

Comments on the Try Homes Application to Develop the Campion House Site: *Conservation Assessment in Support of a Planning Application in respect of Campion House*

Prepared for **Campion Concerns** by

Allen Davison, Natalie Stephenson, Gina Richards, Richard Redman, David Pavett,

6th July 2006

MAIN POINTS

- There is little if any justification for the claims made by the developer that it meets the requirements of PPG15 and other measures or in any other way provides grounds for the approval of the application.
- The Assessment attempts to systematically denigrate the character of Spring Grove Conservation Area. In 4.4 it questions the judgement of the Council for its designation of the area as a conservation area, stating categorically that it does not accord with ENV – B2.1 of the LBH UDP **“because it predates the policy”**. This is untrue. Our copy of the UDP includes Spring Grove in its list of designated conservation areas. The Spring Grove Conservation Area is also clearly shown on the UDP map of conservation areas (UDP Map 2).
- Significantly, in Section 2, para 2.6, of the Assessment PPG15, 4.5 is quoted on the subject of appeals against refusals of planning permission, pointing out that the Secretary of State “will take into account the authority’s justification for designation of a conservation area”.
- The Assessment quotes (2.1) from the 1992 Southland case that there is no absolute requirement to enhance a conservation area. This is tantamount to an admission that the proposal fails to do so.
- In writing about the existing buildings in Thornbury Road and particularly those immediately opposite the Campion House site it carefully avoids any reference to their stylistic qualities or identification of their period, merely dating them as late 19th century/pre WWI and lumping them together with others as 20th century.
- The Edwardian and Arts and Crafts houses facing the site are one of the most attractive features of the conservation area. The proposed block would dominate the street thereby harming its visual amenity.
- Fairacre, a modest block of flats at the junction of Thornbury and Church Roads, built c1960, maintains the skyline of its immediate vicinity, and does not clash with the adjacent houses. It serves as an example to refute suggestions that there is no merit in developments from that period.
- The developer’s claim for “the enhancement of Campion House” by detaching it from the existing, about-to-be-demolished, 20th century additions is a justifiably modest one. It would be enhanced far more if the proposed new buildings were moved further away and were smaller in scale, especially if they were recognisable as a number of individual houses and not a solid block of masonry.
- The developer claims that converting Campion House, once a private dwelling place, into flats is a “reversion to its original status.” That is untrue: it was a family home.
- Saying that the quadrangular concept and apse “reflects the religious use of the site during the 20th century” is a mere, meaningless assertion. It is a verbal allusion only without any architectural significance.

- The belief expressed by the developer that the original aim of building a series of villas as neighbours to Champion House was never met, apparently, in the developer’s eyes, justifies not building detached or semi-detached houses now.
- Try Homes regards the loss of a major part of the current Local Open Space, including loss of the sports pitch, tennis court, pond and a large number of trees as “limited encroachment” and that it is “mitigated by the cloister-like design of the development which retains significant recreational space”. The 15% encroachment is major not “limited” and the building design does nothing to mitigate it.
- PPG15 2.1 says the principal act as amended requires development plans to include policies for the conservation of the natural beauty and amenity of the land and for the improvement of the physical environment. How have they done that?
- PPG15 4.18 says “Special regard should be had for such matters as scale, height, form, massing, respect for the traditional pattern of frontages, vertical or horizontal emphasis and detailed design (e.g. the scale and spacing of window openings, and the nature and quality of materials). General planning standards should be applied sensitively in the interests of harmonising the new development with its neighbours.” This is highly relevant to the buildings immediately opposite the site and which will be detrimentally affected by the scale of the proposed development.
- PPG15 recognises that the protection of the historic environment should be reconciled with meeting the economic and social needs of the community but there is nothing in the developer’s proposals to show that the economic and social needs of the community would suffer if the development was scaled down or the style of buildings altered. The social needs of the community would be better met by providing more family accommodation and far fewer small flats that are more likely to attract a transient population.
- English Heritage’s **Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals**, Section 4.15, says on the subject of the qualities of buildings and their contribution to the area that

“This part of the appraisal should include a general description of any dominant architectural style, the prevalent types and periods of buildings, their status (i.e. statutorily or locally listed) and essential characteristics and their relationship to the topography and/or the skyline”.

