

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Katharine Bligh	21/03/2023 16:50:01	OBJ	<p>1. Demolition of the O2 Centre and all built structures is unnecessary, far too costly in terms of money and harmful carbon emissions and environmentally damaging to the detriment of future residents, surrounding neighbours, and to the Climate Emergency. Moreover, the loss of all the retail and leisure outlets, particularly the large Sainsburys supermarket, Waterstones, Homebase and the Cinema would be unacceptable.</p> <p>2. Development is in breach of the local area Plan, the Camden Plan and the London Plan and does not conform to the required mix of commercial/retail/housing/leisure and green open space, with far too much emphasis on residential use.</p> <p>3. Excessive and unnecessary height, much more than the local area, adversely affecting residents and the surrounding conservation areas.</p> <p>4. Excessive density, far more than the local density or the average density for Camden as a whole, especially to the detriment of future residents and of surrounding neighbours due to the very poor social design of the development.</p> <p>5. Insufficient and poorly utilised usable green space, adversely affecting future residents also other South and West Hampstead residents as the area is lacking in public open green space.</p> <p>6. Lack of social and "affordable" housing. There is provision for only 35% of so-called "affordable" housing (which isn't actually affordable for most people) and only 65% of that is for "social" rent, which is nowhere near Camden Council's requirement of 50%. And, as we know, developers have a habit of subsequently whittling down "social" and "affordable" figures as time goes on.</p> <p>7. Fifteen years in which to complete the development is far too long and there is a danger that it could be abandoned half way through. For example, look at 100 Avenue Road just down the road at Swiss Cottage, which has become a permanent building site with a vast hole in the ground - another good reason why demolition should not be attempted. The whole area would be blighted for a very long time to come.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Katharine Bligh	21/03/2023 16:50:07	OBJ	<p>1. Demolition of the O2 Centre and all built structures is unnecessary, far too costly in terms of money and harmful carbon emissions and environmentally damaging to the detriment of future residents, surrounding neighbours, and to the Climate Emergency. Moreover, the loss of all the retail and leisure outlets, particularly the large Sainsburys supermarket, Waterstones, Homebase and the Cinema would be unacceptable.</p> <p>2. Development is in breach of the local area Plan, the Camden Plan and the London Plan and does not conform to the required mix of commercial/retail/housing/leisure and green open space, with far too much emphasis on residential use.</p> <p>3. Excessive and unnecessary height, much more than the local area, adversely affecting residents and the surrounding conservation areas.</p> <p>4. Excessive density, far more than the local density or the average density for Camden as a whole, especially to the detriment of future residents and of surrounding neighbours due to the very poor social design of the development.</p> <p>5. Insufficient and poorly utilised usable green space, adversely affecting future residents also other South and West Hampstead residents as the area is lacking in public open green space.</p> <p>6. Lack of social and "affordable" housing. There is provision for only 35% of so-called "affordable" housing (which isn't actually affordable for most people) and only 65% of that is for "social" rent, which is nowhere near Camden Council's requirement of 50%. And, as we know, developers have a habit of subsequently whittling down "social" and "affordable" figures as time goes on.</p> <p>7. Fifteen years in which to complete the development is far too long and there is a danger that it could be abandoned half way through. For example, look at 100 Avenue Road just down the road at Swiss Cottage, which has become a permanent building site with a vast hole in the ground - another good reason why demolition should not be attempted. The whole area would be blighted for a very long time to come.</p>
