

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Virginia	30/03/2022 17:57:35	COMMNT	Over development with not enough infrastructure to cope with increase in population for the area, parking, schools, medical services etc
2022/0528/P	Virginia	30/03/2022 17:57:56	COMMNT	Over development with not enough infrastructure to cope with increase in population for the area, parking, schools, medical services etc
2022/0528/P	Mervyn Druian	31/03/2022 07:11:28	OBJ	This lunacy. Finchley Rd can barely cope with the traffic as it is.
2022/0528/P	Mark Felix	30/03/2022 23:23:22	OBJ	<p>This will be terrible for the area - removing a large supermarket cheaper than Waitrose and leading to potential Traffic and overcrowding issues</p> <p>I am fully supportive of affordable housing but I don't think this helps the area much</p>
2022/0528/P	Steven Reid	31/03/2022 10:34:13	COMM	There simply won't be enough infrastructure to allow for this increase in population as a disabled individual I already find it difficult to get access to local shops and transport links from my home on Kidderpore Avenue to the existing O2 Centre and I fear the extent of queues on the transport network and in shops with this increase, please ensure that the infrastructure can support this.
2022/0528/P	Bevero	31/03/2022 10:39:34	COMMNT	Environmentally not acceptable to demolish o2. Centre. Space for flats too dense, not Beneficial to community.
2022/0528/P	Alan Greenwood	31/03/2022 10:35:48	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the plans to remove the O2 Centre, and the car park. The existing Sainsbury supermarket is a key amenity to the local community as is the adjacent Homebase.</p> <p>I understand that no supermarket operator will replace the Sainsbury without a car park. . The car park serves the local Finchley Road & Swiss Cottage town centre. I cannot see how the area can be a thriving community without car parking and a large supermarket.</p> <p>The plans, eg lack of car park and large supermarket, appear to be focussed up benefits to young single people or couples without families. This type of development will strip the community feel from the area. Older people (who cannot cycle) and families will be obliged to leave.</p> <p>As an aside, I hope that Camden has budgeted for a significant increase in its policing budget to cope with the change in demographic and dense housing.</p>
2022/0528/P	Kerstin	30/03/2022 19:21:29	OBJ	<p>Object.</p> <p>Too high, too many, too ugly.</p>
2022/0528/P	Kerstin	30/03/2022 19:21:35	OBJ	<p>Object.</p> <p>Too high, too many, too ugly.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Sibylle Tretera	30/03/2022 18:37:44	OBJ	

I am objecting to the 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/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

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

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.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Sibylle Tretera	30/03/2022 18:37:47	OBJ	

I am objecting to the 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/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

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

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.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Raphael Martins	31/03/2022 10:41:35	OBJ	<p>The O2 Centre Redevelopment is cause for great concern for the entire communities of Finchley Road, Frognal, West Hampstead, Swiss Cottage and South Hampstead. Due to the scale of development in terms of heights, densities and increase in population the impacts are widespread affecting station capacities including all West Hampstead Stations and Finchley Road which are already at capacity as well as local amenities including Schools, GPs and Local Clubs. Although I am not against the redevelopment of the site in principal, it is a site of strategic importance for the local community and has been heavily used by it for this time and as such, the new plans should deliver on the needs of surrounding neighbourhoods.</p> <p>There are a number of critical facilities which need to be re-supplied in the new development with the same or more area of provision. This includes a very large supermarket given the increase in residents in the area, a large gym with swimming pool (removal of sporting facilities is against Sport England Guidance and The Local Plan) as well as a large cinema. Current proposals show their replacement as smaller tick-box amenities which need to be reversed or resupplied on an area by area replacement basis.</p> <p>The current provision of green space is not enough, a green corridor to the south of the plan with a couple of squares will not provide sufficient park space for the community, West Hampstead in particular has very few public green spaces compared to the city average, this area must be able to provide more green space and reduce building numbers if it is to be a truly civic development as it promises. At the moment, it is only serving the interests of the shareholders of Landsec.