It also says that

“The twentieth century is often the most undervalued and vulnerable period of building and it will be important for the appraisal to recognise, where appropriate, the contribution made by twentieth century buildings regardless of their style (many of which are being revived)”.

In the remaining sections of this document we make a detailed examination of points arising from the developer’s Conservation Assessment.

1. Introduction

The 'Assessment'	Our comment
1.1 “Campion House in Thornbury Avenue..”	Campion House is in Thornbury Road!

2. Under the headings of **Regulatory Framework and Legislation** it identifies the legislation applicable to the establishment of conservation areas and quotes extensively from Planning Policy Guideline Note 15 (PPG15).

The 'Assessment'	Our comment
2.1	
Quoting PPG15, 4.20 re the 1992 South Lakeland case before the House of Lords that established that there is no absolute requirement to enhance a conservation area, it goes on to admit that it is a desirable objective.	The need felt to quote this passage doesn't excite confidence in the developer's intentions. But 4.20 goes on to say, in a part Try Homes omits to mention, “the objective of preservation can be achieved either by development which makes a positive contribution to an area’s character or appearance or by development which leaves the character and appearance unharmed” . We see no positive contribution being made to the character and appearance of the area and would argue that it is likely to be harmed by the development.
2.4	
“ it is the quality and interest of areas, rather than that of individual buildings, . such as the historic layout of property boundaries and thoroughfares ...”	The main effort in this document is to claim that little of interest remains from the 19th century and that the 20th century buildings are without interest (untrue). The writers somehow forgot about the topographical issues which would have shown that the original Davies plan is still clearly in evidence
2.5	
“..the definition of an area’s special interest derives from an assessment of contributory (and detracting) elements: topography – thoroughfares; historic development; building materials; character and hierarchy of spaces; quality and relationship of trees and other green features; unlisted buildings that make positive contribution to special interest..”	Try Homes is good at making statements that detract from the quality of the conservation area but fails to show any appreciation of the area’s historic development and character.
2.6	
PPG15 4.5 “An authority’s justification for designation... is a factor which the Secretary of State will take into account in considering appeals against refusals....”	Try Homes’ reference to this guideline is surely a strong pointer to the way it will proceed if its application is refused.

The 'Assessment'	Our comment
2.7	
PPG15 is quoted 'What is important is not that new buildings should directly imitate earlier styles, but that they should be designed with respect for their context, as a part of a larger whole which has a well established character and appearance of its own'.	The proposed development, judged according to this criterion, is a massive failure since it is so clearly out of character with the surroundings (see other commentary papers by Campion Concerns).
2.8	
4.18 "...special regard should be had for such matters as scale, height, form, massing, respect of traditional pattern of frontages, vertical or horizontal emphasis and detailed design (the scale and spacing of window openings and the nature and quality of materials)."	4.18 goes on to say "General planning standards should be applied sensitively in the interests of harmonising the new development with its neighbours in the conservation area." Can the proposed structure really be said to be in harmony with the houses immediately opposite on Thornbury Road and at right angles to it on Thornbury Avenue?
2.11	
"PPG15 recognises that the protection of the historic environment should be reconciled with meeting the economic and social needs of the community."	There is nothing in the developer's proposals to show that the economic and social needs of the community would suffer if the development was scaled down or the style of buildings altered. The social needs of the community would be better met by providing more family accommodation and far fewer small flats that are more likely to attract a transient population. The proposal lacks any data on the housing needs of the area.
2.12	
"A report by the Director of Environmental Services... to support the designation ... includes ... an assessment of the character of the area. ... It should be noted that although this document forms the basis of the Council's justification for designating the conservation area, it has not been consulted upon or approved by the Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance and does not form part of the Development Plan."	This reference to appeals is beginning to sound like a threat. It is also based on false claims. Which UDP is CgMs reading? Our one has Spring Grove in its list of designated conservation areas (page 91). The Spring Grove Conservation Area is also clearly shown on the UDP map of conservation areas (UDP Map 2)!

