



Appeal Decisions

Inquiry opened on 19 June 2007

Site visit made on 26 June 2007

by **C J Ball** RIBA IHBC FRSA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date: 18 July 2007

Campion House, Thornbury Road, Osterley TW7 4NN

Appeal A: APP/F5540/A/07/2040494

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Try Homes Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application, Ref 01119/M/P3, is dated 4 December 2006.
- The development proposed is the retention of Campion House and existing gate lodge to the south of the site, the demolition of an existing annex and outbuildings, and the redevelopment of the site including the conversion of Campion House and the erection of 2 new buildings ranging from 3-5 storeys (1 block at 3 storeys and 1 block with a lower ground level and 3-5 storeys above) to create 239 units (38 1-bedroom flats, 163 2-bedroom flats 17 3-bedroom flats and 21 4-bedroom terraced houses) with associated parking, access and landscaping to the site.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Appeal B: APP/F5540/E/07/2040493

- The appeal is made under sections 20 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for conservation area consent.
- The appeal is made by Try Homes Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application, Ref 0119/M/CA2, is dated 4 December 2006.
- The works proposed are the demolition of existing extensions to Campion House and associated outbuildings including the chapel, refectory, dormitories and classrooms.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed and conservation area consent is refused.

Preliminary matters

1. The inquiry sat for 5 days on 19-22 and 26 June 2007. I made a preliminary unaccompanied visit to the area on 18 June and an accompanied site visit on 26 June.
 2. I note that, on the 28 March 2007, the Council resolved that, had it been in a position to do so, it would have refused the planning application for 3 reasons:
 - (i) the proposed development, by reason of its position, size, design and appearance and landscaping, would have an undue adverse impact on the street scene and on the setting of Campion House. It would therefore be contrary to the relevant development plan policies;
-

- (ii) the proposed development, by reason of its position, size, design and appearance and landscaping, would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area, contrary to the relevant development plan policies;
- (iii) Given the proposed level of encroachment upon the Local Open Space in an area of Publicly Accessible Open Space Deficiency, the proposed development would be contrary to the relevant development plan policies.
3. The application for conservation area consent would have been refused because, in the absence of an acceptable development of the site, the proposed works of demolition would be contrary to the relevant development plan policies.
4. At the inquiry the appellant submitted revised plans showing amendments to the submitted scheme, intended to address criticism of the design. The amended plans show relatively minor modifications, primarily to the detailed elevational designs. In my view they do not materially alter the overall nature of the applications and I concluded that consideration of the amended scheme at the inquiry would be unlikely to be prejudicial to the interests of the other parties.

Agreed matters

5. At the inquiry, the main parties submitted a statement of common ground. This gives a short description of the appeal site and its surroundings; details the recent planning history of the site, including a description of the late design amendments; lists relevant national planning policy guidance and development plan policies; and sets out matters forming part of the development which are either agreed, controlled by condition or not at issue, including the principle of residential development on the site, noise, air quality, flood risk, wind, contamination, residential density, nature conservation, daylight and sunlight, privacy, refuse and recycling storage, Lifetime Homes standards, mix of unit sizes, affordable housing provision, community infrastructure, highway impact and parking provision, sustainable building principles, and the level of private and communal amenity space provided. The appeal drawings are listed.

Planning obligation

6. At the inquiry, the appellant submitted a final draft of a unilateral undertaking as a deed of planning obligation under s106 of the Act. A final signed copy was received within 5 working days of the close of the inquiry as agreed. The undertaking effectively binds the appellant company as owner of the site and its successors in title, should the appeal succeed, in summary:
- (i) to providing all 96 affordable housing units on the site before 50% of the open market development is occupied;
 - (ii) to providing and maintaining the area of publicly available open space on the site, including a multi-use games area and a neighbourhood equipped play area, open and available to the public from sunrise to sunset throughout the year;
 - (iii) to paying contributions on commencement of the development of £250,000 towards the improvement of local health facilities, £75,000 towards local public transport improvements, £135,000 towards community infrastructure improvements and £905,000 for the provision of 50 local secondary school places and 65 primary school places in order to mitigate the impact of the development in these areas;
 - (iv) to carrying out highway improvement work in the vicinity of the site in order to mitigate the impact of increased traffic on local highways;

- (v) to implementing, complying with and monitoring a Green Travel Plan to encourage means of travel other than the car;
 - (vi) to implementing a Considerate Contractor scheme during construction to minimise disruption to local residents;
 - (vii) to taking part in the English Partnerships First Time Buyers Initiative.
7. Although the Council has some concerns about the monitoring arrangements for the Green Travel Plan, it acknowledges that the undertaking would overcome a number of objections and would meet a range of local policy objectives. The undertaking is an important material consideration in these appeals.

