

Make Sure Your Views Count

*The Public Inquiry into the **Linden Homes** application to develop the Campion House site will start on **Tuesday 28th July**. Four days have been booked for the Inquiry but its location is yet to be announced.*

The Inquiry is organised by the **Government Planning Inspectorate**. It will consider the appeal of **Linden Homes** against the Council's refusal of its third application to develop the Campion site.

Public Interest is Key

Residential activity over this development has so far been successful in preventing inappropriate designs from being accepted. The reason is simple. The residential response at each stage has been exceptional for both its quality and its quantity.

Residents have written again and again to explain in their own words what they thought was wrong with the developer's proposals. They have gone along to exhibitions organised by the developer, by the Council and by Campion Concerns. They have attended meetings of both the **Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee (Planning)** and the **Sustainable Development Committee** (the Council's planning committee where its final decisions are made).

Public Inquiry '07

At the Public Inquiry of June '07 into the Council's refusal of Linden Homes' second application the Inspector opened the Inquiry by saying "This development has produced a very high level of public interest". That fact gave weight the representations of Campion Concerns. It was clear to the Inspector that our views were based on real knowledge of the area and of residents' views.

In his final judgement the Inspector for the '07 Inquiry agreed with all the main points we and the Council had made.

There IS Something You Can Do

The three years of campaigning over development plans for the Campion site have shown that *residential activity can*

have an impact. If residents had not demonstrated their concerns as clearly as they did we would probably now be facing a monstrous monolithic block along Thornbury Road along with the attendant human problems that poor architectural design leads to.

Conservation Area Standards

People need to live in decent conditions. We have never campaigned to stop development on the site. The purpose of our activity has been to get a development which is based on planning guidelines and which fits in with the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

We want the eventual residents to live in homes which fit in with the attractive, open and green character of the area. There are no arguments which would justify providing homes which detract from the character of the area.

Two Things You Can Do

1. Make sure that the inspector knows your views. If you wrote to the Planning Department about the third application your letter will be passed to the Inspector. If you didn't write, or have further points to add then please take the time to send a letter.

2. Attend the Inquiry even if only for a day or half day. It's difficult for people at work but please try.



This aerial view shows how much open space there is on the site. Calculations attempting to show that the development will not encroach on total open space are not credible.

Why We Support The Council's Refusal

Letters to the Inspectorate must be received by 18th June ... Letters to the Ins...

The Council refused the application on three grounds:

- 1. Encroachment on open space.** At various stages the developer had argued that (i) encroachment was justified by the provision of public access to open space and (ii) there would be no encroachment. The Council did not accept either of these arguments
- 2. The housing mix is wrong.** A development consisting mainly of one- and two-bedroom flats neither matches known demand for homes nor the character of the area.
- 3. The size and appearance of the development would have an adverse impact on the area.** The development includes blocks that are significantly larger than anything in the conservation area. There are also concerns about the views from *within* the development and from adjacent streets.

Campion Concerns' View

We think that each of the Council's objections is sufficient grounds for refusal. This is clearly the case for objections (1) and (2) above since the development proposals are in conflict with the clearest possible statements of policy at every level.

Objection (3) is also valid in our view but relies more on matters of design judgement and may be harder to make a conclusive case.

Open Space

Having realised that we had a strong argument on open space the developer switched from trying to justify open space encroachment to claiming that there was no such encroachment.

Our argument on space is very strong because the relevant national guidelines (PPG17) say that if a developer intends to change the use of open space then they "...will need to consult the local community and demonstrate that their proposals are widely supported by them." (PPG17, para 10)

The developer employed a PR agency to ask residents' views on open space. This exercise quickly came to a halt when support for the developer's plans could not be demonstrated. We wrote to the agency involved asking about their questions and method of analysis. This went unacknowledged.

Objective No.1 of the London Plan is the protection of open space from development encroachment.

Housing Mix

The London Mayor is concerned about the over-provision of one- and two- bedroom flats. These would be 71% of the proposed development. This fails to meet the known demand for larger units and is out of character with the area (mainly two- and three-storey family homes).

The Design

The third application design is a big improvement on those of the first and second applications. We think that the architects made a real effort to understand the area and to listen to residents' opinions.

We believe that the architects had to achieve targets set by the developer and this prevented them from being able to produce a final design that both conformed with planning guidelines and was in tune with the area. The signs are that the developer required a housing density that prevented this.

Over To You

After three years of Campion activity you may feel "campaign fatigue". So do we!

An acceptable proposal is within sight so don't give up.

Letters to **Temple Quay House**
The Planning **2 The Square**
Inspectorate: **Temple Quay**
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Letters should contain the reference numbers below and the site address (Campion House, Thornbury Road, Isleworth TW7 4NN). They should state whether you wish to support or oppose the Linden Homes appeal against the Council's refusal. **They should reach the Inspector by 18th June.**

You can send views on line by following the link below. Enter one of the numbers and then click on the link provided. Look for the **Document** section with the phrase "Click **here** to view the documents for this case, and to access facilities to Comment." This leads to a link for entering comments.

You should say in your letter if you agree with Council's reason for refusal but you can also add points of your own.

Please attend the Inquiry if you can. It would help if you would let us know if you intend to attend all or part of it.

Keeping Track of The Appeal

The Planning Inspectorate's case IDs for the appeal are **2099169** and **2098830**

No documentation is available on the appeal at the time of writing. To track the application go to:

www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcspotal/casesearch.asp