Under the section **Development Plan**, the assessment quotes from the LBH Unitary Development Plan, adopted December 2003, various policies considered by the developer to be relevant to their application.

- ENV – B.2.1 Designation of conservation area
- ENV – B.2.2 Preservation and enhancement of conservation area
- ENV – B.2.3 Reuse of redundant historic buildings
- ENV – B.2.6 Identification and protection of buildings of local townscape character
- ENV – B.2.7 alterations to listed buildings and buildings of local townscape character

3. Site description and historical background

The ‘Assessment’ 3.1 – 3.8	Our comment
<p>“ Site description and historical background”</p> <p>“In 1925, the Great West Road severed the Estate and, as a result a building boom during the 1920s and 30s infilled most available space. Since the Second World War, new development has mostly involved the redevelopment of previously developed land”.</p> <p>It compliments “.. the Lodge to the south of Campion House..” as contributing “...to the character and appearance of the conservation area”.</p>	<p>This section repeats material from the Council's designation document for the area. The material is okay insofar as it goes. The problem is that it doesn't go very far. All the descriptions relate to the Davies Plan and to Campion House. There is no detail on anything else. Subsequent developments in the area spanning a century and a half are not considered.</p> <p>It gives the impression that the house it identifies as “the Lodge” (104 Thornbury Road) is part of the development site. It is not! It is entirely separate from the proposed development. Such reference to this building and the rare admission of one that contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area of character gives the impression that Try Homes is seeking credit for leaving the building in situ and thus “enhancing” the area.</p>

4. Analysis of character and appearance

The “analysis” of character and appearance amounts to little more than character assassination and denigration. Put in the simple terms of the developer’s language the former Spring Grove Estate has been so redeveloped since it was laid out in the mid-19th century that the original buildings and their plots have been demolished, replaced by an “incoherent” mix of 20th century developments of various scales and quality. The developer fails to grasp or acknowledge that there is more to The Spring Grove Conservation Area than the original Davies Plan. Later buildings of quality and architectural merit have been added.

The ‘Assessment’ 4.1 – 4.3	Our comment
<p>1. The original 19th century plan “failed”.</p> <p>2. The Hounslow report to support the designation does not fully acknowledge the extent of 20th century developments. The area is said to have “failed” to retain its mid-19th century character.</p>	<p>This section of just over two pages (800 words) is the only part of the entire document in which there is any description of the area apart from the Campion site.</p> <p>No effort is made to evaluate what was achieved and what remains from the original plan (houses, topography).</p> <p>This is completely confusing. The question should not be ‘do later developments retain the original character?’ but rather ‘do they add character of their own?’.</p>

The ‘Assessment’ 4.1 – 4.3 (cont’d)	Our comment
<p>3. Thornbury Avenue and the North of Thornbury Road (West side) were developed between 1896 and 1913/15.</p> <p>4. The North of Thornbury Road (East side) partially developed between 1896 and 1913/15.</p> <p>5. Developments to the south east of the site are largely post Second World War.</p> <p>6. Developments to the south west (Oakley Close and Kilberry Close) took place in the last 20/30 years.</p> <p>7. “On the whole, the former Spring Grove Estate has been comprehensively redeveloped since it was laid out in the mid-19th century and as a result the original buildings and their plots have been demolished, altered or infilled with an incoherent mix of 20th century housing developments of various scales and quality”.</p> <p>It further claims that their own assessment and “objective analysis” of the area in the vicinity of Champion House shows that it has “failed to retain its mid-19th C character and the area has more of a 20th century suburban character”</p>	<p>There is no evaluation of the nature and quality of these developments.</p> <p>There is a very brief description of the houses which does not even mention architectural style. No attempt to evaluate character and quality.</p> <p>No evaluation.</p> <p>Some of the buildings are described as substantial 3-storey blocks. Bearing in mind the 251 home, 5 storey block proposed by Try homes it should be emphasised that these blocks are only 3 storey and that none of them contains more than 27 flats (and even then with separate entrances for different sections)! Also Kilberry Close is not in the conservation area.</p> <p>This description shows how little concern CgMs had to make an accurate and objective description of the area. It is not true that “the original buildings ... have been demolished”. Quite a few remain. To dismiss all the 20th century developments (including the attractive Edwardian and Arts and Crafts housing directly opposite the Champion site) as an incoherent mix without any detailed evaluation is disgraceful.</p> <p>The use of “suburban” in the above context is interesting given that elsewhere in its applicable and on numerous occasions the developer erroneously classifies the area as “<u>urban</u>”</p>
4.4	
<p>“The report written by Hounslow Council to support the designation of the Spring Grove Conservation Area (2002) ... does not justify the designation using the criteria set out in the Hounslow UDP in Policy ENV – B.2.1 (adopted 2003) because it predates the policy. When the criteria are considered in relation to the Spring Grove Conservation Area, it is clear that the character and appearance of the conservation area is limited to its associations with the original layout and historic street pattern of the Spring Grove Estate</p>	<p>More attempts to undermine the status of the conservation designation. The claims about the alleged failure to meet the criteria of ENV – B.2.1 are false. First it is clear that the list is not comprehensive. Second it is clear that not all the criteria are expected to be met by a given area. Finally it is clear that the Spring Grove Conservation Area does meet many of the criteria. In particular the area meets criteria (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi). One can only imagine that the authors of this statement were hoping that the barrage of negative comments would make their case and that readers would not check their references. When those checks are made, as in this case, their claims fall</p>