Main issues

8. In view of the foregoing I consider there to be 2 main issues in these appeals:
- (i) the effect the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the area, bearing in mind the location of the site within the Spring Grove Conservation Area;
 - (ii) The impact of the proposal on the provision of local open space.

Planning policy

9. The local development plan includes the Spatial Development Strategy for London 2004 (the London Plan) and the London Borough of Hounslow UDP 2003. The London Plan policies of particular relevance include 4B.1 (Design principles for a compact city); 4B.3 (Maximising the potential of sites); 4B.11 (Heritage conservation); 3D.7 (Realising the value of open space); and 3D.10 (Open space provision in UDPs). Similarly relevant UDP policies include IMP.5.1 (High quality building and urban design); ENV-B.1.1 (New development); ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation areas); ENV-B.2.6 (Identification and protection of buildings of local townscape character); H.4.2(Residential density); ENV-N.1.10 (provision of new local open space); and ENV-N.1.11 (protection and improvement of local open space).
10. Relevant national guidance is set out in PPS1 *'Delivering Sustainable Development'*, PPS3 *'Housing'*, PPG15 *'Planning and the Historic Environment'*, and PPG17 *'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation'*. Other material considerations include the UDP supplementary planning guidance on design and residential standards. I shall also take account of the DETR/CABE publication *'By Design - Urban design in the planning system: towards better practice'*.
11. In considering the appeals, I am required by s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

12. Champion House is the name given collectively to the group of buildings forming a residential seminary. It was closed in 2004 and is currently unused. Centred on a substantial mid-Victorian mansion, formerly called Thornbury House, the original grounds were developed during the 20th century to provide a chapel, additional classrooms and residential accommodation. While Thornbury House is a rather grand, large-scale building, the newer structures linked to it are of a more domestic scale, ranging between 1 and 3 storeys in height. The buildings line the eastern boundary of the site on Thornbury Road, with other ranges extending west into the centre of the site. The western part of the site is open garden and recreation grounds, including part of the original formal garden to Thornbury House. Redevelopment with flats and

terraced houses would take place on the more southern part of the site. The modern links to Thornbury House would be removed. The grounds to the west would be redesigned to include play and recreation areas and would be open to the public.

