application.

The variation is not in keeping with the local area and the original plan should be kept to.

Consultation Responses

Heritage (received 06/11/23)

Action required prior to determination: No (see below)

Heritage Assets

Listed Building (LB), which is a designated heritage asset; the application building is Grade II Listed.

Discussion

The following should be read in conjunction with previous heritage comments by Julia Foster (now left the council) dated 19th January 2022 and 31st March 2022. In these comments all matters were resolved except for the height of the CDT/IT extension which was not built in accordance with the previously approved application, and subsequently the current applications were recommended for refusal.

Whilst revised elevations have now been submitted, the changes are nominal and not felt to entirely address previous heritage concerns which identified harm to the setting of the listed building. However, this is likely to be towards the lower end of the 'less-than-substantial' scale, but harm none the less. And as such, in line with paragraph 202 of the NPPF this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, securing its optimum viable use.

Heritage (received 21/06/21)

Summary

The proposed amendments to the approved scheme, as built are not considered acceptable and this application should be refused.

Heritage Assets

Denham Village Infants School is a grade II listed building.

Relevant planning history

Extensions to the rear to provide a CDT/IT room and new a school hall, and internal alterations were approved in 2018 under PL/18/2415/HB and conditions for that application were approved under PL/19/3696/CONDA on 17.3.20.

Discussion

The heritage assessment is the impact on the significance the special historic and architectural interest of the listed building.

For the reasons given above it is felt that in heritage terms that:

The amendments which have been made to the approved extension to the CDT/IT extension to this grade II listed school do not conform to the approved plans. It is considered that this unauthorised deviation from the approved plans causes 'less than substantial harm' to the significance and setting of the designated heritage asset, due to the amended design, proportions and scale. No public benefits of the proposed amendments to the approved scheme to balance that harm has been identified; contrary to paragraphs, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 202 and 203 of the NPPF, and the 1990 Act.

I would therefore support refusal of this application on these grounds.

Significance; description of the site and surroundings;

Denham Village Infants School is a grade II listed building. Constructed in 1877-8 in yellow stock bricks with brick dressings, it has a tiled roof with a pyramid roofed bellcote and weathervane. It is single storey with projecting end bays; that to right being the teachers' house. The attached boundary walls, including the front and side walls are also included in the listing.

Proposals

With any planning or listed building consent approval, it is important that the permitted drawings are followed accurately; especially with regard to the height of buildings as any increase in height would be likely to require fresh applications. The original applications which were approved, including 17/40685/PREAPP and PL/18/2415/HB involved a considerable amount of time and negotiation but which resulted in extensions which balanced the continuing use of the school for the 21st century and retaining the purpose for which it was constructed with the impact on the significance of the Heritage Asset. In view of this, everyone involved should have been aware of how sensitive any deviations to the approved scheme would be.

The increases to the height and scale of the development which have occurred in this scheme are significant and would have been unlikely to have been approved if submitted formally as part of the original scheme or as an amendment. If the department had been consulted when the problems in implementing the approved scheme were initially identified, it would have been possible to find a solution to the problems at the time with much less cost to the budget and to the functioning of the

building.

With regard to the wind catchers, they were well detailed on the approved drawings and were attached to a modern part of the building so it was not considered necessary to condition this element, as any deviation from the proposed design should normally have been referred back to planning. If this had been done, it is likely that amendments could have been made to the scheme which would have better balanced the impact of the enlarged structures on this historic setting. However, I have read the arguments put forward as to why the approved wind catchers cannot be fitted, and it would appear that there is no satisfactory solution to the larger, less attractive units that have been fitted. This is regrettable as it is considered to cause some harm to the setting of the listed building, but on balance, as there does not appear to be an alternative if this building is to function properly, this amendment is therefore accepted as the approved wind catchers do not appear to be implementable.

The proposed CDT/IT extension to the rear of the domestic scaled School House took extensive negotiation prior to the original approval and in order to meet the specific needs of the that use, was already considerably larger than it was considered appropriate in that sensitive location. The approved eaves height was the same as the existing pitched roof rear extension containing the office, kitchen and heads office; this existing extension is well proportioned and the details and materials are in character with the original school building. The Heritage Statement submitted with the approved application stated in section 3.5 'Architectural Vernacular'; 'Proposed elevational proportions and volumes have been designed to follow the vernacular of existing structures, this is to ensure that the aesthetic nature of the existing structures is not compromised and to ensure that there is a visual harmony across the site.' Beneath that and under the heading 'Elevations' it is added that 'As can be seen below, the CDT block and hall follow the shapes and proportions of existing structures.' The proposed elevations have been added in under the above statement as a 'Proportional comparison' showing the existing pitched roof rear extension and the proposed CDT extensions with a label to both; 'Shapes and proportions of proposed structure to follow that of existing.' However, as built the eaves are significantly higher than the existing extensions, resulting in a much more dominant and more intrusive extension, which does not follow the 'shapes and proportions of existing structures' or provide the 'visual harmony across the site' which was intended with the approved scheme. Apart from the increased eaves height of the extension, the shallower roof pitch and the addition of brickwork between the window impact on the design and proportions of the extension, giving the building a bulkier appearance.

