



Report to South Area Planning Committee

Application Number:	PL/23/3402/FA
Proposal:	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of new 3-bed single storey dwelling
Site location:	River View Village Road Denham UB9 5BE
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Smith
Case Officer:	Kaya Allnut
Ward affected:	Denham
Parish-Town Council:	Denham Parish Council
Valid date:	31 October 2023
Determination date:	9 February 2024
Recommendation:	Conditional permission

1.0 Summary & Recommendation/ Reason for Planning Committee Consideration

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of new 3-bed single storey dwelling.
- 1.2 The planning application is being referred to the South Area Planning Committee due to a call-in from Denham Parish Council.
- 1.3 Recommendation for the application is conditional permission.

2.0 Description of Proposed Development

- 2.1 The application site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and within the Denham Village Conservation Area. There are a number of listed buildings located within close proximity or adjacent to the site, though River View itself is not listed. The boundary wall to the front of River View is listed with changes previously approved under application references PL/20/0067/FA & PL/20/0068/HB.
- 2.2 The proposed dwelling would be a single storey bungalow style dwelling with a simple but contemporary design and naturally influenced materials. The dwelling would have a simple pitched roof with a ridge measuring approx. 4.4m in height.
- 2.3 The proposed dwelling would be orientated to run parallel to Village Road and would be set further back from the highway than the existing dwelling by approx. 25m.
- 2.4 The proposed dwelling would be constructed of natural vertical timber boarding and multi-facing red brick, with a standing seam black metal roof and timber framed openings. It is recommended that specific details of these are secured by condition.

2.5 The application is accompanied by:

- a) Ecological Survey
- b) SuDS Drainage Calculations
- c) Topographical Survey
- d) Design and Access Statement
- e) Heritage Statement
- f) Tree Report and AIA
- g) Ecology and Trees Checklist

2.6 Plans:

- h) Existing Plans & Elevations 22 WRAN EX01 A
- i) Existing Plans & Elevations 23 WRAN EX01
- j) Proposed Plans & Elevations 23 WRAN PE02
- k) Comparative Site Sections 23 WRAN SS01
- l) SuDS Design Existing Site Plan 22000-001 B
- m) Topographical Survey 220001-003 B
- n) SuDS Design Proposed Site Plan 220001-002 B
- o) Existing Site Plan 23 WRAN SP01 A
- p) Proposed Site Plan 23 WRAN SP02 B

3.0 Relevant Planning History

3.1 Relevant planning history for the site:

- ER/1090/60 – Erection of a single storey dwellinghouse. – Conditional Permission.
- 06/01521/EUC - Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed: bollards in entrance drive. – Certificate Refused.
- 14/01290/FUL - Application to remove the occupational limitations imposed by a legal agreement attached to planning permission ER/1090/60 and use Wrango Cottage as a dwellinghouse without restriction. – Conditional Permission.
- PL/20/0067/FA - Demolition of existing entrance piers, and erection of new piers, gates and walling to widen existing entrance; proposed signage, lighting, letterbox in wall, installation of mounted entry box system and repairing of entrance apron. – Conditional Permission.
- PL/20/0068/HB - Listed building consent application for Demolition of existing entrance piers, and erection of new piers, gates and walling to widen existing entrance. – Conditional Consent.
- PL/20/1109/FA - Erection of detached dwellinghouse, garage and ancillary building incorporating stables and staff flat following demolition of existing bungalow, garage and outbuildings. – Withdrawn.
- PL/21/1238/FA - Demolition of existing bungalow and garage (unlisted building in a conservation area), erection of a new dwelling and amended drive. - Refused permission (committee delegation), Appeal dismissed.
- PL/22/1789/SA - Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed single storey rear extension not exceeding 4 m depth, Part A and front porch not exceeding 3 sqm, Part D. – Part approved, Appeal allowed.

