

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Mara	19/03/2022 14:24:54	PETITNOBJ E	Dear all, This is to express my opposition and concern about the plan for demolition and development of the O2 centre area. High rise building in a lovely, low rise, green and quiet area are the ugliest possible proposal possible. The health centres of the area are already at full capacity so we would need guarantee that another medical centre will be created to serve the new residents. On top of all this we need a big supermarket (hence a parking) and a cinema as the area demographic has a big quantity of families.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Tracey-Lee Wingrove	19/03/2022 16:12:08	OBJ	OBJECTION TO PROPOSAL TO DEMOLISH THE O2 CENTRE AND BUILD 1,800 FLATS

I live in Belsize Park and am a frequent user of the O2 Centre and strongly object to the application to construct tall buildings of flats for the following reasons:

1. Height of Building

. London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."

The Finchley Road is not such a suitable area. Although it has shops along the street itself everything immediately behind is residential and of a low height.

The tallest buildings elsewhere in the area are 10 and 11 storeys towards West Hampstead and this should serve as a maximum height of a "tall" building. Anything taller – as per this application- should be refused

2. Conservation

Although technically this development is outside of a conservation area it is in between Fitzjohn's and Netherall, Belsize, South Hampstead and West End Green conservation areas and as such, should be mindful of the impact on these areas. The surrounding areas are mostly low to medium rise mansion blocks and terrace houses in yellow or red brick – traditional Victorian and Edwardian designs. The new development would be totally not in keeping with this in terms of scale, heritage and height of buildings.

The tall buildings in this development would also totally block views southwards across South Hampstead and this goes against guidelines in the conservation areas mentioned above.

3. Affordable Housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

Although many projects do not meet the council's objective this project falls way short of affordable housing provision and should be refused.

4. Car Parking

Despite the laudable desire of Camden Council to reduce car usage in the borough this would eliminate the large car park now used for Sainsbury's and Homebase. I believe those businesses would suffer greatly because many shoppers need a car to collect large DIY purchases and large food shops. For example, disabled users cannot struggle on the bus while carrying shopping. Families now often shop only once a week and hence have a very large shop which needs a car to get it all home.

In addition the Finchley Road is a red route which means that drivers cannot even stop briefly to collect someone and their shopping.

The car park also supports the Town Centre of shopping along the Finchley Road with shoppers parking at Sainsbury's, using other local shops before returning and buying food at Sainsbury's. So the abolition of this parking space will negatively impact the entire "Town Centre".

5. Viability of Sainsbury's and Homebase

As mentioned above the traffic into these shops will suffer and Sainsbury's has maintained that it cannot keep a large supermarket without car parking. There is a big difference between small and large supermarkets with the former charging higher prices and having a smaller selection of items. This is the only large supermarket for many miles and a busy one at that so if it is replaced by a small shop then local residents will drive even further to Brent Cross and other areas for their shopping, affecting climate change even more with more miles being driven through our areas.

6. Medical Facilities

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".</p> <p>This development only offers a vague suggestion of GP surgeries in future tranches of building. The development at King's Cross promised GP surgeries and after 18 years still has not materialised, putting great pressure on existing surgeries. This is not satisfactory and hence the proposal should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	Yoke Thian	21/03/2022 20:57:40	OBJ	<p>1800 new home is way too many for that limited space. Agree the area can be better utilised, with car park at underground and more green space, there could also be more amenities with local shops.</p> <p>Any new home should be planned with schools, GP community centres, communal area and even more car parks for residence or office space!</p>
2022/0528/P	Roberto Pozzi	19/03/2022 17:18:19	OBJ	<p>Dear Council,</p> <p>I write to you about the "uphill battle" being waged by residents of Hampstead, South Hampstead, and West Hampstead against LandSec's proposed 1900 flat development on the site of the current O2 Centre at Finchley Road. We are concerned at the absence of city planning to guide and curb LandSec's stated goal of building several 16-story high rises to divest itself of retail properties that have become unprofitable during covid. We the residents of Camden believe the promise of political inducements to Camden Council, namely control of 35% of the flats in development to be earmarked for social housing, will pervert planning decisions. We fear the areas surrounding - where conservation rules restrict the look and feel of streetfronts to the point of controlling whether windows and ironworks are "in keeping" - will be overshadowed by multi-story towers, the character of which will change this area forever and for worse.</p> <p>This development is currently a proposition of smoke and mirrors, with slim-to-no research on how an additional 1900 households will find integration into schools, transport, or community services, or how the services it removes - namely the super Sainsbury at the O2 - will be recreated to serve an even larger community. How can London help our borough fight back against the profit-seeking LandSec and a Council that aims to profit politically from a beefed-up property portfolio at the expense of settled residents? Development is inevitable in our city, but development in keeping with our environment is what we seek. Terraced housing is in keeping, high-rises that overshadow their own alleged green spaces are not.</p>
2022/0528/P	natasha mitchell	19/03/2022 09:17:17	COMMNT	<p>I am very concerned that the new housing development planned for the O2 Centre site is going to cause overcrowding In the local area, putting too much additional strain on local resources. Further consideration needs to be made regarding The implications to quality of life, for those living in the proposed blocks, Appear to too many in number and too tightly packed into the proposed area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Clare Wilkins	19/03/2022 11:16:15	COMMNT	I strongly object to this development. The area cannot cope with such an influx of people. Have the planners/developers council noted the existing pressure on the Overground/tube/local schools and amenities? The proposed building is far too tall, a supermarket and a well-used leisure centre will be lost - aren't these important facilities? Where do the you propose all the local people who use these facilities and all the new people should shop/exercise/access leisure facilities/send their children to school? Does anyone who proposes these ill-thought out developments use the tube/schools/shops/facilities in the area? How do you propose thousands (or even hundreds) of extra people will access Finchley Road tube or get on a bus at rush hour? The proposed development would require a massive investment in improved infrastructure which is obviously not being done. This plan is excessive, ill-thought out, dangerous and harmful to the community and solely for the financial benefit of the developers. Although it is hard to see who will actually buy/rent those flats when Finchley Road will become even more congested and polluted and unpleasant. The building works alone with the noise, air pollution and massive disruption will be an absolute nightmare for local residents and businesses. There are creative and clever ways to re-develop - this is not it. This proposal, in its current form, is madness.
2022/0528/P	Sandra Miller	19/03/2022 11:26:33	OBJ	really object because i dont believe the infrastructure is in place to support this development
2022/0528/P	David Hill	20/03/2022 13:04:47	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I am writing in respect of planning application 2022/0528/P.</p> <p>I object the proposed plan due to overdevelopment which is going to blight the local area.. The number of proposed properties is going to be more dense in this area than any other area in Camden. This going to harm local infrastructure and the local environment. This development will lead to overcrowding and put pressure on local services such as GP and transport. The loss of the supermarket will be a loss to the local community. The proposed plan will lead to far too many small homes and few family homes. In addition there is a lack of new public green space.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Malcolm Brown	20/03/2022 20:32:33	OBJ	<p>I object on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Massive increase in population density2. No equivalent increase in local infrastructure3. No equivalent increase in local green spaces4. No equivalent increase in local facilities5. Decrease in local facilities6. Building designs have minimal safety features given this post Grenfell construction.7. Minimal affordable housing <p>The combination of points 1 to 5 are significant given the Jubilee line is at capacity both in terms of train content and number of trains on the line. The current post pandemic ramp up means there may be some capacity at this instant but, if people are to want to move to this new site then it means that we are returning to a pre-pandemic central London working paradigm and capacity will likewise return to normal. Adding 5000+ new residents is just not going to work.</p> <p>Both Finchley Road and West End Lane are pretty much stationary at rush hour as it stands. Adding thousands more inhabitants who all want to turn their cars, taxies, ubers, ambulances into this estate is going to make this much much worse. So again without investment in infrastructure there is simply not the capacity to take this many more residents.</p> <p>Points 4 and 5 indicate a complete absence of consideration for not just the existing residents but also the new ones. Sainsburys is a high volume retail outlet and well attended in the area. To remove this while adding thousands more residents will put a heavy load on the nearby Waitrose, for those who can afford it, and will drive those who can't further afield, further increasing the strain on the transport infrastructure.</p> <p>All this and the council is still not providing sufficient affordable housing.</p> <p>The above suggests an absence of any real thought for existing or potential new residents minimal planning and a general greed as the primary driver.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Anne Stevens	18/03/2022 10:17:58	COMMNT	<p>I object to this application which I hope Camden will refuse, on the following grounds</p> <p>1.The density of housing proposed is too high. The proposed density of 330 dw/ha will also be some three times more dense than specified by the government’s Model Design Code, and will massively exceed the 2016 London Plan SRQ (Sustainable Residential Quality) density matrix recommendations for urban settings such as this one.</p> <p>2 Poor design. a. Cladded towers up to 15 stories are entirely out of keeping with the architecture of the local area in the Finchley Road/ West Hampstead area, and especially the conservation areas nearby. The local architecture is predominantly in red brick, and includes mansion blocks of up to about four or five stories. Any design for this site should be broadly compatible with this style.</p> <p>b. The developers are proposing quite tall blocks with relatively narrow pedestrian spaces between them on a broadly East West orientation. it is not clear whether, when or for how long each day those pedestrian spaces will be out of shadow. Shadow produces a tendency to damp conditions, algal growth on pavement surfaces etc. Either the spaces will have to be artificially lit for extended period, involving energy consumption, or they will be dark and uninviting. The word for such areas used to be "slum" and that is what these spaces will rapidly become.</p> <p>c. I see no evidence of pro-active "design for security" in these plans. Pro-active design for security should involve open - but overlooked - spaces, absence of tight corners or escape alleys etc. These principles are not evidently followed.</p> <p>d. Fire safety. The block will apparently have only one escape possibility, and it is not clear that there will adequate access for fire engines, long ladders etc on all sides of each block.</p> <p>3 Absence of Green space. The only major green space provided is alongside the railway line. it is relatively narrow, and likely to be very difficult to maintain and keep clean and litter free. It is not clear that the space will be much better than the existing litter-ridden verge of the railway. The plans need to provide sufficient space to allow for wide borders on each side of the proposed path- the wide planted borders in the Olympic Park at Stratford provide good examples of what should be possible.</p> <p>There are at the moment some 60 to 100 trees in the existing car park. The developers should, in the interest of combating climate change, be planning to at least double that number of mature trees on the site. I would suggest that all the pedestrian spaces between the blocks should be planned as avenues - sufficiently wide to comfortably allow a row of street trees along each side. It is well known that being able to see trees and green plants out of dwellings makes an important contribution to mental health. Modern developments should be planning for every dwelling to have at least two or three trees clearly visible from within the apartment. It would be desirable, in this age of food poverty and the need for sustainable supply to ensure that a major development such as this has a good provision for vegetable growing, either as small allotments or as a community vegetable garden/orchard.</p> <p>4 Unnecessary demolition. There is a good deal of embodied carbon in the existing O2 centre. It is usually well frequented and serves useful purposes. It should not be necessary to demolish it. It could be refurbished if maintenance is required and with good design could surely be incorporated into any new master plan. This does not apply to the Homebase warehouse or the car showroom, which are less substantial buildings.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Dharmesh Trivedy	19/03/2022 21:33:12	OBJ	<p>Tall Buildings - The area is not suited to tall buildings.</p> <p>Affordable housing - The development falls far short of the affordable housing target, and furthermore provides the bare minimum in both mix of affordable housing and affordability of that housing in a way that might compensate or mitigate that. It should therefore be refused.</p> <p>Car parking - The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.</p> <p>Loss of large supermarket - The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.</p> <p>Community facilities - As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Hunadda Sabbagh	20/03/2022 10:49:31	OBJ	

Dear planning team,

I vehemently object to the density of this new development plan. I think that it is frankly embarrassing that various Labour-led councils across the city have seen fit to utterly disregard the social fabric of the city over which they preside by giving the go-ahead to this type of plan.

There are too many homes, bringing in too many people to an already densely packed area that sits between two major arteries. The minimum of the minimum of outdoor space has been proposed, with no regard for how the social and psychological health of London residents has slowly been eroded by the disappearance of green, open recreational space. The people who will live here will be stuck between two main roads with no real breathing space whatsoever and no adequate playing space for children and teens.

We also already know that high tower blocks are both dangerous and antisocial, so why these 15-story blocks have been approved is beyond me. A progressive council would only be approving lower, more sociable, safer blocks of flats.

The percentage of "affordable housing" is also laughable and miniscule. As we know already, even this small number will be subject to further reduction as has happened across London already as developers sneakily erode the number of affordable units and renege on their "promises".

Finally, there are no concrete assurance that the development will retain a large, affordable supermarket, which is vital to the residents of the area. We only have vague assurances of the "services" that the developers intend to include.

This is a regressive, antisocial and dangerous development that needs to be stopped.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Histasp Contractor	19/03/2022 12:02:33	OBJ	<p>Although the buildings are not in a conservation area, the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green conservation area statements are relevant, which protect the areas surrounding the site.</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>While Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that if it did, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <p>Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification. It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access.</p> <p>A common theme in the feedback to Camden's recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.</p> <p>This public view is in-keeping with the tallest buildings in the area:</p> <p>The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward. The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>This development contains several buildings that are taller than either of these. It is therefore extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.</p> <p>As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies:</p> <p>They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground.</p> <p>Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.</p> <p>Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, is it located in the Fortune Green & West</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:

"Is human in scale"

"Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass"

"Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings", including that tall buildings should "avoid any negative impact" (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas.

"Has regard to the impact on local views" identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation.

Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.

Affordable housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

While we recognise that Camden's Cabinet member for planning has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. The London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

However, the related factors are all, at best, the minimum that is required under Camden's policies:

Policy H4 specifies a balance within the affordable housing component of 60-40 between social-affordable and intermediate, which this barely scrapes, being exactly 60% social affordable by both habitable rooms and floor areas.

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a 'social-affordable' rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

The development falls far short of the affordable housing target, and – furthermore – provides the bare minimum in both mix of affordable housing and affordability of that housing in a way that might compensate or mitigate that. It should therefore be refused.

Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment. This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'.

