

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0484/P	Riccardo Cumerlato	19A Alvanley Gardens NW6 1JD NW6 1JD	12/03/2025 13:42:53	OBJ	<p>I am writing to express my profound frustration with this planning application. While it is indeed appropriate that this site be utilized for much-needed housing, as endorsed by the Neighbourhood Plan in 2015 and Camden's own policy documents, the manner in which this development is being pursued is deeply troubling.</p> <p>The Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan clearly indicate that approximately 950 homes is the suitable number for the entire Homebase & Car Park site. However, the updated plans for Phase 1 have taken a concerning turn. The size of the buildings in the original plans was already excessive; the addition of two storeys to three of the tallest blocks in the updated plans, along with extra storeys to five other blocks, is utterly out of keeping with the local area. The tallest block now reaches a staggering 17 storeys, with two blocks at 16 storeys, and the tallest block is over four metres higher than previously approved. This excessive height will undoubtedly affect the view from surrounding areas, a point previously highlighted by Historic England, which noted the harmful impact on designated heritage assets through development within their setting. Moreover, these towering blocks will mar some of London's iconic views of St Paul's.</p> <p>The density of the development is another point of contention. The updated plans propose an additional 43 homes, bringing the total in Phase 1 to 651 — a 7% increase from the previous number of flats. This deviation from Camden's Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan will exacerbate congestion in the local area, particularly at the tube stations and on the trains, further straining already overburdened infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, the application touts the creation of an additional 300 square metres of green space by removing one of the blocks. However, Camden's standard for open space is 9 square metres per occupier. Even with the conservative assumption of one person per new flat, the required open space would be 387 square metres. This falls short of the standard, and when considering the total green space required by Camden's policies, the previous proposals offered 13,308 square metres against an estimated requirement of 33,261 square metres. The addition of 300 square metres only brings the total to 13,608 square metres, which is still less than half of what is required.</p> <p>In conclusion, while the need for housing is undeniable, the approach taken by the council and the developer appears to prioritize maximum size over thoughtful integration into the surrounding area. This disregard for established policies and standards is deeply disappointing and calls for a reconsideration of the plans to better align with the community's needs and Camden's own guidelines.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0484/P	Lois George	12 WEECH ROAD WEST HAMPSTEAD NW6 1DL NW6 1DL	13/03/2025 00:19:01	OBJ	<p>I am objecting to the updated planning application for the O2 centre/ Homebase/Car park site== Phase 1. for the following reasons:</p> <p>1)Camden's own policy documents - 'Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan' -indicat 950 homes is about the right number for the whole of the Car Park and Homebase Site. once built if allowed to increase heights of blocks which = more flats, which = more people How has this increase of another 4000 -5000 people affect the congestion for Finchley Road, West Hampstead and Finchley Road tube stations? This needs to be addressed .</p> <p>2)In Phase 1 updated plans add 1,2 and3 storeys to some tower blocks making the tallest block to 17 storeys which makes it over 4 metres higher than previously approved. Making the tallest blocks of 16.& 17 storeys even more out of keeping with the surrounding area Views of St Paul's and other important London views will be forever damaged by the taller blocks if allowed to increase heights of the blocks.</p> <p>3) 43 new homes will be added in the updated plans so Phase1 would increase the total to 651 homes.which is a 7% on the previous number of flats. this taked theeven further from Council's own Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan. Leading to even more congestion in the local area for local tubes stiaions, trains and buses only 20% of the 43 new homes will be 'affordable', only 8 at genuine social rent levels. Camden Council's policy is 50% affordable homes in new developments. Only36% will be 'affordable by floor space if the updated plans go ahead.</p> <p>4) By removing 1 of the blocks an additional 300sq metres of green space will be added, much is made of this in the application . Camden's standards for open space is 9 sqm per occupier. Even if 1 person lived in each of the 43 new flats, mean that 387sqm would be needed to meet Camden's standard for open space. Assuming no changes in the later phases, the total green space required by Camden's standard was estimated at 33,261sq.metres. The previous proposals offered 13,308 sq.m.addingthe 300sq.m. only takes the total to 13,608which is much less than half of what Camden's policies require.