

**SUPPORTING
PLANNING STATEMENT
ON BEHALF OF**

Linden Homes Chiltern

Site at:
Campion House,
Thornbury Road,
Isleworth,
TW7 4NN

Prepared by
Mr Douglas C. B. Bond BA (Hons) MRTPI
Woolf Bond Planning LLP
Chartered Town Planning Consultants

NOVEMBER 2009

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This Statement has been prepared in support of a planning application to redevelop Campion House, Thornbury Road, Isleworth.
- 1.2. The Council will be aware that this will be the fourth planning application scheme on this site. The previous schemes were:
 1. 273 units: application refused, appeal withdrawn.
 2. 239 units: application refused, appeal dismissed.
 3. 154 units: application refused, appeal allowed.
- 1.3. The determination of these applications has established a number of principles that in turn allow the current scheme to be considered.
- 1.4. It is a well-established planning principle that each application should be determined on its own individual merits. The scheme has been prepared not only in light of the recent approval for the redevelopment of the site comprising 154 units but also taking into account the comments the applicant received in the consideration of that earlier scheme, in particular by Council Members and the local community. This is particularly relevant given advice in PPS3, paragraph 14 which refers to Local Planning Authorities developing a shared vision with their local communities of the type(s) of residential environments they wish to see and developed design policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for a local area. Pre-application meetings with Officers and the community have also influenced the scheme and detailed aspects of it.
- 1.5. This scheme has therefore been very much developed against this background, as well as taking into account general market conditions in order to best secure

the regeneration of this site and secure an opportunity to enhance the character and appearance of both the site and the area with an imaginative development that accords with national, London and local design and planning policy aspirations.

1.6. In this regard, the scheme builds upon the benefits secured with the recently consented scheme but with a different form of development that is seen to be wanted by the local community at both Council and neighbourhood level.

1.7. This Statement has been prepared in conjunction with the Design and Access Statement and Conservation Area Statement that include detailed assessments of the site and the surrounding area. They illustrate how the scheme has evolved in response to this context. This Statement also relies upon other reports submitted with the planning application. These include:

- Design and Access Statement
- Conservation Area Statement
- Viability Statement
- Tree Survey
- Transport Statement
- Sustainable Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Community Consultation Statement
- Energy Statement
- Ecological Report
- Noise Assessment
- Wind Assessment
- Sunlight Daylight Assessment
- Permeable Paving Statement

1.8. The Statement is arranged as follows:

- Relevant planning history
- Description of the site and surrounding area
- Relevant planning policy context

- Accepted planning matters
- Analysis of planning considerations
- Conclusions

1.9. The following documents are referred to in this Statement:

1. First appeal decision letter dated 18th July 2009.
2. Planning Officer's Report on last application (No. 01119/M/P4) to the Sustainable Development Committee.
3. Last appeal decision letter dated 26th August 2009.

1.10. In addition, a series of photographs are referred to. These are attached as an annex.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

- 2.1. The detailed Design and Access Statement and Conservation Area Statement, prepared by John Thompson and Partners, provide a detailed description of the site and surrounding area.
- 2.2. With reference to Plan DB1, the site extends to 3.22 hectares and lies on the western edge of the Spring Grove Conservation Area. The historic analysis of the site and surrounding area (see Conservation Area Statement) confirms that this site has always been different to the remainder of the Conservation Area, being outside the planned residential estate that lies to the east to which the Conservation Area is centered around.
- 2.3. The site includes Campion House (originally Thornbury House) and its grounds, one of the earliest dwellings in the area.

Thornbury Road

- 2.4. The site fronts onto Thornbury Road to the east. A mix of semi-detached, terraced and flatted development lies in this road (see Photographs 1, 2 and 3).
- 2.5. The central section of Thornbury Road in the vicinity of the site, as seen in Photograph 10, is characterised by an avenue of mature trees either side of the road which form an important characteristic of the immediate area. The northern half of Thornbury Road, closest to the A4 Great West Road, has lost the street trees, resulting in a harder more exposed urban environment.

- 2.6. The site lies behind these frontage trees. The collection of frontage buildings (see below) forms a continuous line of development with no views through or any perception of open land to the rear (Photographs 22, 23 and 24).
- 2.7. The variety of residential development opposite the appeal site is also characterised by building setbacks of varying depths and different frontage curtilage treatments. The uniform feature is the tight grain of development with limited gaps between buildings.
- 2.8. This frontage form of development is also characterised by development to the rear (Morton Avenue and Caroline Close).
- 2.9. The scale of building includes 2-storey pitched dwellings (Photograph 2), some with accommodation introduced into the roofscape (Photographs 3 and 4), and 3-storey terraces and flats (Photographs 1, 4 and 6). Some of these properties are also elevated above the road level resulting in buildings of greater height than 2 storeys (Photograph 9).

Thornbury Avenue

- 2.10. Residential development in Thornbury Avenue lies to the north of the site comprising uniform pairs of semi-detached 2-storey dwellings (Photograph 12). Some of these properties have introduced accommodation in the roofscape.
- 2.11. Similar to the grain of development in Thornbury Road, the houses are characterised by tight flank to flank gaps of no more than 2 metres. There are no clear views across the open space from Thornbury Avenue. This is evident from Photographs 12 and 13 representing a typical view up Thornbury Avenue and from Thornbury Avenue looking south. Photograph 14 illustrates the widest gap between the dwellings (over a single-storey, flat roof garage).

2.12. Late 20th Century cul-de-sac residential developments lie to the south of the site (Photographs 15 to 18). Three-storey pitched apartments lie immediately adjacent to the appeal site with terraced dwellings to their immediate south.

Sports Ground to the west

2.13. An Indian Gymkhana Club and Sports Ground lie to the west of the site. This area is accessed from Thornbury Avenue. The Sports Ground provides hockey, cricket and football facilities and includes a floodlit, all-weather sports pitch (Photograph 19). This facility is screened and separated from the appeal site by a belt of Cypresses trees seen in Photograph 19 and a short northern section of deciduous trees. All of these boundary trees lie within the site and are to be retained. The landscape backdrop will be retained (Photograph 20).

2.14. The only visual link between these two areas is the existence of 4 floodlighting columns seen from within the site (Photograph 21).

Application Site

2.15. The site itself is described in detail in the Design and Access and Conservation Area Statements. For the purposes of this Statement, the site comprises:

- Champion House (1856), a building of local townscape character. This was one of the earliest buildings in the locality and is regarded as the “Jewel in the Crown” in the Spring Grove Conservation Area.
- Unsympathetic kitchen and dining block extensions (1930 and 1954) lie to the north of Champion House
- A three-storey high chapel (1964) is linked to Champion House by a single storey link to its south. The chapel extends along the site frontage.
- Two significant Cedar trees, one in front of Champion House and the other

to its south, make a contribution to the important tree-lined Thornbury Road street scene.

- A shallow landscape verge is set behind a solid security fence (Photograph 28).
- An unremarkable three-storey pitched student residential wing (1962-1967) to the south of the chapel.
- A single-storey hall (Tigar Hall) set back from the road behind a smaller incidental building on the southern edge of the appeal site.
- A series of single-storey buildings to the rear.
- Unmanaged and unused private open grounds to the rear of the site.
- Remnants of a structured landscape to the rear of Campion House.