</p> <p>Cycling in the area obviously needs to be improved, a cycleway in the east-west direction does nothing to improve cycling in the area as most people move north south, therefore bridges of the railways, although complex but perfectly possible as prefab elements which are lifted or launched into place and within the budget of Landsec need to be provided to create those important north-south links.</p> <p>The heights of the buildings proposed are completely out of character in the area, camden council has previously said the site should have around 900 homes. Living in tower blocks as such is not great, over time they start to have infrastructural problems and require a lot of energy to run over time due to simple aspects such as large pumps for water. They also increase the heat island effect, increase winds speeds at ground which will make the 'park' area highly undesirable area after all. Looking at the plans, there are serious questions for building control which needs to be addressed as well as the quality of the arrangements of the flats are very questionable. There also does not seem to be sufficient supply of lifts for the number of people meaning the overall living experience of these buildings will be incredibly poor.</p> <p>The sustainability of the site cannot be good when building so much on this scale, tall buildings consume a lot of energy and the embodied energy of the building itself will be incredibly high as well as the demolition and waste of the existing shopping centre. Surely if we are to properly address the climate emergency we should look to retrofit what is already there which structurally is sound and very flexible to change. Surely a park can be prioritised rather than buildings and surely communal infrastructure and council housing can be supplied rather than investment objects in towers.</p> <p>There are many missed opportunities for the site, but the current form of development is inappropriate and needs be completely reconsidered urgently.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	lisa warshaw	30/03/2022 12:38:38	COMMNT	Overdevelopment for this small space. More air pollution that is horrible for people suffering with lung impairments post covid or woth covid or asthma (like myself). We need trees not more cars and traffic. Minimizie activities that burn fuels needlessly. This scheme is not green in anyway. Its about money and developers not about the quality of peoples lives. we need trees and minimum energy use. This area is already too built up with no regard for greening or open spaces
2022/0528/P	Margaret lipworth	30/03/2022 17:39:28	YES	I absolutely object to the changes planned to our lovely o2 center. It will also cause a worse traffic nightmare than it is already.
2022/0528/P	Margaret lipworth	30/03/2022 17:39:31	YES	I absolutely object to the changes planned to our lovely o2 center. It will also cause a worse traffic nightmare than it is already.
2022/0528/P	Shravan Sood	30/03/2022 19:36:39	OBJNOT	Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans. This proposed development is sandwiched between multiple conservation areas and is therefore completely out of character with its surrounding areas. Also there are already public transport/ traffic bottlenecks which will only get worse.
2022/0528/P	Shravan Sood	30/03/2022 19:36:44	OBJNOT	Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans. This proposed development is sandwiched between multiple conservation areas and is therefore completely out of character with its surrounding areas. Also there are already public transport/ traffic bottlenecks which will only get worse.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Kieran McIlwain	30/03/2022 17:53:55	SUPC	<p>I support this development subject to some conditions.</p> <p>Rationale for support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - London is in the grips of a housing crisis and demand far outstrips supply. It is critical that Camden does all it can to enable the rapid building of homes to address this massive shortfall. - Transit-oriented developments such as this, which concentrate housing density around key public transport links, are established methods of reducing car-dependency and the carbon impact of new homes. - The existing site is under-utilised and the amenities provided are poor. It is unacceptable that such a large amount of space is given over to open-air parking space in the middle of Zone 2. <p>Conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Serious consideration must be made by Camden to utilise S.106 contributions to improve the safety, lighting, and appeal of Billy Fury Way, including an expansion of "Granny Dripping's Stairs" to provide greater access to the proposed development - Engagement should be made with Transport for London to undertake a feasibility study into the use of and expanded "Granny Dripping's Stairs" as an eastern entrance to the Jubilee line platforms at West Hampstead station, improving pedestrian accessibility to the station from both the new development and the existing neighbourhood of South Hampstead, thereby reducing the pressure on already narrow pedestrian pathways on West End Lane. This could also provide an opportunity for the introduction of step-free access to the station.