</p> <p>5) in conclusion, for all the above reasons I am objecting to the updated panning application referred to as Phase 1.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0484/P	John Gray	93 Ravenshaw Street	12/03/2025 23:08:16	OBJ	<p>Why 43 More Homes?</p> <p>I note the significance of evolving Government policy on stairs in tall residential buildings, recent changes in Building Regulations, and the publication of revised BS 9991 since the consented design was submitted in Dec 2022. I also acknowledge that the effect of these changes is likely to increase the size of the circulation cores, which would result in a corresponding decrease in residential NIA if the building envelope were to remain as consented. In order to re-provide the consented number and mix of dwellings, it therefore might be reasonable to permit modest expansion of the building envelope. The least disruptive (and most cost-effective) way would be to widen the floorplates slightly to maintain the same mix of dwellings around the larger cores. However, replacing the lost accommodation by adding an additional storey would be far more costly due to the associated additional façade and would be far less desirable for its impact on townscape. So that is clearly not the real motivation behind these changes.</p> <p>The s73 proposal seeks to add 43 additional homes to this consented phase by adding storeys to all but 2 of the 10 blocks in phase 1. The applicant's disingenuous justification for increasing the development by citing new fire regulations is a false argument. It is contemptuous to use the Trojan horse of fire safety to hide what is actually an entirely commercial decision.</p> <p>Non-Compliance with Adopted Local Plan</p> <p>By seeking to increase the quantity of accommodation beyond the numbers already consented, this s73 application reopens the question as to how it can be justified in relation to the applicable Planning policies:</p> <p>LB Camden Local Plan & Site Allocations Plan 2020 Policy WH12 (02 Centre, carpark & car showrooms sites)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed uses: Mixture of types of permanent self-contained homes, town centre uses, community uses, open space Indicative housing capacity: 950 additional homes <p>LandSec's overall masterplan was granted outline consent for 1800 new homes (which is nearly double the 950 capacity recorded in the adopted local plan). Whilst it is not unusual for applications to seek increased capacity, it is truly extraordinary for a LPA to grant consent to a proposal that bears so little respect to its own assessment of the appropriate number of homes. That the applicant is now seeking to yet further increase the 608 homes in phase 1 by 7% calls into question LB Camden's governance of its own published planning policies.</p> <p>GLA Affordable Housing Targets (May 2023 Draft)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.7.1 requires the percentage of affordable homes to be measured by habitable room. Section 2.7.2 requires applicants to present affordable housing figures by habitable room, by units, and by NIA. <p>This s73 application fails to follow this policy by presenting the affordable homes by GIA and making no mention of habitable rooms.</p> <p>Unrealistic Design of Community Centre</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0484/P	Lara Berkowitz	19A Alvanley Gardens	12/03/2025 13:48:19	OBJ	<p>The design proposals for the new standalone community centre seem poorly thought out. It no longer has any connection to the central square. Its external appearance features large expanses of south-facing glazing, which will be make it prone to overheating. Its extravagant design seems unrealistic given the absence of any knowledge on its ultimate use or operator. There is a real danger that this structure (as currently designed) will struggle to find a suitable operator due to its impracticality and will quickly become a white elephant.</p>
		NW61JD			<p>I am deeply disappointed with the revised planning application for the redevelopment of this car park. While I appreciate the necessity of utilizing this site for much-needed housing, I cannot overlook the apparent disregard for the surrounding area's character and the local community's preferences, as indicated in the Neighbourhood Plan endorsed by referendum in 2015.</p> <p>Camden Council's policy documents, including the Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan, suggest that approximately 950 homes would be appropriate for the entire Homebase & Car Park site. However, the updated plans propose excessive increases in building height and density that far exceed the Council's guidelines.</p> <p>Firstly, the proposed addition of two storeys to three of the tallest blocks in Phase 1 and extra storeys to five other blocks is disheartening. This revision results in a tallest block of 17 storeys, with two others reaching 16 storeys. The tallest block now stands over four meters higher than previously approved, rendering it even more incongruous with the local area's aesthetic. Such height increases will undoubtedly diminish the view from surrounding areas. Historic England has already expressed concern, highlighting the harmful impact on designated heritage assets due to the development's excessive volume and scale within their setting. Furthermore, the higher blocks threaten to obstruct some of London's iconic views of St Paul's Cathedral.