

Campion Concerns Monitoring Group

101 Thornbury Road, TW7 4NL, Tel: 020 8847 0008/020 8568 4494

31st May 2007

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Section 78

**Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas)
Act 1990 – Section 20**

**Town and Country Planning Appeals (Inquiries Procedure)
(England) Rules 2000**

**Proofs of Evidence
of the Campion Concerns Monitoring Group
(Rule 6 Party)**

In respect of

**The Application of Try Homes
To Develop the Campion House Site
Thornbury Road
Osterley TW7 4NN**

Case Reference Numbers:

**APP/F5540/A/07/2040494/NWF (Planning)
APP/F5540/E/07/2040493/NWF (Conservation Area)**

Index

Section	Title	Page
	Introduction – The Campion Concerns Monitoring Group	3
1	The appeal site and its immediate environment	3
2	The Spring Grove Conservation Area	7
3	The proposed buildings	9
4	Open space including public open space	11
5	Traffic/public transport/highways	13
6	Environmental issues	15
7	The application papers	16
8	Final note	17
	Appendix A – The Campion Concerns Monitoring Group	
	Appendix B – Density calculations for local housing	
	Appendix C – Increase in homes in the conservation area.	
	Appendix E – Photographic evidence: Thornbury Road	
	Appendix F – Photographic evidence: Conservation Area	
	Appendix G – Exhibition for second application modifications	
	Appendix H – Comments on walk-time survey	
	Appendix I – Comments on community involvement	
	Appendix J – Open space calculations	
	Appendix L – Photographs showing sports pitch and tennis court	
	Appendix M – Copies of testimonials on use of sports pitch	
	Appendix N – Comments on Try Homes' Conservation Area appraisal	
	Appendix O – Comments on theTree survey	
	Appendix P – Site map showing Locally Designated Open Space	
	Appendix Q – CABE advice for Design and Access statements	

Introduction – The Campion Concerns Monitoring Group

The Campion Concerns Monitoring Group is a voluntary group of residents which was formed in December '05/Jan '06 in response to workshops and an exhibition organised on behalf of Try Homes by Green Issues Communications. The group set itself the aim of monitoring developments regarding the Campion House site with the aim of trying to ensure that any development would be in accordance with planning guidelines and would respect the local built environment and the Spring Grove Conservation Area. The group has good reason for believing that its work is supported by the majority of residents in the area surrounding the Campion site. For more detail on the group and for evidence of support see **Appendix A**.

1. The appeal site and its immediate environment.

- 1.1. **104 Thornbury Road (a.k.a. the “Gate Lodge”)** was a part of the Campion House complex but was sold separately from the rest of the site. Try Homes bought the main site. No 104 was bought by its current occupants. The problem is that (1) there are constant references in the Try Homes paperwork to this property as if it were part of their site, (2) the area of the site quoted for density calculations and other purposes includes that of No. 104.

Evidence

- 1.1.1. We presume that there is no disagreement about ownership of 104. The Planning Authority has confirmed that they understand the situation with respect to ownership.
- 1.1.2. The area of the land belonging to No.104 should be deducted from the area of the site. We estimate this area to be 0.036 hectares. This would reduce the area of the site from 3.26 hectares to 3.22 hectares. (We also note that in the Building Survey Report prepared for the Trustees for Roman Catholic Purposes Ltd prior to the sale of the site, the site was given as 7.75 acres – including 104. 7.75 acres = 3.14 hectares. This agrees with calculations we have made for the site area.)
- 1.2. **The seminary block is unsympathetic to Spring Grove Conservation Area (SGCA).** It is quite unlike any other buildings in Thornbury Road. This in itself would not make it unsuitable but in fact its form and scale detract from the character of the street. Thornbury Road is a long one extending as it does from the London Road to the A4. Most of the houses are two-storey semi-detached but there are also a few large detached houses. The housing immediately opposite the Campion Site consists of detached and semi-detached housing and one small block of flats which has been designed to harmonise with the scale of the existing buildings. This block is set well back from the road and has a roof line which is the same as the adjacent housing. The student block on the Campion site, because of its scale (length and height) presents a negative contrast with this housing.

The inconsistency of the student block with the overall street scene means that replicating the collegiate layout/style of existing buildings was not a useful design objective. Had there been genuinely exploratory design consultation with local residents this problem would soon have been highlighted.