2022/0528/P	Beverly	31/03/2022 08:57:46	APP	<p>I strongly object to the plans to change the O2 centre to residential flats.</p> <p>I am a local resident and use all the Homebase , Sainsburys , cafes and cinemas regularly. I use the car park which is really important when I use the centre.</p> <p>We need to have a communal hub not residential eyesore which takes away all facilities for the local area.</p>
2022/0528/P	Beverly	31/03/2022 08:57:48	APP	<p>I strongly object to the plans to change the O2 centre to residential flats.</p> <p>I am a local resident and use all the Homebase , Sainsburys , cafes and cinemas regularly. I use the car park which is really important when I use the centre.</p> <p>We need to have a communal hub not residential eyesore which takes away all facilities for the local area.</p>
2022/0528/P	Beverly	31/03/2022 08:57:49	APP	<p>I strongly object to the plans to change the O2 centre to residential flats.</p> <p>I am a local resident and use all the Homebase , Sainsburys , cafes and cinemas regularly. I use the car park which is really important when I use the centre.</p> <p>We need to have a communal hub not residential eyesore which takes away all facilities for the local area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Beverly	31/03/2022 08:57:52	APP	<p>I strongly object to the plans to change the O2 centre to residential flats.</p> <p>I am a local resident and use all the Homebase , Sainsburys , cafes and cinemas regularly. I use the car park which is really important when I use the centre.</p> <p>We need to have a communal hub not residential eyesore which takes away all facilities for the local area.</p>
2022/0528/P	Beverly	31/03/2022 08:57:54	APP	<p>I strongly object to the plans to change the O2 centre to residential flats.</p> <p>I am a local resident and use all the Homebase , Sainsburys , cafes and cinemas regularly. I use the car park which is really important when I use the centre.</p> <p>We need to have a communal hub not residential eyesore which takes away all facilities for the local area.</p>
2022/0528/P	P. beaumont	31/03/2022 09:03:37	COMMNT	<p>Thoroughly object to the redevelopment of the O2 centre and surrounding areas. It will make a bottleneck of the Finchley Road, already a very busy artery out of central London. It will also completely change the nature of our community.</p>
2022/0528/P	Avie Littler	30/03/2022 15:33:13	OBJ	<p>This is a monstrous plan for a predominantly low rise terrace house area already densely occupied. We already have constant road up from Thames Water, GPS overloaded, West End lane is already a dangerous wind tunnel and these blocks would make it worse. What are Camden thinking of?!!! The height! The numbers of extra people at the tiny tube entrance! Presumably no parking permits allowed although they are privately purchased to get around this! And extra visitor cars! However could you even think to approve such a plan? We all agree the carpark (mostly used by Audi showroom) is a waste of space but no no no to that many more homes and a totally disproportionate height. Scrap it and listen to your local voters or you won't be in power any more the next time a planning application comes around. Who could vote for such local insensitivity to the wishes of the residents of WestHampstead.</p>
2022/0528/P	Avie Littler	30/03/2022 15:33:15	OBJ	<p>This is a monstrous plan for a predominantly low rise terrace house area already densely occupied. We already have constant road up from Thames Water, GPS overloaded, West End lane is already a dangerous wind tunnel and these blocks would make it worse. What are Camden thinking of?!!! The height! The numbers of extra people at the tiny tube entrance! Presumably no parking permits allowed although they are privately purchased to get around this! And extra visitor cars! However could you even think to approve such a plan? We all agree the carpark (mostly used by Audi showroom) is a waste of space but no no no to that many more homes and a totally disproportionate height. Scrap it and listen to your local voters or you won't be in power any more the next time a planning application comes around. Who could vote for such local insensitivity to the wishes of the residents of WestHampstead.</p>