</p> <p>Secondly, the updated plans propose an additional 43 homes in Phase 1, raising the total number to 651. This 7% increase in density diverges further from the Council's own Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan. An increase in housing units will potentially exacerbate congestion in the local area, particularly at nearby tube stations and on the trains, thus detracting from residents' quality of life and the area's infrastructure capabilities.</p> <p>In conclusion, while new housing is essential, it is crucial that development fits harmoniously with its surroundings and adheres to agreed-upon guidelines. The current revision appears to prioritize maximizing size and density over maintaining the character and functionality of the local area. I urge the Council and the developer to reconsider these changes and align the plans more closely with Camden's established policies and the community's vision for its neighborhood.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0484/P	Anne Alexandre	170 Goldhurst Terrace Flat 1 London NW6 3HN	12/03/2025 15:28:20	OBJ	<p>Adding more height and density than what has been consented for the phase 1 of this project is totally out of place and will harm existing and new members of the Camden community.</p> <p>1- Too high: The updated plans add two storeys to three of the tallest blocks in Phase 1, and extra storeys to five other blocks. This takes the tallest block to 17 storeys, with two 16 storey blocks. The tallest block is now over four metres higher than previously approved. This is even more out of keeping with the local area than before.</p> <p>The higher blocks will affect the view from surrounding areas. Historic England previously commented that “The volume and scale of the development means that there is a harmful impact to designated heritage assets through development within their setting.” Many of Camden conservation areas, including the whole of South Hampstead, are within one mile of the development. The higher blocks will also damage some of London’s important views of St Paul’s.</p> <p>2- Too dense relative to green space: While the removal of one block and the addition of 300sqm of green space are welcome, the increased number of “single aspect” flats is not. The updated plans add 43 more homes, taking the total in Phase 1 to 651. This is a 7% increase on the previous number of flats. This takes the plans even further away from the Council’s own Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan. This will lead to even more congestion in the local area, including at the local tube stations and on the trains.</p> <p>Furthermore, assuming no changes to later phases, the total green space of 13,608sqm is still much less than half of what Camden’s policies require. Indeed, the requirement by Camden’s standard was estimated at 33,261 square metres.</p> <p>Thank you</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0484/P	Helena Paul	Pandora Road London NW6 1TS	12/03/2025 14:33:03	COMMNT	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this issue. As a long-term participant in the West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Forum I have been monitoring this and other recent local building developments and transport issues etc for many years. I have seen the development of 156 and 187-199 West End Lane and related issues, quite a few of which arise once more in the case of the O2 Centre car park redevelopment proposal from Landsec.</p> <p>Landsec are planning too much housing on this site. This will have negative impacts on the residents and also on the local area. And now we find that one of the blocks has increased in height yet again to 17 storeys, while a number are 16 which exceeds the norm for this area. Current plans are for 650 units and the final amount is planned to be 1,800.</p> <p>It feels as though this gradual process of plan expansion is designed to get us to gradually accept eg: higher blocks and more flats in the area, to say nothing of impacts on nearby streets and housing. I find it dishonest in some ways to proceed in this way; it feels as if Landsec are expanding the plan step by step so as to gain support by making the first phase seem comparatively smaller and less impactful.</p> <p>GREEN SPACES</p> <p>We have also been endlessly promised green sites by Landsec in an area that already lacks them, yet the actual design does not live up to such promises. I question whether enough thought has been given to where children living in these flats might play on this site. Although Landsec claim there will be green and play space, the overall plan looks very crowded (https://o2centremasterplan.commonplace.is/) with tall (up to 17 storey) blocks that are often only 16 metres apart. This means that many 'green spaces' will be completely overshadowed by those blocks.</p> <p>It also appears that the main green space, a planned health centre and creche are on land that Landsec does not own, so these may just be promises that are never fulfilled, but exploited to gain consent. GREED for profit must not be allowed to dominate planning.