2.16. The site forms part of the designated Spring Grove Conservation Area. Campion House is designated a building of local townscape character. The more recent kitchen and dining block extensions to its north have a negative effect on the immediate setting of the house and its original historic form. The chapel and student accommodation block to the south (Photographs 22, 23 and 24) also represents a neutral or negative effect on the Conservation Area (First Appeal Inspector, Document 1, paragraph 26 and last Planning Officer's Report, Document 2, paragraph 7.153). The Conservation Area is assessed in detail in the Conservation Area Statement submitted with the planning application.

2.17. The western half of the site to the rear of the buildings comprises unused private open space (Photograph 25). Most of this area has been designated as Local Open Space in the Hounslow UDP.

2.18. The extent and form of development along the Thornbury Road and Thornbury Avenue frontages provides no public visual linkages into the private open space at the rear of the site. Boundary treatments to the south (Photographs 26 and

27) preclude any clear views across this space from Oakley Close and Kilberry Close.

2.19. As a result the open space at the rear serves no public visual amenity or recreational function to the local community.

2.20. The site as a whole comprises previously developed land (PDL) consistent with the definition in PPS3, Annex B. PDL is defined as that which is, or was, occupied by a permanent structure and includes all of the land within the curtilage of the development.

2.21. The Local Planning Authority prepared a Conservation Area Character Appraisal in January 2006. The document acknowledges the important features of the Conservation Area, including :

- tree-lined avenues
- mature trees within gardens
- private grounds
- fronting garden settings

2.22. The appraisal acknowledges the existence of a formal ornamental garden leading from the original building (Campion House).

2.23. Much of the original Victorian character has been eroded by more recent 20th Century redevelopment schemes.

Accessibility

2.24. The appeal site is located 200 metres from the junction of Thornbury Road and the A4, Great West Road, an arterial road which runs east/west into Central

London. The location provides a good level of public transport accessibility and several bus routes pass along the A4.

2.25. The bus stop for route H28 lies directly in front of the appeal site heading in both directions whilst bus route H91 lies on the A4, Great West Road, within walking distance of the site. Furthermore, the site is within walking distance of Osterley Station on the Piccadilly Line and the main line railway station of Isleworth to the south of the site with access to London Waterloo. There is an existing cycle route along the northern section of Thornbury Road and along the northern and southern sides of the A4.

2.26. Local facilities lie within a 5 minute walk of the appeal site, including amongst other shops and services a café, restaurant, travel and estate agents, newsagent, dentist and pharmacy on Thornbury Road opposite the junction with the A4. There are schools within reasonable walking distance as highlighted in the Transport Assessment which accompanied the planning application, as well as a wide range of services and facilities at Hounslow Town Centre, which is a Metropolitan Centre.

Open Space

2.27. The site lies within an area of Publically Accessible Local Open Space Deficiency. A need therefore exists to provide appropriate accessible open space and play facilities in this part of Spring Grove.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Policies and Guidance

- 3.1. The principal town planning legislation is the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications are to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Development Plan

- 3.2. At strategic level Development Plan policy is found in the adopted London Plan (February 2008) and at Borough level, the approved Hounslow UDP, 2003. Relevant policies are listed below.

London Plan

- 3.3. The following London Plan policies are of relevance to the applications:

The Mayor's Objectives

Policy I.1 The Mayor's Objectives

The Broad Development Strategy: The Overall Strategy

Policy 2A.1 Sustainability criteria

Policy 2A.9 The suburbs: supporting sustainable communities

Thematic Policies:

Living in London

Policy 3A.1 Increasing London's supply of housing

Policy 3A.2 Borough housing targets

Policy 3A.3 Maximising the potential of sites

Policy 3A.5 Housing choice

Policy 3A.6 Quality of new housing provision

Policy 3A.8 Definition of affordable housing

Policy 3A.9 Affordable housing targets

Policy 3A.10 Negotiating affordable housing in individual private residential and mixed-use schemes

Policy 3A.17 Addressing the needs of London's diverse population

Policy 3A.18 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities

Policy 3A.19 The voluntary and community sector

Policy 3A.23 Health impacts

Policy 3A.24 Education facilities

Working in London

Policy 3B.6 Improving London's ICT infrastructure

Policy 3B.7 Promotion of e-London

Connecting London Policies – Improving Travel in London

Policy 3C.1 Integrating transport and development

Policy 3C.2 Matching development to transport capacity

Policy 3C.3 Sustainable transport in London

Policy 3C.9 Increasing the capacity, quality and integration of public transport to meet London's needs

Policy 3C.17 Tackling congestion and reducing traffic

Policy 3C.21 Improving conditions for walking

Policy 3C.22 Improving conditions for cycling

Policy 3C.23 Parking strategy

Enjoying London

Policy 3D.8 Realising the value of open space and green infrastructure

Policy 3D.11 Open space provision in DDPs

Policy 3D.12 Open space strategies

Policy 3D.13 Children and young people's play and informal recreation strategies

Policy 3D.14 Biodiversity and nature conservation

Policy 3D.15 Trees and woodland
Policy 3D.16 Geological conservation

The Crosscutting Policies:

Climate change and London's metabolism: mitigation of and adaption to climate change and using and managing natural resources

Policy 4A.1 Tacking climate change
Policy 4A.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 4A.7 Renewable energy
Policy 4A.9 Adaption to climate change
Policy 4A.14 Sustainable drainage
Policy 4A.16 Water supplies and resources
Policy 4A.17 Water quality
Policy 4A.18 Water and sewerage infrastructure
Policy 4A.19 Improving air quality
Policy 4A.20 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes

Designs on London

Policy 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city
Policy 4B.3 Enhancing the quality of the public realm
Policy 4B.4 London's buildings: retrofitting
Policy 4B.5 Creating an inclusive environment
Policy 4B.6 Safety, security and fire prevention and protection
Policy 4B.8 Respect local context and communities
Policy 4B.11 London's built heritage
Policy 4B.12 Heritage conservation
Policy 4B.13 Historic conservation-led regeneration
Policy 4B.15 Archaeology

Implementing the London Plan:

Delivering the Vision

Policy 6A.4 Priorities in planning obligations
Policy 6A.5 Planning obligations

Hounslow UDP

Implementation policies

Policy IMP1.1 Integrating patterns of land use and the provision of transport
Policy IMP 1.2 The reuse and recycling of urban land and buildings
Policy IMP6.1 Planning Obligations

National Environmental Policies

Policy ENV-N.1.10 Provisions of new local open space
Policy ENV-N.1.11 Protection and improvement of local open space

Policy ENV-N.2.3 Promotion of nature conservation management
Policy ENV-N.2.3A Species protection
Policy ENV-N.2.4 Habitat protection
Policy ENV-N.2.5 Habitat reconstruction
Policy ENV-N.2.6 Landscape features
Policy ENV-N.2.7 Trees and community woodlands
Policy ENV-N.2.8 Tree Preservation Orders

Built environment policies

Policy ENV-B.1.1 New Development
Policy ENV-B.1.5 Environmental improvements
Policy ENV-B.1.9 Safety and security
Policy ENV-B.2.2 Conservation areas
Policy ENV-B.2.3 Reuse of redundant historic buildings
Policy ENV-B.2.6 Identification and protection of buildings of local townscape character
Policy ENV-B.2.7 Alterations to listed buildings and buildings of local townscape character
Policy ENV-B.3.2 Sites of archaeological importance