4.0 Summary of Representations

4.1 Four Letters of Objection and one letter of support have been received. These are summarised in Appendix A.

5.0 Policy Considerations and Evaluation

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

National Design Guidance

South Bucks Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted February 2011): Policies CP1, CP8, CP9, CP12

South Bucks District Local Plan (Adopted March 1999 Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011): Policies EP3, EP4, EP5, H9, GB1, GB10, GB11, C1, TR5, TR7

South Bucks District Local Plan Appendix 5 (Conservation Areas)

South Bucks District Council Residential Design Guide SPD (Adopted October 2008)

Denham Neighbourhood Plan 2020 – 2036 (Adopted January 2022): Policies DEN2

Principle of Development

Core Strategy Policies:

CP1 (Housing provision and delivery)

Local Plan Saved Policies:

GB1 (Green Belt boundaries and the control over development in the Green Belt)

GB10 (Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt)

GB11 (Rebuilding of dwellings within the Green Belt)

- 5.1 The NPPF was updated December 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.
- 5.2 It is noted that policies GB1, GB10 and GB11 are not entirely in accordance with the NPPF. Where there is a difference or conflict in policy, then the NPPF takes precedence.
- 5.3 Recent planning application reference: PL/21/1238/FA which sought permission for a similar development relating to the erection of a replacement dwelling with the inclusion of a large subterranean basement was refused permission by the planning committee on 22nd March 2022. The application was refused on two grounds; firstly, that the replacement dwelling was found to be materially larger than the one it would replace and would therefore amount to inappropriate development, and secondly that the replacement dwelling, by virtue of its design and orientation would adversely impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings.
- 5.4 An appeal was subsequently submitted and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. The Inspector in making their assessment of the proposal upheld the reason for refusal regarding the Green Belt, concluding the proposed development would be inappropriate development and would result in a dwelling materially larger than the one it replaced and would result in a harmful loss of openness to the Green Belt. The Inspector did not however reach the same conclusion of the committee and

considered that the proposed development would not result in a detrimental harm to the setting of the Conservation Area, nor the adjacent listed buildings and therefore quashed the second reason for refusal.

- 5.5 Prior to the submission of this current planning application a Certificate of Lawfulness application for a single storey side extension and a 3sqm porch (ref: PL/22/1789/SA) was also allowed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate and forms a material consideration in the assessment of this application.

Impact upon the Green Belt

Core Strategy Policies:

CP9 (Natural environment)

Local Plan Saved Policies:

GB1 (Green Belt boundaries and the control over development in the Green Belt)

GB10 (Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt)

GB11 (Rebuilding of dwellings within the Green Belt)

- 5.6 Paragraph 142 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
- 5.7 Paragraph 154 of the Framework states the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate subject to several exceptions. One of these, 154 d) allows for the replacement of a building provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. Other exceptions include 154 g) which allows for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would; not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.
- 5.8 Policy GB1 of the South Bucks District Local Plan sets out exceptions where planning permission will be granted for development in the Green Belt. It refers to replacement dwellings being permitted subject to complying with Policy GB11 of the Local Plan. Policy GB11 relates specifically to the rebuilding of dwellings in the Green Belt. Criteria include that the size of the replacement dwelling would be no greater than that of the original dwelling plus any extensions which would comply with the terms of policy GB10 or that of the existing dwelling if this would be larger than that permitted under that policy.
- 5.9 Guidance for Policy GB10 states that "Extensions, which together with all previous extensions, are not of a small scale in relation to the original dwelling will be considered unacceptable in the Green Belt. In this connection, extensions or alterations which would result in the original dwelling having increased its floorspace by more than half will not be regarded as small scale".
- 5.10 In dealing with the previous appeal, the Planning Inspector found that the proposed replacement dwelling would be materially larger than the one it was to replace. In making their assessment the Inspector acknowledged that the proposed basement space, of which was a substantial size, should be included within the floorspace calculations for the purposes of the Green Belt assessment. The previous scheme,

including the basement had a gross floor area of 376sqm, which equated to an increase of 174.5% over and above the floor area of the original dwelling (total floor area of approx. 137sqm).