The effect on the character and appearance of the area

13. The site, including the grounds, lies within the Spring Grove Conservation Area, which was designated in 2002. The conservation area's special interest stems from an ambitious mid-19th century project to develop almost 300 acres of land around Spring Grove House with villas and houses in large plots on tree-lined avenues, an estate planned to be a grand Victorian suburb. Although it was never completed, the original estate plan still survives, albeit in an evolved form. The original street network is readily identifiable and many of the large houses, including Thornbury House, remain. These prominent original houses contribute much to the character of the area. Two magnificent cedar trees frame Thornbury House's street frontage and are part of the mature avenue landscape. More modest development, from the turn of the 20th century to recent times, has subsequently infilled the remaining land. This has generally been carefully considered, and the resulting pattern of development respects the original estate layout.
14. The site's immediate surroundings consist of an area of primarily 2-storey semi-detached dwellings, with some more modern 3-storey development to the south. Of particular interest is the row of Edwardian and 'Arts and Crafts' houses immediately opposite the site. Their scale, materials and roofscape contribute significantly to the special interest of the area, and these houses make a major contribution to the character of the conservation area. Overall, Spring Grove has a cohesive, distinctive, and well established character and appearance.
15. Thornbury House itself– renamed Campion House – has been identified under UDP Policy ENV-B.2.6 as a building of local townscape character worthy of protection, effectively a 'locally listed' building in the terms of paragraph 6.16 of PPG15. Some of the attractive group of Edwardian and 'Arts and Crafts' houses opposite the site are similarly protected. The remainder of the seminary buildings, including an extension to Thornbury House, are of limited architectural value. While the chapel is of some interest, the parties agree that these buildings generally make no positive contribution to the character of the conservation area, indeed the hostel accommodation is of poor design quality and, if anything, makes a negative contribution. As envisaged by paragraph 4.7 of PPG15, there is an opportunity to replace them by an imaginative, high quality development designed to enhance the area.
16. The parties generally agree that, in order to maximise the potential of the available development land, replication of the predominant estate form of development would not be particularly appropriate. London Plan Policy 4B.3, reflected by UDP Policy H.4.2, requires development proposals to achieve the highest possible intensity of use compatible with local context, the design principles set out in Policy 4B.1 and public transport capacity. Appropriate residential density ranges are set out in the accompanying Table 4B.1 '*Density, location and parking matrix*'. While Thornbury Road is on a bus route, the site is some considerable distance from local stations and rather more than 10 minutes walk from the town centre, so its index for public transport accessibility (PTAL) is low at 2. The appellant argues that the site is in a transitional, more urban location but in my view the local context falls squarely within the Table's description of a suburban location - *lower density development, predominantly residential, of 2–3 storeys*. In such a location, the density indicated for a scheme of terraced houses and flats is 200-250 habitable rooms/hectare (hr/ha) or 50-80 units/hectare (u/ha).
17. Density calculations should be based on net residential area which, bearing in mind the description given in Annex B of PPS3, should only include incidental open space and

landscaping which is necessary to meet the needs of the occupants. In this case, although there would be some shared use of the publicly accessible open space and play features, I share the Council's view that, for the purposes of density calculation, the developable site area should not include at least 1 hectare - about half - of the public open space on the western part of the site. Nor should it include half the width of Thornbury Road, to accord with the London Plan method of calculation. I consider that the developable site area should therefore be at most 2.26 hectares. Since there would be 239 units containing 759 bed spaces, the density proposed would be about 336 hr/ha or 106 u/ha. These figures substantially exceed the upper levels of the matrix guidance. The matrix is a guide rather than an absolute rule but, since there is no evidence to show that there are particular local circumstances which would justify a higher density in this location, I consider this to be an indication of an over-intensive use of the site.

18. The existing seminary buildings are laid out in what is effectively a 2 or 3 sided, loosely planned arrangement of courtyards lining Thornbury Road but open to the grounds to the west. The existing street elevation to the south of Thornbury House consists of 2 distinctive main elements, the chapel and the 3-storey residential block. They are about 20 metres or so apart, linked by a first floor bridge over single storey classrooms on either side of the main access route into the site. As a result, the street elevation is broken up into several separate key elements, separated by openings or smaller scale links which gives the street elevation a more or less domestic scale.
19. 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.
20. I agree that some form of courtyard development would be appropriate on the southern part of the site, both as a means of achieving an appropriate density and as an interesting way of reflecting the historic use and development of the site. However, the scheme proposed is based on a much more formal enclosed double courtyard arrangement, deliberately taking its cue from the quadrangles of Oxbridge colleges. There is no real explanation as to why this is an appropriate or desirable design approach in this location other than that the 'collegiate' form would perpetuate the character of the former use. In my view, the new building would do nothing of the sort. This form of development would reflect little of the informal, ad-hoc arrangement of the seminary buildings. It would introduce what would be, to all intents and purposes, a very large single building, on a scale and formal character that has no local counterpart, into this varied suburban area. The new building would not adequately respect or relate to the local sense of place and identity. I believe that, as an architectural strategy, this approach is misplaced.
21. The design envisages a building that ranges from 3 to 6 storeys in height. Most of it would sit over a basement car park, which would effectively reduce the impact of car parking on the site. The basement level car park would be edged with flats to the west and the lower bedroom floor of 2-storey units on Thornbury Road to the east. Here, a series of access bridges would span the excavated basement 'moat', which would run almost the full length of the Thornbury Road frontage. While Thornbury House has a semi-basement, this excavated 'moat' would be a far more noticeable and incongruous feature of the street scene.
22. The basement excavation would come close to the southernmost cedar tree near Thornbury House. While the appellant's arboriculturalist provides some reassurance

about the effect on the root spread of the tree, I am concerned that the fairly deep excavation may lead to the lowering of the water table around the tree, with consequent damaging effects. The loss of this tree would have a major harmful impact on the character of the conservation area.