2022/0528/P	Jane Johnson	30/03/2022 17:00:05	OBJ	<p>This is much too tall for the surrounding area, and not on a human scale. It would mean losing a valued supermarket and hugely useful parking space. There is not the 50% affordable housing there should be.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Thea Chiarini	30/03/2022 17:16:32	AMEND	<p>Dear madam/sir,</p> <p>The proposed development contains some aspects that would be very detrimental to the area/community. Hampstead is in a Conservation zone and as such should be valued and not depleted of its beauty.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) height of proposed buildings appears to be enough to be visible in the skyline from the top floors of the Hampstead community 2) lack of parking - it is absolutely ridiculous not to allow for parking onsite, not in an adequate manner. This will only congest even further the already difficult area of CA 3) loss of some important services such as a large supermarket, gym, homebase store 4) absolutely ridiculous number of units proposed. Affordable housing can and should be done in areas where people can then live nicely and not on top of one another. <p>This plan needs to be revised and amended</p>
2022/0528/P	Thea Chiarini	30/03/2022 17:16:36	AMEND	<p>Dear madam/sir,</p> <p>The proposed development contains some aspects that would be very detrimental to the area/community. Hampstead is in a Conservation zone and as such should be valued and not depleted of its beauty.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) height of proposed buildings appears to be enough to be visible in the skyline from the top floors of the Hampstead community 2) lack of parking - it is absolutely ridiculous not to allow for parking onsite, not in an adequate manner. This will only congest even further the already difficult area of CA 3) loss of some important services such as a large supermarket, gym, homebase store 4) absolutely ridiculous number of units proposed. Affordable housing can and should be done in areas where people can then live nicely and not on top of one another. <p>This plan needs to be revised and amended</p>
2022/0528/P	David Scaife	30/03/2022 17:17:02	OBJ	I am totally opposed to this. The influx of new residents - circa 5,000 by most estimates - is unsustainable.
2022/0528/P	C J Blakemore	30/03/2022 17:28:36	OBJ	Final line of objection should have read: The current proposal does NOT benefit our community and is wholly unsuitable. Rethink this poor proposal.
2022/0528/P	C J Blakemore	30/03/2022 17:17:15	OBJ	<p>The scale of this development both in terms of density and height is disproportionate to the size and location of the site. From where I live in Froggnal the new tower blocks will be an ugly addition to skyline as well as the fact the housing will generate more traffic in an already congested area. Introducing more vehicles to the area will also create more pollution and compromise the already poor quality of air along Finchley Rd. There will be more congestion and therefore more delay along Finchley Rd. The community will also lose useful shopping and facilities of the O2 centre such as Sainsbury's, a cinema, restaurants and Homebase. Any redevelopment must include community amenities such as shops and also include areas of much needed green space in this very urban area. The redevelopment of the O2 site needs to be sustainable, green and maintain community resources. The current proposal does benefit our community and is wholly unsuitable. Rethink this poor proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Clemencia Wiese	30/03/2022 17:30:19	PETITNOBJ E	I object to a high-rise massive development in an area that should be developed keeping in line with the residential nature fo the neighbourhood and where preference to a variety of potential residents, that is families, couples and singles could live. In addition a greater importance to green and natural areas should be given.
2022/0528/P	Leonard Geiger	30/03/2022 18:20:43	OBJ	Too many apartments with little to no infrastructure to support As a resident I don't want to lose the amenities of the O2 Centre and believe transport, retail, healthcare, education services are stretched as it is Where are the new schools, retail, eg food shopping, GP surgeries to support this number of people?
2022/0528/P	Michelle Newman	30/03/2022 19:06:24	PETITNOBJ E	This proposed development in its current form should not go ahead. The much needed facilities already there disappearing and not being replaced and bringing in 1,000 plus people with no improved amenities is just surely untenable. This is just devastating for the area and the surrounding area.
2022/0528/P	Michelle Newman	30/03/2022 19:06:32	PETITNOBJ E	This proposed development in its current form should not go ahead. The much needed facilities already there disappearing and not being replaced and bringing in 1,000 plus people with no improved amenities is just surely untenable. This is just devastating for the area and the surrounding area.