Environmental protection policies

Policy ENV-P.1.1 Environmental sustainability: environmental impact statements and sustainability checklist
Policy ENV-P.1.2 Water pollution and water quality.
Policy ENV-P.1.3 Surface water run off
Policy ENV-P.1.4 Waste water management
Policy ENV-P.1.5 Noise pollution
Policy ENV-P.1.6 Air pollution
Policy ENV-P.1.7 Light pollution
Policy ENV-P.1.8 Development proposals on or near contaminated land
Policy ENV-P.1.9 Remediation of contaminated and potentially unstable land
Policy ENV-P.2.1 Waste management
Policy ENV-P.2.4 Recycling facilities in new developments

Housing policies

Policy H.4.1 Housing standards and guidelines
Policy H4.4 Provision for children's play in housing developments
Policy H4.5 Associated facilities for residential developments
Policy H6.2 Environmental improvements in residential areas

Community and leisure policies

Policy C.1.4 New social and community facilities
Policy C.2.1 Educational facilities
Policy C.3.1 Statutory undertakers and public authorities
Policy C.4.1 Facilities for young children

Policy C4.3 Physical access to social and community facilities
Policy C.5.6 Access routes
Policy C.6.2 Provision of new arts, cultural, entertainment and library facilities

Transport Policies

Policy T.1.2 The movement implications of development
Policy T.1.4 Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments
Policy T.2.1 Pedestrian access
Policy T.2.2 Pedestrian safety and security
Policy T.2.3 Strategic and local cycle networks
Policy T.2.4 Public transport infrastructure
Policy T.2.6 Safety of public transport
Policy T.3.1 Improvements sensitive to particular uses
Policy T.4.2 Oppose overall increases in highway capacity for private vehicle and seek reduction in traffic levels
Policy T.4.3 Traffic implications of new development
Policy T.4.4 Road safety
Policy T.4.5 On-street parking
Policy T.5.1 Air quality implications of traffic
Policy T.5.2 Reducing traffic nuisance in residential areas
Policy T.5.3 Vehicle crossovers and hardstandings

National and Strategic Planning Policies

3.4. The relevant national planning policies are:

- PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development
- PPS3: Housing
- PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- PPS12: Local Development Frameworks
- PPG13: Transport
- PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment
- PPG16: Archaeology and Planning
- PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- PPS22: Renewable Energy
- PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control
- PPG24: Planning and Noise
- PPS25: Development and Flood Risk

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

- 3.5. Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment (April 2004) (London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance).
- 3.6. Sustainable design and construction (May 2006) (London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance).
- 3.7. London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (February 1997).

General standards and controls:

Section 1 Design and layout
Section 3 Safety and security guidelines
Section 4 Daylight and sunlight

Residential standards and controls:

Section 9 Form and design
Section 10 private amenity space
Section 12 Internal space provision

- 3.8. Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document to the Hounslow Local Development Framework (March 2008).
- 3.9. Air Quality Supplementary Planning Document to the Hounslow Local Development Framework (March 2008).
- 3.10. Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Recreation (London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2008).

Other relevant documents

- 3.11. Spring Grove Conservation Area (report to the Sustainable Development Committee meeting of 18 April 2002).

- 3.12. Champion House: Draft Planning Position Statement (report to Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee (Planning) meeting of 14 July 2005).
- 3.13. Conservation Area Character Appraisals (report to and minutes of Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee (Planning) meeting of 19 January 2006).

Relevant Planning Policy Issues

- 3.14. From the above planning policy context the following planning policy matters are identified that are addressed in the Statement. These are:
- a) Efficient use of land
 - b) High quality design
 - c) Character and appearance of Spring Grove Conservation Area
 - d) Open space
 - e) Provision of affordable housing
 - f) Housing mix.
- 3.15. Each of these topics are addressed in turn in relation to the relevant Policies in the London Plan and the Hounslow UDP.

A. Efficient Use of Land

London Plan

- 3.16. London Plan Policies 3A.1 and 3A.2, increasing London's supply of housing and Borough housing targets, require Boroughs to promote policies that seek to achieve and exceed housing targets.
- 3.17. London Plan Policy 3A.2 looks for an intensification of housing provision through higher densities where consistent with the principles of sustainable residential quality (Policy 4B.3) and the density location and parking Matrix (Table 4B.1)

(page 176 of London Plan).

- 3.18. In respect of these policies, Policy 4B.3, Maximising Potential Sites, seeks to assume that development proposals achieve the highest possible intensity of use compatible with the local context, design principles in 4B.1, public transport capacity and consideration of a density matrix – Table 3A.2.
- 3.19. Adopting the principles of PPS3, Annex B, the net site area calculation, which in turn derives a density figure, is influenced by the extent of open space to be included. The first appeal Inspector (Document 1, paragraph 17) concluded that at least 1 hectare – about half of the proposed public open space – should be excluded from the net site area.
- 3.20. The Local Planning Authority (last Planning Officer's Report, paragraph 7.36) suggests that more than 1 hectare but less than 1.35 hectares ought to be subtracted from the red-line application site area (3.22 hectares) in order to obtain a net developable area. This is on the basis that the Council suggests that not all of the proposed Publicly Accessible Open Space would be publicly accessible without constraint. The Council excluded footpaths close to buildings, albeit these still provide public access to the new/reconfigured open spaces.

Hounslow UDP

- 3.21. UDP Policy IMP.1.2 encourages the reuse and recycling of existing vacant buildings where this is appropriate and sustainable, the maximum use of previously developed land, development and redevelopment at higher densities subject to ensuring high levels of public transport accessibility and a high quality design and environment.

B. High Quality Design

London Plan

- 3.22. Consistent with the theme of maximising development opportunities, the London Plan seeks to set out a series of Design Principles for a Compact City (Policy 4B.1). The application scheme accords with these design principles.

Hounslow UDP

- 3.23. UDP Policy H4.1 sets out Housing Standards and Guidelines. The Policy indicates that proposals should have regard to:

- form and design
- daylight and sunlight
- privacy and space in between buildings
- private amenity space
- roads
- footpath, parking and servicing
- recycling and composition
- refuse storage and collection
- noise
- the Council's proposed Residential Design Guide

C. Character and appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area

- 3.24. The UDP Proposals Map confirms the site is located within the built up area of Hounslow and is located within the designated Spring Grove Conservation Area.

London Plan

- 3.25. London Plan Policies 4B.11, 4B.12 and 4B.13 relate to London's Built Heritage and seek to protect and enhance the Capital's Historic Environment. Policy 4B.12 also seeks the identification of spaces and gardens where opportunities for the enhancement may be realised and encouraged and facilitate inclusive

solutions to provide access for all within a Historic Environment.

3.26. In a similar vein, Policy 4B.13, Historic Conservation-Led Regeneration, notes that schemes should be supported that make use of historic assets (in this instance Campion House) and stimulate environment and community regeneration where they bring underused spaces into appropriate use and promote inclusiveness in their design.

3.27. These heritage policy objectives are secured by the application scheme through the restoration, conversion and use of Campion House and restoring the historic gardens to the rear of the house and opening this area up to public view and use.

Hounslow UDP

3.28. The Built Environment policies of the UDP include Policy ENV-B.1.1, New Development. This seeks to ensure that all development proposals make a positive contribution to overall environmental quality having regard to a number of criteria.

3.29. Policy ENV-B.2.2, Conservation Areas, states that the Council will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservations Areas by ensuring development respects the character of the existing architecture and scale and design and materials, with a presumption in favour of retaining any building which makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area.