The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. The loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed. Read more here.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).</p> <p>This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows. Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	Ian Centis	19/03/2022 14:04:51	OBJ	Abominable project of anonymous massive dehumanising blocks reminiscent of the outskirts of Novosibirsk
2022/0528/P	Charlie attwood	19/03/2022 14:45:31	OBJ	Awful idea!
2022/0528/P	David Hill	20/03/2022 13:01:10	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I am writing in respect of planning application 2022/0528/P.</p> <p>The object the proposed plan due to overdevelopment which is going to blight the local area.. The number of proposed properties is going to be more dense in this area than any other area in Camden. This going to harm local infrastructure and the local environment. This development will lead to overcrowding and put pressure on local services such as GP and transport. The loss of the supermarket will be a loss to the local community. The proposed plan will lead to far too many small homes and few family homes. In addition there is a lack of new public green space.</p>
2022/0528/P	B A La-Garde	21/03/2022 08:55:04	COMMNT	The present parking at the O2 Centre provides safe off-street parking which serves the area, not just the immediate on-site shops; removing that will increase road traffic by encouraging those who need cars in order to use Sainsburys and Homebase out of the area to Brent Cross. Providing bicycle parking does not meet the same need for those who need to carry heavy bags. It will leave only Waitrose, which has inadequate parking, as the major food store in the area. The Council will thus be seen to be encouraging unfair trading.
2022/0528/P	Camilla Quint	19/03/2022 20:00:11	COMMNT	<p>I object to this development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Building is too all for the area 2) It does not fit with the Conservation area 3) It does not have 50% affordable housing as required in Local Plan policy H4 4) There is no car parking 5) The large supermarket will be lost 6) Poor/insufficient commitment to community facilities
2022/0528/P	Mrs White	20/03/2022 11:07:12	COMMNT	<p>This is outrageous idea and plans should be withdrawn immediately.</p> <p>These plans have removed almost all parking and there is no guarantee that it will provide health facilities</p> <p>Several tall buildings not right for the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	anthony fobel	19/03/2022 11:39:13	COMMNT	<p>I object to this planning application on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- it's creates far too many residences in an already highly congested area without the necessary mitigates to deal with parking, general congestion and pollution- the number of tall buildings in a low-rise area- It delivers no social rented housing.- It removes almost all parking whatsoever.- It provides no binding guarantees that it will provide health facilities.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Graeme	20/03/2022 10:46:06	OBJ	Tall Buildings

London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."

While Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that if it did, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:

Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification. It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access. A common theme in the feedback to Camden's recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.

This public view is in-keeping with the tallest buildings in the area:

The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward.

The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.

This development contains several buildings that are taller than either of these. It is therefore extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.

As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.

Conservation

The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies:

They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground.

Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, is it located in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

“Is human in scale”

“Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass”

“Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings”, including that tall buildings should “avoid any negative impact” (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas.

“Has regard to the impact on local views” identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation.

Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.

Affordable housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

While we recognise that Camden’s Cabinet member for planning has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. The London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

However, the related factors are all, at best, the minimum that is required under Camden’s policies:

Policy H4 specifies a balance within the affordable housing component of 60-40 between social-affordable and intermediate, which this barely scrapes, being exactly 60% social affordable by both habitable rooms and floor areas.

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a ‘social-affordable’ rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

The development falls far short of the affordable housing target, and – furthermore – provides the bare minimum in both mix of affordable housing and affordability of that housing in a way that might compensate or mitigate that. It should therefore be refused.

Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden’s policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden’s policy of ‘car-free development’ is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'.

The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed. Read more here.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).

This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	ROBERT BLAY	19/03/2022 11:40:27	COMMNT	<p>Unless you open more Doctor surgery's and make the Royal Free Hospital bigger you cannot build more flats in West Hampstead. Also a year ago we lost Morrisons supermarket in Camden to flats, now you want to demolish Sainsburys in the 02, where do we shop then? I will have to drive my diesel car to shop in Tesco. The only reason you want to build more flats is for the land owners to get rich .</p>
2022/0528/P	Clive Beecham	19/03/2022 12:09:07	AMEND	<p>I object to the development in particular on the 2 grounds listed below.</p> <p>1.I have no wish whatsoever to see high rise buildings coming to this part of London. Please do not allow this. High rise buildings destroy the ambience of our locality.</p> <p>2. My perception is that the amount of parking provided is woefully short of what is necessary. Whilst it right and proper to take steps to wind down traffic, people still need the opportunity to have their cars and to have them parked, which is a different argument altogether.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Graeme	20/03/2022 10:46:09	OBJ	Tall Buildings

London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."

While Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that if it did, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:

Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification. It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access. A common theme in the feedback to Camden's recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.

This public view is in-keeping with the tallest buildings in the area:

The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward.
The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.
This development contains several buildings that are taller than either of these. It is therefore extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.

As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.

Conservation

The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies:

They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground. Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature. Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, it is located in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

“Is human in scale”

“Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass”

“Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings”, including that tall buildings should “avoid any negative impact” (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas.

“Has regard to the impact on local views” identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation.

Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.

Affordable housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

While we recognise that Camden’s Cabinet member for planning has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. The London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

However, the related factors are all, at best, the minimum that is required under Camden’s policies:

Policy H4 specifies a balance within the affordable housing component of 60-40 between social-affordable and intermediate, which this barely scrapes, being exactly 60% social affordable by both habitable rooms and floor areas.

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a ‘social-affordable’ rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

The development falls far short of the affordable housing target, and – furthermore – provides the bare minimum in both mix of affordable housing and affordability of that housing in a way that might compensate or mitigate that. It should therefore be refused.

Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden’s policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden’s policy of ‘car-free development’ is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'.

The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed. Read more here.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).

This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Jonathan Kropman	19/03/2022 18:33:31	COMMNT	<p>Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	Jonathan Kropman	19/03/2022 18:33:31	COMMNT	<p>This is a headline grabbing project that is far too ambitious. Not enough thought as to overcrowding and implications for existing residents of the area as well as the new ones who would fill this development. Not enough schools, medical support, transport provision and no thought for the impact on traffic in a very densely trafficked and lived in area.</p> <p>For once think about improving the neighbourhood as it is and staging a proportionate and not over dense increas in housing.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Francesca	20/03/2022 10:47:25	COMMNT	Tall Buildings

London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."

While Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that if it did, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:

Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification. It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access. A common theme in the feedback to Camden's recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.

This public view is in-keeping with the tallest buildings in the area:

The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward.

The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.

This development contains several buildings that are taller than either of these. It is therefore extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.

As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.

Conservation

The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies:

They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground.

Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, it is located in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

"Is human in scale"

"Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass"

"Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings", including that tall buildings should "avoid any negative impact" (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas.

"Has regard to the impact on local views" identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation.

Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.

Affordable housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

While we recognise that Camden's Cabinet member for planning has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. The London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

However, the related factors are all, at best, the minimum that is required under Camden's policies:

Policy H4 specifies a balance within the affordable housing component of 60-40 between social-affordable and intermediate, which this barely scrapes, being exactly 60% social affordable by both habitable rooms and floor areas.

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a 'social-affordable' rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

The development falls far short of the affordable housing target, and – furthermore – provides the bare minimum in both mix of affordable housing and affordability of that housing in a way that might compensate or mitigate that. It should therefore be refused.

Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'.

The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed. Read more here.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).

This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	Jonathan Kropman	19/03/2022 18:33:34	COMMNT	<p>This is a headline grabbing project that is far too ambitious. Not enough thought as to overcrowding and implications for existing residents of the area as well as the new ones who would fill this development. Not enough schools, medical support, transport provision and no thought for the impact on traffic in a very densely trafficked and lived in area.</p> <p>For once think about improving the neighbourhood as it is and staging a proportionate and not over dense increas in housing.</p>
2022/0528/P	Jonathan Kropman	19/03/2022 18:33:37	COMMNT	<p>This is a headline grabbing project that is far too ambitious. Not enough thought as to overcrowding and implications for existing residents of the area as well as the new ones who would fill this development. Not enough schools, medical support, transport provision and no thought for the impact on traffic in a very densely trafficked and lived in area.</p> <p>For once think about improving the neighbourhood as it is and staging a proportionate and not over dense increas in housing.</p>
2022/0528/P	Jonathan Kropman	19/03/2022 18:33:40	COMMNT	<p>This is a headline grabbing project that is far too ambitious. Not enough thought as to overcrowding and implications for existing residents of the area as well as the new ones who would fill this development. Not enough schools, medical support, transport provision and no thought for the impact on traffic in a very densely trafficked and lived in area.</p> <p>For once think about improving the neighbourhood as it is and staging a proportionate and not over dense increas in housing.</p>
2022/0528/P	Debbie	18/03/2022 16:24:14	INT	<p>It's slightly alarming that my email to the Case Officer, earlier this month, has already been recorded as a comment. It was not intended as a Consultation Response. It was an attempt to find an answer before I left, if any, response - which is why I contacted this Case Officer direct.</p> <p>I am requesting it be removed altogether, or at least my FULL name be removed & even though it has been 'redacted' on the Council site.</p> <p>Nevertheless, regarding this application, I feel somewhat unqualified to respond as the many other people have done so far.</p> <p>What I would like to say is that, whatever the outcome, this site needs (at least) one Changing Places Toilet facility; which, having received email confirmation from Landsec direct, I would like to say I am at least pleased to know they & fully support the delivery of&.</p> <p>I would be more than willing to discuss this further with them & of which they are aware.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Sidney Charity	20/03/2022 10:26:09	OBJ	This is a huge driver of gentrification, and will make the area unaffordable for many in the community. The plans cater to wealthy people and include only a small amount of affordable housing. As a resident it will affect overcrowding in the area, especially of train stations which are already packed during rush hour. The density will be 6-7 times the Camden average, which isn't healthy for anyone. Any scheme for building new houses should be to solve the housing crisis, rather than lining developers pockets and catering to the wealthy. In other words, it should be about building affordable homes and council housing, in a way which doesn't make the area unaffordable for those who call this their community.
2022/0528/P	Martin Vogel	20/03/2022 17:34:13	INT	The removal of the existing O2 centre and car showrooms to be replaced by housing is potentially a beneficial development. But the proposal imposes too many costs on the local neighbourhood with insufficient gains. The high-rise blocks are too high for the neighbourhood. The density of homes envisaged will put too much pressure on nearby facilities: such as shops, pavements, transport, schools, and medical services. The development needs to be lower density with more public space and greater consideration given to pedestrian and cycling routes through the neighbourhood. There should be improvements to the local Underground stations (with new entry/exit points from the development site) and replacement of some the shopping facilities that will be lost, particularly the large Sainsbury's. More generally, as the density of housing in West Hampstead is increased, there should be concerted efforts to reduce car ownership and usage and significant improvements to public transport, cycling and walking in the area. And much more prioritisation given to the provision of green space and public spaces to enhance the liveability and air quality of the area. Otherwise risks West Hampstead risks becoming choked by in-fill developments and increasing traffic.
2022/0528/P	Adam Hills	21/03/2022 15:05:20	COMMT	No thought has been given to the strain on the existing infra-structure.... this is a get rich quick money making scheme....I object to it
2022/0528/P	Clive Beecham	19/03/2022 12:09:10	AMEND	I object to the development in particular on the 2 grounds listed below. 1. I have no wish whatsoever to see high rise buildings coming to this part of London. Please do not allow this. High rise buildings destroy the ambience of our locality. 2. My perception is that the amount of parking provided is woefully short of what is necessary. Whilst it right and proper to take steps to wind down traffic, people still need the opportunity to have their cars and to have them parked, which is a different argument altogether.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Krishna Hathi	19/03/2022 14:03:46	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I live in this area because I love my access to a local gym (virgin active), the cinema and an easy access affordable supermarket.</p> <p>I STRONGLY OPPOSE this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>FIRE HAZARD: Given the flats are to be built between two train lines, in the event of a disaster, there is no evacuation plan for these flats (likely 6,000 people). This is a huge hazard. What is a legitimate evacuation plan not risking the lives of all these people????</p> <p>SUPERMARKET ACCESS: As many people in Camden DO NOT own a car, supermarkets are necessary within walking distance. Sainsbury's is a requirement for myself and my family. Other local shops do not stock the products or have the capacity to accommodate more people in number</p> <p>I urge you to object to these plans or bring the numbers of flats to a reasonable level. 1,800 flats seems insane!!!</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Krishna Hathi</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Shalaka Karandikar	19/03/2022 12:26:10	OBJ	<p>Tall buildings & conservation</p> <p>This building will be detrimental to the vista in the area and not in keeping with the maximum height of others buildings. This is of particular concern in a conservation area such as this</p> <p>Congestion- the extra amount of traffic caused by such a huge development will put a massive stress on already congested local area and services. In particular on street parking and public transport</p> <p>Car parking</p> <p>This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.</p> <p>Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:</p> <p>The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment. This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'.</p> <p>The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.</p> <p>Loss of large supermarket</p> <p>The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.</p> <p>This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.</p> <p>The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Joe Taylder	18/03/2022 17:29:28	OBJ	refused.
2022/0528/P	Alexander Shinder	19/03/2022 11:53:35	OBJ	<p>There is no need to demolish a functioning and popular shopping centre, providing amenities not otherwise available in the surrounding area. It would be feasible for a redevelopment to be completed without demolishing the O2 Centre and I don't see why the latter option is being promoted by the Council. In particular I'm unconvinced from the plans that the replacement supermarket will be of the same size / scale as the existing Sainsbury's, which is critical to the local community. The only other large supermarket is Waitrose which is unaffordable for most people, as are small format convenience stores.</p>
2022/0528/P	Chris	19/03/2022 11:30:26	OBJ	<p>The surrounding conservation areas are low rise and are in the aspirational part of the borough. This is relevant not just for those living in these areas but for those who aspire to. Buildings with this height will be detrimental to the area and be discordant with giving a suburb an inner city feel. There are other objections such as density and the impact of such a large number of new homes in a mature part of London but the height is the main one. The need to build housing; attract developers and obtain affordable housing levy are all correct but if the load were spread across the borough a development at 8 storeys in height would still help Camden achieve its objectives.</p> <p>The whole idea is a disaster. I'm sure many other posts will highlight the legal and policy challenges, but as a resident if the area I deplore these ideas.</p> <p>The removal of the Sainsbury's supermarket and O2 shopping centre would lead to marked up expenses for locals who use the facilities as we seek other areas to do our affordable shopping. The O2 centre offers a cinema and gym facilities which are also exceptional, I would suggest the local council start thinking more creatively with how to support the centre instead of looking at ways of demolishing it.</p> <p>The development of high rises sets an awful precedent for the local area. Across London we are seeing high rises being raised and their long term impacts being poorly thought out, they detract from the characters of the local area and make Camden just another borough of London.</p> <p>From an environmental perspective I struggle to see the value of adding this develop to the local area. The area is already exceptionally congested and this will just create further congestion. It just feels at odds with other policies such as the bigger focus on permanent cycling infrastructure which aims to reduce pollution in the local area.</p> <p>98% of people are against this infrastructure, please listen to the locals.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Susan Lawrence	19/03/2022 12:14:42	OBJ	<p>Dear sirs , I wish to object strongly to the Landsec proposals , which apparently have been developed in conjunction with certain people on Camden Council .</p> <p>1. The Tall Buildings in the plan are totally inappropriate for the area and will ruin it, against existing planning guidelines.</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>While Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that if it did, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <p>Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification. This is clear if you superimpose the local streets showing Landsec's effect on the area , as the many flyers circulating do. This box seems not to accept images, or I would include one.</p> <p>It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access.</p> <p>A common theme in the feedback to Camden's recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.</p> <p>This public view is in-keeping with the tallest buildings in the area:</p> <p>The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward. The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This development contains several buildings that are taller than either of these. It is therefore extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.</p> <p>As a result, while Camden has neglected to designate areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead one to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies:</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground.

Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, is it located in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:

"Is human in scale"

"Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass"

"Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings", including that tall buildings should "avoid any negative impact" (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas.

"Has regard to the impact on local views" identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation.

Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.

Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'.

The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Risk of flooding

Thames Waters report clearly shows that this development will contribute to the existing drainage and flooding problems of the area. This will cause difficulties with insurers, increase flooding risk etc. Another reason why the application should be refused.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Loss of large supermarket,

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities, gym swimming pool , cinema

The proposals envisage substantial loss of amenity locally. The gym ,and especially swimming pool , and cinema are important local facilities which will be destroyed or diminished in these proposals, while the number of local residents increases hugely .

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed. Read more here.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).

This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows. Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.

Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Mariam Azarian	20/03/2022 17:41:54	OBJ	This development is completely disproportioned with the area. Nobody wants this incredibly high density of people on such a small patch of land between two railways. More and more studies are showing how bad noise is for human health; building that many flats in such close proximity of the railways if putting all those inhabitants at risk. This will only be really low quality housing! This patch of land is much more suitable for a green space or shops with car parks. I am opposed to this project as it is now.
2022/0528/P	Mr S Perry	19/03/2022 12:54:09	SUPPRT	Wholeheartedly support this. We need more dwellings where people want to live, and in an area like London then densification is the only way forward, we must build higher, as this development does. The people moving into these buildings will spend money in local shops and restaurants and bring new life to what is a slightly run-down area between Hampstead and West Hampstead.
2022/0528/P	john gilbert	19/03/2022 12:54:39	OBJ	<p>1 Ten storeys should be the maximum height of any building. This is isn keeping with the low rise nature of the local area</p> <p>2 The density of the site should be reduced to accommodate no more than 1,000 dwellings. The current plan delivers dark uniform canyons that will get few hours of light and feel unsafe at night.</p> <p>3. The plan sights Kings Cross as a comparator but doesn't show comparative density ratios. The proposal should show the ratio of cubic metres of built space to site acres for Kings Cross and for the O2 Centre proposal</p>
2022/0528/P	S. Nix	19/03/2022 13:39:59	OBJ	<p>Like the majority of others responding, I strongly object to this proposed development and for the same reasons: too many new homes/flats proposed for the space allowed (even with the reduced amount of 1800), loss of current amenities (Sainsbury's as it is now, cinema, gym/fitness concern, Waterstones, restaurants), too much pressure on an area where existing services are already struggling (GP surgeries, schools, stores, etc.), exacerbation of the existing heavy traffic problems. In addition, the upheaval and chaos that will result from the destruction and construction process over the coming years will, I believe, continue far past any expected timeframe and cause massive problems and misery in the interim.</p> <p>I went to one of the in-person consultations held at the O2 Centre at the beginning of March. I was told that the existing Sainsbury's would go, but that it, or another supermarket, would be included somewhere on the site; I understood this would be smaller than what is presently available. I think that is a critical mistake. Eliminating the parking area will also create a knock-on effect of people attempting to park in the neighbouring areas of West Hampstead, South Hampstead, and similar. This will create more traffic congestion and pollution and ruin neighbourhoods, some of which are conservation areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, I think the 'green spaces' allowed in the proposed development are weak and pathetic in that they are too few, not big enough and merely a token gesture.</p> <p>There is so much widespread and fervent opposition to this I hope the council and developers take it on board - otherwise, what is the point of doing a consultation in the first place?</p>
2022/0528/P	Katie	19/03/2022 16:38:22	OBJ	The area does not have enough infrastructure to support this many new flats. The transportation would be completely overwhelmed, and as it is, Camden does not keep our streets clean. This has been in a full decline from/ during the pandemic. I appreciate new building, but this many new flats is irresponsible and not thought through.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Francis Roodt	19/03/2022 16:50:08	OBJ	<p>I am a local resident with a young family. I wish to object to all aspects of the proposed plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) The area is already over populated and public services (notably public transport, schools, roads and GPs) are simply unable to cope with recent increases in the residential population. For example; I cannot get my daughter on any number of buses in the mornings as they are so overcrowded the driver cannot open the doors. The tubes at rush hour are just horrible, the platform (even with Covid) is so busy it's become dangerous. Getting a GP appointment can take over a week, they can only spend 10 minutes with a patient. Schools are already oversubscribed. I don't have a car but finding parking for friends and food deliveries is almost impossible.</p> <p>b) The O2 centre offers commercial services to residents, many of which are really valued, the cinema, Sainsbury's, creche, book shop and various restaurants and shops are extensively used. The parking is functional. The O2 centre and the Homebase act as a focal point and should not be demolished or at least repurposed. Frankly more could be done to make the area feel green, including more charging points for cars and clearly protected bicycle lanes.</p> <p>c) The proposal itself looks awful. Its a long line of soulless high rises which invoke the very worst of modern buildings. While I fully understand that London as a never ending demand, there have recently been a number of massive blocks build on west end lane and new buildings on Finchley Rd, surely the council need to recognise that there is a maximum capacity the area can reasonably sustain. I believe we have already passed that point some time ago.</p> <p>Please stop adding more residential apartments and preserve the O2 centre and commercial services we have.</p>
2022/0528/P	Michael Wakefield	20/03/2022 11:41:25	OBJ	<p>As resident of West. Hampstead I fear for the traffic and transport of vehicles connected with the development of the O2 centre. Roads will not be able to cope with the increase of deliveries and collections needed for such an operation. Additionally, there seem to be no social facilities planned for the estate which will make life difficult for those inhabitants.</p>
2022/0528/P	j borgeaud	21/03/2022 23:14:33	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the overbearing, over-dense development at the O2 site. West Hampstead is not the area for a such an inappropriate high rise development accommodating a huge density of people.</p> <p>This development will mean the loss of the much needed Sainsburys supermarket with nothing to replace it. Any retail outlets on the site will be predominantly for the residents and of a much smaller scale. Present shoppers, and their cars, will be forced to drive further to do their shopping. Hardly good for the environment. The present O2 site has a constant movement of vehicles and people which means it feels fairly safe for women. Once that car movement has gone the whole atmosphere will change and it could be a very scary place to visit, especially at night. Billy Fury Way and Granny Dripping Steps are also ideal escape routes from the site for anyone intent on criminality with little chance of pursuit.</p> <p>This whole development, with an influx of thousands of people from elsewhere, and the removal Sainsburys and the O2, brings no benefit to West Hampstead.</p> <p>I urge Camden to consider the present residents and poor commuters in West Hampstead and reject this application.</p>
2022/0528/P	Michelle	22/03/2022 04:51:29	COMMNT	<p>This project is based purely on financial profit and not at all designed for the community in mind. Far too many blocks and units for the infrastructure in the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Michelle	22/03/2022 04:51:31	COMMNT	This project is based purely on financial profit and not at all designed for the community in mind. Far too many blocks and units for the infrastructure in the area.
2022/0528/P	Michelle	22/03/2022 04:51:33	COMMNT	This project is based purely on financial profit and not at all designed for the community in mind. Far too many blocks and units for the infrastructure in the area.
2022/0528/P	Michelle	22/03/2022 04:51:35	COMMNT	This project is based purely on financial profit and not at all designed for the community in mind. Far too many blocks and units for the infrastructure in the area.
2022/0528/P	Michelle	22/03/2022 04:51:37	COMMNT	This project is based purely on financial profit and not at all designed for the community in mind. Far too many blocks and units for the infrastructure in the area.
2022/0528/P	Kate Ross	20/03/2022 18:11:28	COMMNT	I am 100% against this. I lived in NW6 for 10 yearnd now NW3 for the last 12 years and experience the impact of building sites, overcrowding and not enough infrastructure. These towers are not at all in keeping with our neighbourhood. The traffic caused by the building site and then the residences will be a nightmare for years. But you seem to be doing this for personal gains. Why not build something simpler and more sustainable? Stop this building please.
2022/0528/P	Mazal	20/03/2022 20:35:01	OBJ	I object to this plan to Demolish 02 Centre .it will change life for Worse for all , we need 02 as it is now and we need food store with parking facilities and home base and builders yard . All is basic needs for normal people to have , life is bad Enough is it is, We hardly can breathe with all this restrictions. taking this away will be like killing us !
2022/0528/P	Mazal	20/03/2022 20:35:05	OBJ	I object to this plan to Demolish 02 Centre .it will change life for Worse for all , we need 02 as it is now and we need food store with parking facilities and home base and builders yard . All is basic needs for normal people to have , life is bad Enough is it is, We hardly can breathe with all this restrictions. taking this away will be like killing us !

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Daniel Harris	20/03/2022 14:44:01	OBJ	<p>The development is assessed against:</p> <p>The London Plan The Camden Local Plan The Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Camden's 2013 Site Allocations and (sadly) its 2019 draft Site Allocations Although it is not in a conservation area, also of relevance are the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green conservation area statements, which protect the areas surrounding the site.</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>While Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that if it did, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <p>Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification. It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access. A common theme in the feedback to Camden's recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.</p> <p>This public view is in-keeping with the tallest buildings in the area:</p> <p>The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward. The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This development contains several buildings that are taller than either of these. It is therefore extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.</p> <p>As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies:</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground.

Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, is it located in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:

"Is human in scale"

"Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass"

"Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings", including that tall buildings should "avoid any negative impact" (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas.

"Has regard to the impact on local views" identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation. Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.

Affordable housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

While we recognise that Camden's Cabinet member for planning has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. The London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

However, the related factors are all, at best, the minimum that is required under Camden's policies:

Policy H4 specifies a balance within the affordable housing component of 60-40 between social-affordable and intermediate, which this barely scrapes, being exactly 60% social affordable by both habitable rooms and floor areas.

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a 'social-affordable' rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

The development falls far short of the affordable housing target, and – furthermore – provides the bare minimum in both mix of affordable housing and affordability of that housing in a way that might compensate or mitigate that. It should therefore be refused.

Car parking

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment. This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'. The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed. Read more here.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".</p> <p>However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).</p> <p>This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows. Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	Michelle	22/03/2022 04:51:39	COMMNT	This project is based purely on financial profit and not at all designed for the community in mind. Far too many blocks and units for the infrastructure in the area.
2022/0528/P	Michelle	22/03/2022 04:51:41	COMMNT	This project is based purely on financial profit and not at all designed for the community in mind. Far too many blocks and units for the infrastructure in the area.
2022/0528/P	Mazal	20/03/2022 20:35:09	OBJ	I object to this plan to Demolish 02 Centre .it will change life for Worse for all , we need 02 as it is now and we need food store with parking facilities and home base and builders yard . All is basic needs for normal people to have , life is bad Enough is it is, We hardly can breathe with all this restrictions. taking this away will be like killing us !
2022/0528/P	Mazal	20/03/2022 20:35:12	OBJ	I object to this plan to Demolish 02 Centre .it will change life for Worse for all , we need 02 as it is now and we need food store with parking facilities and home base and builders yard . All is basic needs for normal people to have , life is bad Enough is it is, We hardly can breathe with all this restrictions. taking this away will be like killing us !
2022/0528/P	Mazal	20/03/2022 20:35:16	OBJ	I object to this plan to Demolish 02 Centre .it will change life for Worse for all , we need 02 as it is now and we need food store with parking facilities and home base and builders yard . All is basic needs for normal people to have , life is bad Enough is it is, We hardly can breathe with all this restrictions. taking this away will be like killing us !
2022/0528/P	Mazal	20/03/2022 20:35:19	OBJ	I object to this plan to Demolish 02 Centre .it will change life for Worse for all , we need 02 as it is now and we need food store with parking facilities and home base and builders yard . All is basic needs for normal people to have , life is bad Enough is it is, We hardly can breathe with all this restrictions. taking this away will be like killing us !