- 5.11 The Inspector continued to highlight that in addition to the larger floor area, the replacement building would also have an increased width, eaves, ridge height and a bulkier roof form. In finding the proposed development would not accord with exception d), the Inspector concluded that the repositioned building with its increased physical dimensions and bulkier roof form would overall appear as a more prominent building than the existing bungalow.
- 5.12 The proposed replacement dwelling as submitted with this application is calculated as having a total floor area of approximately 203sqm. The current scheme has omitted the previously submitted basement level and retains the single storey bungalow style dwelling. The proposed development would result in a total floor area increase of 48% over and above that of the original dwelling. The replacement dwelling would in comparison to the previous scheme, have a notably smaller overall floor area.
- 5.13 As highlighted by the Planning Inspector, floor area is not the determinant factor in assessing whether the building would be considered as materially larger than the one it is to replace as set out under paragraph 154 d). The proposed replacement dwelling in this instance be of a single storey form, maintain the existing eaves height and have a lower ridge height (0.5 m lower) than that existing dwelling. The replacement dwelling would further benefit from a simple, less bulky roof form. Based on the comparison of the physical dimensions and overall design, it is considered that the new building would not be materially larger than the one it would replace and the proposal would be considered to align with exception 154 d) of the NPPF and conform with the policies GB1 and GB11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999).
- 5.14 The Inspector, in assessing the previous scheme considered the replacement dwelling against exception 154 g) of the NPPF after finding the proposal would not align with exception 154 d). In making this assessment, the Inspector found that aspects of the previous scheme gave rise to a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than that of the existing development on site. In this connection, they considered that the repositioning of the proposed larger dwelling would cause it to extend further into the open area to the east of the site causing a visual effect on openness. They acknowledge that the visual effect of the proposed development would only be perceived from limited vantage points, however concluded that given the larger physical dimensions of the proposal against the existing development, there would be both a visual and spatial impact on the Green Belt. The Inspector concluded that the proposed larger dwelling would have a moderate visual and spatial impact and therefore found the appeal scheme to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 5.15 When assessing the current proposal against exception 154 g), it is acknowledged that the building would be repositioned 90 degrees from the existing building position as per that of the previous appeal. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that given the smaller physical dimensions of the proposal, the lower simple roof form and less prominent and bulky design, the replacement building would not be viewed as a prominent building nor materially larger than the one it would replace. When considering this, the proposed development would not be considered to result in a greater harm to the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development on site and would align with the parameters of exception 154 g) of the NPPF.

5.16 Overall, for the reasons set out above, it is considered that the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would align with policies GB1 and GB11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) and the exceptions under paragraph 154 of the NPPF.

Transport matters and parking

Local Plan Saved Policies:

TR5 (Access, highways work and traffic generation)

TR7 (Traffic generation)

5.17 Highways officers responsible for parking and highways safety raise no objection to the proposed development, subject to condition for the parking to be laid out prior to initial occupation of the new dwelling. A suitable condition will be imposed on any grant of approval in this regard.

5.18 The dwelling shows a three bedroom dwelling. As parking standards are taken from the following document: Buckinghamshire Parking Guidance September 2015. Denham is within Zone B (Mid-range population) where guidance requires three parking spaces within the curtilage of the application site, which is optimal for a property with three bedrooms. The proposed plans indicate that there would be sufficient space to accommodate the required parking in this instance.

5.19 The proposal is therefore, not considered to give rise to any parking or highway safety issues that would warrant refusal of planning permission in this instance.

Raising the quality of place making and design & Historic Environment

Core Strategy Policies:

CP8 (Built and historic environment)

Local Plan Saved Policies:

EP3 (The Use, Design and Layout of Development)

EP4 (Landscaping)

C1 (Development within a Conservation Order)

H9 (Residential development and layout)

5.20 The application site is located within the Denham Village Conservation Area. The application site is also located adjacent, or in close proximity, to a number of listed buildings including The Old Store to the west and Wrango Hall opposite. The listed buildings and Conservation Area constitute designated heritage assets.

5.21 Paragraph 205 of the NPPF advises that great weight should be given to conservation of a heritage asset, with the weight varying depending on importance of the asset. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. 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 securing its optimum viable use.