3.30. Policies ENV-B2.6 and B.2.7 seek to protect buildings of local townscape character and their settings. This is relevant given Campion House is identified as a building of local townscape character. One of the merits of the application scheme is the preservation and enhancement of Campion House itself and its setting.

D. Open Space

3.31. The UDP Proposals Map confirms that the rear (west) of Campion House has been designated as Local Open Space.

London Plan

3.32. London Plan Policy 3D.8 relates to realising the value of open space and green infrastructure. It seeks to promote and improve access to London's Network of Open Spaces and realise the potential value of open spaces to communities. Finally, the policy expects all developments to incorporate elements of open space and make positive contributions to open space which is integrated with the wider network.

3.33. Policy 3D.11 relates to open space provision in DPDs. It notes that broad areas of Public Open Space Deficiency should be identified and priorities set for addressing them. Wider public realm, improving accessibility for all and creating new links are also encouraged by the policy.

3.34. Policy 3D.12 relates to Open Space Strategies. It seeks to create and enhance all types of open space, including enabling positive management of open space and enhancing the beneficial use of open space for the community.

3.35. The proposals, by reason of creating new Publicly Accessible Open Space in place of the current private space, will accord with the objectives of this policy.

3.36. Paragraph 3.308 suggests that opportunities for creating new public open spaces should be promoted where possible, targeting areas of deficiency. Where appropriate this should include opening up public access to privately owned open spaces. The application scheme accords with these objectives.

3.37. Policy 3D.13, Children and Young Peoples Play, encourages such facilities and that new housing development should include provision for play and informal recreation. This has been achieved in the application scheme.

Hounslow UDP

3.38. The provision of new Local Open Space is outlined in UDP Policy ENV-N.1.10. This highlights three key objectives:

1. Increase the provision of Local Open Space, especially in areas of Publicly Accessible Open Space Deficiency. With reference to UDP Map ENV-N1, the site lies in an area of Publicly Accessible Open Space Deficiency.
2. Seek to increase public accessibility to areas of Local Open Space.
3. Promote and expand opportunities for active and passive recreation through improvement of public access to Local Open Spaces in conjunction with new development.

3.39. The application scheme secures these objectives, in particular by providing new local open space at the front of the site along the Thornbury Road frontage.

3.40. The explanatory text (paragraph 3.13) notes that new Publicly Accessible Open Space should include a range of facilities to ensure it will be valued by the local community.

3.41. Paragraph 3.14 confirms that:

“The creation of publicly accessible open space is particular important in areas where there is deficiency.”

“The Council regard it is as important to add to the provision of publicly accessible open space where possible in order to improve the

quality of the environment for all.”

- 3.42. UDP Policy ENV-N.1.11, Protection and Improvement of Local Open Space, acknowledges that Local Open Spaces are both public and private open areas. The policy identifies three functions of Local Open Space as:
1. Providing essential visual breaks in built-up areas.
 2. Contributes to local amenity.
 3. Meet, or are capable of meeting recreational needs.
- 3.43. The policy notes that development on Local Open Space will not be granted, except in very special circumstances, especially where it would lead to a deficiency in publicly accessible open space.
- 3.44. The policy notes that opportunities should be taken to improve its amenity value and to increase public access within areas identified as having an open space deficiency.
- 3.45. Supporting paragraph 3.15 confirms that Local Open Spaces can include incidental Open Spaces found in housing areas. It is only the larger areas that are designated on the Proposals Map but the policy also applies to small areas not specifically designated.
- 3.46. Paragraph 3.16 reiterates that in the areas of publicly accessible open space deficiency the Council will particularly seek to ensure that public access to Local Open Space is improved.

E. Provision of Affordable Housing

London Plan

- 3.47. Policy 3A.9 sets a strategic affordable housing target (50%) and within that a

London wide objective of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision. Policy 3A.10, Negotiating Affordable Housing, in individual and private resident and mixed use schemes requires Boroughs to seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing having regard to affordable targets, the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. The targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs. The quantum of affordable housing is explained and justified further in the submitted viability Statement.

F. Housing Mix

London Plan

- 3.48. London Plan Policy 3A.5, Housing Choice, requires Boroughs to ensure that new developments offer a range of housing choices, including mix of housing sizes and type. The scheme accords with this policy.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1. Previous schemes have been refused by the Council owing to concerns over:

- a. Mix of dwellings.
- b. Impact on the character and appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area.
- c. Impact on the setting of Campion House.
- d. Extent of encroachment into the local open space and in these situations a lack of very special circumstances.

- 4.2. Other issues raised include:

- Density.
- Private amenity space.
- Viability in terms of affordable housing provision.
- Section 106 contributions.

4.3. In light of the relevant planning policy context and the consideration of previous schemes, a number of points have been accepted by the Council. These are highlighted under a series of headings in the following section of this Statement.

5. ESTABLISHED PLANNING MATTERS

5.1. The principle of a residential development of the site

- That the principle of redeveloping a vacant Roman Catholic Seminary (Use Class C2 (Residential Institution)) for residential development has been accepted by the Council in the determination of the last application and the last Appeal Inspector when allowing the 154 unit appeal.

5.2. **Noise**

- That subject to appropriate safeguarding and mitigation conditions noise is not a determinative issue. This is confirmed by the submitted Noise Assessment.

5.3. **Air Quality**

- That subject to appropriate mitigation conditions covering sustainable transport measures and air-quality management projects as allowed by PPS23 the impact of the proposal on air pollution is not an issue.

5.4. **Flood Risk**

- The submitted Flood Risk Assessment confirms that subject to the imposition of a condition requiring surface water source control measures and a SUDS, the application scheme doesn't cause any on or off site flood risk.

5.5. **Wind**

- The applicant's submitted wind assessment confirms that this is not an issue and no mitigation measures are necessary.

5.6. **Contamination**

- That subject to an appropriate phased contamination condition this is not an issue.

5.7. **Nature conservation**

- The submitted ecological reports confirm that in relation to nature conservation, subject to appropriate obligations and/or conditions, the site has no nature conservation constraints, whilst the proposals for the new/reconfigured local open space will enhance the nature conservation value of the site.

5.8. Daylight & Sunlight

- The applicant's submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report confirms that the application scheme accords with the BRE guidelines in respect of Daylight & Sunlight.

5.9. Internal Space Standards

- The proposed units comply with the total floor area Standards set out in the UDP SPG 1997 Guidelines (see Design and Access Statement).

5.10. Lifetime Homes Standards

- An appropriate number of the residential units comply with the Joseph Rowntree Foundation Lifetime Homes standards.

5.11. Sustainability

- The submitted Sustainability Statement confirms that sustainable building principles will be applied, subject to conditions and/or obligations secured by a Section 106 deed (see Design and Access Statement).

5.12. Local Open Space

- The recent approval of the 154 unit scheme establishes the principle of new and reconfigured Local Open Space along the Thornbury Road frontage in the form of Thornbury Green and to the rear comprising Thornbury Gardens. The planning application very much respects the proposals for these areas as already consented. As highlighted later in this Statement the very special circumstances identified by the previous Inspector also apply to the application scheme. These conclusions represent significant material considerations in the determination of the planning application.