The ‘Assessment’	Our comment
4.4 (cont'd)	
<p>“Moreover, the cartographic, documentary and visual assessment of the area has revealed that the mid-19th century character of the area has been eroded by the demolition of many of the original Spring Grove Estate buildings, the erosion of historic property boundaries and by substantial 20th century redevelopment of the area. It is considered that although the area has a pleasant suburban character and appearance, it no longer possesses a coherent character and, generally, the twentieth century developments which dominate the area are unremarkable in terms of their quality.”</p>	<p>The word “eroded” is repeated several many times without ever being specific. The cliffs around the coast have been eroded but they are still there and still significant. Just so for the 19th century character. Quite a few Davies houses still remain (One has recently been fully renovated) but you would not learn that by reading this “Conservation Assessment”.</p> <p>The reference to “substantial” 20th century developments is meant to reinforce the idea that the historical character of the area has gone. The Assessment's authors forget that the 20th century is also history. As the English Heritage document Guidance on conservation area appraisals puts it: <i>“The twentieth century is often the most undervalued and vulnerable period of building and it will be important for the appraisal to recognise, where appropriate, the contribution made by twentieth century buildings, regardless of their style (many of which are currently being revived).”</i></p> <p>Finally, given the effort made elsewhere in the application papers to deny the suburban character of the area we note the description “pleasant suburban character”. Quite so, and that is the opinion of many of the residents who have chosen to live there. No one with their critical faculties intact could describe the block of 259 homes proposed by Try Homes as being of a “pleasant suburban character”.</p> <p>To deal with the twentieth century developments in the dismissive phrase “unremarkable in terms of their quality” shows how little effort was made in the compilation of this report to make a fair and balanced judgement of the conservation area. There are many 20th century buildings of real interest ranging from those already mentioned above to the Art-Deco influenced Isleworth and Syon Boys School, various blocks of flats which fit harmoniously with the area and, we should not forget the preserved cinema frontage at the corner of Harvard Road and London Road.</p>

5. Impact of proposed development on character and appearance

It attempts to show grounds for the eventual conclusion that the Try Homes proposals are consistent with the character of the conservation area and, consequently, should be approved.

