

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Tim Faulkner	11/04/2022 18:15:27	OBJ	I am objecting to the massive over development of the entire area but specifically the O2 which would impose tremendous overload on all of the public utilities which re already massively over stretched. This together with taking away a vital supermarket and all of the shops none of which are duplicated on Finchley Road where there is no parking anyway. I am astonished at the complete lack of proper thought given to planning in this area in terms of traffic congestion, quality of the air noise and general destruction of green spaces. The public transport is over crowded as are all aspects of the area. quite apart form the congestion on West End Lane which will be impassible
2022/0528/P	Said Abdallah	07/04/2022 14:47:46	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I would like to oppose this development. It will overwhelm the surrounding buildings and damage the community, infrastructure and local environment. This is because current services are already at maximum stress without additional demands.</p> <p>The loss of O2 Centre will be detrimental to the community.</p> <p>I appreciate the need for housing, however, this is not the solution, it doesn't address the need for affordable starter homes and places an unnecessary burden on the local community.</p> <p>Many thanks and kind regards, Said Abdallah (Dr) MBChB MRCP</p>
2022/0528/P	Rubana	11/04/2022 17:34:57	OBJ	Too much housing already, we need places like O2 centre! Too many residents only add further pressure on schooling, transport and the list goes on.
2022/0528/P	Ward	07/04/2022 11:48:35	OBJ	Compared to the existing O2 Centre with its shops, cinemas, Sainsburys & Homebase, the proposed flats/buildings are enormous, casting shadows, creating wind corridors and certainly not a place that people generally will feel comfortable walking around or relaxing. The O2 Centre is not that old, the Sainburys/Homebase shops are more than fit for purpose. Some of the new residents will need parking spaces as well as those visiting the shops and general area; where are they to park? The roads around this area are already congested. I am NOT against additional housing/facilities being created for our growing population but surely these high-rise structures do not fit in with the existing mainly Victorian neighbourhood and something more sympathetic could be designed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Sawsan El-Khadem	07/04/2022 15:01:23	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I would like to oppose this development. It will overwhelm the surrounding buildings and damage the community, infrastructure and local environment. This is because current services are already at maximum stress without additional demands.</p> <p>The loss of O2 Centre, Sainsburys and public green space will be detrimental to the community; as these are a valuable resource to the local population.</p> <p>I appreciate the need for housing, however, this is not the solution, it doesn't address the need for affordable starter homes and places an unnecessary burden on the local community. Instead it creates more unaffordable rental investment properties.</p> <p>Many thanks and kind regards, Sawsan El-Khadem (Dr) MbChB</p>
2022/0528/P	James Box	08/04/2022 14:15:36	OBJ	<p>I whole heartedly object to the planning of this development.</p> <p>Finchley Road is already clogged with traffic at peak times, this will no doubt get a lot worse with thousands of extra residents either having cars or using taxi's/Ubbers. The Services will be completely overwhelmed, but most importantly, having many towers will be a blot on the landscape. This is a very picturesque area and we all know what tower blocks end up looking like in 15 years time, they will be ugly, obstructing views and light and end up being an eye sore rather than a thing of beauty.</p> <p>This cannot go ahead, it will be the downfall of the area and Camden Council are once again, considering making a hugely wrong decision.</p>
2022/0528/P	Sara Miriam Nae	09/04/2022 09:18:19	OBJ	<p>Strongly object as there are insufficient services to support the new residents once towers are built. The area is already busy and polluted.</p>
2022/0528/P	Lucy Clark	11/04/2022 16:52:43	OBJ	<p>I find it incredibly that despite a majority of residents who responded to your ¿consultation¿, objecting to high rise developments and the proposed numbers of new flats, which will lead to such a large increase in the density of our present population, you continue to ignore us and go ahead with your plan. What, I wonder, are you if not our representatives? Clearly you think you are above listening to us, who must be seen as unimportant even though we pay your salaries and will be the ones affected by your dreadful plans. Where will all these people park, shop, school their kids, commute from etc etc??? And still not enough affordable housing for our public service employees who we underpay as it is!!!!!! Disgusting!!!!!!</p>
2022/0528/P	Philippe Durrant	12/04/2022 08:51:20	OBJ	<p>I object to these plans, as a resident of West Hampstead. It is a bad idea for the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Tim Faulkner	11/04/2022 18:15:22	OBJ	I am objecting to the massive over development of the entire area but specifically the O2 which would impose tremendous overload on all of the public utilities which re already massively over stretched. This together with taking away a vital supermarket and all of the shops none of which are duplicated on Finchley Road where there is no parking anyway. I am astonished at the complete lack of proper thought given to planning in this area in terms of traffic congestion, quality of the air noise and general destruction of green spaces. The public transport is over crowded as are all aspects of the area. quite apart form the congestion on West End Lane which will be impassible
2022/0528/P	Kavi Thakrar	11/04/2022 17:44:04	OBJ	Simply unacceptable. Will put even further strain on the area. 2000 homes is ridiculous. We need local amenities, not more housing in an already overpopulated part of London
2022/0528/P	raphael estripeau	08/04/2022 21:20:05	PETITNOBJ E	This needs to be voted against. How is this even an option to build horrible tower blocks in the centre of a lovely area. I'd be positive if it was not inspired from horrible buildings from the 1980s... Did we not learn anything about the aesthetic and urbanist failure of these times? Do we really want to start again building for the sake of it without thinking about how it will age? Give us a shard or a sky gardens, instead of trying to maximise your profits per square meters, then maybe we'll change our minds. No to this!