2022/0528/P	Edward Mayer	21/03/2023 11:56:20	OBJ	<p>The development is in my view too big, too high, too dense and lacks any aesthetic or cultural quality. It looks like it will block out day light to residents, overload local transport facilities, and provide cramped accommodation, quite possibly with high inherent power costs, with the likely long term prospect of it becoming a slum, with implications for enhanced crime and declining public order. It has the appearance longer term of a potential "No Go" area excluding law abiding citizens and law enforcement. It has as far as I can see only minimal and notional "green" spaces, (the developer's publicity showed a photograph of children playing on plastic grass - not really acceptable these days) with it would appear very little to offer families with children and children themselves, and it is in addition aesthetically unstimulating. I think it looks like just the sort of development that London does not need. The way it looks one would never dare to walk through it after dark.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Nayra Bello Oshanahan	21/03/2023 10:58:08	OBJ	<p>Dear planning Committee Members of Camden Council, as former Labour Swiss Cottage councillors and concerned citizens from the area, we would like to address concerns with Landsec's proposal for the O2 centre development.</p> <p>We would like to strongly oppose Landsec's plan for the O2 centre. We firmly support the representations presented by the Confederation of Local Community Groups of July 2022, a highly valued collective effort of twelve local organisations. We also subscribe the objections of the South Hampstead Flooding Action Group.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned that these proposals have not been fundamentally amended after the community and residents organised and consistently repeated the main objections in the different "consultation events" that have been undertaken.</p> <p>We can begin by highlighting the excessive density and heights of Landsec's proposal. This massive development, as proposed, is not aligned in terms of density, with any of the different planning instruments, not even with the local neighbourhood development plan, democratically developed and praised by Camden Council. This, in articulation with the poor design in terms of lack of green and public open space, compared to its density and heights, will not only have a negative impact on the material conditions of future residents and current neighbours from the area, but also negative environmental effects on the surrounding conservation areas and in general on the local wildlife. Increased flood risk will result from this massive development as it stands, especially in South Hampstead, recently severely affected by flooding. There is also rich evidence of negative social effects of tall buildings, in terms of environmental and maintenance costs, and on families, social interaction and mental health. An unnecessary and environmentally damaging demolition of the existing O2 centre should be questioned, especially because Camden is signatory of the climate emergency. Every bit of emissions count in the current climate context we are facing.</p> <p>The existing proposal will have detrimental effects on already stretched and limited public goods and services, such as transport access, GP surgeries, dentistry services, schools, local parks, cleaning services and clean air, and therefore, on the quality of life of current and future residents.</p> <p>We are happy to see that the Confederation of community organisations includes a wide range of documents for the planning committee members to assess the value of these negative effects. On wider neighbourhood objectives, members can see the contradiction of this proposal with the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, Camden Local Plan, and a recently adopted Supplementary Planning Document. Members can also read about research on appealing design from the Bartlett School of Planning at UCL, who has done extensive research on how to design places with quality and has not been followed by Landsec. It is even difficult to find resonance between this proposal and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that also underlines sustainability and well-designed places as key objectives. GLA Assembly has also publicly heard about the limitations of tall buildings as response to the housing crisis and its negative effects on family and health.</p> <p>Planning committee members can find a wide range of supportive, material arguments against this proposal. Technical arguments are backed by mainstream planning documents that do not support the proposed heights and density. Socially, the project does not include enough social, genuinely affordable housing, offering far below Camden's own policy of 50%. Poor design, as this massive proposal shows in its lack of originality, prioritising quantity before quality, is increasingly an argument in the planning inspectorate to reject</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