The 'Assessment'	Our comment
5.1	
Proposes demolishing existing buildings except Campion House and building 273 residential units.	No comment save that replacing them by 273 residential units is an unjustified over-development
5.2	
“The development and will provide new residential accommodation in a form that will improve upon the current buildings and regenerate this part of conservation area. “	What does regeneration mean in this context?
5.5	
<p>“... The quadrangle concept reflects the religious use of the site during the twentieth century.”</p> <p>“A palette of traditional materials has been drawn from”</p> <p>“The scale of the proposed development would respect that of the buildings standing on the site at present”</p> <p>“The design of the quadrangles creates the feeling of open space within the development site. This serves to reduce any feeling of 'bulk'. The layout of the frontage buildings conceals public views from Thornbury Road”</p> <p>“The Density will be less intense than that of the twentieth century developments, such as those to the north and east.”</p>	<p>This is a verbal not a visual allusion. This reference would occur to no one except someone paid by the developer to find a justification for their project. Why are there no details on this palette even in the Architect's notes? Virtually any building, even the most modern, uses many traditional materials. This is playing with words to give a pleasant sounding gloss with no real commitment to anything specific.</p> <p>This is a strange sort of judgement. Having described the present buildings as so unworthy that they do not even need permission to pull them down the authors of the Assessment are now claiming that the proposed building is consistent with the current ones! The obvious truth is that it is the surrounding buildings with which the development needs to be consistent and on that matter our authors are silent.</p> <p>At least it is recognised that there is a bulk to be offset. The extent to which this is achieved, however, is another matter. Even if it were true that the feeling of bulk within the quadrangle is reduced one can ask reduced from what to what? It remains that the building is massive compared to other properties in the area. It also remains that the quadrangle has no effect on the effect of bulk on the view from Thornbury Road and this is implicitly recognised by pointing out that there is scarcely any public view into the quadrangle (despite the fact that the main supporting Statement for the application claims that there is such a view).</p> <p>Which developments are being referred to here and what are the comparative densities? The 20th century developments along Thornbury Road (facing the Campion site) and Thornbury Avenue to the north are in stark contrast to that of the proposed development.</p>

The 'Assessment'	Our comment
5.5 (cont'd)	
<p>“Respect for the traditional pattern of frontages. ... the scale and width of the frontage buildings all respect the traditional pattern of development and frontages within this part of the conservation area”.</p> <p>“Modern and natural materials typical of those traditionally used within the conservation area have been selected.”</p>	<p>Which traditional frontages would that be? Those of the “incoherent” and “unremarkable” 20th century developments? Only someone who has lost all sense of judgement could seriously maintain that the frontage of the proposed building bears any relation at all to that of the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>This tells us nothing.</p>
5.6	
<p>Drawing on 5.5 it claims development is in accordance with PPG15. 4.17/18 and describes the development as an “imaginative, high quality design that will enhance the area...”</p> <p>“The proposed buildings are designed to sit comfortably within the well-established character of the area as a whole”</p>	<p>Mere words again: the claims that they make are “imaginative”.</p> <p>The final sentence is a very interesting remark. Having spent a large part of this report trying to establish that the original 19th century character of the area has been “eroded” and replaced by “incoherent” 20th century buildings the authors of the report have now decided that the area has a “well established character”. One has the right to ask where the real incoherence is in all this.</p>
5.7	
<p>“The development would be in accordance with ENV – B.2.2 ..” as it “..enhances the character of the area and Campion House.”</p>	<p>This is a groundless claim. See elsewhere.</p>
5.8	
<p>“...in accordance with policy ENV- B 2.3 of the Hounslow UDP as it promotes the original ‘residential use of Campion House.’”</p>	<p>Well, if people live in it, it does become residential, but comparing its future usage as a block of flats with its original status as a family home is ludicrous.</p>
5.9	
<p>Preservation of the listed building and restoration of its detached character accords with ENV – B.2.6.</p>	<p>Try Homes cannot but preserve the listed building. Trying to claim brownie points for complying with the statutory requirement is nonsensical.</p>
5.10	
<p>Alterations to Campion House and the restoration of original architectural form and character accords with ENV-B.2.7</p>	<p>It does not. See earlier comments. In addition it is worth pointing out old OS maps show that the original formal gardens extended so far as to be in line with Church Road.</p>
5.11	
<p>“The form, scale, massing and design of the development have been the subject of discussions between the applicant and the London Borough of Hounslow. The current design is a result of those discussions.</p>	<p>This sentence gives no real information. Discussions were held. Decisions were made as a result. These seem to hint at a level of agreement. Importantly, however, it does not actually say so. The information content of the sentence is negligible.</p>