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Sam Padmore	21/03/2022 10:36:05	OBJ	I strongly object to this awful plan - it is pure greed with no thought to the local area or the people that live and work there. Tower blocks of up to 15 stories, all packed between the two railway tracks running from West End Lane to the O2 centre on Finchley Road is obviously a really terrible plan. The strain on sewage and water pipes, on public pavements and roads, on local doctors and schools and the trains and tubes and buses...and the fire safety and quality of life of those who will live there... Camden Council you are ignoring it all in pursuit of corporate cash. I object to selling our neighbourhood to Landsec, I object to flooding and crowds and lack of light and excess of noise, I object to the destruction of our village life and the ruination of the local area. You must stop this.
2022/0528/P	margaret kreps	18/03/2022 11:14:32	APP	Apart from the overcrowding issues in an area already full to the brim, the loss of a large and useful Sainsburys will be particularly mourned by those of us who can't afford to shop at the nearby Waitrose. Why are we having the loss of this, and our much loved local cinema, foisted on us ? To line developers' pockets, as usual, is the answer !!!
2022/0528/P	Anne	18/03/2022 10:50:44	OBJ	I wish to lodge my OBJECTION to this planning permission based on the following (and not limited) reasons: - health risk to resident's well being as being crammed in like sardines is not ideal living - Camden council already struggling to service Camden residents who pay high council tax and not getting value for money ie. the streets (particularly Finchley Road) are always filthy, full of rubbish, rotting food and junk that is scattered over the pavement - local amenities such as schools, doctors etc. do not have capacity to deal with the huge volume of extra residents - this many extra apartments will put a huge strain on infrastructure such as roads, drainage, sewerage etc. - major health risk to all residents in area because of the increased traffic, pollution and noise - safety issue due to increased level of people and anti-social behaviour
2022/0528/P	K lai	20/03/2022 09:06:18	OBJ	I object to this as this would increase traffic on Finchley Rd. It is already a confestion spot as it stand today. This will make daily travel ridiculous. The buses and tube will be even more crowded on the daily commute.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	James Bland	20/03/2022 08:14:27	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr Fowler,</p> <p>The plan to erect this number of dwellings? in place of a large supermarket, car park, cinema and shops shows complete disregard for the local population and their needs.</p> <p>The large supermarket caters for many customers in the area by virtue of its car park. This facility also enables people to perform errands at the post office, bank, tube station pick-up and local shopping.</p> <p>By removing this parking facility you will starve the shops of their customers. You will also make it harder for locals to lead their normal lives.</p> <p>The input of this number of new dwellings cannot be accommodated by the local schools, nurseries, GP surgery or (already-busy bus route and tube station) This is is on top of the removal of the 82 bus route and no space for a cycle lane.</p> <p>The o2 is a social hub for the community providing entertainment, restaurants, coffee shops, classes, a gym and somewhere to park to meet.</p> <p>I strongly object to this planning permission.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Dr J Bland</p>
2022/0528/P	K lai	20/03/2022 09:06:21	OBJ	<p>I object to this as this would increase traffic on Finchley Rd. It is already a confestion spot as it stand today. This will make daily travel ridiculous. The buses and tube will be even more crowded on the daily commute.</p>
2022/0528/P	Angelo Muccio	19/03/2022 14:01:57	INT	<p>I am concerned with the proposed planning application (2022/0528/P). I reside in the neighboring area of the proposed planning application and am concerned with the impact on my social welfare.</p> <p>The primary concern is the volume of new housing and therefore the required support facilities and services. Addition of 1,800 new flats will result in additional residents of approximately 5,000-6,000. This is a seismic increase requiring suitable facilities and services for the people residing in the area. Are there plans to support fundamental health and educational requirements e.g. doctors, dentists, nurseries, schools, etc.?</p> <p>I believe part of the planned proposal should be reserved for non-residential requirements. This will have the dual benefit of reducing the number of residents and ensuring the appropriate support facilities and services can be planned in the immediate area for the new residents.</p> <p>Of course not doing so will put significant strain on the surrounding area, negatively impacting the quality of life of existing residents.</p> <p>A better balanced proposal is required.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	daniel daly	20/03/2022 09:54:47	OBJ	must not happen. this is an outrage and a huge problem to deal with for locals.
2022/0528/P	Colleen Kelsall	20/03/2022 16:57:09	COMMNT	<p>This development doesn't seem to do anything for West Hampstead except line the pockets of the developers and I imagine Camden council. These don't seem to be ecologically developed or thought through at all. The green spaces are literally non existent and definitely not large enough to accommodate a tenth of the 4000+ adults and children plus pets on a sunny weekend. We should be thinking about the future and the climate crisis so if anything should be built it should be built with that in mind and these clearly are not. Knocking down what is there already (The O2 Centre etc..) is also incredibly bad for the environment. Has anyone actually accessed what the impact of all of this is on the environment and therefore the planet. Are the units triple glazed? How are they heated in the winter and cooled in the summer? Are the buildings environmentally sustainable? No gas boilers I assume? What will the EPI be? Have they been BREEAM rated? Do the architects, developers and builders work with the UK Green Building Council? They are extremely unattractive and again without any thought for the environment so no green roof terraces and balconies, also so tall and close together! I was under the impression that buildings couldn't be higher than 10 storeys which to be honest is still too tall, what is the impact of this many buildings stealing light from the homes around them and plunging them into the shadows? Do these people get compensation for being so heavily overlooked and overshadowed? I really don't understand how the local infrastructure can support this many units and therefore people, has this even been thought of? What are the results of the studies? Please don't tell me that building over the car car park will be greener for the planet because people will have to walk, we all know that's not true, they won't walk they will just have to driver further to shop! I have also only recently realised how many empty buildings etc., that there are around this area, surely it would be money well spent bringing these buildings up to a high standard before adding to the over development of this neighbourhood and creating another ecologically challenged building for the future. It's an overcrowded mess, to be honest I am shocked that it has even got to this stage. Please do better for the future of the planet and peoples lives.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Tim Borgeaud	21/03/2022 21:48:52	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning application.</p> <p>I am very concerned about several factors that even modest density of extra residents will cause.</p> <p>The site being developed currently includes commercial facilities, most notably including a large supermarket, that appear to be quite heavily used by pedestrians from West Hampstead and nearby. I assume that the loss of these facilities will lead to more car trips from and back to West Hampstead. In addition, new additional residents will need deliveries, services, and visitors. I would expect some additional road infrastructure would be needed to allow for the extra traffic.</p> <p>I also understand that current transport links (rail) and also the roads in this area are also busy and possibly close to capacity, so I would assume that new residents and additional facilities such as schools, doctors, shops and services etc, will place more pressure on services that are already overcrowded.</p> <p>I am also concerned that new facilities, such as doctors surgeries etc and also green space would also be required to cater for the extra residents. Obviously, if the area did include the typical garden and additional public green space that is found throughout the rest of the area, and also space for extra shopping and services (beyond that currently found on the site), then there this would not be such a worry.</p> <p>An empty space, even used and inaccessible, does not present a problem to the current area. I fail to see how current occupants of this area, and surrounding areas, will not be put under greater pressure and need to travel further (to find space etc).</p>
2022/0528/P	Jacqueline Anne Dyche	20/03/2022 19:18:04	COMMNT	<p>I would like to register my objection to this proposed development on the following grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The number of flats is massively in excess of what is reasonable for the size of the site and for what he local area's infrastructure can support 2) There is minimal green space and recreational area. There is a desperate need for a large open area to enhance the area and provide and make the development less oppressive and intense 3) It's a massive loss to the area to lose the retail facilities of the o2 centre 4) The parking provision is laughable
2022/0528/P	Nina	19/03/2022 08:54:26	APP	<p>This is atrocious. I lived in the area when the O2 centre was built so tearing it down after only a short and not replacing a big supermarket with parking facilities is really going to affect the area in a bad way. First Morrissons in Chalk Farm, now this?</p> <p>Also, 5000 homes in that space??? Who is your town planner? Please could you let us know who is getting paid here by the developer to get sign off. Even a child looking at the CG model can see that this is a ridiculous proposal, why can't you?</p> <p>It will ruin the area. It will only enrich rich developers and some select people at Camden council who when asked would probably never choose to live in their own cramped new development. Do something about it!!!!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Simon Parkin	19/03/2022 11:58:15	OBJ	I oppose this development. There are no other high rises in the area. This makes me really angry the process of no consultation. We need the facilities and parking at the O2 centre.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Charles Openshaw	21/03/2022 14:25:01	OBJ	Tall Buildings

London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."

While Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that if it did, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:

Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification. It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access. A common theme in the feedback to Camden's recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.

This public view is in-keeping with the tallest buildings in the area:

The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward.

The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.

This development contains several buildings that are taller than either of these. It is therefore extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.

As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.

Conservation

The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies:

They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground.

Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, it is located in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

"Is human in scale"

"Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass"

"Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings", including that tall buildings should "avoid any negative impact" (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas.

"Has regard to the impact on local views" identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation.

Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.

Affordable housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

While we recognise that Camden's Cabinet member for planning has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. The London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

However, the related factors are all, at best, the minimum that is required under Camden's policies:

Policy H4 specifies a balance within the affordable housing component of 60-40 between social-affordable and intermediate, which this barely scrapes, being exactly 60% social affordable by both habitable rooms and floor areas.

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a 'social-affordable' rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

The development falls far short of the affordable housing target, and – furthermore – provides the bare minimum in both mix of affordable housing and affordability of that housing in a way that might compensate or mitigate that. It should therefore be refused.

Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'.

The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed. Read more here.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).

This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	S Mills	19/03/2022 12:28:26	OBJ	<p>Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	Phi Gould	19/03/2022 12:28:23	COMMT	<p>I object to the proposals.</p> <p>1) The master plan is not deliverable because Landsec do not own all the sites. The proposals should provide a sustainable solution phase by phase and not allow a developer to cherry-pick the high value aspects of the plan, leaving less profitable but socially valuable components as aspirations.</p> <p>2) Building heights proposed are out of context and harm the architectural character of the area. Hampstead Square is at the limit of what is acceptable, Landsec's proposals should be no higher.</p> <p>3) Funding needs to be found in the first phase for lifts at Finchley Road and West Hampstead tube stations, and for an enhanced public realm where the site connects with the A41 and West End Lane.</p> <hr/> <p>I am objecting to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 high rise building This is largely a low rise area with a distinctive heritage and look and feel. It is important to maintain this as this is why many people choice to live here. Putting up four extremely tall buildings will decimate this and ruin the area.</p> <p>2 over population in a small area with an already strained infrastructure. West Hampstead/ Hampstead is already creecking at the seems in terms of the infrastructure. There are not enough doctors, schools and poor transportation to serve the number of people already living here. Pushing another 3000-4000 people into this small space will totally cripple the infrastructure and further impact the already poor standard of living offered by Camden council services. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>3 super market Getting rid of the largest supermarket in the area is madness. Offering to replace this with another metro supermarket is wrong. These shops offer a limited selection at much higher prices. This is unfair and wrong. The proposed commitment to put in a small supermarket without parking will only service the people moving into this complex. What about all the other Camden residents? No thought about them.</p> <p>4 parking Taking away the parking for shoppers , movie goers and people wanting to eat at restaurants is also unacceptable. There is very little parking in this area already. There is no solution offered for people who need to do a weekly shop and need to transport this home. Also no solution for disable people being able to do the weekly shop. If the parking lot is taken away the developers need to replace this with another option enabling all Camden residents to park there.</p> <p>5. Transportation and highly trafficked area. Transportation is already poor. The traffic outside the o2 centre is already horrendous at most times of the day. Pushing in another 3000-4000 people is going to exacerbate this problem. Bus services are also already stretched . Offering to invest in widening the West Hampstead station is good but will not be enough to alleviate the problems which will only get worse moving these thousands of people about.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Ivana	20/03/2022 19:13:56	OBJ	Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment. This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'. The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".</p> <p>However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).</p> <p>This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows. Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	Mr and Mrs Antonucci	20/03/2022 21:03:04	OBJ	<p>1,800 flats seems a huge number. We were under impression that the initial number was lower. Even if it wasn't, 1,800 flats implies a huge structure. We're concerned about its environmental impact. We also believe it could strain public transport significantly, adding to a situation that's already extremely congested. We also think it will put an unsustainable pressure on all the public and private facilities and infrastructure: medical, recreational, educational, etc. We strongly object to the 1,800 flats project. Please reduce the number of flats.</p>
2022/0528/P	Mr and Mrs Antonucci	20/03/2022 21:03:07	OBJ	<p>1,800 flats seems a huge number. We were under impression that the initial number was lower. Even if it wasn't, 1,800 flats implies a huge structure. We're concerned about its environmental impact. We also believe it could strain public transport significantly, adding to a situation that's already extremely congested. We also think it will put an unsustainable pressure on all the public and private facilities and infrastructure: medical, recreational, educational, etc. We strongly object to the 1,800 flats project. Please reduce the number of flats.</p>
2022/0528/P	Claire Giribaldi	19/03/2022 11:01:03	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Though recognising that there is a need for more houses; the buildings proposed are particularly tall and do not match with the typical small houses in the area. The type of architecture is basic and uninspiring. Also, has health of future residents been considered with the close proximity of a busy road with high background levels of air pollution? The proposal for commercial amenity is less important than the large shops currently present and there will be no space for others in the area to park for their shopping. The reduction of number houses is not sufficient compared to previous proposals. Please refuse this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Lisa Montgomery	19/03/2022 11:33:03	COMMNT	<p>My serious concern is about density of population on Finchley Road and at the Finchley Road and West Hampstead tube station.</p> <p>Sidewalks on Finchley Road in this area are already very crowded with people regularly being pushed into the street by the density of the foot traffic. Equally, both the Finchley Road tube station and the West Hampstead tube station are small, with very limited space throughout the stations or on the sidewalks outside of them. It is already very much the case that West End Lane is jammed with people flowing into the streets during busy travel periods. Someone will get killed by traffic or falling onto a platform if the density gets much worse. It is not as simple as having a member of staff at the entrance to the station to control crowds. There is nowhere for those crowds to go. Adding 1800 flats to the area is a recipe for disaster.</p>
2022/0528/P	Lisa Montgomery	19/03/2022 11:33:05	COMMNT	<p>My serious concern is about density of population on Finchley Road and at the Finchley Road and West Hampstead tube station.</p> <p>Sidewalks on Finchley Road in this area are already very crowded with people regularly being pushed into the street by the density of the foot traffic. Equally, both the Finchley Road tube station and the West Hampstead tube station are small, with very limited space throughout the stations or on the sidewalks outside of them. It is already very much the case that West End Lane is jammed with people flowing into the streets during busy travel periods. Someone will get killed by traffic or falling onto a platform if the density gets much worse. It is not as simple as having a member of staff at the entrance to the station to control crowds. There is nowhere for those crowds to go. Adding 1800 flats to the area is a recipe for disaster.</p>
2022/0528/P	Harold Lorenzelli	19/03/2022 11:33:59	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I hereby announce my objection to the proposed building of flats on the site of the O2 centre which clearly go beyond the architectural ethos of the area in terms of height. In addition, why are there no firm proposals for social housing in the plans?</p> <p>Yours, Haroldorenzelli</p>
2022/0528/P	Janet Nabney	20/03/2022 14:11:52	INT	<p>The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed.</p> <p>Despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed).</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.</p> <p>More careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation and the area is not suited to high-rise buildings.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Aimee Bryant	17/03/2022 18:11:45	PETITNOBJ E	Who is ensuring the local infrastructure can cope?? What about our drainage systems (I personally flooded this year, and know now that over development is a huge factor). Who is ensuring schools, GPS, dentists etc can cope with sure a huge surge of local residents. I bet none of these flats will be available to purchase for a fee anywhere near what working class locals can afford. This is far too many flats in one small area. We have to stop these types of developments
2022/0528/P	Judith hoffman	19/03/2022 18:03:16	OBJ	I am totally against any further development in this area. We simply do not have the infrastructure to accommodate so many households!