The explanation given by the applicant is that the approved eaves height would have caused current and future problems with regard the insulation of the old flat roofed extension alongside, but this could have been much better resolved when this issue was discovered. Why couldn't a thermal break have been added between the two extensions and insulation could have been added between the joists of the existing extension, or a completely new roof provided to the old extension, with concentrated insulation added.

Any future increase in the height of the existing old flat roof would any way require listed building consent and probably planning permission, and the increase in the thickness of the roof would be likely to be resisted, so that the increased height of the CDT/IT extension is unnecessary and not justified. It is therefore considered that this extension should therefore be reduced in height to conform with the approved plans.

Heritage Policy Assessment

The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The proposals are considered to preserve the architectural and historic interest of the listed building and therefore complies with sections 16/66 of the Act. NPPF The proposal is considered to cause harm to the significance of the designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Local Plan

The proposals comply with the policy C6 of the South Bucks District Local Plan adopted March 1999 Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011)

Historic England Guidance

Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment- 2015, and Making Changes to Heritage Assets- 2016

Conclusion

For the reasons given above it is felt that in heritage terms that:

The amendments which have been made to the approved extension to the CDT/IT extension to this grade II listed school do not conform to the approved plans. It is considered that this unauthorised deviation from the approved plans causes 'less than substantial harm' to the significance and setting of the designated heritage asset, due to the amended design, proportions and scale. No public benefits of the proposed amendments to the approved scheme to balance that harm has been identified; contrary to paragraphs, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 202 and 203 of the NPPF, and the 1990 Act. I would therefore support refusal of this application on these grounds.

Representations

Amenity Societies/Residents Associations

The Headteacher and Full Governing Board of Denham Village School (received 09/11/21):

I am writing this letter on behalf of the Full Governing Body of Denham Village School in response to the complaints received about the windcatchers on the hall and the height of the roof at the new end of the building.

Denham Village School has been through a trying time, both before Covid with building planning permission, delays and then trying to keep the work going on through a pandemic to better serve the children of our community when they returned.

When the school finally opened its doors again to welcome students back, the new buildings and classrooms, and especially the hall, were such integral parts of the daily lives of the children. The school is very small, and so the hall and the new CDT suite are the absolute heart of the school.

They are the only real communal areas they have.

Lunch is provided in the hall, which is now hot food from a provider who comes in to serve it to the children.

After school clubs such as Gymnastics and Dance, are in the school hall.

The school receives much needed additional income from lettings, including the Bucks Adult Learning providers who use the hall to run adult community classes.

It is for use by not just the school, but the community as a whole.

When it was built, the windcatchers which are at the centre of this topic, were complimented so many times as being in keeping with the area, innovative, attractive and most importantly eco-

friendly, which is such an important lesson for our children to have about the way we treat our environment.

How then are we to explain, that the hall is to be closed for very expensive works, to reduce the eco-friendly footprint of the hall, because people don't like the way it looks?

At a time when funding is so essential in the education sector in particular, spending many thousands of pounds changing a perfectly functional and thoughtfully built building which has been there for a long time now with no issues, seems extremely unfair and very counterintuitive.

More to the point, the drawings and plans were available from 2018, and I myself attended the planning meeting which was open to all community members and neighbours of the school. The drawings and plans were all displayed at this meeting and online for many months if not longer.

If there were not complaints then, or for the proceeding 3 years, why is any consideration being given to these complaints now?

The children have suffered immensely through this pandemic and are finally at their fully open school with no closures in sight.

Please consider this letter when you are making your choices in this matter, as I for one cannot imagine having to explain to the children why their school is to become a building site once more and there will be yet another change to their routine and disruption to their learning and progression.

Other Representations

2 comments have been received supporting and simply commenting on the proposal:

- Hall is well designed
- Environmentally friendly
- Benefits pupils
- Alterations are minor
- Provides good community facilities
- Design is sympathetic to history of the building

1 comment has been received objecting to the proposal:

- Wind catchers larger than described
- Wind catchers not in keeping with building
- Impact on outlook from neighbouring property
- Materials used not environmentally friendly
- Overbearing when viewed from neighbouring property
- Loss of light to neighbouring property