CONCLUSIONS

The ‘Assessment’ <i>6.1.- 6.4</i>	Our comment
<p>“This report has analysed the character and appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area.....”.</p> <p>“The limited encroachment on open land will be mitigated by the cloister-like design of the development which retains significant recreational space.”</p> <p>“The limited encroachment on open land will be mitigated by the cloister-like design of the development....”.</p> <p>“... it is respectfully requested that permission be granted.”</p>	<p>These paragraphs simply repeat assertions made earlier in the Assessment. It is then concluded that the development will enhance the area and should be approved. Since nothing earlier in the document produced any serious argument that the development would even preserve the character of the area, let alone enhance it, the conclusion is entirely unwarranted. There is no evidence of any attempt to survey the conservation area in a balanced and objective way. There is no evaluation of what remains of late-19th century and early and mid 20th century Edwardian, Arts and Crafts and Art Deco architecture.</p> <p>It is a major encroachment on Local Open Space which includes the loss of a sports pitch, tennis court and a pond.</p>

The Maps

The map section of the assessment has no notes. One must assume that the maps are meant to speak for themselves. There is a location and site map and then a series of maps showing from 1741 through to 1999. Apart from the 1741 map the rest are OS maps.

The purpose of the series of maps is presumably to show the evolving topography of the area. One problem with this however is that had it been intended to give a clear impression of the evolving topography of the area then the various maps would have been adjusted to show the same area on the same scale. As it is the locations and scales jump around as one turns from one map to another. This is another indication, among many, of the lack of due care taken to present the materials in a meaningful way.

Apart from these points we have no quarrel with the maps in themselves since they are a normal part of the historical record.

The main conclusion that we draw from looking at the these maps is that there is clear imprint of the original Davies plan on the area both in terms of its topography and in terms of the remaining Davies Houses. Furthermore, the subsequent waves of building activity each need to be studied in themselves.

From the late 19th century there are Victorian terraces and possibly mansions (in some cases we are not sure whether mansions are Davies or post-Davies). After that Edwardian Houses were added. Then there is the series of Arts and Crafts houses which were built (from 1914 to 1929). Subsequently many pleasant typically suburban infills were added in the 1930s. We should not forget also the pre-Davies houses that still remain such as the 1830s cottages at the London Road end of Thornbury Road (along with other buildings from the same period. These developments can be seen on the maps by someone who knows the area and knows what they are looking for in the maps. Presenting the maps without comment gives no indication of all this and we can only assume that this was deliberate.

The Photographs

A series of 70 colour photographs taken in the Spring Grove Conservation Area are reproduced without annotation, apart from numbered locations on a map. They are presumably meant to give a visual impression of the area and this in turn is presumably supposed to support the arguments developed in the text of the Assessment. In fact the photographs show the same lack of **any serious effort to present a fair and balanced view of the area that has already been noted with respect to the main text and the presentation of the maps.**

Twenty six of the photographs are of Campion House and other buildings on the Campion site. That leaves a total of **44 photographs of the conservation area.**

There are 10 photographs of Thornbury Road to the North of Eversley Crescent. Remarkably, these make no attempt to give an impression of the properties directly facing the Campion House site. Only two of the period houses facing the site (Nos. 95/97) are shown. There is not a single photograph of the attractive Arts and Crafts houses facing the site. It is surely legitimate to ask why this obvious omission? The only other building shown facing the site is the Fairacre block of flats. There is a very poor shot of a couple of modern houses at the north end of the street (east side). Taken as a whole these pictures do not give a worthwhile visual impression of the immediate visual context of the development.

The Photographs of the London Road end of Thornbury Road show some of the Victorian/Edwardian terraces but fail to include the pre-Davies cottages and other pre-Davies buildings. Also missing is a large Victorian house (opposite the Mosque) which was built at the same time as the Davies developments but was independent of it.

There is no clear photograph of St Mary's Church which is a focal point in the area.

The comments we have added to the photographs should suffice to make clear that the photographic record of the conservation area makes no attempt to present it in an objective light. Many of the photographs are of the least interesting buildings and sometimes even when a building is of interest the photographs are taken from the worst possible angle.