6. ANALYSIS OF RELEVANT PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1. In light of the relevant planning policy context and recent planning history, in particular the appeal decision granting permission for the 154 unit scheme, the following planning issues are identified that need to be addressed:

- Loss of open space

- Housing mix
- Density
- Impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Setting of Campion House
- Residential amenities
- Affordable housing
- Section 106 agreement

6.2. Each of these matters is addressed in turn below.

Local Open Space

6.3. The most recent appeal decision identified a number of significant points.

6.4. UDP Policy ENV1.1.11 identifies 3 local open space objectives:

- a) Contribute to local amenity.
- b) Meet or are capable of meeting recreational needs.
- c) Provide essential visual breaks in built up areas.

6.5. The previous Inspector (document 3) considers whether the local open space on the application site met any of these objectives.

6.6. In respect of contributing to local amenity and meeting or capable of meeting recreational needs, the Inspector at paragraph 16 noted that the land has historically been in private ownership. He continued noting:

“It makes little contribution to a local amenity and would appear to meet no current recreational needs.”

6.7. In relation to providing an essential visual break the Inspector concludes at paragraph 18:

“I consider that the contribution of the local open space in providing a visual break in the built environment context of Thornbury Road and other developments to the west is of limited value.”

6.8. The Inspector therefore concludes that:

“While I note that a considerable extent of the appeal site is designated local open space, I found that it has a rather limited practical function within the locality. Such a consideration is material to my decision.”

6.9. A similar objective conclusion should arise in the Local Authority’s determination of the current application in relation to local open space. This is an important finding of fact when assessing the extent of encroachment into the Local Open Space and balancing this against very special circumstances associated with the scheme.

6.10. With this conclusion in mind it is relevant to set out Local Open Space Policy Objectives.

Local Open Space Policy Objectives

6.11. The London Plan and UDP set out a number of Open Space Policy objectives. The current site, being private space with no public access and fulfilling no community use, does not meet these objectives. In contrast the reconfigured local open space will.

6.12. This is evident from the fact that UDP Policies ENV.1.10 and ENV.1.11 seek to increase public accessibility to areas of Local Open Space. This is achieved by

the application scheme.

- 6.13. Improvement of public access to Local Open Space is also encouraged by the Policy by use of planning obligations in conjunction with new developments. The application scheme is consistent with this approach.
- 6.14. Consistent with paragraph 3.13 of the UDP, the proposed new Publicly Accessible Open Space will include a range of features to ensure that it will be valued by the local community for a range of activities.
- 6.15. The application site lies in an area of publicly accessible open space deficiency. Paragraph 3.14 of the UDP confirms that the creation of Publicly Accessible Open Space is particularly important in areas where there is deficiency. The paragraph continues noting that:

“The Council regards it as important to add to the provision of publicly accessible open space where possible in order to improve the quality of the environment for all.”

- 6.16. UDP Paragraph 3.16 reconfirms that:

“Areas which do not have convenient access to public open spaces are identified on the Public Accessible Local Open Space Deficiency Map (Map ENV-N.1) and it is these areas where the Council will particular seek to ensure that public access to Local Open Space is improved.”

- 6.17. The fulfillment of this important aspiration is secured by the application scheme and represents a very real benefit.

- 6.18. The London Plan Policy 3D.8 refers to the protection, promotion and improving access to London's Network of Open Spaces. The supporting text, paragraph 3.297, notes that the Mayor will work with partners to identify any strategic deficiency in provision of Publicly Accessible Open Space.
- 6.19. Paragraph 3.298 continues noting that open spaces play a vital role in providing a valuable source and focus for local communities, can have a positive effect on the image and vitality of areas, provide respite from built environment, provide an opportunity for recreation; promote health, wellbeing and quality of life, provide vital facilities for developing children's play, exercise social skills and enhance biodiversity. The proposals for the new Publicly Accessible Open Space on the application site will realise all of these "vital" roles which are currently not attainable on the site in its current state.
- 6.20. Paragraph 3.300 of the London Plan notes:

“As London becomes more compact and intensive in its built form, the value of these open spaces will increase and development should help to meet the consequential increase in demand, especially for Public Open Space and provision for children. “

- 6.21. The redevelopment of the site in the manner proposed not only provides for new residential accommodation, consistent with other policy objectives, but also fulfils the consequential increase in demand for Public Open Space, over and above the Open Space requirements of the development itself.
- 6.22. The London Plan Policy 3D.11 requires areas of Public Open Space deficiency to be identified and priorities set for addressing them; encourage function and physical linkages to the wider public realm, improve accessibility for all and create new links based on local (and strategic) needs. The application scheme

realises these policy objectives.

- 6.23. Policy 3D.12, Open Space Strategies looks for the positive management of open space and to enhance the beneficial use of them for the community. An Open Space Strategy has yet to be completed by the Council.
- 6.24. The consistent theme of the development plan is to achieve the significant policy objective of improving public accessibility to open spaces, in particular in areas of public open space deficiency and the ability of the local community to use these “new” accessible spaces thereby enhancing the quality of life. The ability of the application scheme to bring about these important open space policy objectives is a material consideration in favour of the scheme.
- 6.25. The application scheme seeks to respond positively to the identified Local Open Space Policy objectives.

New/Reconfigured Local Open Space

- 6.26. The application scheme almost replicates the form and composition of the new and reconfigured local open space as approved under the 154 unit scheme. In terms of extent of the local open space, the first Appeal Inspector (239 unit scheme) concluded that the loss of Local Open Space in the region of 20-25% was too much, albeit against the background of no very special circumstances.
- 6.27. The last Inspector (154 unit scheme) concluded that the degree of loss associated with this scheme was between 7.6% and 18%. Importantly the Inspector when assessing the very special circumstances arising from the scheme (see below) did not consider the case was a finely balanced one at the margins of acceptability.

- 6.28. The previous Inspector confirmed the Planning Officer view that Thornbury Green can serve reasonably as partial compensation to the loss of local open space at the rear such that a net area of loss of open space is the relevant consideration.
- 6.29. With reference to Local Open Space Proposals Plan No. 004 the current application results in a net loss of local open space of 0.32ha (15.7%). The extent of net loss is an improvement on the Council's 18% figure for the previous 154 unit scheme. Even if the rear gardens were excluded from the private local open space the net loss is 18%.
- 6.30. Secondly the scale of the proposed buildings adjacent to the local open space is reduced, in particular in form, mass and height. The proposed dwellings will therefore have less of a dominating presence on the local open space.
- 6.31. Finally, the application not only results in less of a loss of local open space to the previous 154 unit scheme it is also relevant to note that the scheme results in an increase of publicly accessible local open space, 1.64 hectares as opposed to 1.46 hectares (a 0.18 hectare increase (a 12.3% increase)) by comparison to the consented scheme.
- 6.32. Given Development Plan policy emphasises the importance of publicly accessible space, the increase in the amount of publicly accessible local open space on the site is therefore a significant factor in favour of the current application scheme.
- 6.33. The suggestion in the Council's pre application correspondence that the scheme results in a greater extent of encroachment into the local open space is incorrect. The need therefore for a compensatory increase in a very special circumstance is not a necessity. In any event the very special circumstances are

so overwhelming that a similar amount of encroachment plus or minus 18% would still be acceptable.

- 6.34. As acknowledged by the last Appeal Inspector the application of UDP Policy ENV-N.1.11 requires very special circumstances to justify the magnitude of loss of local open space envisaged with the application.

Very Special Circumstances

- 6.35. I now address whether very special circumstances that arise from this scheme justify the level of proposed encroachment.