We believe that in considering an appropriate design for the development two factors should have been borne in mind:

- 1.2.1. the low population on the site over a very long period. Not only was that population low (never at any point greater than 150 and for recent decades much lower than that) but also that population consisted of students who were single males living according to a modest lifestyle.
- 1.2.2. The function of the buildings was *institutional* with only a small residential component. That residential component was for housing a relatively small number of single men plus a small staff. This was in contrast to the rest of the buildings in Thornbury Road which is mainly family housing. The application has sought to combine the institutional character of the present buildings in terms of scale, layout and design while transforming the site into one to be used for ordinary residential purposes.

Evidence

- 1.2.3. Annotated photos of street housing and the Campion student block (Appendix E). These show the range of styles and the scale of the buildings opposite the Campion site.
- 1.3. **The seminary block was modified in the mid 70s** to improve the accommodation. This reduce the number of student rooms from about 150 to 80.
- 1.4. **The site includes two sports areas.** One of these is sports pitch on which two goal posts are clearly visible on the aerial view of the site provided in support document on landscaping provided by Try Homes. Many local residents can recall their children playing on the pitch. The pitch was also used by local clubs. Two schools have also provided testimonials to the effect that their

Evidence:

- 1.4.1. Aerial photograph of site in landscape documents shows goalposts on sports pitch. Also in Appendix L.
 - 1.4.2. photograph of tennis/netball site in Appendix L.
 - 1.4.3. copy of testimonials on use of sports pitch: Appendix M.
 - 1.4.4. Statement provided by Sport England to the Hounslow Planning Authority (included in pages 26/27 of the Officers' Report to the SDC, 11th December, concerning the first application). Sport England confirmed that their view remained the same for the current application (see Officers' Report to SDC of 28th March 2007).
- 1.5. **The suburban status of site and its PTAL rating.** The **London Plan** characterises London's suburban areas as having "*lower density development, predominantly residential, of two to three storeys, as in some parts of inner London and much of outer London*". That description fits the area round Campion House.

The density matrix of the **London Plan** (and also the proposed revision of the matrix) distinguish between areas which are within 10 minutes walk-time of a

town-centre and those which are not. The Campion site is not even close to being within 10 minutes walk time from the town centre. Using the standard walk time of 80 m per minute it takes 17.5 minutes to walk from the Campion site to the extreme edge of the town centre. There are few shops at that point. To get to the retail chains that are its focal point requires approximately 22 minutes. This distance from the town centre reinforces the view of that the site is suburban.

Finally, the PTAL rating of 2 has been confirmed by Transport for London.

Evidence

- 1.5.1. The **Draft Planning Position Statement** produced by the planning officers for this site describes the surrounding area as “a predominantly residential area outside of the town centre where the neighbouring and adjoining built development is predominantly two-storey in scale, although the houses on the opposite side of Thornbury Road are set at a higher level than the buildings on the Campion House site and there are pockets of three-storey development sited to the south.”
 - 1.5.2. The Officers' Report to the SDC on the application states that the PTAL for the site is 2 (paragraph 7.159). Planning officer Paul Draper also informed us in writing in February 2006 that TfL had confirmed the PTAL for the site is 2. This rating is also confirmed in the Try Homes Transport Analysis.
 - 1.5.3. On density see 1.6 below
 - 1.5.4. Comments on the Try Homes' Walk Time Survey: Appendix H
- 1.6. **The density of the surrounding built environment.** While we understand that in general it is the consequences of density rather than density itself that can be considered as grounds for refusal there is, nevertheless a reason for guideline densities. A sharp difference in density should alert those concerned with design to possible problems. It is also the case that national and regional guidelines have stressed that the main opportunities for increasing density lie within town centres.

Evidence

- 1.6.1. **Hounslow UDP H.4.2.** “Density standards are a useful tool for house development in order to protect local character and to assist developers in preparing their proposals. However density will be of secondary importance after taking account of the individual requirements of each site and the merits of each scheme. Residential density in new developments should take account of the established density of the surrounding areas”
- 1.6.2. **PPS1 para 16:** “Matters to consider when assessing design quality include the extent to which the proposed development: ... Is well integrated with, and complements, the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access.”
- 1.6.3. **PPS1 para 46:** “Local Planning Authorities should develop housing density policies having regard to: ... The characteristics of the area, including the current and proposed mix of uses. – The desirability of achieving high

quality, well-designed housing having regard to the considerations in paragraph 16”.