A serious attempt at a photographic record would have (1) given an idea of the remaining Davies houses, (2) shown the interesting layers of developments in the main periods since the Davies plan, and finally (3) it would have made a detailed study of the housing in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development. In the event the photographs in the CgMS document do none of these things. Despite this obvious attempt to present the area in a poor light it has been impossible to hide its very real quality and we have tried to bring this out in our comments on the photographs.

As it is the photographic record is notable for the omission of buildings of real interest and the emphasis of those which are of little interest. It is difficult to see how the evidence of misrepresentation could be stronger.

Comments on the photographs in the Conservation Area Assessment

<i>CgMs Photograph</i>	<i>Our Comment</i>
27 – Kilberry Close (from Campion House Grounds)	Built 1986. Shows modest scale of 3-storey blocks of flats.
28 – Oakley Close (from Campion House Grounds)	Built 1976. Shows modest scale of 3-storey blocks of flats.
29 – Thornbury Road (north east towards the A4)	Poor quality photograph. Shows 1930s detached house and two town houses built in the 90's, 6 Edwardian houses (barely visible)
30 – Thornbury Road (east side, south of A4)	Streetscape. Manages not to show the fine Arts and Crafts houses! Some of these were built pre-WW1, others in the 20s.
31 – Thornbury Road (northwest) towards A4	Four Edwardian houses. These are among the many 20 th century developments that are of interest.
32 – Thornbury Avenue (from Thornbury Road)	Predominantly late Victorian/Edwardian houses. Spacious houses. Attractive frontage.
33 – Fairacre Church Road (from Thornbury Road)	Six 3-storey town houses, built in mid 60s. These preserve the roofline established by earlier housing opposite Campion House.
34 – Thornbury Road (north) towards A4.	Trees in front of Campion House.
35 – Fairacre, (Corner of Church Road/Thornbury Road).	Block of six flats, 3-storeys, see comment on photograph 33.
36 – 95/97 Thornbury Road (opposite seminary block)	Middle of three pairs of attractive Edwardian Houses, built 1904. Long front gardens, very green.
37 – Thornbury Road (opposite southern corner of Campion House site)	Part of Moreton Avenue development, built 1966. Rest of Moreton Avenue is a Close. Short rows 2-storey terraced houses (windows at top are skylights to the second floor). Slightly unusual design including some porthole windows.
38 – Thornbury Road, (west side, south of Campion site)	Part of Kilberry development, built 1986. Picture taken from least attractive angle. Colours misleading. Block of twelve 3-storey flats with two separate entrances.
39 – St Christopher's Close (off Thornbury Road)	4-storey block of 16 flats. The rest of the close is 2-storey rows of terraced houses. Built 1970. The block is unattractive but is set well back from Thornbury Road from where it is partially obscured by trees. This is the only 4-storey purpose-built block of flats in the immediate vicinity of Campion House.
40/41 – Corner of Thornbury Road/Eversley Crescent	Original Davies house built in the 1850s. It has been recently restored and converted into flats.
42 – Thornbury Road (west side, south of Eversley)	Mix of Victorian houses, some pre-1895. Of architectural interest. Some terraced, some semis.
43 – Thornbury Road (west side, south of Spring Grove Road)	Late Victorian/Edwardian. Of architectural interest.