1. New public accessible open space. The proposal will create a large proportion of the site as new Publicly Accessible Open Space. This will secure a number of Development Plan policy objectives (see paragraphs 6.11-6.25 above).

The first Inspector (Document 1, paragraph 30) described increasing the area of Public Accessible Open Space in the area as a “very real benefit” that has to be balanced against the extent of encroachment and loss of open space. The second Inspector, paragraph 21 found that this was a tangible benefit which was of significant weight.

This very real benefit is reinforced by the fact that the site lies in an area of Public Open Space deficiency. The Development Plan (UDP paragraphs 3.14 and 3.16) confirms that the creation of publicly accessible open space is particularly important in areas where there is a deficiency. Moreover the London Plan Policy 3D.12 (Open Space Strategies) at paragraph 3.308 begins stating:

“Opportunities for creating new public open spaces should be promoted where possible, targeting areas of deficiency.... where appropriate this should include opening up the public access to privately owned open spaces such as sports pitches and utilities land, including sites that are no longer required for their original purposes.”

The London Plan at paragraph 3.297 also notes that the Mayor will work with partners to identify any strategic deficiency in the provision of publicly accessible open space.

There are limited opportunities to reducing the identified deficiency in Public Accessible Open Spaces in this area and remove the deficiency designation for this area. The application scheme will help meet this important objective.

The Council's client Management, Leisure and Cultural Services (interim) believes there would be:

“An...ongoing public benefit with the opening up of additional public space, particularly with play equipment.” (My underlining)

The application scheme accords with this stated aspiration.

The provision of new publicly accessible open space and improved access to the space will comply with the London Plan (Policies 3D.8, 3D.11 and 3D.12, supporting paragraphs 3.297, 3.298) 3.300 and 3.308 (see paragraphs 5.23-5.29 above). As the UDP notes, adding to the provision of publicly accessible open space where there is a deficiency in a highly developed environment will “improve the quality of the environment for all”. (UDP paragraph 3.14) and secure “vital” roles for creating more inclusive healthier communities (London Plan paragraph 3.298).

As noted the application scheme increases the amount of publicly accessible open space by comparison to the consented 154 unit scheme which further reinforces the merits of this scheme and this benefit which is of significant weight.

2. Enhanced Thornbury Road frontage. The setback positions of Plots 28-43 retain the significant opportunity for a new local open space in the form of “Thornbury Green” along the Thornbury Road frontage similar to the consented scheme. This new area has four significant advantages.

Firstly, the creation of this space will open up historic views of Campion House from the south for the first time since the 1960s. This can in part be appreciated by the site layout plan. Consistent with the first Inspector's findings (Document 1, paragraph 26) it would be more appropriate for Campion House (Thornbury House) to stand out from the surrounding development, in the way other surviving mansions do. The

renewed prominence of this building of recognised townscape importance in the street scene will increase, consistent with its status in the street and Conservation Area. In a similar vein, the space created around the southern-most Cedar tree will also enhance the street scene and Conservation Area by allowing a more attractive green landscape setting to the road to emerge. This new/configured open space proposal has been supported by the Council's Conservation Officer.

Secondly, the setback position of Plots 28-43 will create a frontage area measuring between 18 metres and 27 metres deep and 109 metres in length to create a Publicly Accessible Local Open Space on the Thornbury Road frontage (to be known as Thornbury Green). The Publicly Accessible Open Space will be the first publicly accessible frontage space in the Spring Grove Conservation Area, enhancing the function, appearance and setting of the street scene and enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area itself. This is particularly so given the Conservation Area is characterised by open garden frontages.

The inclusion of a local children's play area in this location will also enhance the relation of the space to the wider local community, creating a more inclusive space for both existing and future residents.

Thirdly, the new gaps created between Block A and Campion House and Plot 28 allow new and enhanced appreciable views to the rear (west) of the site increasing the public realm and the public's perception of openness of the new Publicly Accessible Open Space area from Thornbury Road which is currently physically and visually closed off by a continuous line of frontage buildings (Photographs 22, 23 and 24).

Finally, the gap between Plots 31 and 32 align with Church Road to create "Church Walk", the historic route between the site and St. Mary's Church.

The last Inspector acknowledged, at paragraph 22, improved permeability through the development, both across the new local open space at the front but also to the local open space at the rear. The Inspector found that awareness of the local open space would increase which was seen as a very special circumstance. The current application scheme secures this benefit too.

The new local of the open space along the Thornbury Road frontage, its use and relationship with the existing residential areas to the east allows the new open space to be designed to respond more effectively to residents need and the provision of new paths to link the space to the

surroundings thereby providing convenient public access to the open spaces. The proposed formal gardens and children's play area in an area which is currently deficient in publicly accessible open space will result in a significant improvement to both the quality and function of the open space on the site and its relationship with the existing local community. The features are also compatible with the setting and surrounding land uses and will serve to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area within which the site lies.

The reconfiguration of the open land pattern on site which includes more open land on the road frontage and new and enhanced (more visible and wider range) views of Campion House and views into the depth of the site. This represents a significant improvement to the quality of the Open Space brought about by the proposal by comparison to the existing configuration of the Local Open Space on the site.

3. Restoring Campion House and enhancing its setting. The proposed sensitive siting and design of the building to the north (Block A), the demolition of the kitchen/dining extensions to Campion House and the location of Plot 28 to the south will create new space around Campion House that will enhance its setting by allowing greater space around the building, commensurate with its original historic setting (see Design and Access and conservation Area statements).

The space given to Campion House and to the southern-most Cedar tree when viewed from the south will enhance the street, the contribution of these two elements within it and the Spring Grove Conservation Area. The new enhanced setting to Campion House will re-elevate the prominence of this building commensurate with its status within the immediate locality representing a further enhancement to the character and appearance to the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

This element of the scheme is similar to the previous two schemes. The first Inspector identified the enhancement of Campion House as a "real benefit" stating:

"Selective demolition at Thornbury House would restore its integrity and provide a more open setting, akin to the original design intention and more appropriate to its origins as a key part of the Victorian suburb and to its status as a locally listed building. Conversion to flats, if sensitively done, would ensure its repair and survival. This would be of real benefit to the area. The

small 3-storey block of flats to the north, designed as a 'villa', would make an appropriate transition between the large scale Thornbury House and the 2/3 storey semi-detached houses beyond. This arrangement would also open up views of the grounds. "

The latest Appeal Inspector (paragraph 25) noted the proposals which are largely replicated here will enhance the landscape setting to the House.

The application scheme, similar to the consented 154 unit proposal, locates the frontage building back from Thornbury Road. This, as the last Inspector recognised (paragraph 32) allows open views towards Campion House that would emphasise its historic status and position within the site and locality, thereby enhancing its setting in the Thornbury Road street scene.

The gap between Plots 31 and 32 is similar to Blocks C and D, albeit the proposed houses are smaller in scale. In this regard the last Inspectors comments at paragraph 33 apply where he stated:

"Blocks C and D would be relatively large and contemporary four storey structures situated to the south-west of Campion House. On balance, I am satisfied that the landscaped separation gap would be sufficient, in addition to their lower height and relatively simple appearance, to ensure that they would not compete unduly with the Italianate grandeur of Campion House. The latter would be seen as detached from other structures, within a verdant landscaped setting wherein the dominant cedar trees would remain in an improved frontage context; a fact not diminished by the transitory and subservient scale of the suitably detailed 'villa' of Block A to the north."

