

Appendix F

The Officers' Recommendations to the SDC on Try Homes' first application to develop the Campion site

We have underlined the objections which seem to us to apply equally to the 2nd application. CCMG

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 Had an appeal on the grounds of non-determination not been made, refusal of planning permission would have been recommended and, in the absence of an acceptable scheme for the redevelopment of the site, refusal of conservation area consent would have also been recommended. In the circumstances, Members' endorsement of the reasons set out below is sought.
- 9.2 Reasons that the planning application would have been refused had the application not been appealed on grounds of non-determination:
1. 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 UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New development), ENV-N.1.11 (Protection and improvement of Local Open Space), ENV-N.1.10 (Provision of new local open space) and ENV-N.1.12 (Retention of playing fields) and Policies 3D.7 (Realising the value of open space) and 3D.10 (Open space provision in UDPs) of the London Plan.
 2. In the absence of a satisfactory Flood Risk Assessment as required by PPG25 (Development and Flood Risk) the proposed development may create an unacceptable flood risk either to future occupants and/or elsewhere. In the absence of details of the proposed sustainable urban drainage scheme the proposed development fails to reduce flood risk. The proposed development would be contrary to UDP Policies ENV-P.1.3 (Surface Water Run Off), ENV-W.2.4 (Floodwater) and Policies 4C.6 (Flood plains), 4C.8 (Sustainable drainage), 4A.12 (Water quality) and 4B.6 (Sustainable design and construction) of the London Plan.
 3. The proposed development makes insufficient provision for private amenity space to be provided at the site and so would be detrimental to the amenities enjoyed by prospective occupants of this development contrary to UDP Policies H.4.1 (Housing Standards and Guidelines) and UDP Supplementary Planning Guidance (February 1997).
 4. In the absence of further details of the Arboricultural Survey undertaken by the applicant the proposal is contrary to UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New development), ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation Areas), ENV-N.2.3 (Promotion of nature conservation management), ENV-N.2.4 (Habitat protection), ENV-N.2.6 (Landscape features) and ENV-N.2.7 (Trees and community woodlands); Policy 3D.12 (Biodiversity and nature conservation) of the London Plan; and UDP Supplementary Planning Guidance (February 1997).
 5. With the bat survey having been carried out by the applicant during an unsuitable time of year for surveying bats and in the absence of a presence/absence survey of Great Crested Newts and reptile surveys, the proposed development is contrary to UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New development), ENV-N.2.3 (Promotion of nature conservation management), ENV-N.2.3A (Species protection), ENV-N.2.4 (Habitat protection), ENV-N.2.6 (Landscape features); Policy 3D.12 (Biodiversity and nature conservation) of the London Plan; and UDP Supplementary Planning Guidance (February 1997).
 6. 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. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to UDP Policies IMP.5.1 (High quality building and urban design), ENVB. 1.1 (New development), 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), H.1.1 (Location of new housing development), H.4.1 (Housing standards and guidelines) and ENV-N.2.7 (Trees and community woodland); Policies 4B.1 (Design

principles for a compact city), 4B.11 (Heritage conservation), 4B.10 (London's built heritage) and 3D.12 (Biodiversity and nature conservation) of the London Plan; and UDP Supplementary Planning Guidance (February 1997).

7. 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 UDP Policies 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), ENV-B.2.7 (Alterations to listed buildings and buildings of local townscape character) and ENV-N.2.7 (Trees and community woodland); and Policies 4B.1 (Design principles for a compact city), 4B.11 (Heritage conservation), 4B.10 (London's built heritage) and 3D.12 (Biodiversity and nature conservation) of the London Plan.
 8. The proposed development would, with the drawings submitted showing 225 bicycle parking spaces, fail to meet Transport for London indicative guidance on cycle parking standards contrary to Annex 4 (Parking standards) and in turn fails to provide sufficient, secure bicycle parking facilities contrary to Policies 3C.21 (Improving conditions for cycling) and 3C.22 (Parking strategy) of the London Plan.
 9. With the drawings submitted showing 303 car parking spaces the proposed development would provide car parking in excess of the Council's maximum desirable provision of 280 spaces and in excess of the London Plan's maximum desirable provision of 273 spaces, which would undermine the use of more sustainable non-car modes and, by reason of the level of traffic generated and with an incomplete transport assessment (for example, the generated trips as a result of the Brunel University Osterley Campus site have not been included), would give rise to traffic conditions prejudicial to highway safety, increased danger, cause noise, congestion and environmental intrusion. The proposed development therefore fails to meet UDP Policies IMP.1.1 (Integrating patterns of land use and the provision of transport), ENV-B.1.1 (New development), T.1.1 (The location of development), T.1.2 (The movement implications of development), Policy T.1.4 (Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments), T.4.2 (Oppose overall increase in highway capacity for private vehicles and seek reduction in traffic levels), T.4.3 (The traffic implications of new development), T.4.4 (Road safety), T.5.3 (Vehicle crossovers and hardstandings) and ENV-P.2.5 (Energy and resource efficiency) and to Annex 4 (Parking standards) of the London Plan as well as Policies 3C.22 (Parking strategy) and 4B.3 (Maximising the potential of sites) and Table 4B.1 (Density location and parking matrix) of the same.
 10. The proposed development would, by reason of the traffic access and egress arrangements (unsatisfactory in relation to the visibility splay at the main access and in the absence of a swept path assessment of the proposed access junctions), give rise to traffic conditions prejudicial to highway safety and the safety of footway users contrary to UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New development), T.1.2 (The movement implications of development), Policy T.1.4 (Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments), T.2.2 (Pedestrian safety and security), T.4.3 (The traffic implications of new development), T.4.4 (Road safety), T.5.3 (Vehicle crossovers and hardstandings) and Policy 3C.22 (Parking strategy) of the London Plan.
 11. The proposed development would put strain on the existing local education facilities and health facilities contrary to UDP Policies H.4.5 (Associated facilities for residential developments), C.2.1 (Educational facilities), C.3.2 (New or extended health facilities) and IMP.6.1 (Planning obligations) and Policies 6A.4 (Priorities in planning obligations) of the London Plan and would not secure the provision of public access to Local Open Space in an area identified as having a Publicly Accessible Open Space Deficiency failing to meet UDP Policies H.4.5, IMP.6.1, ENV-N.1.10 (Provision of new Local Open Space) and ENV-N.11 (Protection and improvement of Local Open Space); and Policies 3A.15 (Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities), 3A.17 (Health objectives), 3A.18 (Locations for health care), 3A.21 (Education facilities) and 6A.4 of the London Plan.
- 9.3 Reasons that the application for conservation area consent would have been refused on had the application not been appealed on grounds of non-determination: In the absence of an acceptable redevelopment of the site the proposed works of demolition would be contrary to UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New development), ENVB. 2.2 (Conservation areas), ENV-B.2.3 (Reuse of redundant historic buildings) and ENV-B.2.7 (alterations to listed buildings and buildings of local townscape character).