5.22 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. Section 66 of the Act requires that development which affects a listed building or its setting, shall have special regard to the desirability or preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

- 5.23 Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that development within a Conservation Area that fails to preserve or enhance its character will not be permitted, including views into or out of the Conservation Area. Proposed development within the Conservation Area must also be of a high standard of design sympathetic to the existing building and the Conservation Area as a whole.
- 5.24 Local Plan policy EP3 states that development will only be permitted where its scale, layout, siting, height, design, external materials and uses are compatible with the character and amenities of the site itself, adjoining development and the locality in general. Poor designs which are out of scale or character with the surroundings will not be permitted.
- 5.25 Local Plan policy H9 requires that proposals for residential development are compatible with the character of the surrounding area in terms of density, layout, design, height, scale, form and materials.
- 5.26 Neighbourhood Plan policy DEN2 requires that design in Denham Village must demonstrate full regard to the principles of the Denham Conservation Area Character Appraisal, and to a number of design features within the Conservation Area. Of particular reference to this current application, in the Conservation Area, DEN2 seeks to secure "A rare glimpse from the street between buildings and open gates to the mature landscape of long rear gardens, the river and countryside to the south".
- 5.27 The Denham Conservation Area Character Appraisal states that rooflines are varied because of differing ridge and eaves heights, with gabled end and hipped roofs common. Buildings are noted as almost always being parallel to the road. The existing dwelling is noted as not being in character with the Conservation Area due to its modern but poorly considered 1970 design, large garage door facing onto the highway, horizontal emphasis, materials and single storey scale.
- 5.28 As noted above, the Planning Inspector in assessing the previous scheme onsite, found that given the quality of the building to be replaced and the location and style of the proposed replacement dwelling, would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. In assessing this, they firstly acknowledged that the CA lies largely in the form, scale, detailing and materials of its historical buildings of different ages and styles. They also acknowledge the variety to the architecture and that there is a degree of consistency in that dwellings are largely parallel to face the road.
- 5.29 The Inspector highlights that the existing building is somewhat at odds with the existing pattern and grain of development along this section of the road as its principle elevation does not face onto the road and as a result of this and its existing appearance, fails to share any characteristics with the position and appearance of other buildings found nearby.
- 5.30 In assessing the impact of the previous scheme against the adjacent listed buildings, the Wrango and The White Cottage, the Inspector considered that the replacement dwelling would be of a comparable height to the existing building and although re-orientated to face the road, would provide broadly the same outward views from the White Cottage and the Wrango such that how the views are experienced from the heritage assets would not be negatively impacted. Additionally, given the distance and low-level roof form, no harm to the setting of the heritage assets was identified and

they concluded that the development would have otherwise aligned with the development plan policies and the provisions of the NPPF.

- 5.31 As identified previously, the current dwelling on the site is modern and in design terms, is of its time being of a simplistic and poorly considered 1970's building. Therefore, the demolition of the existing building is of no concern in heritage terms. The design approach for the current proposal has changed from the previous scheme which was of an Arts and Craft style design to a contemporary approach with a simple form and good quality facing materials.
- 5.32 The Council's Heritage Officer has reviewed the submitted application and states that new development in a conservation area does not always have to be a copy of the traditional buildings around it. The Council recognises the positive impact that modern design and good quality materials can have within historic area. Successful architecture can be produced either by closely following historic precedents in a conservation area, or by adapting them or even contrasting with them. Local building forms and details contribute to local distinctiveness; however, this does not mean they must be followed and replicated in a poor pastiche way.
- 5.33 In comparing the previously proposed replacement dwelling to that currently submitted, the overall height of the replacement dwelling is now lower than the existing bungalow and that of the previous scheme and the resultant dwelling would be further hidden from the wider views. The position and orientation is similar to the previous scheme in which the Inspector had no heritage objection too. The replacement dwelling would no longer feature a garage door facing the street scene which is noted by both the planning Inspector and the Conservation Area appraisal as a feature at odds to the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area. The proposal would provide for the opportunity to integrate higher quality materials and an overall improved contemporary appearance, which will be secured by condition.
- 5.34 As noted by the Inspector, much of the replacement dwelling would be hidden from view by the listed wall, concluding it would not have a significantly greater presence when viewed from within the Conservation Area and would not harm the setting of the LBs or how they are experienced with the Conservation Area. Confirming the replacement dwelling would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and the setting of the nearby listed buildings.
- 5.35 It is acknowledged that there is a fall-back option to extend the existing building via permitted development rights under application PL/22/1789/SA (allowed at appeal). Due to the orientation, linear form, and design of the existing dwelling this would result in further massing and the inappropriate architectural style being more visible within the context of the identified heritage assets and the current proposal is therefore considered to provide a betterment in regard to resultant impact upon the Conservation Area and setting of the nearby listed buildings.
- 5.36 Noting all of the above, the current design approach is considered reasonable and the proposed dwelling is considered to preserve the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings. No public benefits are required in support of the proposed development in this instance.
- 5.37 Concerns have been raised in regards to the proposed design within the Conservation Area and a neighbouring representation has been submitted with a detailed Heritage Assessment setting out the proposals impact upon the Conservation Area and adjacent