In this regard, the scheme meets London Plan Policy aspirations (4B.11 (London's built heritage), 4B.12 (Heritage Conservation)). In a similar vein, Policy 4B.13 Historic Conservation Led Regeneration notes that schemes should be supported that make use of historic assets (in this

instance Campion House) and stimulate environment and community regeneration where they bring underused spaces into appropriate use and promote inclusiveness in their design. The aspirations in UDP Policies ENV-B2.6 and B.2.7 regarding protecting buildings and local townscape character and their settings are exceeded by not only protecting but enhancing Campion House and its setting.

4. Improved quality of open space. The application scheme enhances the quality of the proposed new Public Local Open Space by retaining and enhancing the historic structure of the formal Campion House Gardens that lie to the rear of the building. These improvements are detailed in the landscape section of the Design and Access Statement. This is consistent with London Plan Policy 4B.12 which seeks the identification of spaces and gardens where opportunities for enhancement can be realised and encouraged and to facilitate inclusive solutions to provide access for all within a historic environment.

New attractive public views of the rear of Campion House will also be created by the proposals (Photograph 29) thereby increasing the appreciation of this locally important building, the quality and character of the proposed new Publicly Accessible Open Space and that of the area as a whole.

5. The ecological value of the site will be enhanced. An Ecological Management and Enhancement Plan is to be implemented. The existing site has little ecological value (last Planning Officer's Report, paragraph 4.18). The submitted Ecological Assessment proposes a number of enhancements that will create a more diverse and interesting ecological habitat that in turn will make the newly reconfigured open space more valuable and more interesting to the local community. This can be secured by planning condition. The last Inspector (paragraph 21) acknowledged this as a very special circumstance.
6. The new/reconfigured open space better performs the functions of designated Local Open Space as identified in UDP Policy ENV-N.1.11. The newly configured open space has been designed for the existing community to form an intrinsic feature of quality for the local neighbourhood. The current Open Space is undervalued, underused, out of view and inaccessible at present. Its value to the area is therefore very limited, a point accepted by the last Inspector (paragraph 18). The proposal aims to raise its profile and value and integrate it more fittingly within the community thereby enabling it to better reflect the identified functions of designated Local Open Space areas.

Accordingly, the function of the Local Open Space is to be enhanced by

the proposed redevelopment of the site by comparison to the existing situation. The scheme therefore results in a qualitative enhancement of the open space on the site.

7. PPG17. The proposed new/reconfigured Local Open Space that provides multiple functions consistent with the Annex to PPG17.
 8. Obligations. The Unilateral Undertaking will secure the laying out of and the management and maintenance of the public local open space area. The undertaking will include restrictions on new development on the whole of the proposed public open spaces. Public access will be secured in perpetuity whilst a public sign will be erected and retained highlighting access to this area from Thornbury Road. These measures will secure the preservation and maintenance of the new and reconfigured Local Open Space.
 9. Tigar Hall. The scheme retains this building, which has some historical association with the site.
 10. Affordable Housing. In response to the desire of the Council and Local Community the scale and form of the development has been significantly reduced (154 units to 82). Despite this and the findings of the submitted Viability Statement the scheme still makes an affordable housing contribution. As the Viability Statement confirms the proportion of affordable is the same as the consented 154 units in terms of % return. Accordingly against a background of a vulnerable scheme in financial terms the extent of affordable housing proposed represents a very special circumstance similar to the consented scheme.
 11. The scheme as a whole enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The Officers have concluded that the existing street frontage has a neutral or negative effect on the Spring Grove Conservation Area. The application scheme will replace this with a new frontage local open space, an enhanced setting and renewed prominence to Campion House and a set of buildings that acknowledge the historic form of locally listed buildings opposite.
- 6.36. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be a small loss of the existing level of designated Local Open Space on the site (15.7%) this is less important in this context given the very limited value of the open space to the area and community. It is considered that this loss will be mitigated and outweighed by the significant enhancements and improvements to the quality and function of

the Local Open Space arising from the new and reconfigured spaces.

- 6.37. The above points collectively represent very special circumstances that, consistent with the application of UDP Policy, justifies the level of encroachment. This is also consistent with advice in PPG17, paragraph 16, where the benefits being offered to the community are weighed against the loss of open space that will occur and the conclusion of the last Inspector (paragraphs 21-26).

Housing Mix

- 6.38. The application provides the following mix:

4 no. 1 bed units (4.89%)
14 no. 2 bed units (17.07%)
4 no. 3 bed units (4.87%)
60 no. 4 bed units (73.17%)
Total = 82 no. units

- 6.39. The scheme has been prepared against the background of Councillor and Local Community Concerns regarding dwelling mix.

- 6.40. The scheme now has a larger proportion of houses, which very much respects the local community's aspirations for the site and their perception of the character of the immediate surrounding area, in particular the Spring Grove Conservation Area. In this regard the scheme is very much consistent with advice in PPS3, paragraph 14 which notes:

“Local planning authorities should develop a shared vision with their local communities of the type(s) of residential environments they wish to see and develop design policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the local

area, aimed at:

- **Creating places, streets and spaces which meets the needs of people, are visually attractive, safe, accessible, functional, inclusive, have their own distinctive identity and maintain and improve local character.**
- **Promote designs and layouts which make efficient and effective use of land, including encouraging innovative approaches to help deliver high quality outcomes.”**

6.41. Pre-application discussions with Officers and the local community confirm that the proposed housing mix is consistent with the shared vision of the local community.

6.42 Pre-application correspondence dated 01/10/09 confirmed that the increased provision of larger family dwellings was welcomed. It is noted that 95% of the units proposed are dwellings that are family sized of which 78% are 3-5 bedrooms whereas 90% of the appeal scheme were family sized but in the form of 2 bedroom units.

6.43. The proposed mix of dwellings and the form of the family accommodation proposed is seen as a significant benefit of the scheme and a positive response to the aspirations of members and local residents.

6.44. The surrounding area is characterised by a large proportion of houses. The inclusion of a small proportion of flats is also compatible with the surrounding area, which includes converted large houses into apartments, as well as new-build flatted schemes. This form and pattern of development is also consistent with the proposed conversion of Campion House to apartments, in addition to the purpose built Block A for flats.

6.45. The proposed dwellings also meet the UDP SPG 1997 Guidelines and minimal floor areas. Accordingly the proposed mix responds positively to the Council's aspirations for the form and type of housing preferred on the site and its compatibility with the character of the surrounding area.

Density

6.46. The application scheme results in a density of 41.6 dwellings per hectare and 228.4 habitable rooms per hectare.

6.47. These densities are derived from a development area comprising the proposed residential development area itself, plus 1.25 hectares of the local open space, consistent with the Council's considerations of the net developable area for the previous application.

6.48. Table 3A.2 of the London Plan sets out the density matrix. Applying the Matrix the application site has been judged to fall within Accessible Index 2 and suburban/urban setting.

6.49. With reference to the Matrix, the application scheme is within the acceptable upper ranges of both suburban and urban locations with a PTAL between 2 and 3.

