

Development on the Champion House site

Site Planning Principles and Guidance from the Appeal Inspector's Report.

[Paragraph references are in square brackets.]

- (1) Although the Davies Plan was never completed it survives in an evolved form. This is seen in the street network and many of the large buildings from that period. Even most modern developments have been generally carefully considered and respect the original estate plan. [13]
- (2) The immediate vicinity of the site is mainly 2-storey semi-detached dwellings (some modern 3-storey development to the south). The Edwardian and 'Arts & Crafts' houses opposite are of particular interest. [14]
- (3) The site comes under the London Plan description of a suburban location (lower density development, predominantly residential, of 2-3 storeys. The indicated density is 50-80 dph or 200-250 hrha. It is agreed that to maximise the site potential the predominant estate form would not be appropriate. The London Plan policy 4B.3 requires the highest possible intensity of use compatible with the context. [16]
- (4) Density calculations should be based on the net residential area and its incidental open space. It should exclude at least one hectare of the locally designated open space. It should also not include half the area of Thornbury Road. This leaves a maximum for calculation purposes of 2.26 ha. [17]
- (5) The existing buildings on the site are broken up into several separate key elements, separated by openings or smaller scale links giving the street elevation a more or less domestic scale. [18]
- (6) A small 3-storey 'villa' block of flats to the north would make an appropriate transition between the scale of Thornbury House and the 2/3 storey houses beyond. It would also open up views of the grounds. [19]
- (7) It is necessary that the scale and character of the building respects that of the surrounding developments and should respect or relate to the local sense of place and identity. [20]
- (8) An excavated moat form for below ground-level flats would be incongruous. [21]
- (9) A basement car park would effectively reduce the impact of car parking. [21]
- (10) The new development must not threaten the cedar trees in any way. [22]
- (11) New buildings must relate well to the scale, height, nature, massing and character of their surroundings. [23]
- (12) The scale of the buildings previously proposed would have had an overbearing impact on visitors to the recreation ground. [24]
- (13) Thornbury House should stand out from the surrounding development rather than be subsumed by a new development of an unrelenting similarity of height. [26]
- (14) The street elevation must respect the well established character and appearance of the conservation area. [26]
- (15) The UDP/London Plan require "rigorous protection of existing open space". Development on local open spaces is prohibited unless there are very special circumstances to indicate otherwise. [28]
- (16) The provision of publicly accessible open space would be a very real benefit of the development. [29, 30, 32]
- (17) An enclosed courtyard, entirely within the footprint of a building, cannot realistically be described as local open space. [31]
- (18) There was originally a football pitch on the grounds which has not been used for some time and may not be worthy of retention. The real need is for improvement in the quality of facilities for the sports pitches in the borough to which the developer should make a substantial contribution. [33]
- (19) There is no reason why the listed statue the Descent From The Cross should remain in its exact current location. [34]
- (20) Provision of new housing, including a substantial amount of affordable housing (a variety of tenures), would be beneficial. [35]
- (21) The previous application attempted to cram too much onto the site. The scheme was over-large, monolithic, out of scale and far too intensive in use. It would not have been compatible with its local context and would have led to a significant loss of open space. [36]