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Susan Zur-Szpiro	20/03/2022 22:54:47	OBJ	<p>I AM WRITING TO OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION 2022/0528/P on the basis of the design contradicting several of Camden's own building policies! My objections are mostly before:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height, mass and form contravene national guidance • Overshadowing contravenes the Right to Light act • Layout and density contravene the London Plan policy • Design conflicts with Camden's Climate Change and Clean Air Action Plan • Proposed scheme will swamp (literally) local Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets • Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets • Politically motivated elimination of private transport <p>Overbearing height, mass and form The National Model Design Code advises building heights of 3-4 storeys and densities of 60-120 dwellings per hectare for an urban neighbourhood site such as O2. Landsec is proposing 18 towers of 8-11 and 11 towers of 12-16 stories to give 312dph which 3-5 times recommended density. This is 'super density' development and not surprisingly, the site has not been classified to avoid this embarrassing challenge.</p> <p>Camden's Local Plan policy A2 requires a minimum open space of 9m2 per occupant, implying an open space of 40-45,000 m2. Landsec's proposal totals 15,500m2 which is just one quarter of Camden's own policy requirement in an area that is officially green-space deprived.</p> <p>Overshadowing and Loss of light to neighbours Skylight, sometimes known as diffuse skylight, is diffused all around us even on cloudy days, whilst sunlight is the light which comes directly from the sun on clear days. BRE define daylight as a combination of skylight and sunlight, adding, "The quantity and quality of daylight inside a room will be impaired if obstructing buildings are large in relation to their distance away". In a British context, skylight is the more important component. A loss of view is not a valid planning objection but the 'right to light 'of nearby neighbours to the north of this scheme is protected by the Rights to Light Act 1959.</p> <p>Layout and density of building A 'tall building' is defined as anything higher than 10 storeys. This development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. The area is unsuitable for high rise buildings and the primary benefits of this 'new neighbourhood' of sub-standard architecture – more in keeping with an office than a residential setting- will go to the developer, Landsec and Camden Council, not to the community.</p> <p>Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard, co-founder and director of the Making Cities Liveable International Council says, "the construction industry is a powerful engine for fuelling economic development. Tall buildings offer increased profits for developers. However, the higher a building rises, the more expensive is the construction. Thus, the tallest buildings tend to be luxury units, often for global investors. Tall buildings inflate the price of adjacent land, thus making the protection of historic buildings and affordable housing less achievable. In this way, they increase inequality."</p> <p>The density is abnormally high and significantly exceeds the London Plan Density Matrix even for a site of PTAL 6. Camden, a borough which has produced some of the highest quality homes in the last 50 years, is said in a report that went to cabinet in early March, to have co-designed this insensitive housing environment.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

In conflict with Camden's Climate Change and Clean Air Action Plan

There are sound reasons not to demolish the O2 Centre. In the words of a Camden Council Planning officer: 'Land Sec will need to demonstrate that the redevelopment of the O2 centre is more sustainable than refurbishing the building. To do this they will need to submit a whole life carbon assessment'. The embodied carbon as energy consumed in manufacturing, delivering and installing the materials to build, and fit-out these buildings over a planned 15-year construction and their disposal at end of life as well as operational carbon associated with electricity, gas and other fuels used for heating, cooling, ventilation, lighting, hot water, and other electrical equipment must be accounted for.

Construction also has a significant and negative impact on local air quality and potentially public health if it is not carefully managed. Construction activity is responsible for 4% of NO2 emissions, 24% of PM10 emissions and 9% of PM2.5 emissions in Camden.

Increases Pressure on Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets

Where is the significant and long overdue increase in medical resources in West Hampstead to reflect the needs of 5000+ new users? NHS England published guidance in February 2018, requiring extended access to GP services, including at evenings and weekends, for 100% of the population by 1 October 2018. Access to basic health and dental care for local residents has diminished not increased.

The area will face more overcrowded pavements, roads, transport and the loss of all the amenity of the O2 centre, including a large supermarket with 550 parking spaces – none of which can be effectively replicated in this scheme. Without any parking, no large format store to replace the current Sainsbury's can be viable.

Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets

The O2 site is bordered by five conservation areas:

- South Hampstead
- West End Green
- Fitzjohns/Netherhall
- Redington/Frognaal
- Belsize

In point 3.2.2 of the FG&WH Neighbourhood Plan it states: 'The height of new buildings shall have regard to conservation and respect the proportion, scale, massing and rooflines of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. In all development there shall be a clear presumption in favour of preserving the distinct character and appearance of the Area, as well as the views across it.'

In observations, posted on the O2 planning application, Historic England comments: 'The buildings on the site are substantially greater than that found within the conservation areas and would appear in some views from within them and out of them. The volume and scale of the development means that there is a harmful impact to designated heritage assets through development within their setting.'

The O2 site is surrounded by 29 listed buildings and 5 conservation areas. Their settings will be blighted by the intrusion of towers blocks and is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Good Practice Advice by Historic England.

Politically motivated elimination of private transport

The scheme objective that "The impacts of car parking should be designed out" reveals a socialist utopian

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

ambition to eliminate private transport. The intended outcome is for all 'citizens' to become wholly dependent upon state provided transport (TfL!) and have no alternative (except walking or cycling). Under UK net-zero plans, all Internal Combustion Engine vehicles will be banned from 2030. However, Electric Vehicles will rightly not be banned. Eliminating private transport in Camden is politically motivated and denies residents their legal rights to private transport. This will also impact Camden and London's economic and labour market flexibility and overall will reduce growth and impact employment in Camden.

There are 2 further objections: 1. The impact on drains and flooding risk as Thames Water's report has indicated, safety risk of only one staircase, the negative social impact on all residents except maybe young singles or couples. It would be a dreadful place to live for babies, children, teens, parents of young children, residents with disabilities, elderly. The problems of drugs, criminal behaviour, etc are well known for those living in such inappropriate tall buildings with no amenities for residents.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Volkswagen Group UK Ltd	18/03/2022 10:04:36	OBJNOT	Dear Mr Fowler

I refer to the above planning application which includes the redevelopment of a site currently occupied and operated as a successful business by Volkswagen and Audi at 277 and 279 Finchley Road. Volkswagen and Audi would like to object to the proposals for the redevelopment of the site.

Background to objectors

The Volkswagen car dealership at 277 Finchley Road has been operating successfully since 1999 with several members of the team working at this location from day one. The car showroom currently employs 70 people on site, the majority of which are local. The company is invested in the training of local young people and currently employ 4 apprentices at the site and have 2 more apprentices starting this year. There is strong customer support for the retention of the dealership in the area and there is a desire for the dealership to remain at this site. Volkswagen have expressed a strong interest to continue trading and invest in this site in the future.

Similarly, Audi employs 50 local people at the dealership at 279 Finchley Road and the showroom has been operating successfully from this location for over 25 years. Currently the unit employs 3 apprentices with more to join the dealership later in the year.

As well as typical car dealership operations, the businesses also play an important role in providing a servicing function for vehicles within the local area including private hire, blue light, car sharing and subscription clubs. This includes a contract with Zip Car and Addison Lee, who are both running electric vehicles. Repairs are carried out at the site to Police and Ambulance vehicles on a regular basis. This local service requires a physical location and space to continue, the closure would have a knock-on detrimental impact on these other local businesses and services who rely on this facility.

Overall, across the two dealerships at this location, the proposed development poses a risk to 120 local jobs and at least 10 apprentices.

Proposals

The red line boundary of the submitted planning application (reference: 2022/0528/P includes the unit currently occupied by Volkswagen (Alan Day Volkswagen) and Audi (Finchley Road Audi). The application proposes the demolition of these units and the redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses (the car dealerships sit within the N6 and N7 plots which sit in phase 2 of the planned masterplan). Car showroom use is not listed within the proposed description of development, so the proposals do not allow for the continued operation of this successful businesses as it stands, or as part of, this proposed development.

The submitted planning statement provides the following justification for the removal of the car showroom use from the site:

“Located in the west of the Site are car showrooms and a Builders Merchant. As set out in the land use assessment within this Statement, these uses represent an inefficient use land. They are not compatible with a high-quality residential development and also constrain the ability of the Site to deliver the range of public

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

benefits sought by the Local Planning Authority.”

No justification or evidence is provided to back up this statement.

Site and Planning Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Volkswagen and Audi believe that the proposals as they stand are contrary to local planning policy (Camden Local Plan 2017) for the following reasons:

1. Policy A1- Managing the impact of development states the following: the council will seek to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities. The proposed development proposes to demolish and remove all traces of the existing characteristics of the local area and community, including the demolition of two successful car dealerships which employ and train over 120 local people. The proposed development does not therefore seek to balance the needs of the development with the needs of the existing local area, it seeks to replace the existing uses, and therefore the proposed development is contrary to this policy.
2. If phase 1 (the detailed element of the proposed plan for the redevelopment of the car park) is permitted and goes ahead while plans are being finalised for the remaining phases, Volkswagen and Audi have concerns regarding noise, vibration, odour, fumes and dust during the construction phase and the impact this could have on the employees, customers and business operation of the car dealerships. Volkswagen and Audi have concerns about the impact on the sunlight and daylight received by the employees of the car dealerships due to the height of the blocks proposed (protected in England and Wales under common law, adverse possession or by the Prescription Act 1832) and have concerns regarding the transport impacts of the development including potential intensification of Blackburn Road for servicing and delivery access to the western blocks of housing. This could interrupt and disrupt the successful business operation of the car dealerships which require clear access from Blackburn Road. For these reasons, the proposed development is contrary to Policy A1.
3. Policy E1- Economic Development states that the council will support businesses of all sizes, maintain a stock of premises that are suitable for a variety of business, support local enterprise development, employment and training schemes for Camden residents, will safeguard the existing employment premises in the borough that meet the needs of industry and other employers and will recognise the importance of employment generating uses including retail. As outlined in the above section, the existing car dealerships at this location are successful, meet the needs of the industry and employs and trains local residents of Camden. The removal of this use from this site is therefore contrary to Policy E1 as the jobs, investment and training opportunities provided as part of this existing use will be lost. The aim of this policy is to retain, not remove or redevelop active and successful businesses.
4. Policy E2- Employment Sites and Premises states that the council will protect premises or sites that

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

provide employment for Camden residents and those that support the functioning of the local economy. The council will resist development of sites unless it can be demonstrated that the site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business use and that the possibility of retaining, re-using or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative type and size of business use has been fully explored over an appropriate period of time. The policy states that the council will consider higher intensity redevelopment of premises or sites that are suitable for continued business provided that the redevelopment retains existing businesses on the site as far as possible. The current car dealership buildings are suitable for this existing employment use and the applicant has not taken any steps to retain the use as part of the redevelopment scheme (or has even included car dealerships as part of the mix of uses proposed in the description within the outline proposals). The proposed scheme is therefore contrary to this policy and the council should not support the loss of the car dealerships as part of this redevelopment.

5. Volkswagen and Audi appreciate that the car dealerships are located within the West Hampstead Interchange area where improving the public transport provision and movement around the area is a key objective. The council expects developments in the area to contribute towards a mix of uses, new housing and improved accessibility and street environment. The policy does not state that this should be to the detriment of existing successful employers in the area.

6. The adopted Camden Site Allocations Document (2013) allocates only the O2 Centre car park area (1.35ha) for mixed use housing development. Consultation on the draft site allocations local plan took place in March 2020. This document included a wider area (4.5ha) including the O2 Centre, the car park, the Homebase store and the car showrooms for mixed use redevelopment. This is not adopted policy and therefore currently only the car park area of the site benefits from a mixed-use allocation. Any further development, including the compulsory purchase, demolition and replacement of existing successful businesses in this area is therefore contrary to adopted allocation policy.

7. The site is located within the Finchley Road/ Swiss Cottage Town Centre. Policy TC1 states that the council will promote retail and other town centre uses within these areas. Policy TC2 states that the council will provide for and maintain a range of shops and other suitable uses to provide variety, vibrancy and choice within Town Centres. A housing dominated scheme is therefore unsuitable in an allocated Town Centre and not in compliance with this policy.

8. Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages are located within the O2 Centre Building and along Finchley Road. Policy TC2 states that primary frontages will be protected for retail use in order to maintain the retail function of the centre and secondary frontages will be protected as locations for shops together with a broader range of other town centre uses to support the viability and vitality of the centre. The policy states that residential uses may be supported above retained ground floor retail frontages. Although the proposals include an element of commercial space at ground floor levels of the building, this is limited, and residential units are still included at ground floor level throughout the development. These proposals are therefore contrary to Policy TC2.

9. The proposals are contrary to Policy CC1- Climate change mitigation as the submitted Energy Statement fails to fully rationalise the proposed demolition of the car dealerships. The applicant fails to justify why it is not possible to retain and improve the existing buildings. The proposals include a substantial demolition of well-functioning buildings across the site, and Volkswagen and Audi believe this has not been fully justified.

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

This is contrary to Policy CC1 which states that “all proposals for substantial demolition and reconstruction should be fully justified in terms of the optimisation of resources and energy use”.

Desired Outcome

Volkswagen and Audi would like to continue operating from this successful location. This will ensure the retention of the current employment and training opportunities at the successful dealerships. Volkswagen and Audi do not have alternative locations within the vicinity to relocate the branches to so if the current use does not remain, then local jobs, training opportunities and successful businesses which contribute towards the local economy and meet an established local need will be lost.

Volkswagen and Audi have concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the success of their businesses so would encourage Camden Council to refuse this application, and the entire site is left as it is.

Volkswagen and Audi however understand that the car park site has already been allocated for mixed use development and is therefore likely to come forward for development soon. Volkswagen and Audi would like to ensure that appropriate mitigation is put in place to limit any disruption to their business during any construction work associated with this and appropriate transport assessment is carried out to ensure that this will not result in any impact or conflict on the access road to the car dealerships. Volkswagen and Audi believe that if this neighbouring site does come forward, there is the potential for this to complement and work alongside existing uses such as the car dealerships. Volkswagen and Audi would be keen to understand why the applicant believes the car dealership use is not considered compatible with residential development, numerous other examples are provided across London where these uses operate successfully as neighbours. Volkswagen and Audi have the strong view that the development of the site allocated within the adopted Local Plan can come forward successfully (as indicated in Phase 1 of the proposed masterplan (which is proposed to come forward independently) covered by the detailed element of the planning application) without the requirement for the compulsory purchase or use of the land currently occupied by Volkswagen and Audi car dealerships.