</p> <p>Apparently "the proposed development is unable to meet the full policy requirements in respect to open space" (para 10.42 of the Planning Statement.). Apparently Camden has been offered money to compensate for this, but that is not acceptable, Frankly, for this Camden resident, it amounts to attempted bribery. Camden must insist that there is an area of green space coherent with its rules, which means at least doubling the green space on the site, too much of which already doubles in the plan as a path through the estate from West End Lane to Finchley Road as well.</p> <p>OVERCROWDED STATIONS AND STREETS</p> <p>One example of the likely impacts of this new over-development - West End Lane is already overcrowded with traffic and pedestrians – many of them moving between the 3 stations on the street. At rush hours, it is difficult for people with children, luggage etc, for older people or people with disabilities to move around on West End Lane or to access</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>West Hampstead underground station. There are also points in the day where crowds of people are rushing to and from the Overground and Thameslink stations, which adds to the problem.</p> <p>Both West Hampstead and Finchley Road underground stations have only STAIRS. I see a lift is now planned for West Hampstead, which is welcome, but frankly that is not enough – we urgently need an escalator at both stations because unlike the other stations in West Hampstead, both West Hampstead and Finchley Road underground stations have only a single staircase for two platforms and it can get extremely crowded.</p> <p>The impact of up to between 3-4,000 new residents from a car-free development (which is great) on these already overcrowded stations will be considerable and needs more thought.</p> <p>I cautiously welcome the fact that there will now be a community centre on the site as many of us have requested many times.</p> <p>I HAVE A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS APPLICATION: As noted above: it seems that 1,800 units of housing are planned for the whole development once complete. This is almost 3 times the amount of the first phase.</p> <p>What will the impact be on demand for schools and health services in the area? The latter are already very stretched. Camden must carefully consider this when assessing the Landsec proposal. It should not be forgotten that the Blackburn road redevelopment also involves a number of flats.</p> <p>Camden must also keep in mind that , as stated above, a promised health centre, creche and green space may never happen – since Landsec does not own the site for which they are proposed.</p> <p>SOCIAL HOUSING NEEDED Affordable housing is priced at a percentage of local prices. What we really need more of is social housing. I am glad to see that this has been increased to 115 flats, but this is still only a small proportion (under 20%) of the 650 planned for phase 1. We need more – 25% at least.</p> <p>Will social housing be of the same standard as other housing and mixed with it, or will it be concentrated in the least favourable parts of the site as so often happens?</p> <p>It also seems that the majority of the flats will be single or double units, with very few family homes. Surely it is important to have a good mix of types of housing on any estate?</p> <p>How will Camden ensure that the development is genuinely car-free and residents do not find ways to park cars elsewhere?</p> <p>OVERSEAS INVESTORS I understand that overseas investors will be allowed to purchase housing on this site in order to rent it out. THIS SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN in London, as I believe to be the case under Danish</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>law eg: in Copenhagen. This practice is exploited by overseas buyers for profit and it helps to push up prices in affected cities like London. Can Camden act to prevent this happening?</p> <p>STANDARD OF CONSTRUCTION</p> <p>So much modern building is defective, as we have seen over the years: https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2023/oct/21/cracked-tiles-wonky-gutters-leaning-walls-why-are-britains-new-houses-so-rubbish</p> <p>Buying a new build house? Up to 300 faults found on average! https://newhomequalitycontrol.co.uk/buying-a-new-build-house-up-to-300-faults-found-on-average/</p> <p>Ronan Point is also an important lesson with partial collapse caused by poor design and poor construction: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ronan_Point</p> <p>The quality of building materials (including insulation materials) are a vital issue.</p> <p>Have Landsec properly checked and verified what is planned with independent experts?</p> <p>Has Camden checked these plans with quality of construction materials and design in mind? Has Camden ensured that this housing is climate friendly, ie does not emit heat in the winter or become too hot in summer, requiring unnecessary air conditioning?</p> <p>O2 CENTRE AND SAINSBURY'S</p> <p>We have been told (at a recent meeting with Landsec in the O2 centre) that Sainsbury's will not shut yet and that the O2 centre will not be demolished for several years. What is the actual situation? What impact will uncertainty and short term availability have on the interest of businesses and organisations that might wish to use the O2 Centre?