Listed Buildings. While this has been acknowledged and reviewed, noting the above assessment and the comments of both the Planning Inspector and the Councils Heritage Officer, no objections are raised in this regard and the proposed development has been found acceptable in this instance.

- 5.38 The proposed development would therefore, comply with Local Plan policies C1, EP3 and H9, as well as paragraph 205 of the NPPF, Neighbourhood Plan policy DEN2 and the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Amenity of existing and future residents

Local Plan Saved Policies:

EP3 (The use, design and layout of development)

EP5 (Sunlight and daylight)

- 5.39 Local Plan policy EP3 requires regard to the amenities of adjacent properties. Policy EP5 states that development will be permitted only if it would provide for adequate daylight, and where possible sunlight, to reach into spaces around and between buildings and other physical features and would not result in a significant loss of daylight or sunlight to adjacent buildings or land.
- 5.40 Concerns have been raised in regard to potential loss of light and overlooking/ loss of privacy to neighbouring residents. Historically, the planning committee and the Inspectorate did not raise objections in regard to residential amenity and the proposed application is not considered to be substantially different to that previously considered acceptable in regard to neighbouring residential amenity.
- 5.41 The proposed dwelling would be set approx. 14m from the nearest neighbouring dwelling, and 4m from the nearest common boundary, though 3.8m at the closest point. Taking into account these separation distances and the single storey scale of the proposed dwelling with its reduced ridge height it is not considered that there would be any significant loss of light for occupiers of the adjacent dwelling or their rear amenity space.
- 5.42 With regards to potential overlooking. Given the single storey nature of the dwelling the proposal would enable no views toward neighbouring dwellings which are not presently experienced or achievable from elsewhere in the site and as such are found acceptable. Moreover, the existing flank boundary treatments would help to preserve privacy.
- 5.43 Overall, the proposed development is considered to comply with Local Plan policies EP3 and EP5 and would preserve the amenities of neighbouring dwellings.

Flooding and drainage

Core Strategy Policies:

CP13 (Environmental and resource management)

- 5.44 The site is located within a surface water flood zone. Flood risk calculations have been submitted (report dated October 2023) and an appropriate condition is proposed to deal with infiltration and discharge run-off.

Trees

Core Strategy Policies:

CP9 (Natural environment)

Local Plan Saved Policies:

EP3 (The use, design and layout of development)

EP4 (Landscaping)

5.45 A tree report and tree protection plan has been submitted in support of the application. An amended TPP was requested to ensure protection measures matched to the AMS submitted. Details have been reviewed by the Council's tree officer whom raises no objection subject to conditions.

Ecology

Core Strategy Policies:

CP9 (Natural environment)

5.46 An ecological assessment has been submitted, finding that the site is of limited ecological value, with no evidence of bats recorded. Subject to a condition requiring the submission of a scheme of ecological enhancements, no objection is raised.