The density of the surrounding housing was never, to our knowledge, examined by Try Homes. We have made a detailed study of the density of the catchment area which we gave to the Planning authority at an early stage. The density proposed in this application, however calculated (more on this at point 3.4), is in sharp contrast to that of the surrounding housing.

Evidence

1.6.4. **Appendix B:** Density calculations for Campion catchment area.

1.6.5. **Officers report** to SDC (28th March) on the Try Homes application, paragraphs 7.32 to 7.45

Residential density should be based on land directly associated with the housing. It should therefore exclude areas not directly associated with the housing. Thus, for example, the calculations for the Brunel development excluded wider open space from the net site area used for density calculations.

Evidence

1.6.6. **PPS3 Appendix B** defines net site density as follows “Net dwelling density is calculated by including only those site areas which will be developed for housing and directly associated uses, including access roads within the site, private garden space, car parking areas, incidental open space and landscaping and children’s play areas, where these are provided.”

In the case of the Campion site some or all of the locally designated open space should be set aside for wider uses in accordance with the Draft Planning Position Statement for the development. The density calculations should be made using the total area minus the land to be made available for wider use.

The Officer’s Report on the application presented to the SDC of 28th March gave various methods of calculating density without saying which one was appropriate in this case. We believe that in the light of the above the calculations of paragraphs 7.39 (using a net site area of 2.26 hectares) or paragraph 7.40 (using a net site area of 1.36 hectares) should be considered as applicable.

Evidence

1.6.7. Officers’ Report to the SDC of 28th March paragraphs 7.39 to 7.45.

We conclude that the density for this site is above the indicative range of the London Plan guidelines. Even if, contrary to the advice of PPS3, the whole site area were to be used the density would still be close to double that of the surrounding catchment area. If the houses in the conservation area alone are considered then this ratio is increased further.

2. The Spring Grove Conservation Area

2.1. Conservation Area characterised by low-rise family housing. The Davies plan is still evident in the morphology of the area.

Evidence:

2.1.1. Assessment of Hounslow Planning Authority contained in Draft Planning Position statement (July 05). Description of Spring Grove Conservation Area in Conservation Officer's Designation report for the Spring Grove Conservation Area - adopted April 2002. Draft report on area for Conservation Area reappraisal presented to SDC 21st March 2006.

2.1.2. Officers' description of Conservation area in their report to the SDC on 28th March 2006, paragraphs 6.29, 6.30.

2.1.3. Street layout of Davies plan clear from series of maps in Try Homes Conservation Assessment (November 2006) Figures 3 to 17.

2.1.4. For the Davies Houses still well in evidence in the area see Appendix F.

2.2. The character of Thornbury Road and adjoining streets owes much to the Davies Plan

Evidence:

2.2.1. still a main road for the area and still linked to the other Davies roads (see map in Try Homes Conservation Area Appraisal , Figure 17.

2.2.2. Housing opposite Campion site fits the Davies concept of an area for family housing (Appendix E).

2.3. The design proposed in the application constitutes an over development.

Evidence

2.3.1. **Appendix C:** Summary table of dwelling units in the Conservation Area. This shows that the proposed development plus Brunel development and Moore House would increase the number of homes by approximately 40%. The Appendix also includes a summary table of the dwelling units in consultation catchment area – the proposed development would increase the number of units by over 40%. The Appendix also gives important data on the ratio of houses to flats in the area around the Campion site.

2.3.2. For density considerations and data see 1.6

2.3.3. The scale of the building in terms of height, length and massing is far greater than any other residential development in the street or the conservation area (with the partial exception of Lancaster House which is discussed in our Statement of Case). See section 3 for more details.

2.3.4. A development on this scale would produce an excessive strain on local services such as schools. It is not well placed with regard to primary schools in that none of them are within 10 minutes walk-time. In addition all of the schools are at or near capacity. Finally, some of the schools which would serve the site are so far away (more than 20 minutes walk-time) that it is certain that the result would be a significant increase in car trips at peak times.

Evidence

2.3.5. **Try Homes Walk-Time Survey**, Transport Accessibility Diagram (appendix B). This shows that all the primary schools are outside the 10 minute walk zone.