23. The new building would contain 2 courtyards. The northern courtyard would be entirely enclosed as private gardens. Although there would be a narrow 5 metres wide opening from Thornbury Road into the southern courtyard, it would be so deep – some 16 metres – that from almost every viewpoint the perception would be of a continuous frontage to Thornbury Road, some 100 metres long. In my view, the full height narrow courtyard entrance slot would do nothing to reduce the apparent length of frontage. In design terms, the Thornbury Road elevation takes its cue from the height of the chapel - the highest building to be demolished and much the same height as Thornbury House - then replicates this for the whole length of the street frontage. The whole 100 metre frontage would be otherwise unchanged by variation in height or scale. At 4 to 5 storeys high above basement level, this would be unlike anything in the surrounding area. I consider that the building would not relate well to the scale, height, nature, massing and character of its surroundings.
24. The appellant argues that the eaves level would be perceived as the height of the building. That may be true from the western side of Thornbury Road, although the basement storey in full view would give the impression of a 4 storey building to the eaves. From the eastern side of Thornbury Road, and on the approaches to the site, the long metal-sheeted roof accommodating the fifth and occasional sixth storey would be very apparent. The industrial scale roofs would have a limited visual interest and their form and materials would be particularly incongruous. From the western side of the site, within the public open space, the building would be perceived as a massive continuous wall, 4 to 5 storeys high, with an almost continuous plane of metal roof punctuated only by 2 6-storey projections of some substance. Such a massive building would have a particularly overbearing impact on visitors to the recreation ground.
25. The appellant has attempted to mitigate the impact of such a large building by adding projecting bays, varying the materials, using dormers and ‘crumbling’ the corners. While these measures would succeed to some extent in breaking up the elevations, they would do little to diminish the mass and bulk of the building in relationship to the surrounding buildings or reduce its impact on the street scene.
26. The appellant refers to Thornbury House as the ‘jewel in the crown’. I consider that, to reflect this, it would be more appropriate for Thornbury House to stand out from the surrounding development, in the way other surviving mansions do, rather than be subsumed by new development of an unrelenting similarity of height. The existing street frontage is acknowledged to have a neutral or negative effect on the conservation area. In my view, this more continuously built-up frontage would have a far greater adverse effect, since it would entirely alter the nature of Thornbury Road. As a consequence of excessive density, the scale, height and massing of the new building would have a much more harmful effect on the suburban character of the conservation area. It would not be compatible with its local context and I consider that neither the character nor the appearance of the conservation area would be preserved.
27. I therefore find that, in conflict with national policy guidance and key development plan policies, the proposed development would not be well-integrated with the scale, density and layout of the neighbouring buildings. Its courtyard form, massive bulk and long street elevation would have little respect for the well established character and appearance of the conservation area, and the design would fail to take the opportunity available for improving the character and quality of the area. I consider that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