Other Matters

5.47 Details referring to the previous scheme within the submitted DAS and Heritage Statement are noted. Nevertheless, an assessment has been made based on the submitted plans, as set out above, and this inaccuracy in a supporting document would not constitute a reason for refusal.

5.48 The objection requesting to restrict further planning applications on the site is noted. Any proposal for the creation of an additional dwelling would require submission of a planning application - each application is assessed on its own merits and it is not considered reasonable to impose such a restriction.

6.0 Weighing and balancing of issues / Overall Assessment

6.1 This section brings together the assessment that has so far been set out in order to weigh and balance relevant planning considerations in order to reach a conclusion on the application.

6.2 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

6.3 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.

- 6.4 As set out above it is considered that, the proposed development would accord with development plan policies relating to Green Belt, historic environment, transport and parking, neighbour amenity, character and appearance of the area, ecology and flooding and drainage.
- 6.5 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.

7.0 Working with the applicant / agent

- 7.1 In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 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.
- 7.2 In this instance the plans as submitted are considered acceptable by the Council. An amended TPP was requested during the course of the application by the Councils Tree Officer and subsequently found acceptable.

8.0 Recommendation: Conditional permission. Subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning from the date of this decision notice. (SS01)
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (or any statutory amendment or re-enactment thereof).
2. No development shall take place until a schedule of materials to be used in the elevations of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This schedule of materials shall include details of any joinery details, rainwater goods, and eaves and detailing. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (SM01)
Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality. (Policy EP3 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) refers.)
3. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a specification of all finishing materials to be used in any hard surfacing of the application site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be constructed using the approved materials. (SM02)
Reason: To ensure that such works do not detract from the development itself or from the appearance of the locality in general. (Policy EP3 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) refers.)
4. Notwithstanding any indications illustrated on drawings already submitted, no development shall take place until a scheme of landscaping which shall include indications of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and details, including crown spreads, of those to be retained has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. None of the trees, shrubs or hedgerows shown for retention shall be removed or felled, lopped or topped within a period of five years from the date of this permission, without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority. (ST01)
Reason: To ensure satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of visual amenity. (Policies EP3 and EP4 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) refer.)

5. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the development hereby permitted or the substantial completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees, hedgerows or shrubs forming part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of five years from the occupation or substantial completion of the development, whichever is the later, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. (ST02)

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and continuing standard of amenities are provided and maintained in connection with the development. (Policies EP3 and EP4 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) refer.)
6. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the arboricultural method statement submitted and approved as part of the planning application and under the supervision of a retained arboricultural specialist in order to ensure that the phasing of the development accords with the stages detailed in the method statement and that the correct materials and techniques are employed. (ST18)

Reason: To maintain the visual amenity of the area. (Policies EP4 and L10 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) refer.)
7. The scheme for parking, garaging and manoeuvring indicated on the submitted plans shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

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
8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 and Classes A, B, C and D of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) , no enlargement, improvement or other alteration (including the erection of a garage, stable, loosebox or coach-house within the curtilage) of or to Wrango Cottage, the dwellinghouse the subject of this permission, shall be carried out nor shall any building or enclosure required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of any said dwellinghouse as such be constructed or placed on any part of the land covered by this permission.

Reason: The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt where strict control over development is necessary in order to maintain the openness of the Green Belt. (Policy GB1 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) refers.)
9. Prior to any above ground construction works commencing on site, an ecological/biodiversity enhancement scheme shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme and details.

Reason: To protect and enhance the biodiversity and ecology of the site. (Core Policy 9 of the South Bucks Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted February 2011) refers.
10. No works, other than demolition, shall begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be

implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:

- Water quality assessment demonstrating that the total pollution mitigation index equals or exceeds the pollution hazard index; priority should be given to above ground SuDS components
- Ground investigations including:
 - Infiltration in accordance with BRE365
 - Groundwater level monitoring during the winter period (From November until March)
- Subject to infiltration being inviable, the applicant shall demonstrate that an alternative means of surface water disposal is practicable subject to the drainage hierarchy as outlined in paragraph 080 of the Planning Practice Guidance.
- Including a discharge rate as close as reasonable practicable to greenfield runoff rate
- Floation calculations based on groundwater levels encountered during winter monitoring (November-March) or based on the worst case scenario of groundwater at surface level
- Drainage layout detailing the connectivity between the dwelling and the drainage component(s), showing pipe numbers, gradients and sizes, complete together with storage volumes of all SuDS component(s)
- Calculations to demonstrate that the proposed drainage system can contain up to the 1 in 30 storm event without flooding. Any onsite flooding between the 1 in 30 and the 1 in 100 plus climate change storm event should be safely contained on site.
- Construction details of all SuDS and drainage components
- Details of how and when the full drainage system will be maintained, this should also include details of who will be responsible for the maintenance
- Details of proposed overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance or failure, with demonstration of flow direction

Reason: The reason for this pre-construction condition is to ensure that a sustainable drainage strategy has been agreed prior to construction in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that there is a satisfactory solution to managing flood risk.

11. 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>
25 Oct 2023	23 WRAN SL01
25 Oct 2023	23 WRAN PE03
25 Oct 2023	23 WRAN SS01
25 Oct 2023	FEDS-220001-003-B
25 Oct 2023	SUDS FEDS-220001-002-B

APPENDIX A: Consultation Responses and Representations

Councillor Comments

Cllr Guy Hollis: comments received 2nd November 2023 – Concerns regarding choice of roof given that this will likely be the only visible part from Village Road, within the Conservation Area and not in keeping with the other roofs in street.

Parish/Town Council Comments

Parish Council Call-in request received 8th November 2023 – {Denham Parish Council object to this application and would like this called-in to the LPA planning committee, as this is contrary to the neighbourhood plan 2020-2036 policy DEN2. This planning application is out of character with neighbouring properties situated within the Denham Village Conservation Area. The applicant's heritage statement refers to a basement being included under paragraph 2.1 but there is no plans to support this on the planning portal. Also, contained within this same document reference is made to the Conservation officers approval of design in paragraph 2.3, although there are no comments from the Conservation Officer on the planning portal. The design is out of character with the neighbouring properties situated within the conservation area. For these reasons, the application requires further public scrutiny and we would like to come along to that hearing to present our case. Please advise when that hearing may take place.

Consultation Responses

Tree Officer response received 2nd November 2023 - I have reviewed the tree report and AIA plan by GHA Trees Arboricultural Consultancy (29 Sept 2023) which includes an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). The submitted tree report appears to be a fair representation on the quality of trees on site. The preliminary AMS outlines the ground tree protection measures are shown on the submitted AIA plan, but they are not shown. A revised plan showing protective fencing for the site should be submitted to ensure the ground protection measures for retained trees is in accordance with national BS 5837 guidance. I have no objection in arboricultural terms following revised AIA plan and if planning permission is permitted, I recommend planning condition ST18.

Archaeology Officer response received 16th November 2023 - Thank you for consulting the Buckinghamshire Council Archaeological Service on the above proposal. We maintain the local Historic Environment Record and provide expert advice on archaeology and related matters. The proposed works are not likely to significantly harm the archaeological significance of any assets. We therefore have no objection to the proposed development and do not consider it necessary to apply a condition to safeguard archaeological interest.

Waste Officer response received 20th November 2023 - I have looked at the plans and due consideration has been given to waste management and container provision aspects of the proposal. Waste collection point indicated on plans within the Design and access document which states that, bins will be taken to Village Road for collection without the need for waste vehicles to enter site and appropriate external storage for containers within the curtilage of the property. Standard container provision for domestic households is one of each bin for refuse (180L), recycling (240L), paper/card box (55L) and food caddy (23L). Therefore, Waste services have no objections towards the proposal for waste and recycling provisions at property. Residents to present their waste and recycling at the property boundary for kerbside collection. All collections to take place in accordance with Council policies.