<i>CgMs Photograph</i>	<i>Our Comment</i>
44 – Thornbury Road (west side, north of Spring Grove Road)	See comment on photograph 42.
45 – Thornbury Road (west side, south of Spring Grove Road)	See comment on photograph 43
46 – Thornbury Road (west side, south of Spring Grove Road)	Example of turn-of-the-century semis. Interesting frontage.
47 – Thornbury Road (east side, south of Spring Grove Road) near Mosque.	Probably Victorian (marked on the 1865 map). It is astounding that CgMs have not noted the value of such houses.
48 – Draper Close (off Thornbury Road, west side)	One of the recent developments which has done nothing for the architectural interest of the area . Most of the development is 3-storey town houses. It seems to have escaped the notice of CgMs that this development is not in the Conservation Area. To the south of the point from where the photograph was taken is the oldest part of the area pre-dating the Davies Plan. It includes 6 terraced cottages, the Milford pub, and other buildings of the same period.
49 – Thornbury Road (west side, north of London Road).	Part of the group commented on above (photograph 48). Includes view of rear of Honor Gardens (3-storey town-houses)
50 – The Grove (west side, Spring Grove side)	Attractive 3-storey (semi-basement) pre-1866 houses. Also view of Davies type mansions either side of Grovewood Court.
51 – The Grove (east side, Spring Grove side)	Attractive Edwardian 3-storey houses. Beyond the photograph view there are other similar 2-storey Edwardian houses. Further down the road is an interesting example of 1930s architecture (the Firestation complex).
52 – Grovewood Court. The Grove (west side, Spring Grove end).	4-storey block of 12 flats. Built 1974. Incorrectly located on the map as being in the position occupied by Granwood Court.
53 – The Triangle, junction of the The Grove and Osterley Road	Important part of the Davies Plan topography virtually unchanged. Includes an unfortunate view of Brunel student block in the background. This block is to be demolished as part of the Brunel development.
54 – 1 Osterley Road	Original Davies building now in flats. Open spacious view. Photograph taken across The Triangle.
55 – Harvard Road (east side, south from the Grove)	Poor photograph. Between the wars houses. Lower down (outside photograph view) there are 3 pairs of pre-WW1 houses.
56 – The Grove (west side, London Road end)	Between-the-wars spacious semis.
57 – Odeon Flats (corner of The Grove/London Road)	This is one of our favourites! It is the ugliest possible picture of this development. It is the back view of the flats built behind the recently restored Art-Deco cinema frontage. None of this is recorded in the photographs. Could this be mere oversight?
58 – 64 The Grove.	4-storey infill block of flats. Not very attractive.
59 – Grove Road (opposite north end of Avenue Rd)	This expansive 2-storey house is marked on the 1894 map. It could be from the middle of the century. Interesting frontage.
60 – College Road (west side, south of Grove Road)	Pre-WW1 (shown on 1912 map). Edwardian.

<i>CgMs Photograph</i>	<i>Our Comment</i>
61 – Brunel Student Block, Ridgeway Road	What is this picture doing in the collection? It is certainly an ugly building which adds to the poor impression of the Conservation Area that the CgMs document tries to paint. They seem to have overlooked the fact that this building is going to be demolished as part of the Brunel development. It is therefore not of much interest in terms of characterising the area to which the Campion development is required to be sensitive.
62 – Church Road (north side, between Ridgeway Road and Osterley Road)	The houses in this photograph are probably between-the-wars infill. They are not without interest. They fit in well with the local Church.
63 – Thornbury Court, Church Road (corner Church Road/Osterley Road)	This plain building has little for the eye to follow. We guess that it was built in the late 30's. It is the least interesting building in Church Road which we suppose is why it is featured in two separate photographs whereas the most interesting buildings in the street appear in none.
64 – Osterley Road (south of Church Road)	This is one of the widest tree-lined roads in the area. It is part of the original Davies street layout. This picture manages to make it look rather scrappy and uninteresting.
65 – Isleworth and Syon School (from Osterley Road)	The school, built in 1939, is of some architectural interest. The frontage shows a clear Art Deco influence. This rear view must be the worst possible angle from which the photograph could have been taken.
66 – Deborah Close, Osterley Road (west side, south of Church Road)	Built, we guess, in the mid-70s. Plain 4-storey block of 20 flats with town houses at the back.
67 – St Mary's Church/Thornbury Court, Osterley Road (towards A4)	The Davies Church appears here only as a background to another photograph of Thornbury Court (see comments on photograph 63).
68 – Church Road (from Osterley Road)	This is a very poor photograph of a very interesting street including a mix of Arts and Crafts houses and a good example of a 1930s block of flats (two 3-storey blocks, each with 10 flats).
69 – Osterley Road (east side, towards A4)	Another view of Osterley Road showing its typical suburban character with a mix of spacious between-the-wars houses.
70 – Osterley Road (west side, towards A4)	Ditto 69.