The impact on the provision of local open space

28. All of the seminary grounds and gardens to the west of the existing buildings are designated as Local Open Space, and the site falls within an Area of Publicly Accessible Open Space Deficiency. UDP policies broadly reflect the London Plan objectives of promoting growth without encroachment on open spaces and the rigorous protection of existing open space, indeed requiring an increase in the provision of local open space in areas of deficiency. Development on local open spaces is prohibited unless there are very special circumstances to indicate otherwise.
29. The footprint of the proposed building would encroach substantially into the area designated as local open space, perhaps by about 20-25% of its area. The remaining land would be laid out with paths and gardens, and part of the original garden of Thornbury House would be restored. The layout would include a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play and an all-weather multi-use games area, screened by existing trees. The grounds and these facilities would be open to the public, thereby increasing the area of publicly accessible open space in the area.
30. This very real benefit has to be balanced against the extent of encroachment and loss of open space. The appellant argues that encroachment totals no more than 10% and that this limited amount is acceptable, given the benefits of the scheme. However this calculation, as a form of compensation, depends on the inclusion of the landscaped frontage area on Thornbury Road and the southern internal courtyard as part of the area of publicly accessible open space. The landscaped frontage strip is not currently part of the area designated as local open space. This area would provide a degree of privacy for the basement bedrooms, and paths within it would lead to the building's entrances. It is not an area which would naturally lend itself to use by the public, and I do not consider it reasonable to include this strip as part of the area of public open space.
31. The southern courtyard would be almost wholly enclosed, apart from the gated, narrow 'slot' entrance off Thornbury Road and the access under the building to the grounds beyond. There would be little public perception of openness from outside the building and the courtyard would not provide an open outlook or visual break in the built-up area. I do not consider that an enclosed courtyard, entirely within the overall footprint of the building, can realistically be described as local open space. The courtyard is overlooked by dwellings, with front doors and access to private terrace areas on all sides and a main access from the basement car park in the centre. It would have the appearance of a private enclosed courtyard, discouraging public use and unattractive to passers-by. The courtyard would be publicly accessible but, while it might occasionally be used as a route to the grounds beyond, I consider it unlikely that the public would make any real use of the courtyard as public open space.
32. In my view, the extent of the actual encroachment of the building onto the local open space is much greater than claimed and the provision of suitable publicly accessible open space much less. While opening the grounds to the public is an undoubted benefit of the scheme, there would be a substantial loss of open space within the site. On balance, I consider the benefits of public access insufficient to provide the very special circumstances necessary to outweigh the development plan policy objectives intended to prevent such a substantial loss of local open space.
33. There was originally a football pitch in the grounds. There is evidence to show that, at one time, it was used informally by local schools and others, as well as seminarians, but it has clearly not been used for some time. I am not convinced that it can be considered a playing field as such, worthy of retention. I note that the Council's Regeneration and Development Manager indicates that there is a surplus of sports pitches in the borough; the real need is for improvement in the quality of the associated facilities. The appellant would make a substantial contribution to the

improvement of community infrastructure, which could be used to provide higher quality sports facilities in an appropriate location. With this in mind, I do not consider that the consequent loss of the pitch is a major disadvantage of the scheme. Nonetheless, overall I consider that the proposal would have a negative impact on the provision of local open space.

Other matters

34. There is an interesting statue on the Thornbury Road frontage of the seminary by the noted American artist Andrew O'Connor (1874-1941). Dated 1937, it is known as *Ghosts or Descent from the Cross*, and it is listed grade II for its special interest as a late instance of fine figurative religious art. Demolition of the seminary and replacement by other buildings would clearly affect its original setting. However, while the statue is clearly part of the history of development of the seminary, there seems to me no specific architectural or historic value in its exact positioning. Although practically speaking it could stay where it is, as the list description points out, its condition is deteriorating through exposure to the weather. Providing it remains accessible to public view, there seems to me to be every advantage in relocating the statue to a more sheltered location on the site. This would ensure the preservation of the statue in association with the seminary site.

Conclusions

35. The proposed development would undoubtedly bring some benefits to the area. It would make use of an area of redundant, previously-developed land; it would provide a new area of public open space in an area of deficiency; it would repair and restore locally listed Thornbury House to beneficial use; and not least it would bring new housing, including a substantial number of affordable units in a range of sizes and tenures.
36. However, I consider that the design attempts to cram far too much development onto the site, which is in a sensitive location. This attempt to achieve a large number of dwellings at an inappropriately high density has led to a scheme design which is overlarge, monolithic, out of scale and far too intensive in use. I consider that the design has not been positively influenced by, or is at all compatible with, its local context. It would not knit in with its surroundings. It would harm the conservation area and lead to a significant loss of local open space. It would not contribute positively to making the area better for people and it would not respect the local character, context or community.
37. I consider on balance that the benefits of the development would be far outweighed by the substantial harm it would cause to the local area. This harm could not be overcome by conditions or by the provisions of the s106 planning obligation. I understand that the Council is meeting its housing targets so there is no overriding need for housing sufficient to outweigh the objections. Overall, I consider that the design is inappropriate in its particular context and that the scheme fails to take the opportunities available for improving or enhancing the character and quality of the area. It is not therefore acceptable.
38. In the absence of an acceptable scheme of redevelopment, I consider it necessary to withhold conservation area consent, in accordance with UDP Policy ENV-B.2.2. Notwithstanding the general view that part of the existing street frontage is of negative value, this is in order to ensure that a very large and ugly gap in the conservation area is not created as a result of demolition far in advance of redevelopment.
39. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Formal Decisions