Highways Officer response received 21st November 2023 - Village Road is a C-classified road subject to a speed restriction of 30mph. This application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow, and erection of a 3-bed single storey dwelling. In consideration that the development is essentially a like-for-like residential development, I would not expect a material difference in vehicle movements when the existing dwelling is compared with that which is sought. Therefore, I do not consider the application to result in a significant intensification of use of the existing access point onto the public highway. Whilst it is noted that the access is proposed to be widened under application reference PL/20/0067/FA, it does not appear any work to the public highway is necessary. With regard to parking, 3(no) parking spaces have been proposed for the development. As such, I am satisfied that the development would offer the optimum level of parking in accordance with the Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance policy document when taking into account the level of habitable accommodation featured for the dwelling. Mindful of the above, the Highway Authority raises no objections to this application, subject to the following condition being included on any planning consent that you may grant:

Condition: The scheme for parking and manoeuvring indicated on the submitted plans shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

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.

Heritage Officer response received 22nd November 2023 - The heritage assessment is the impact, if any, on the setting of the listed building. Along with any impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Significance

It should be noted that the Heritage Assessment (March 2021) has not been updated since the previous application which included a basement, and as such references this aspect. However, the following heritage comments will relate to the current submitted scheme. The Heritage Assessment of the site remains unchanged from 2021 and as such the submitted document is acceptable. The existing cottage on the site, River View, formerly known as Wrango Cottage is a modern 1970s bungalow located within the Denham CA. Originally built as a gardener's cottage for Wrango for such a small insignificant dwelling it occupies a large and verdant plot. Along the entire front boundary, abutting the rear of the pavement is the Grade II Listed brick wall, approximately 7ft in height. The basic form of the village is a nucleated row running west from St. Mary's Church to the village green, then south over the Misbourne towards Oxford Road. The significance of the Denham CA is mainly drawn from the historic built development as well as key verdant spaces.

Response

The current dwelling on the site is modern and in design terms, is of its time being of a simplistic and poorly considered 1970's building. Therefore, the demolition of the existing building is of no concern in heritage terms. It is acknowledged that there is a fall-back option to extend the existing building via permitted development rights (PL/22/1789/SA). Due to the orientation, linear form, and design of the existing dwelling this would result in further massing and the inappropriate architectural style being more visible within the context of the identified heritage assets. It has also been noted that the inspector in their appeal decision (previously refused scheme) stated that much of the replacement dwelling would be hidden from view by the listed wall, concluding it would not have a significantly greater presence when viewed from within the CA and would not harm the setting of the LBs or how they are experienced with the CA. Confirming the replacement dwelling would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and the setting of the nearby listed

buildings. In comparing the previously proposed replacement dwelling to that currently submitted, the overall height of the replacement dwelling is now lower than the existing bungalow (fall back option) and that of the previous scheme. So will be further hidden from the wider views. The position and orientation are also similar to the previous scheme in which the inspector had no heritage objection too. The design approach for the current replacement dwelling has changed from the use of Arts and Craft style features to more contemporary approach with a simple form and good quality facing materials. New development in a conservation area does not always have to be a copy of the traditional buildings around it. The council recognises the positive impact that modern design and good quality materials can have within historic area. Successful architecture can be produced either by closely following historic precedents in a conservation area, or by adapting them or even contrasting with them. Local building forms and details contribute to local distinctiveness; however, this does not mean they must be followed and replicated in a poor pastiche way. As such, the current design approach is considered reasonable. Considering the fall-back option, along with the inspectors' comments to the previous scheme in relation to the identified heritage assets, the current application is considered acceptable in heritage terms.

Conclusion

For the reasons given above it is felt that in heritage terms the application would not raise any heritage objection.

Representations

1 Letter of support received – main points summarised below:

- design would be in keeping with rural plot and help development blend in with natural surroundings.

4 Letters of Objection received – main points summarised below:

- loss of privacy for neighbouring residents
- potential further development of the plot (restriction requested)
- incorrect details within the submitted DAS
- loss of light
- impact on Conservation Area and adjacent Listed Buildings (specifically design and materials)
- impact on the Green Belt (specifically scale and re-orientation)
- re-orientation previously refused and should not be permitted
- site notice removed during consultation period
- PD fall back better than proposal in regard to heritage impact and Green Belt impact