2.3.6. The nearest primary school (over 10 minutes walk), Spring Grove School, is not in the Osterley and Spring Grove Ward. The nearest school serving the Ward i.e. In the primary school catchment area for the Campion site, is Marlborough School which about 25 minutes walk time (for an adult). Marlborough is also at or near capacity.

2.3.7. It is the view of the ward councillors that the area is currently short of primary school places. This view has been publicly expressed.

3. The Proposed Buildings

3.1. Main Building is out of character with the surrounding housing.

Evidence

- 3.1.1. The scale is inappropriate (see photographs in **Appendix E**) which would be in marked contrast to existing housing.
- 3.1.2. CABA advice on design in **Design at Appeal** “The idea that design issues are not supported at appeal may be due to confusion over what design is really about. Some people wrongly feel that design just means aesthetics, style and the outward detailing of a building ...Design is about how places work, fit together, and the quality of life they support. Proposals must show that the development will function well in addition to being attractive and responding to the existing character of the area.” It is our case that this application does not respond to the existing character of the area but rather that it perpetuates the failure to do so of the buildings to be replaced.
- 3.1.3. The Hounslow UDP: paragraph 2.6 “Good design should be encouraged everywhere and there should be effective protection for the historic environment.” (Our emphasis.) Paragraph 5.6 “...Conservation Areas and the Thames Policy Area need protecting from inappropriate development...”. Policy ENV – B.1: “To promote high quality design, urban design and a sense of place and identity throughout the Borough, and promote improvements which prioritise a safe, sustainable, accessible and pedestrian friendly environment for all.”

We believe that even a casual inspection of the area would show that the scale of the proposed buildings is so much greater than those of the street and the area that they would contrast with existing buildings to their detriment and would shift visual focus in the street from the existing housing. This would produce a dominating effect that would be to the detriment of the visual environment and the reading of the historical character of the street and the area.

3.2. The main block(s) would harm the Spring Grove Conservation Area

Evidence

- 3.2.1. Photographs of housing in the area and opposite the Campion site make the contrast with what is proposed clear. See Appendices E and F.
- 3.3. Residents of proposed development would not have the recommended private amenity space.

Evidence

- 3.3.1. The shortfall on private amenity space is detailed in the Officers' Report to the SDC on 28th March (paragraphs 7.46 to 7.52). The applicant has sought to minimise the shortfall by claiming that the publicly accessible open would function as dual public/private space. The CABA manual **Better Places to**

Live provides a reminder of the need to distinguish clearly between public and private spaces: “Most residential environments comprise a mix of public, private and communal spaces. It is important that the role of each space is clear and that the boundaries between different types of space are clearly defined.” (page 52).

3.4. Density fails to respect that of surrounding built development.

Evidence:

3.4.1. See Appendix B for details of local housing density.

3.4.2. PPS1, paragraph 34 states “Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.”

3.5. Residents opposed to scale and layout and design.

Evidence

3.5.1. A petition stating that residents wanted the density on the site not to depart radically from that of the surrounding housing and also opposing encroachment on open space was signed 473 residents and was sent to Try Homes shortly before the first application to develop the site in April 2006. See Appendix A for the text of the petition.

3.5.2. Large numbers of residents wrote individual letters to the Planning Authority to object to the scale of the development. Many extracts were provided in the Officers' Report to the SDC of the 28th March 2007.

3.5.3. When it became clear that neither the Applicant nor the Planning Authority would organise an exhibition on the second application the Campion Concerns group decided to do so. An exhibition was held on 17th January in the Indian Gymkhana Club and was attended by 100 people. At that exhibition all the Applicant's papers and drawings were made available with guidance notes to help them navigate through the material. The feedback provided was overwhelmingly opposed to the application. This general view was clearly expressed by residents to Mr Nicholson of Try Homes when he attended the exhibition.

3.6. The **A** Block would prevent a clear view onto the public open space

Evidence

3.6.1. Try Homes Drawing Access Plan 0108 108 shows that the combined effect of Block A and the associated bin store would restrict the view onto the proposed public park to an extent that would mean that much of the area would not be visible. This could give rise to safety/security concerns and discourage potential users of the area.