Appeal A: APP/F5540/A/07/2040494

40. I dismiss the appeal, and refuse to grant planning permission for the retention of Campion House and existing gate lodge to the south of the site, the demolition of an existing annex and outbuildings, and the redevelopment of the site including the conversion of Campion House and the erection of 2 new buildings ranging from 3-5 storeys (1 block at 3 storeys and 1 block with a lower ground level and 3-5 storeys above) to create 239 units (38 1-bedroom flats, 163 2-bedroom flats 17 3-bedroom flats and 21 4-bedroom terraced houses) with associated parking, access and landscaping to the site.

Appeal B: APP/F5540/E/07/2040493

41. I dismiss the appeal, and refuse to grant conservation area consent for the demolition of existing extensions to Campion House and associated outbuildings including the chapel, refectory, dormitories and classrooms.

Colin Ball

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Stephen Morgan of Counsel	Instructed by the Director of Legal Services, London Borough of Hounslow.
He called:	
Maggie Urquhart BSc BArch PGDipLA RIBA	Conservation and Urban Design Officer, London Borough of Hounslow
Burnetta van Stipriaan BSc MSc	Principal Planning Officer, London Borough of Hounslow.

FOR THE APPELLANT:

John Male QC	Instructed by Richard Tilley, Director, CgMs Consulting Ltd.
He called:	
Martin Kelly DipLA DipUD MA FLI FIHT FRSA	Managing Director, Derek Loveday London Ltd, Level 7, 52 Grosvenor Gardens, Belgravia, London.
Jonathan Edis BA(Hons) MA PhD MIFA IHBC	Director and Head of Historic Buildings, CgMs Consulting Ltd, Morley House, 26 Holborn Viaduct, London.
Richard Tilley MA MRTPI MRICS	Director, CgMs Consulting Ltd, Morley House, 26 Holborn Viaduct, London.

FOR THE CAMPION CONCERNS MONITORING GROUP:

David Pavett	101 Thornbury Road, Isleworth.
Gina Richards	101 Thornbury Road, Isleworth.
Hamid Khan	5 Church Road, Isleworth.
Terry Leonard	1 Church Road, Isleworth.

OTHER INTERESTED PERSONS:

Natalie Stephenson 94 Thornbury Road, Isleworth.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- 1 Briefing note regarding transport issues.
- 2 Comments on biodiversity impact.
- 3 Statement of common ground.
- 4 Bundle of core documents 1-8.
- 5 Amended plans 0108: 119B, 120B, 121A, 122A, and 123A.
- 6 Set of reduced drawings, including amended plans.
- 7 Extract: Towards the Mayor's Housing Strategy – Building more homes.
- 8 Extract: Council's Urban Space Study – public open spaces.
- 9 Photographs of model.
- 10 Model certification.
- 11 Copy CCMG letter dated 12 February 2007 to local councillors.
- 12 CCMG response to amended elevations.
- 13 Information on sports pitch usage in Hounslow.
- 14 Extract: BS 5837:2005: planning for trees flow diagram.
- 15 Extract: London Housing: Briefing: need for larger affordable homes.
- 16 Extract: The use of Density in Urban Planning: measuring density for different purposes.
- 17 Aerial photograph of site 2005.

- 18 Draft planning conditions.
- 19 Final draft agreed planning conditions.
- 20 Draft condition re contributions.
- 21 Draft s106 Unilateral Undertaking.
- 22 Final draft s106 Unilateral Undertaking.
- 23 Closing statement of the Campion Concerns Monitoring Group.
- 24 Closing submissions on behalf of the local planning authority.
- 25 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE INQUIRY

- 26 Copy of final signed s106 Unilateral Undertaking.
- 27 Note of Council's 2 residual areas of disagreement.
- 28 Final list of agreed conditions – planning permission and conservation area consent.