The outline planning permission element of the proposals for the remainder of the site within the red line boundary include a range of uses for the site, but this does not include car dealerships as part of the list of potential sui generis uses. Planning policy seeks to retain existing successful businesses and employment as part of the intensification of sites. Justification has not been provided within the submitted documentation for the absence of the existing car dealerships within the description of proposed commercial uses. If this planning application is viewed favourably, Volkswagen and Audi strongly encourage the applicant and council to amend the list of uses proposed to include the retention of the existing car dealerships as part of the emerging plans for the wider site.

The car showroom units are not included within the detailed plans submitted, nor within the demolition plan, so it is clear from the planning documents that development is not intended immediately, and these plots will be subject to further detailed planning applications for demolition and redevelopment. Currently no justification has been provided for the exclusion of this use within the outline proposals. Volkswagen and Audi would welcome the opportunity to engage with the applicant and council to discuss how the existing car dealerships can be incorporated either at their existing location or at an alternative ground floor location as part of the wider redevelopment. An example of where this has worked well elsewhere is at Lookers Volkswagen

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Battersea, 98 York Road. Images shown in a full version of this letter emailed and posted to you demonstrate how an existing car dealership was incorporated as a ground and first floor use within a larger residential development. If the redevelopment proposals are supported by the council, Volkswagen and Audi would like to engage in discussions regarding how a similar scheme may be achieved for both dealerships at Finchley Road as part of proposed ground floor commercial uses.</p> <p>Volkswagen and Audi welcome further discussion regarding the issues raised in this objection so please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries in relation to the above.</p>
2022/0528/P	Myna Punwani	19/03/2022 11:29:31	OBJ	I agree with all the objections provided by Oliver Cooper. Couldn't have put it any better myself. Please do listen to our objections. Thanks
2022/0528/P	Susan Sitkovetsky	19/03/2022 11:30:15	APP	Please reject this application!!!!!!!!!!!!!! The density of this area is at capacity as it is
2022/0528/P	Charlotte Szostek	19/03/2022 12:52:55	OBJ	<p>I oppose this development.</p> <p>There are not enough provisions of service - in the development, GP - parking etc to compensate the increase of properties on this scale.</p> <p>The community needs the Sainsbury's - the only other nearest large store is Waitrose and this is too expensive for most people.</p> <p>The strain this many apartments and if this nature will add to public transport is too high.</p> <p>I strongly object this planning application.</p>
2022/0528/P	Kimberley smith	19/03/2022 12:53:05	COMMNT	I object to the planning of 02 centre being turned into flats

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Mr Barry Driver	20/03/2022 20:15:09	COMMNT	<p>I am writing in the context of the proposed redevelopment of the O2 Centre and the associated land/buildings between Finchley Road and West End Lane. I have lived at my current address in Daleham Gardens, NW3 for almost 50 years, so I am very familiar with the area in all respects.</p> <p>While one understands that the area is probably not used optimally in its current configuration, as many others have commented, a development of 1,800 homes on the site is a gross overdevelopment by any standards, with all the associated pressures on local services that will result and which are not catered for adequately in the plans themselves - and based on my experience of current services in the area, cannot be provided by those already existing.</p> <p>However, my main comment relates to the plan to demolish the existing O2 shopping centre as part of the redevelopment. I regard the plan to knock down a relatively newly built and perfectly acceptable and valued facility in this way is environmentally (and I suggest also economically) totally unacceptable. Relatively new and well-functioning buildings such as this should be preserved until the point where their operation and maintenance becomes uneconomic - I do not believe that this is the case as far as the O2 Centre is concerned.</p> <p>I have read - and observed -that the occupancy of the O2 Centre has not always been complete and that as distinct from the O2 Centre as a whole, some retailers may have struggled to make a success of their businesses, but that has been more probably due to the failings of their own business models rather than any intrinsic lack of value of the facilities. Moreover, the value of these facilities will increase significantly, even if only a proportion of the proposed residential development and/or a less intensive residential redevelopment took place.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the potential loss of the large Sainsbury's supermarket, as there is no comparable facility within several miles radius. Moreover, the retention of such a facility would seem essential, given the large additional numbers of residential units being proposed, whose residents will not want to shop for their food supplies only from convenience-type stores (with the consequent lesser choice and higher price implications). While supporting the principles of reducing car use, the idea of having no car para facility is unrealistic and would greatly inconvenience or take away many customers (although not myself, as I prefer to walk and carry my shopping home and will continue to shop that way until my age makes it impossible).</p> <p>Thank you for your proper consideration of these comments.</p>
2022/0528/P	Kenneth MacDonal Robbie	18/03/2022 12:30:59	OBJ	<p>As a local resident, I am concerned about the scale and character of this proposed development. I think it would be wholly inappropriate to allow so many high-density and high-rise buildings on this site and in an area which is already congested. I ask the Council to give a higher priority to open and green spaces around Finchley Road and to the general quality of the built environment; and to reducing, rather than increasing, housing density wherever possible.</p>
2022/0528/P	Sandra Crewe	19/03/2022 14:06:19	OBJ	<p>The proposed development is a direct contravention of Camden Councils own policies and guidelines. It does not respect local context and the scale and proportions of proposed buildings would be to the detriment of the local environment. This planning application does not positively contribute in making places better for people and negatively impacts the character and quality of the area. The inappropriate layout and density of buildings will negatively impact people and the environment. The environmental assessments are inadequate and smack of greenwashing. People's safety and well-being is at risk due to the overbearing nature of the proposed development. It should be rejected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	susan eastwood	19/03/2022 15:41:02	COMMNT	I object to the pulling down of the O2 centre. It is a hub for local people to socialise, shop, keep fit and go to the cinema. It would be a huge loss for it to go. Families, singles, old, young we all enjoy and rely on the O2 centre. It's part of our lives! Please don't knock it down.
2022/0528/P	Emir Kaan Kesingil	19/03/2022 18:46:27	OBJ	The proposed project is too big for the area.
2022/0528/P	Andrea	19/03/2022 13:50:27	COMMNT	I am deeply against this development which will overwhelm the local community, remove commercial space, crowd the roads and the stations. I will remember this when we next go to vote
2022/0528/P	Andrea	19/03/2022 13:50:30	COMMNT	I am deeply against this development which will overwhelm the local community, remove commercial space, crowd the roads and the stations. I will remember this when we next go to vote
2022/0528/P	Andrea	19/03/2022 13:50:33	COMMNT	I am deeply against this development which will overwhelm the local community, remove commercial space, crowd the roads and the stations. I will remember this when we next go to vote

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	S Bal	19/03/2022 14:37:06	OBJ	<p>The development is positioned between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green conservation areas. A development of this scale an out of character of existing properties which date back to the 19th century would make a farce of the protected areas surrounding the site. The current buildings in the area are red brick detached or mansion blocks no taller than 6 storeys. Any new development should align with the materials, style and height of existing properties.</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans." The majority of properties in the area are no taller that 3 storeys. Any tall buildings will both change the sky line and make a farce of the protected conservation area. As residents we do not want tall high rise buildings in our residential area. This is not a city location.</p> <p>The underground, overground, bus network, local roads are already severely congested. A development of this scale would put unsurmountable pressure on the resources used by local residents.</p> <p>The area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.</p> <p>They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground. Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature. Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, is it located in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:</p> <p>"Is human in scale" "Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass" "Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings", including that tall buildings should "avoid any negative impact" (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas. "Has regard to the impact on local views" identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.</p> <p>Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation. Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.</p> <p>Car parking The congestion and pollution in the area should justify the development of property to align with a greener London and support Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.</p> <p>Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Kay Boyd	19/03/2022 16:44:08	OBJ	<p>This paragraph states that:</p> <p>Loss of large supermarket Much of the local community of West Hampstead, South Hampstead, Hampstead and surrounding areas will lose the Sainsbury's supermarket which is the largest supermarket in the area. This store will need to remain and if this means that the current car park remains, then this should be a significant factor of the planning application.</p> <p>Community facilities These are already overstretched. GP surgeries, dental surgeries, schools, nurseries, child care/clubs are already struggling to satisfy the needs of the local community. Facilities would need to be provided to any new community.</p> <p>Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".</p> <p>Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery and school should be refused. This development should be refused.</p>
<p>I feel it is imperative to ask the decision makers in Camden Council to disallow this development. It is the responsibility of our local authority to enhance and safeguard the environment within their remit. The pressure from developers and the necessity to boost finances should not justify a plan which is so obviously detrimental and inappropriate to the locality.</p> <p>Having seen the model and despite the reassurances of the architects I can't believe that any planning officer would look at these plans and think that they are of an appropriate scale for their surroundings. It just looks monumental.</p> <p>12 high-rise blocks concentrated in such an otherwise low-rise area, will be a blot on the landscape for posterity. Do you want this to be your legacy?</p> <p>I also object to the mean percentage of social housing and would like to remind the local authority that social housing is an investment for perpetuity as opposed to short term gain.</p> <p>I am fully in favour of linking West Hampstead and Finchley Road in an attractive manner: I am fully in favour of building affordable housing on this site: I am not in favour of a development on this offensive scale.</p>				

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Audrey Mandela for Hampstead Hill Gardens RA	20/03/2022 15:05:10	OBJ	<p>The Hampstead Hill Gardens Residents Association objects to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Size: The development's density, bulk and height are excessive and completely out of character with the surrounding area. The buildings that make up the development are much too tall. They would ruin views in the area, including views from and of the Hampstead area. Conservation: The development would sit between a number of conservation areas whose buildings are consistently low- and medium-rise red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. The development plan is not in keeping with the area in which it would sit. Services: It would put excessive pressure on local services, increase noise and traffic, and have a serious negative effect on the environment. Loss of a large supermarket: Sainsbury's is currently the largest supermarket in the area. The loss of the large car park would have a harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of this amenity and would create more traffic as residents travel further to shop. Precedent: As with other recent applications, allowing this type of development would set a bad precedent for high-rise buildings close to the Heath and conservation areas. It would in fact make a mockery of the existence of conservation areas if they can be surrounded and overwhelmed by such monstrous projects. <p>We urge Camden to refuse this application. Thank you.</p>
2022/0528/P	Dan Hall	21/03/2022 22:42:50	SUPPRT	This looks like a great plan - creating hundreds of affordable homes in a place where there will be much needed. Strongly in favour of approving this application.
2022/0528/P	Jeremy Dell	19/03/2022 12:39:40	OBJ	I totally object to the proposal. It overdevelops the area unreasonably. The amount of additional housing is not sustainable for the area which has already high residential density. The loss of amenities is also hugely frustrating.
2022/0528/P	brian Chalfen	19/03/2022 19:07:04	COMMNT	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>The proposed development seems to contradict so much that Camden has tried to create over the years. There will be high rise blocks which will look out of place but moreover do not give enough space for personal recreation .</p> <p>The local train stations are already very busy at peak times and the extra travellers will compound the problem.</p> <p>There is a shortage of health facilities and no new ones are guaranteed on the development.</p> <p>There are no parking facilities which ignores an essential for a fulfilled life for some members of our community who would otherwise like to live there.</p> <p>The large supermarket with its large carpark is an essential convenience for many people.</p> <p>The two busy roads either end of the site will disrupt local and commuter traffic for a period of many years.</p> <p>I do hope common sense and the fact that there is a huge majority of people who are not happy with the plans will alter your blinkered views and stop the development.</p> <p>Yours Brian Chalfen</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Susan Zur-Szpiro	20/03/2022 22:48:43	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height, mass and form contravene national guidance • Overshadowing contravenes the Right to Light act • Layout and density contravene the London Plan policy • Design conflicts with Camden's Climate Change and Clean Air Action Plan • Proposed scheme will swamp (literally) local Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets • Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets • Politically motivated elimination of private transport <p>Overbearing height, mass and form</p> <p>The National Model Design Code advises building heights of 3-4 storeys and densities of 60-120 dwellings per hectare for an urban neighbourhood site such as O2. Landsec is proposing 18 towers of 8-11 and 11 towers of 12-16 stories to give 312dph which 3-5 times recommended density. This is 'super density' development and not surprisingly, the site has not been classified to avoid this embarrassing challenge.</p> <p>Camden's Local Plan policy A2 requires a minimum open space of 9m² per occupant, implying an open space of 40-45,000 m². Landsec's proposal totals 15,500m² which is just one quarter of Camden's own policy requirement in an area that is officially green-space deprived.</p> <p>Overshadowing and Loss of light to neighbours</p> <p>Skylight, sometimes known as diffuse skylight, is diffused all around us even on cloudy days, whilst sunlight is the light which comes directly from the sun on clear days. BRE define daylight as a combination of skylight and sunlight, adding, "The quantity and quality of daylight inside a room will be impaired if obstructing buildings are large in relation to their distance away". In a British context, skylight is the more important component. A loss of view is not a valid planning objection but the 'right to light' of nearby neighbours to the north of this scheme is protected by the Rights to Light Act 1959.</p> <p>Layout and density of building</p> <p>A 'tall building' is defined as anything higher than 10 storeys. This development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. The area is unsuitable for high rise buildings and the primary benefits of this 'new neighbourhood' of sub-standard architecture – more in keeping with an office than a residential setting-will go to the developer, Landsec and Camden Council, not to the community.</p> <p>Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard, co-founder and director of the Making Cities Liveable International Council says, "the construction industry is a powerful engine for fuelling economic development. Tall buildings offer increased profits for developers. However, the higher a building rises, the more expensive is the construction. Thus, the tallest buildings tend to be luxury units, often for global investors. Tall buildings inflate the price of adjacent land, thus making the protection of historic buildings and affordable housing less achievable. In this way, they increase inequality."</p> <p>The density is abnormally high and significantly exceeds the London Plan Density Matrix even for a site of PTAL 6. Camden, a borough which has produced some of the highest quality homes in the last 50 years, is said in a report that went to cabinet in early March, to have co-designed this insensitive housing environment.</p> <p>In conflict with Camden's Climate Change and Clean Air Action Plan</p> <p>There are sound reasons not to demolish the O2 Centre. In the words of a Camden Council Planning officer:</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

'Land Sec will need to demonstrate that the redevelopment of the O2 centre is more sustainable than refurbishing the building. To do this they will need to submit a whole life carbon assessment'. The embodied carbon as energy consumed in manufacturing, delivering and installing the materials to build, and fit-out these buildings over a planned 15-year construction and their disposal at end of life as well as operational carbon associated with electricity, gas and other fuels used for heating, cooling, ventilation, lighting, hot water, and other electrical equipment must be accounted for.