4. Open space including public open space

4.1. **The loss of 10% open space is unacceptable.** Beyond that we believe that of the open space remaining a significant amount is of lower environmental quality than that the existing open space. We also wish to question the size of the loss taking into account both quality and quantity,

Evidence

- 4.1.1. Open space was lost at the Brunel development where there was an encroachment of 8% or more. Incremental changes with successive developments undermine the declared policies aimed at the preservation of London's open space.
- 4.1.2. The Hounslow UDP ENV-N.1.11: "Planning permission will not, except in very special circumstances, be granted for development on Local Open Spaces, especially where it would lead to a deficiency in publicly accessible open space. It is important not only to protect open space from development, but also to ensure that opportunities are taken to improve the amenity value and to increase public access within areas identified as having an Open Space Deficiency."
- 4.1.3. The London Plan paragraph 3.252: "London also has a wealth of locally important open spaces. Development on local open spaces will not be acceptable where they have been designated for protection in a UDP."
- 4.1.4. PPG 17, paragraph 10: "Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements. For open space, 'surplus to requirements' should include consideration of all the functions that open space can perform. Not all open space, sport and recreational land and buildings are of equal merit and some may be available for alternative uses. In the absence of a robust and up-to-date assessment by a local authority, an applicant for planning permission may seek to demonstrate through an independent assessment that the land or buildings are surplus to requirements. Developers will need to consult the local community and demonstrate that their proposals are widely supported by them. Paragraph 15 below applies in respect of any planning applications involving playing fields." Also relevant paragraphs 17 & 33.
- 4.2. We do not agree with the claim that over 2 hectares of open space are being provided for public access.

Evidence:

- 4.2.1. The courtyard, and the landscaped area along Thornbury Road, would not be appropriate for general public access since this would be unwelcome by the residents living round the courtyard. Planning guidelines and design advice refer to the need to distinguish private and public space and the need for a "defensible space" giving residents a sense of security.
- 4.2.2. See Appendix J.

4.3. The quality of the open space above the car park would be reduced.

Evidence

4.3.1. Much of what was previously green open space would be replaced by hard standing. The soil would be of limited depth although no information has been provided on this. At the Witham Road exhibition organised for the first application the architect present told residents that the soil would not support tree growth and that the trees in the courtyard area would therefore be potted plants.

4.3.2. PPG17 says that local authorities should ensure that “open spaces do not suffer from increased overlooking”. This would clearly be the case for the courtyards and other areas.

4.4. The site includes a sports pitch.

Evidence: See 1.4

5. Traffic/Public Transport/Highways

5.1. The Transport Analysis contains gaps in its evidence that call its conclusions into question.

5.2. Evidence:

- 5.2.1. The TA did not include consideration of other developments in the area such as Brunel (374 units) which is less than 500 m away from the Champion site.
- 5.2.2. The TA did not include important local junctions such as the Church Road/ Thornbury Road junction or that of Thornbury Avenue/Thornbury Road.
- 5.2.3. There was no safety assessment for cyclists of of children walking or cycling to school (Thornbury Road is both a cycling route and a school route).
- 5.2.4. The TA did not include consideration of the effect of traffic queues within the site. Cars queuing to leave could well back up into the underground car park thereby emitting excess fumes leading to a possible safety hazard.
- 5.2.5. If it is possible to improve traffic flow by rephasing the lights at the Thornbury Road/A4 junction then we suggest that this would have been done already.
- 5.2.6. The TA contained no summary data for the existing situation contrasted with (a) the data with this development added, (b) with the combined impact of other local developments. It is consequently not possible either see clearly what problems are likely to arise or to provide solutions to these problems.
- 5.2.7. Some ameliorating measures have been proposed (road widening, light rephasing) but these have not been the subject of detailed proposals (with drawings) for assessment by an independent expert.
- 5.2.8. The problems arising from the increased car usage in Thornbury Road are likely to result in parking restrictions since public transport along the road already has great difficulty when there is double parking. Such restrictions would be a loss of amenity for residents living along Thornbury Road, many of whom do not have garages.
- 5.2.9. We do not believe that the Travel Plan provided by Try Homes would achieve the 10% reduction in car trips claimed. This, it is claimed, would be achieved by offering broadband connections for home working and by pump priming the use of public transport and car sharing with some initial support. Broadband use is already at a high level in the area so encouraging its use would make little difference in practice. Given the difficulties with public transport already mentioned we believe that whatever the impact of initial support (about which there are few details) the removal of that support would cause the situation to revert to the norm. In other words the pump priming effect would be likely to be zero.