development projects. The current Landsec's proposal cannot be aligned with the main conclusions of the recent public health Marmot report "build back fairer". Environmentally, the project does not include enough green space and will lead to high building and maintenance costs, increased emissions due to demolition and negative effects on local wildlife. Politically, housing targets have been dropped by national government. Climate change is urgent to address. Higher maintenance costs will mean increased future costs for Camden Council, too. In this context, Camden Council should not try to respond to the structural housing crisis with a massive development of one site. And in democratic terms, the community is rejecting this project with a strong, collective voice, also founded in existing (planning) policy and research.

We urge planning committee members and former colleagues to honour their commitments as councillors with local democracy and a green, sustainable, fair Camden, to vote against these concrete proposals of Landsec and to discuss alternatives with the Confederation of community organisations and neighbours and the developer.

With concerns,

Nayra Bello O'Shanahan, Leo Cassarani and Simon Pearson (Labour Swiss Cottage councillors, from May 2018 to May 2022)

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	John Saynor on behalf of WHAT	21/03/2023 23:07:59	OBJ	<p>This objection is submitted on behalf of West Hampstead Amenity & Transport, West Hampstead's oldest amenity group, which celebrates its 50th anniversary in 2023.</p> <p>A great deal has been said about this scheme, and there can be little that hasn't been said. However, here are some specific points for the Committee.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We recognise that this site should be used for housing and we agree that car parking is a poor use for a large part of the site. However, we agree with the West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan that development should be in keeping with the rest of the surrounding neighbourhood. This is characterised by low to medium rise building - at a high population density - consisting of two to three storey Victorian terraces, mansion blocks up to five stories high and some recent flats of up to 8 or 9 stories. 2. The proposed 14-15 storey development of tightly packed tower blocks is quite out of keeping with this surrounding area and there is no doubt in our mind that it will 'stick out like a sore thumb' when viewed from any angle. This constitutes serious harm to most parts of the immediate neighbourhood. Various conservation areas are affected, the harm to which is a planning consideration, but those parts of the district that are not in a conservation area will be equally affected. That said, a GLA report considers that the scheme will cause 'less than substantial conservation areas. Large areas of the south bank of the Thames in the Vauxhall/Battersea area are characterised by this kind of forest of tower blocks, but such an arrangement does not fit in with this area. 3. The application fails to deal with the phasing of the development and the impact on both the new residents and local people. The first phase ('detailed) development of 600-odd flats will be hemmed in at both ends of the site. At one end, a narrow footway beside the tube line runs past the VW garage, and at the other end access to Finchley Road is obstructed by the O2 building, leaving a narrow and steep footway to reach the Finchley Road. this situation will persist for several years and we consider that this pedestrian infrastructure is inadequate for a development of this size. The Police in their response have noted the personal safety issues that this will give rise to, especially at night. 4. A consequence of the phasing of the scheme is that key community benefits are deferred until later phases. Phase 2 is to be built on land occupied by VW/Audi and not owned by the applicant - and yet it is here that the medical facility and a larger garden area is to be provided. These benefits may thus not materialise, and if they do, it will not be for five or six years. As it is, the quantum of genuine green space - 'grass for kids to run around on' - is small, and what there is may be affected by on going construction work on other phases. The buildings are placed so close together that - after providing pathways, formal flower beds and access roads - it is very difficult to see how a reasonable amount of green space can be provided. The green space offered falls well below that specified in Camden's planning policy. 5. The developers have made broad claims about the consultations that they have undertaken. We have indeed had many meetings with Landsec, but the overwhelming nature of these involved Landsec telling us what they planned to do, rather than listen to constructive criticism of the scheme. For the first couple of years after the scheme was announced, only two dimensional site plans were provided, with no artists impressions, and it was at quite a late stage that the height of the buildings was announced. Only minor changes have been made during the whole consultation process. We therefore do not believe that consultation was adequate.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

6. We would also add that since the full planning application for the scheme was submitted over a year ago, there has been little further consultation about the scheme (other than a one-way submission of comments by the public) between Planning Officers and local groups. During that time, we understand that there have been regular discussions between officers and the developer, but these have not been paralleled by more open communication with the public. We have not been able to influence the course of decision making during this time.

7. We have read the Financial Viability Report, but we note with concern that Camden's has not commissioned its own report to review the November 2022 version of the Viability Report - the BPS report. We can have no confidence that the developer has the means or desire to deliver its stated commitments to affordable housing and other community benefits. We note that 107 social rent and 85 intermediate rent flats in Phase 1, but the first version of the BPS casts doubt on the ability of the developer to deliver these.

8. The published scheme offers no documented support for transport infrastructure improvements. The developer has made various statements of intent, but no concrete commitments have been forthcoming, for example in the form of planning obligations. When we have asked about these, we have been told that it would be for Camden to chose how the benefits of the scheme would be spread.

Therefore, we urge the Council ro reject the scheme in its present form.

2022/0528/P Rosanne Shamash 22/03/2023 08:15:13 COMMENT

I think this redevelopment plan is wrong and should not take place. This area is already overcrowded and congested and does not need more people.

During school term time, the sidewalks, streets, and public transport are overcrowded and it's almost impossible to walk on the sidewalks on West End Lane and Finchley Road, since there are too many people.

I live and work near to the proposed redevelopment site and rely on the O2 centre to do my grocery shopping at Sainsbury's and Aldi, along with many other of my neighbors. I also saw a lot of elderly take the bus to and from the O2 centre for their weekly or daily grocery shopping. There is no where locally, which is affordable, to do our grocery shopping and I would like Camden and the developers to advise me where I can walk to for my grocery shopping. Online grocery shopping is not an option for me.