</p> <p>This is an important issue: Sainsbury's is extremely valuable as the only large supermarket other than Waitrose in the area.</p> <p>I also had not realised that the O2 centre is greatly valued by many local residents, as it has important facilities for children and adults that are otherwise lacking in the area. As I heard at a recent meeting Landsec organised, this means that a mother can attend an event and know that her child is safely involved in activities elsewhere in the centre.</p> <p>I therefore do not think that Camden should give permission for the O2 centre to be demolished and replaced with housing by Landsec at any point in this project.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Overall, while I agree that this carpark site should be developed for housing, as it is well-situated for that purpose and could be a real haven, I do have serious misgivings about the density of housing proposed and the planned replacement of the O2 Centre, as well as the fact that Landsec are including 'mitigation' plans (green space, health centre, creche) for areas they do</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0484/P	Margaret Philips	37 Dennington Park Road Last 2 NW6 1BB	12/03/2025 14:18:24	OBJ	<p>not own. Therefore I consider that the number of flats planned should be reduced and the size of green space increased. I sincerely hope also that Camden will carefully check the quality of building materials and construction plans in view of the appalling standards of recent building as mentioned above (see standard of construction).</p> <hr/> <p>It is right that this car park between two tube stations is used for much-needed housing. Originally, the plan was for 900, reasonable, the 1800 (unreasonable for the neighbourhood and amenities) and now they plan at least an extra 400. The updated plans add two storeys to three of the tallest blocks in Phase 1, and extra storeys to five other blocks. This is even more out of keeping with the local area. Density: The updated plans add 43 more homes, taking the total in Phase 1 to 651. This is a 7% increase on the previous number of flats. This takes the plans even further away from the Council's own Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan. Of the 43 new homes, 20 are "affordable", with only 8 at genuine social rent levels (described as low cost rent). This keeps the percentage that is "affordable" at 36% by floor space. This continues to be less than Camden Council's policy of 50% affordable homes in new developments. This doesn't meet the Greater London Assembly requirements. Camden's standard for green space is not met. I oppose these new plans, and I live in this ward</p> <hr/>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0484/P	Daniela babuscio	29 canfield gardens, london Lower maisonette SOUTH HAMPSTEAD LONDON NW6 3JP	12/03/2025 14:25:38	OBJ	<p>My main objection is the number of dwellings that are going to be built. According to Camden's policy, the right number of dwellings for the site (old Homebase and the car park) is 950 homes, and the number proposed by Landsec is far in excess. Camden must act in keeping with its policies.</p> <p>Moreover, the height of the proposed dwelling towers is out of proportion with the two added storeys to already very tall blocks of flats. They would be too tall for the area. They would block the view of important landmarks such as St.Paul's Cathedral. This development does not take into consideration the harmful impact on the surroundings and the residents of the area, such as myself. They will be blots on the landscape.</p> <p>There will be too many flats. The new plan adds 43 more dwellings, so in Phase 1 of the plans, the total will be 651 dwellings.. This will inevitably lead to congestion along the pavements and in the two local underground stations, Finchley Road and West Hampstead, as well as on the underground trains.</p> <p>Camden policy for affordable housing in new development is 50%. The proposal offers only 36% of affordable housing by floor space.</p> <p>The green area allocated to the new development is inadequate and insufficient, way below Camden Council's requirements. It will be detrimental to the new residents to have such little open and green space: a total of 13,608 square metres rather than the estimated 33,261 required according to Camden Council's policies.</p> <p>Finally, both the design and the location of the Community centre are inadequate: the new location will be away from the main square, making it less accessible, and the floor-to-ceiling windows will cause overheating in the summer.</p> <p>All these proposed changes by Landsec must be rectified so that they are in keeping with the Council's policies.</p> <p>This whole development will change forever the character of the area with negative impact to the new as well as the old residents</p>
2025/0484/P	Alan Mason	Flat d 11 Compayne Gardens South Hampstead London Nw6 3DG	12/03/2025 19:47:42	OBJ	<p>Opposed by the vast majority residents, and all community groups, and ghastly as the consented scheme (2022/0528/P granted approval 20.12.23) is, it is preferable to the new application, 2025/0484/P, which seeks to increase the heights of the tower blocks and increase the number of dwellings.</p> <p>The London Borough of Camden is asked to note this OBJECTION and refuse consent.</p>