5.3. Walk-time survey map shows that all the primary schools are more than 800 m from the site (i.e. more than 10 minutes adult walk-time)

Evidence

5.3.1. See evidence 2.3.5

5.3.2. See Appendix H for comments on the walk time survey.

6. Environmental Issues

6.1. No proposals to use grey water. The London Plan requires that attention be given to water harvesting and use of grey water.

6.2. Evidence

6.2.1. **London Plan Policy 4A.11.** says that the mayor will work with the appropriate agencies to “secure London's long-term needs” by among other things “using grey water re-cycling systems.

6.3. No proposals to avoid increase run-off from site

6.4. Evidence:

6.4.1. The Try Homes application papers make it clear that the purpose of their surface water management system is to attenuate the peak flows off the site but that the net total water run off would nevertheless increase. We believe that this is contrary to the requirements of SuDs which seeks to reduce total water run-off from new developments.

6.4.2. The Hounslow Supplementary Guidance notes for contractors says that the management system for handling surface water should be agreed at an “early design stage”. We do not believe that this advice has been followed.

6.4.3. **London Plan Policy 4C.8** specifies that surface water should be managed as close to its source as possible.

6.5. It has been claimed that the car park would be naturally ventilated. For that, the wall openings surrounding the car park would have to have an area equal to 5% of the floor area. It seems to us that the dimensions and design of the building will not allow for this.

6.6. The Tree survey was not carried out to the last British Standards. The only tree survey carried out was that done before the first, now withdrawn application to develop the site. It was carried out according to BS 5837:1991. The current standard is BS 5837:2005. In addition the root system southern cedar in front of Campion House would be threatened by the building line according to the Try Survey provided with the application.

Evidence

6.6.1. For detailed questions about the Tree Survey See Appendix 0.

7. The Application Papers

7.1. Conservation area appraisal is one-sided

Evidence

7.1.1. See Appendix N

7.2. Landscape and Visual statement not carried out to latest standards

Evidence: See point 6.7

7.3. The Statement of Community Involvement distorts the reality.

Evidence

7.3.1. Appendix I

7.4. The Design and Access Statement claims to be based on CABE advice for making such statements. We are of the view that it fails to follow this advice in important respects.

Evidence

7.4.1. We provided a detailed analysis of the Design and Access Statement to the SDC in our Yellow Book. Appendix Q contains the the last part of that document which is selection form CABE advice on Design and Access Statements.

8. Final Comment

The great majority of residents have never opposed the principle of a development on this site. Most of us understand the arguments put forward to the effect that demographic and population changes require and over all increase in the density of residential housing.

However, we also believe that these changes must be considered in context and must respect existing housing. The general need to do this becomes even more important in the context of Conservation Areas where there is a specific requirement to respect the historical context as well as the current built forms. I

In the case of the Campion House site the scale of the development should be such that the eventual built form is seen to be harmonious and in keeping with the historical character of the area and with its current built form – especially the high quality, low-density housing along Thornbury Road and specifically the housing directly opposite the development.

What residents what to see is a development with a far greater ratio of houses to flats. The flats should also be in the form of relatively small blocks in keeping with the character of the area.

We believe that this development could be a major opportunity for both the developer and for the residents of the conservation area. For that to happen we think that it should be recognised that the development has to enhance the area. Preservation is not enough when the buildings being replaced did not make a positive contribution.

The design of the development, especially the masterplan, should be undertaken as an exercise in community involvement and in cooperation with the Hounslow planning authority. Using advice from CABI on design and by following guidelines on community involvement we think a design could be reached that would be exciting for the locality, and which Try Homes could use as an exemplary case to add to their promotional portfolio.

This document has been co-authored for the Campion Concerns Monitoring Group
by

David Pavett of 101 Thornbury Road,
Gina Richards of 101 Thornbury Road,
Allen Davison of 102F Thornbury Road,
Terry Leonard of 1 Church Road, and
Hamid Khan of 5 Church Road.
Natalie Stephenson of 94 Thornbury Road
Madhuri Kapila of 10 Fairacre, Thornbury Road

We are residents living within the catchment area defined by the Hounslow Planning Authority for purposes of consultation in connection with the development of the Campion House site. All of us are active members of the Campion Concerns Monitoring Group.