6.50. Notwithstanding this the Guidance on the application of the Density Matrix to individual sites is set out in the Mayor's Housing SPG. This confirms that the Density Matrix provides "broad guidelines". The Matrix is included as a guide, rather than an absolute rule (paragraph 6.4). Finally the Density Matrix should not be seen as prescriptive and should be applied flexibly in light of local

circumstances (paragraph 6.7). The proposed density is considered to be acceptable and consistent with the policy objectives of the London Plan. The scheme makes more efficient use of the site by comparison to densities prevailing in the immediate area. Moreover it is the consequences of density that is material, not the density figure itself. The proposed scheme in terms of layout and design does not lead to any undesirable consequences. This confirms that the proposal is not too intense whilst strikes an appropriate balance in making efficient yet sensitive use of this site in a form that is compatible with the surrounding area.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

- 6.51. The Design and Access Statement confirms that the proposed scheme in layout and elevational form is compatible with the character and appearance of the area, including the Spring Grove Conservation Area.
- 6.52. The proposed frontage to Thornbury Road in terms of size and siting of dwellings, creation of Thornbury Green and the spatial relationship with Campion House are similar to the successful 154 unit appeal scheme.
- 6.53. The last appeal Inspector concluded that the proposed development set behind a landscaped local open space frontage would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Thornbury Road street scene and the Spring Grove Conservation Area as a whole (paragraph 46). Similar conclusions also apply to the current application given the similarity in the layout of buildings and open spaces along the Thornbury Road frontage. The layout at the rear comprising new streets with a strong frontage theme will complement the street pattern of the surrounding area. This is further detailed in the Design and Access Statement.

6.54. The conversion of Campion House and the new landscape space around it, including the successful retentions of the Cedar trees is similar to the consented 154 unit scheme. The last Inspector concluded that the previous scheme would not harm but would enhance the setting of Campion House and would be consistent with the objectives of relevant policies of the Development Plan, particularly as expressed by UDP Policies ENV-B.2.6 and ENV-B.2.7.

Residential Amenities

6.55. The proposed development has been carefully designed to respect neighbouring residential properties.

6.56. The relationship between Block A and No. 114 Thornbury Road is a conventional flank to flank relationship that has been approved with the earlier scheme.

6.57. The housing fronting Thornbury Road are set back behind Thornbury Green and will not impact on the amenities of existing properties opposite by reason of overlooking. The scale of the dwellings will similarly not result in over-dominant relationships either.

6.58. The conversion of Tigar Hall will not give rise to un-neighbourly relationships given the scale of Tigar Hall itself and the acute relationship between this existing building and numbers 35 to 40 Kilberry Close.

6.59. Plots 5-7 either back onto a car parking court or the flank elevations Nos. 11 to 22 Kilberry Close. This arrangement ensures that the amenities and outlook of these neighbouring properties will not be prejudiced by the proposed application.

6.60. Plots 8-9 and 10-11 have been sensitively sited either side of the front elevation of Nos. 23 to 34 Kilberry Close thereby preserving the amenities of these existing residents.

On-Site Amenities

6.61. The proposed layout is based upon a frontage scheme with dwellings either having conventional front to front relationships across a new street, or front to flank relationships on corners. The separation distances of 11½ - 12 metres are acceptable.

6.62. The back-to-back relationships within the scheme are conventional 22 metres, again preserving the respective amenities of the new residential properties.

6.63. Similarly to the consented scheme and the last Inspector's conclusion at paragraph 53, the proximity of the all-weather pitch of the Indian Gymkhana Club would not unacceptably impinge on the living conditions of future residents, given the substantial boundary hedge and the existing controls over the operation of floodlights.

6.64. The proposed houses along the Thornbury Road frontage will be set back from Thornbury Green by front gardens and a path ensuring that there would be no substantive harm to the living conditions of future residents by the Public's use of Thornbury Green.

Private Amenity Space

6.65. All of the proposed houses will have access to an area of private gardens. This is an improvement upon the consented scheme where some of the family houses had no delineated private amenity space.

- 6.66. The previous Inspector raised some concerns with this arrangement, but felt that the quality and extent of the communal open space was sufficient. The application scheme resolves this point whilst still providing access to a high quality area of local open space.
- 6.67. In this regard the scheme represents a high quality design that will create an attractive new high quality residential environment for future residents without impacting upon existing neighbouring properties.

Affordable Housing

- 6.68. Policy 3A.9 sets a strategic affordable housing target (50%) and within that a London wide objective of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision. Policy 3A.10, Negotiating Affordable Housing, in individual and private resident and mixed use schemes requires Boroughs to seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing having regard to affordable targets, the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. The targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs.
- 6.69. In response to the desire of the Council and Local Community the scale and form of the development has been significantly reduced (154 units to 82). Despite this and the findings of the Viability Statement the scheme still makes an affordable housing contribution. The Viability Statement confirms that the proportion of affordable is consistent with London Plan Policy 3A.9 having regard to individual site costs and the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development.

6.70. In these terms the affordable element is consistent with London Plan Policy 3A.9.

Section 106 Agreement

6.71. A Section 106 agreement will include obligations to provide:

- 1.76 ha of open space of which 1.64ha would be publicly accessible local open space including a local play area(s),together with 0.11ha of communal amenity space.
- A restriction on future development on the whole of the 1.76 ha.
- Rights of public access in perpetuity to the 1.64ha area.
- The 1.76ha area to be classed as a local open space under Hounslow UDP policy ENV N.1.11 and subsequent LDF Policy when it is prepared.
- Lay out, landscape and maintenance of the 1.64ha of publicly accessible local open space and 0.11 ha of communal amenity space.
- Provision of Affordable Housing.
- Health care contribution (at the same rate per dwelling as agreed for the consented appeal scheme).
- Education contribution (100% discount to affordable housing consistent with guidance in SPD that such discounts apply where accommodation houses children already resident and educated in the Borough).
- Transport contribution (Flared approach to the Thornbury Road/A4 great West Road Junction and to secure implementation of the revised travel plan).
- A “cascade clause” to provide an additional financial contribution to off-site provision of Affordable Housing if house price sales levels rise above an agreed base level.
- Public realm (possibly for air quality monitoring and improvements to nearby playing fields as agreed as part of the previous appeal scheme).

Benefits of Scheme

6.72. The appeal scheme secures a number of significant benefits:

- Provides for a mixed inclusive scheme that responds positively to the community's housing and open space needs.
- Maximising the potential of the site consistent with the Development Plan policy and objectives.
- Creates a high quality form of development that enhances the character and appearance of the site and the Spring Grove Conservation Area.
- Creates a form of development that responds to the Council's and Local Community's aspirations.
- Creates a residential environment without harm to neighbouring residential properties in terms of amenities by reason of scale, design and privacy.
- Improves access to Public Local Open Space.
- The new and reconfigured Local Open Space creates a better quality, more visible, accessible and usable space to the benefit of all.
- The large majority of the new and reconfigured local open space is publicly accessible space. The extent of publicly accessible local open space has been increased by 0.26ha. This is a significant benefit in an area of publicly accessible open space deficiency.
- The extent of local open space encroachment is less than the accepted 18% envisaged with the consented appeal scheme (15.7%).
- Reuse and enhancement of Campion House, a building of local townscape importance.
- Tigar Hall is retained within the scheme.
- A S106 obligation to secure, layout, preserve and maintain new Publicly Accessible Open Space and communal (private) open space.
- Provision of affordable housing in a range of sizes and tenures that meet identified needs.

6.73. These represent substantial benefits consistent with relevant Development Plan policies and their objectives which reinforce the quality of the application scheme and justify the grant of planning permission.