Construction also has a significant and negative impact on local air quality and potentially public health if it is not carefully managed. Construction activity is responsible for 4% of NO2 emissions, 24% of PM10 emissions and 9% of PM2.5 emissions in Camden.

Increases Pressure on Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets

Where is the significant and long overdue increase in medical resources in West Hampstead to reflect the needs of 5000+ new users? NHS England published guidance in February 2018, requiring extended access to GP services, including at evenings and weekends, for 100% of the population by 1 October 2018. Access to basic health and dental care for local residents has diminished not increased.

The area will face more overcrowded pavements, roads, transport and the loss of all the amenity of the O2 centre, including a large supermarket with 550 parking spaces – none of which can be effectively replicated in this scheme. Without any parking, no large format store to replace the current Sainsbury's can be viable.

Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets

The O2 site is bordered by five conservation areas:

- South Hampstead
- West End Green
- Fitzjohns/Netherhall
- Redington/Frogna
- Belsize

In point 3.2.2 of the FG&WH Neighbourhood Plan it states: 'The height of new buildings shall have regard to conservation and respect the proportion, scale, massing and rooflines of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. In all development there shall be a clear presumption in favour of preserving the distinct character and appearance of the Area, as well as the views across it.'

In observations, posted on the O2 planning application, Historic England comments: 'The buildings on the site are substantially greater than that found within the conservation areas and would appear in some views from within them and out of them. The volume and scale of the development means that there is a harmful impact to designated heritage assets through development within their setting.'

The O2 site is surrounded by 29 listed buildings and 5 conservation areas. Their settings will be blighted by the intrusion of towers blocks and is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Good Practice Advice by Historic England.

Politically motivated elimination of private transport

The scheme objective that "The impacts of car parking should be designed out" reveals a socialist utopian ambition to eliminate private transport. The intended outcome is for all 'citizens' to become wholly dependent upon state provided transport (TfL!) and have no alternative (except walking or cycling).

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

Under UK net-zero plans, all Internal Combustion Engine vehicles will be banned from 2030. However, Electric Vehicles will rightly not be banned. Eliminating private transport in Camden is politically motivated and denies residents their legal rights to private transport. This will also impact Camden and London's economic and labour market flexibility and overall will reduce growth and impact employment in Camden.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Mrs Piggott	19/03/2022 20:05:45	AMEND	<p>I object to the proposal as follows and request your confirmation that each point will be properly addressed - to date each has been evaded. If the o2 development goes ahead with the hideous and jarring build the local area will be aesthetically affected. With c 4,000 more residents on its streets, it could create overcrowding on the narrow streets and on already often overburdened public transport. By monumentally failing to provide any additional amenities to service 4,000 for these new people - it risks their healthcare with a lack of GP surgeries. Please see below:</p> <p>1. Breach of London Plan policy D9: i, paragraph B "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>Given that there the 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward and the the 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area, any new building should be capped at 10-storeys -with a refusal for anything higher.</p> <p>ii paragraph C: Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification.</p> <p>The development is between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. Definitions of these conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies already presented as: low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground.</p> <p>Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.</p> <p>The development is proposed is a few metres from a key Conservation Area and slap back, in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:</p> <p>"Is human in scale" "Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass" "Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings", including that tall buildings should "avoid any negative impact" on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas. "Has regard to the impact on local views" identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.</p> <p>Given the above, careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation but the developer is acting as though it is being located a few metres outside these conservation areas. This should therefore be refused.</p> <p>iii paragraph C: It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development".</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

No provision has been made at all. The development would impact on the often overburdened local Underground stations and Finchley & Frognal Stations. With bus queues already easily 20 to 30 people deep, on narrow pavements on a busy road, this is a health and safety issue. All the more so during the uncertainty of an ongoing pandemic.

2. Affordable Housing

The 35% of affordable housing is 15% below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan. This should not be acceptable to the London Planning Authority.

Equally the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan – it ignores:

Policy H4 specifies a balance within the affordable housing component of 60-40 between social-affordable and intermediate, which this barely scrapes, being exactly 60% social affordable by both habitable rooms and floor areas.

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a 'social-affordable' rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

3. Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden's policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states. Camden's policy of 'car-free development' is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan:

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted 'provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre'.

The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. The loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

4. Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will impact negatively on the sustainability and viability of amenities. As the largest supermarket in the area, Sainsbury's is important for shoppers and, in the absence of an onsite car park, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

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

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

5. Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are weak.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).

This commitment is insufficiently strong and as the failure to provide facilities. Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.

Kindly confirm these objections will be properly addressed – to date they are evaded.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Nicola Tessen	21/03/2022 12:13:32	OBJ	<p>I am objecting to this development on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height, mass and form contravene national guidance • Overshadowing contravenes the Right to Light act • Layout and density contravene the London Plan policy • Design conflicts with Camden's Climate Change and Clean Air Action Plan • Proposed scheme will swamp local Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets • Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets <p>---Overbearing height, mass and form The National Model Design Code advises building heights of 3-4 storeys and densities of 60-120 dwellings per hectare for an urban neighbourhood site such as O2. Landsec is proposing 18 towers of 8-11 and 11 towers of 12-16 stories to give 312dph which 3-5 times recommended density. This is 'super density' development but the site has not been classified as such.</p> <p>Camden's Local Plan policy A2 requires a minimum open space of 9m2 per occupant, implying an open space of 40-45,000 m2. Landsec's proposal totals 15,500m2 which is just one quarter of Camden's own policy requirement in an area that is officially green-space deprived.</p> <p>---Overshadowing and Loss of light to neighbours Skylight, sometimes known as diffuse skylight, is diffused all around us even on cloudy days, whilst sunlight is the light which comes directly from the sun on clear days. BRE define daylight as a combination of skylight and sunlight, adding, "The quantity and quality of daylight inside a room will be impaired if obstructing buildings are large in relation to their distance away". In a British context, skylight is the more important component. A loss of view is not a valid planning objection but the 'right to light' of nearby neighbours to the north of this scheme is protected by the Rights to Light Act 1959.</p> <p>---Layout and density of building A 'tall building' is defined as anything higher than 10 storeys. This development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. The area is unsuitable for high rise buildings and the primary benefits will go to the developer, Landsec and Camden Council, not to the community.</p> <p>Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard, co-founder and director of the Making Cities Liveable International Council says, "the construction industry is a powerful engine for fuelling economic development. Tall buildings offer increased profits for developers. However, the higher a building rises, the more expensive is the construction. Thus, the tallest buildings tend to be luxury units, often for global investors. Tall buildings inflate the price of adjacent land, thus making the protection of historic buildings and affordable housing less achievable. In this way, they increase inequality."</p> <p>The density is abnormally high and significantly exceeds the London Plan Density Matrix even for a site of PTAL 6.</p> <p>---In conflict with Camden's Climate Change and Clean Air Action Plan There are sound reasons not to demolish the O2 Centre. In the words of a Camden Council Planning officer: 'Land Sec will need to demonstrate that the redevelopment of the O2 centre is more sustainable than</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

refurbishing the building. To do this they will need to submit a whole life carbon assessment'. The embodied carbon as energy consumed in manufacturing, delivering and installing the materials to build, and fit-out these buildings over a planned 15-year construction and their disposal at end of life as well as operational carbon associated with electricity, gas and other fuels used for heating, cooling, ventilation, lighting, hot water, and other electrical equipment must be accounted for.

Construction also has a significant and negative impact on local air quality and potentially public health if it is not carefully managed. Construction activity is responsible for 4% of NO2 emissions, 24% of PM10 emissions and 9% of PM2.5 emissions in Camden.

---Increases Pressure on Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets

Where is the significant and long overdue increase in medical resources in West Hampstead to reflect the needs of 5000+ new users? NHS England published guidance in February 2018, requiring extended access to GP services, including at evenings and weekends, for 100% of the population by 1 October 2018. Access to basic health and dental care for local residents has diminished not increased.

The area will face more overcrowded pavements, roads, transport and the loss of all the amenity of the O2 centre, including a large supermarket with 550 parking spaces – none of which can be effectively replicated in this scheme. Without any parking, no large format store to replace the current Sainsbury's can be viable.

---Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets

The O2 site is bordered by five conservation areas:

- South Hampstead
- West End Green
- Fitzjohns/Netherhall
- Redington/Frogna
- Belsize

In point 3.2.2 of the FG&WH Neighbourhood Plan it states: 'The height of new buildings shall have regard to conservation and respect the proportion, scale, massing and rooflines of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. In all development there shall be a clear presumption in favour of preserving the distinct character and appearance of the Area, as well as the views across it.'

In observations, posted on the O2 planning application, Historic England comments: 'The buildings on the site are substantially greater than that found within the conservation areas and would appear in some views from within them and out of them. The volume and scale of the development means that there is a harmful impact to designated heritage assets through development within their setting.'

The O2 site is surrounded by 29 listed buildings and 5 conservation areas. Their settings will be blighted by the intrusion of towers blocks and is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Good Practice Advice by Historic England.

---Flooding

The impact on drains and flooding risk as Thames Water's report has indicated

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	julie bridgewater	20/03/2022 15:28:41	OBJ	<p>I do not believe this project is viable building high rise flats in the O2 space will not resolve housing/community space/ retail space/ parking facilities/ public transport. Admittedly the O2 center could be improved but not by building more housing. Also there will be no capacity to link the finchley road underground station with appropriate disabled access by lifts/escalators (which is badly needed and will be more requirement to improve this point for the future anyway) to the new development and will minimise sustainable and necessary shopping facilities and such minimal green space made available. This whole project needs a completely new strategy for meaningful appropriate low level housing (not high rise) and facilities with a co-hesive community. For the whole area which will be badly affected if this current project goes ahead in its present form. Please please do not continue with this development it has not been thought out properly The next 15 years in its development will again not be fit for prupose by the time it is completed and therefore no reoom to change anything once it's up. Please don't do this too this important an area of conservation. Preservation historical and social and economical the Mess it up again</p>
2022/0528/P	Judith Finegold	20/03/2022 18:05:51	COMMNT	<p>Hi- I am extremely against this development- it is far too ;large and far too high and goes against everythign the local area stands for.Both the construction of this as well as the final development will add to congestion in the area which residents are trying to reduce. This has been proposed with complete disregard to the current Camden residents and is appalling. I hope the current council will listen to our concerns</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Steven Bobasch	20/03/2022 15:45:12	OBJ	<p>Scale: This is a huge development in an already well built area. While it would be mainly on a car park or car showroom, the surrounding area is already busy, the stations are heaving.</p> <p>Overbuilding: The temptation to include many new dwellings is high - I urge Camden to re-consider the longer term impact. There is no evidence of this being evaluated - the building of more housing is all that seems to matter.</p> <p>I urge Camden to reconsider- look again at what their plans say and require this area to have a sustainable development in keeping with the residential area it sits in.</p> <p>Height: Much has been raised about the height to which I would add my view is that this will look like a post war estate. It is surrounded by relatively low lying buildings.</p> <p>I submit that it WILL do harm to the local assets by virtue of its size. It should be limited to 10 stories and I urge Camden to resist the likely crocodile tears from the developers in the longer term interest of our borough.</p> <p>Car Parking: I have raised before the issue that having NO provision for parking is totally unrealistic and even hazardous to well being.</p> <p>I am not advocating any significant allowance for the residents - there are simply too many. Instead I am stressing that there needs to be decent provision for short visits.</p> <p>First, some parking is essential for allowing key workers : carers, ambulance, plumbers fixing leaks and so on to visit their patients/clients , especially in our ageing society.</p> <p>Second, while trying to push people to be car-less is laudable, there is a limit in practice.</p> <p>Most car-less people simple use delivery services and taxis instead. (Thinking that they will all cycle, walk etc is nice on paper but not how people behave especially for heavy items or in bad weather).</p> <p>That means there needs to be provision in the development for such services - like it or not. Delivery drivers cannot use the main road. Aside from it being a very busy red route, it is also too far from many of the towers.</p> <p>Third, people move in (!) have their contents delivered, refurbish, move out and have their contents removed, new people will move in and want to refurbish etc. All to explain that with so many flats will always have some movement of people and works going on.</p> <p>There will need to be parking for all these services even if residents do not have a car.</p> <p>I urge Camden to review this and make serious allowances for the on-going needs of the residents.</p> <p>Supermarket: The site, absent some short term parking, will only suit a small metro shop at best. Loosing Sainsbury would be a detriment to the community and simply increase the amount delivered instead - but there is no space for deliveries either...oops?</p> <p>Health Centre: Such a large development must have a health centre. I understand that there is no express provision of a designated space. Instead, a statement that there may (will?) be something proposed later in detailed planning. Assuming that the developer wants to use the site to sell flats, any later detail is logically going to push the health centre back until, oh dear no space left.</p> <p>I understand that Kings Cross still lacks a health centre despite all the keen words.</p> <p>I urge Camden to make the provision of a health centre (with size and access specified) an explicit condition of approval even at this stage. Further I urge Camden to be robust when the allocated space is under pressure.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Jason Peacock	20/03/2022 18:49:37	OBJ	I am objecting to this outrageous development on the following basis:

- Height, mass and form contravene national guidance
- Overshadowing contravenes the Right to Light act
- Layout and density contravene the London Plan policy
- Design conflicts with Camden's Climate Change and Clean Air Action Plan
- Proposed scheme will swamp (literally) local Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets
- Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets
- Politically motivated elimination of private transport

Overbearing height, mass and form

The National Model Design Code advises building heights of 3-4 storeys and densities of 60-120 dwellings per hectare for an urban neighbourhood site such as O2. Landsec is proposing 18 towers of 8-11 and 11 towers of 12-16 stories to give 312dph which 3-5 times recommended density. This is 'super density' development and not surprisingly, the site has not been classified to avoid this embarrassing challenge.

Camden's Local Plan policy A2 requires a minimum open space of 9m² per occupant, implying an open space of 40-45,000 m². Landsec's proposal totals 15,500m² which is just one quarter of Camden's own policy requirement in an area that is officially green-space deprived.

Overshadowing and Loss of light to neighbours

Skylight, sometimes known as diffuse skylight, is diffused all around us even on cloudy days, whilst sunlight is the light which comes directly from the sun on clear days. BRE define daylight as a combination of skylight and sunlight, adding, "The quantity and quality of daylight inside a room will be impaired if obstructing buildings are large in relation to their distance away". In a British context, skylight is the more important component. A loss of view is not a valid planning objection but the 'right to light' of nearby neighbours to the north of this scheme is protected by the Rights to Light Act 1959.