2022/0528/P	Maria Skyllas	30/03/2022 19:08:03	OBJ	This huge development will ruin the neighborhood feel of this area, increase road traffic and ruin the local amenities that the O2 center provides. My children grew up coming to the O2 center to the cinema and restaurants. We still come there to the supermarket, Homebase and the restaurants. Now my grandson attends baby classes held at the O2 center. Why would demolish something that has been a go to place in the local area? The new development's volume will be an atrocity for the local area and not to mention th skyline, with its huge buildings. I urge the local authorities to reconsider. Building affordable housing is a necessity but when it is done not to the detriment of the area in question.
2022/0528/P	Maria Skyllas	30/03/2022 19:08:09	OBJ	This huge development will ruin the neighborhood feel of this area, increase road traffic and ruin the local amenities that the O2 center provides. My children grew up coming to the O2 center to the cinema and restaurants. We still come there to the supermarket, Homebase and the restaurants. Now my grandson attends baby classes held at the O2 center. Why would demolish something that has been a go to place in the local area? The new development's volume will be an atrocity for the local area and not to mention th skyline, with its huge buildings. I urge the local authorities to reconsider. Building affordable housing is a necessity but when it is done not to the detriment of the area in question.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	James Cutress	30/03/2022 19:53:46	OBJ	<p>I object to this development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most importantly, the buildings are far too tall, with the result that they are completely out of keeping with the surrounding area. 2. The resulting tall buildings would thereby harm the nearby conservation areas, which are made up of low rise buildings. 3. The buildings would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access. 4. The changes result in insufficient parking and would thereby cause traffic and parking problems. 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. 5. The loss of car parking will also result in the loss of an important large supermarket which is regularly used. 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.
2022/0528/P	Zoe Lam	30/03/2022 21:08:59	OBJ	It's already too crowded along Finchley Road. I am concern about the health & safety if thousands of more people moved in to the area.
2022/0528/P	Stuart Natrass	30/03/2022 20:01:29	OBJ	I oppose the plan because I consider that such a high-rise development will be a significant eye-sore and is out of character with the surrounding area. I am also concerned about the increased pressure that it will put on the infrastructure in all it aspects. I understand that there will be no provision for car parking, in which case there will be huge extra pressure on public transport. The existing railway lines (Underground and Overground) are already heavily used. As a general point, I question whether there will be a demand or need for so much extra housing. I would like to be assured that population projections support the case, particularly as there is likely to be a continued move out of London now that hybrid working has become more common. Nor is such a high-rise development likely to attract families.
2022/0528/P	Max gluck	30/03/2022 23:24:59	COMMNT	Yes, build hundreds more homes within walking distance of 5 train stations why would you not approve this
2022/0528/P	Max gluck	30/03/2022 23:25:03	COMMNT	Yes, build hundreds more homes within walking distance of 5 train stations why would you not approve this

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Mervyn Druian	31/03/2022 07:11:32	OBJ	This lunacy. Finchley Rd can barely cope with the traffic as it is.
2022/0528/P	Mervyn Druian	31/03/2022 07:11:34	OBJ	This lunacy. Finchley Rd can barely cope with the traffic as it is.
2022/0528/P	Beverly	31/03/2022 08:57:44	APP	<p>I strongly object to the plans to change the O2 centre to residential flats.</p> <p>I am a local resident and use all the Homebase , Sainsburys , cafes and cinemas regularly. I use the car park which is really important when I use the centre.</p> <p>We need to have a communal hub not residential eyesore which takes away all facilities for the local area.</p>
2022/0528/P	ray zenios	30/03/2022 17:21:53	OBJ	<p>Objection to high rise buildings</p> <p>Objection to taking away car parking spaces for local shoppers thus taking away trade from local amenities</p> <p>Objections to further crowded buildings with no open spaces</p> <p>Wasting money demolishing a centre which serves a purpose</p>
2022/0528/P	K whitcomb	30/03/2022 17:31:56	COMMNT	Housing density too high for local services ie underground and too high to fit in with other buildings.