Layout and density of building

A 'tall building' is defined as anything higher than 10 storeys. This development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. The area is unsuitable for high rise buildings and the primary benefits of this 'new neighbourhood' of sub-standard architecture – more in keeping with an office than a residential setting – will go to the developer, Landsec and Camden Council, not to the community.

Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard, co-founder and director of the Making Cities Liveable International Council says, "the construction industry is a powerful engine for fuelling economic development. Tall buildings offer increased profits for developers. However, the higher a building rises, the more expensive is the construction. Thus, the tallest buildings tend to be luxury units, often for global investors. Tall buildings inflate the price of adjacent land, thus making the protection of historic buildings and affordable housing less achievable. In this way, they increase inequality."

The density is abnormally high and significantly exceeds the London Plan Density Matrix even for a site of PTAL 6. Camden, a borough which has produced some of the highest quality homes in the last 50 years, is said in a report that went to cabinet in early March, to have co-designed this insensitive housing environment.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

In conflict with Camden's Climate Change and Clean Air Action Plan

There are sound reasons not to demolish the O2 Centre. In the words of a Camden Council Planning officer: 'Land Sec will need to demonstrate that the redevelopment of the O2 centre is more sustainable than refurbishing the building. To do this they will need to submit a whole life carbon assessment'. The embodied carbon as energy consumed in manufacturing, delivering and installing the materials to build, and fit-out these buildings over a planned 15-year construction and their disposal at end of life as well as operational carbon associated with electricity, gas and other fuels used for heating, cooling, ventilation, lighting, hot water, and other electrical equipment must be accounted for.

Construction also has a significant and negative impact on local air quality and potentially public health if it is not carefully managed. Construction activity is responsible for 4% of NO2 emissions, 24% of PM10 emissions and 9% of PM2.5 emissions in Camden.

Increases Pressure on Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets

Where is the significant and long overdue increase in medical resources in West Hampstead to reflect the needs of 5000+ new users? NHS England published guidance in February 2018, requiring extended access to GP services, including at evenings and weekends, for 100% of the population by 1 October 2018. Access to basic health and dental care for local residents has diminished not increased.

The area will face more overcrowded pavements, roads, transport and the loss of all the amenity of the O2 centre, including a large supermarket with 550 parking spaces – none of which can be effectively replicated in this scheme. Without any parking, no large format store to replace the current Sainsbury's can be viable.

Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets

The O2 site is bordered by five conservation areas:

- South Hampstead
- West End Green
- Fitzjohns/Netherhall
- Redington/Frognaal
- Belsize

In point 3.2.2 of the FG&WH Neighbourhood Plan it states: 'The height of new buildings shall have regard to conservation and respect the proportion, scale, massing and rooflines of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. In all development there shall be a clear presumption in favour of preserving the distinct character and appearance of the Area, as well as the views across it.'

In observations, posted on the O2 planning application, Historic England comments: 'The buildings on the site are substantially greater than that found within the conservation areas and would appear in some views from within them and out of them. The volume and scale of the development means that there is a harmful impact to designated heritage assets through development within their setting.'

The O2 site is surrounded by 29 listed buildings and 5 conservation areas. Their settings will be blighted by the intrusion of towers blocks and is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Good Practice Advice by Historic England.

Politically motivated elimination of private transport

The scheme objective that "The impacts of car parking should be designed out" reveals a socialist utopian

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Areef Dattoo	20/03/2022 23:21:53	COMMT	<p>ambition to eliminate private transport. The intended outcome is for all 'citizens' to become wholly dependent upon state provided transport (TfL!) and have no alternative (except walking or cycling). Under UK net-zero plans, all Internal Combustion Engine vehicles will be banned from 2030. However, Electric Vehicles will rightly not be banned. Eliminating private transport in Camden is politically motivated and denies residents their legal rights to private transport. This will also impact Camden and London's economic and labour market flexibility and overall will reduce growth and impact employment in Camden.</p> <hr/> <p>We have reviewed the plans thoroughly as the newest tenant within The O2 centre. It is key to understand how the existing tenants who have invested significant capital into building community based businesses will be supported through the proposed changes and how the local community who now rely on these local offerings within The O2 centre will have the same access to facilities.</p> <p>The supplemental planning document states that Camden, through its High Streets work and Renewal Commission, aims to ensure centres remain at the heart of their communities and that where non-residential floorspace is involved, it will need to take into account relevant policies regarding the suitable re-provision of such uses and the SPD specifically refers to re-provision of certain uses, such as a supermarket and community facilities. The Little Gym Hampstead is a key enabler within the local community particularly for parents of young children and young families.</p> <p>The guidance also states development should be phased to minimise disruption to local communities and to sustain the occupation of buildings and provision of existing facilities and services for as long as possible. Also, that business continuity is encouraged and the temporary or 'meanwhile' use of land or buildings for appropriate cultural, leisure, business or retail activities to maintain activity during phased development would be supported. It is important that the Landlord and Camden recognise this in discussions with the current tenants as part of this application process.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Sarah Walton	20/03/2022 23:32:54	OBJ	<p>I object to this plan for the following reasons, among others :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This development of tall buildings is proposed in between 2 conservation areas - West End Green and South Hampstead - which should be protected. 2. These tall buildings will be out of keeping with the traditional architectural style, structures and materials of these conservation areas and they will impact severely on the adjacent conservation areas. They will tower over the existing domestic structures, reducing their light and impeding their views. The aesthetic effect will be to adversely impact the character and architectural heritage of the adjacent conservation areas and the area as a whole. 3. The proposed location has not been identified as a suitable location for tall buildings as specified in the London Plan policy D9, para B. 4. The Plan has not demonstrated that the local transport stations and buses are "capable of accommodating the quantum of development" in the dramatic increase of population there will be, as they are already stretched to capacity. 5. The O2 Centre and large Sainsbury and Homebase supermarkets provide essential community facilities in the Swiss Cottage Town Centre and MUST retain the existing car parking capacity in order to be viable. They are all used and depended on by the whole surrounding area's community.
2022/0528/P	Lily Gartry	21/03/2022 04:54:45	OBJ	<p>1,800 Flats is a horrendous number of flats to be squeezed in a 'not so large' area. Having tall towers will take away from the character of the area and the feeling of open spaces. Having an extra 7,000 or more persons living in a relatively small area will put pressure on the area's amenities and add more pollution and congestion. Veola services of weekly rubbish collections are already struggling. I often have to report a missed collection. Other times they are delayed and they come the following day. Will there be enough GP practices, schools and supermarkets to cope with this horrific increase in inhabitant number (especially that you are getting rid of Sainsburys). With the O2 coffee shops, restaurants and cinemas gone, where will the youth go to vent out. We may see more youth just hanging around street corners and not having a safe, yet cheap, place to meet friends for chats and coffees! Traffic will become very congested, even if the new residents do not own cars. The new residents will require more buses and trains, which will cause more congestion on the roads and on the trains. And you must not forget that the elderly residents will probably use more minicabs/taxis for shopping trips and hospital appointments and this will increase the traffic congestion in and around the O2 area. The size of this proposed development is not suitable for this area. It should be taken to where there are more open spaces. It should not be squeezed in the middle of an already busy area. This proposal is definitely REJECTED.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Tom Bredford	19/03/2022 12:22:51	OBJ	<p>I would like to present my objection to the proposed plan providing the following reasons:</p> <p>Overdevelopment: too many new homes, the masterplan is too dense, and buildings are too tall and large for the capacity of the site and the area's existing local infrastructure.</p> <p>An inappropriate mix of land uses too much residential floorspace and not enough other uses to sustainably support the increased population after the loss of amenities, services, retail, food & drink uses caused by the demolition of the O2 Centre and Homebase. There will be fewer amenities and infrastructure per person after the development. Sustainable development proposals should increase, not decrease, the sq. m provision of such amenities.</p> <p>Inappropriate phasing strategy: healthcare and creche facilities are insufficiently scaled for this scale of development are not delivered until phase 2, after which already 608 new homes will be added. This critical infrastructure should be delivered in phase 1.</p> <p>Heritage: the proposed tall buildings have an overwhelmingly negative impact on the setting of conservation areas (South Hampstead, West End Green, Redington Frogna, Fitzjohns Netherhall) and other heritage assets near the development site, and the proposed buildings in both their tower block typology and design details are too incongruent to the character of these areas which are largely terraced houses and mansion blocks.</p> <p>Overshadowing: loss of daylight and sunlight to existing homes behind and around the development site, such as homes on Rosemont Road and Lithos Road, is damaging to their amenity.</p> <p>Transport capacity: Finchley Road and West Hampstead Stations are already at capacity and cannot support substantial growth in the local population; the feasibility study is conceded by the developer to make them accessible will not provide any added transport capacity.</p> <p>Sustainability: the demolition of multiple existing buildings is inevitably a more carbon-intensive than a strategy that retains the O2 Centre. The strategy is not circular: it does not maximise reuse and minimise raw material extraction. The large scale of new construction will entail massive carbon emissions and air pollution, contrary to Camden's net-zero and environmental commitments. The choice of materials and construction methods will also have substantial embodied carbon; only low-embodied carbon materials should be used with a full life-cycle assessment.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Patrizia Canziani	20/03/2022 11:19:58	COMMNT	<p>Below are a number of key arguments in objection to the O2 Centre application. The development is assessed against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The London Plan • The Camden Local Plan • The Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan • Camden's 2013 Site Allocations and (sadly) its 2019 draft Site Allocations <p>Although it is not in a conservation area, also of relevance are the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green conservation area statements, which protect the areas surrounding the site.</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>While Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that if it did, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification. • It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access. <p>A common theme in the feedback to Camden's recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.</p> <p>This public view is in-keeping with the tallest buildings in the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward. • The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. <p>This development contains several buildings that are taller than either of these. It is therefore extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.</p> <p>As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9. As it is not, it should be refused.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are low- and medium-rise, with the most typical building being three storeys above ground with a lower ground. • Primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature. <p>Furthermore, while it is not located within a Conservation Area, is it located in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

- “Is human in scale”
- “Has regard to the form, function, structure, and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass”
- “Is sensitive to the height of existing buildings”, including that tall buildings should “avoid any negative impact” (emphasis ours) on the West End Green or South Hampstead conservation areas.
- “Has regard to the impact on local views” identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

Given the above requirements, more careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation. Instead, the developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. It should therefore be refused.

Affordable housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

While we recognise that Camden’s Cabinet member for planning has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. The London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

However, the related factors are all, at best, the minimum that is required under Camden’s policies:

- Policy H4 specifies a balance within the affordable housing component of 60-40 between social-affordable and intermediate, which this barely scrapes, being exactly 60% social affordable by both habitable rooms and floor areas.
- Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a ‘social-affordable’ rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

The development falls far short of the affordable housing target, and – furthermore – provides the bare minimum in both mix of affordable housing and affordability of that housing in a way that might compensate or mitigate that. It should therefore be refused.

Car parking

This application fundamentally misunderstands Camden’s policy of car-free development, and in doing so, cannot provide for the amenities that it states.

Camden’s policy of ‘car-free development’ is defined for redevelopments at paragraph 10.20 of the Local Plan. This paragraph states that:

- The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped. The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.
- This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within the Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. The existing (2013) site allocation states that the redevelopment of the car park is permitted ‘provided it does not result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre’.

The O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times on a permanent basis, rather than just within controlled hours, as had been the case before 2020. This has put

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site. the loss of car parking should therefore be resisted.

Loss of large supermarket

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand (which costs up to £320 extra a year for the same products). Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

The loss of parking therefore will lead necessarily to harm to the town centre, make the amenities provided for in the outline permission unviable, and harm mitigation and prevention of climate change, and thus should be refused.

Community facilities

As well as commercial premises that would be harmed by the application, the commitments on community facilities are insufficiently strong. The development at Kings Cross promised health facilities in identical terms, but 18 years later, there is still no GP's surgery there: leading to nearby surgeries being overwhelmed. Read more here.

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).

This commitment is insufficiently strong, as the failure to provide facilities in King's Cross shows.

Furthermore, even if it is eventually delivered, unlike King's Cross, there would be 10-15 years between 700 flats being built in the initial part of the development and the surgery or other facilities being opened in the last stage. This would put unbearable strain on local services in that time.

Any development that does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part, which will be built first and which is the strongest protection, must be resisted. As this does not, it should be refused.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Yvette Pole	20/03/2022 06:48:52	OBJ	The Camden high rise development is totally unacceptable as it will damage the look and feel of the local South Hampstead area which is Victorian Terrace low rise buildings. The new development will thereby be an eyesore for the area, as it is far too high, and thereby it will damage the value of local South Hampstead property owners own residences in the South Hampstead area. It will impact on the enjoyment of what has been to date a protected Victorian terrace residential area with Victorian fronted local shopping, and therefore will negatively affect local property owners. A maximum of three stories in the new development in Victorian style would be far more in keeping with the area, and would better maintain the Victorian heritage of the area. Camden council has breached its own planning laws for the local area in both the height, style and design of the new development. South Hampstead is a local conservation area and the Victorian heritage style of the area should be protected.
2022/0528/P	C Luke	20/03/2022 08:46:01	OBJ	I am very concerned about this new development and in particular: the height of the proposed buildings and the apparent lack of parking facilities. The area is over-populated without enough facilities at present and this will make matters so much worse.
2022/0528/P	C Luke	20/03/2022 08:46:03	OBJ	I am very concerned about this new development and in particular: the height of the proposed buildings and the apparent lack of parking facilities. The area is over-populated without enough facilities at present and this will make matters so much worse.
2022/0528/P	Ranjit	20/03/2022 07:44:38	OBJ	I wish to strongly oppose the proposed development for a number of reasons: 1. The carbon released from tearing down buildings is very bad for our planet. This plan is tearing down relatively new buildings which need to be kept in use for as long as possible. 2. The addition of 5000 new residents in an already crowded area will lead to a collapse of the existing infrastructure including tube stations, buses, pavements, parking, shops, supermarkets, road space. 3. There is already insufficient green space in this neighbourhood. Residents have to walk as far as Regents Park or Hampstead Heath to find the nearest decent park. 4. High rise buildings are not eco friendly as they require much more energy to service than equivalent low buildings. The safety track record of these buildings in this city also is unacceptable.
2022/0528/P	monty Cholmeley	20/03/2022 08:20:54	OBJ	Please don't do this. If you are truly looking after your residents, listen to them. No one wants this to be built.