2022/0528/P	mr manoj bahl	11/04/2022 16:50:27	OBJ	<p>We, the residents, are resolute that this type of development is totally against the look and feel of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Camden Council are failing to represent the local community and are bulldozing through plans which none of the residents support. The locale is congested and the existing facilities are very well used.</p> <p>Please have the decency to serve those that voted to protect their neighborhood and stop looking to profit from council taxes. WE DO NOT WANT THIS DEVELOPMENT IN OUR NEIHBOURHOOD AND WILL TAKE ALL STEPS TO BLOCK IT.</p>
2022/0528/P	Elisa	12/04/2022 06:16:42	OBJ	I strongly object high rises at the O2 centre. We need lots of space and low rises buildings
2022/0528/P	Justin Hedley	11/04/2022 19:48:25	INT	<p>I object to the the development plans for the O2 Centre on the following grounds:</p> <p>The high density of the living accommodation proposed 1,800 which equals approximately up to 7,000 residents and therefore unviable in relation to the site's footprint and it current amenities. It is not an appropriate site to put high-rise flats.</p> <p>A Labour member at the recent meeting was misleading to suggest that the site presented just a timber yard and car-park. The planned removal of the supermarket that serves crucially the local and wider community with no planned equivalent (including Homebase), together with the impact on the public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Further here has been no mention of the widespread drug-dealing between West Hampstead and Finchley Road station and the increased crime that goes with it exacerbated in the absence of police presence allows for this to go unchecked with predictably high levels.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Justin Hedley	11/04/2022 19:48:30	INT	<p>I object to the the development plans for the 02 Centre on the following grounds:</p> <p>The high density of the living accommodation proposed 1,800 which equals approximately up to 7,000 residents and therefore unviable in relation to the site's footprint and it current amenities. It is not an appropriate site to put high-rise flats.</p> <p>A Labour member at the recent meeting was misleading to suggest that the site presented just a timber yard and car-park. The planned removal of the supermarket that serves crucially the local and wider community with no planned equivalent (including Homebase), together with the impact on the public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Further here has been no mention of the widespread drug-dealing between West Hampstead and Finchley Road station and the increased crime that goes with it exacerbated in the absence of police presence allows for this to go unchecked with predictably high levels.</p>
2022/0528/P	Justin Hedley	11/04/2022 19:48:36	INT	<p>I object to the the development plans for the 02 Centre on the following grounds:</p> <p>The high density of the living accommodation proposed 1,800 which equals approximately up to 7,000 residents and therefore unviable in relation to the site's footprint and it current amenities. It is not an appropriate site to put high-rise flats.</p> <p>A Labour member at the recent meeting was misleading to suggest that the site presented just a timber yard and car-park. The planned removal of the supermarket that serves crucially the local and wider community with no planned equivalent (including Homebase), together with the impact on the public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Further here has been no mention of the widespread drug-dealing between West Hampstead and Finchley Road station and the increased crime that goes with it exacerbated in the absence of police presence allows for this to go unchecked with predictably high levels.</p>
2022/0528/P	Justin Hedley	11/04/2022 19:48:40	INT	<p>I object to the the development plans for the 02 Centre on the following grounds:</p> <p>The high density of the living accommodation proposed 1,800 which equals approximately up to 7,000 residents and therefore unviable in relation to the site's footprint and it current amenities. It is not an appropriate site to put high-rise flats.</p> <p>A Labour member at the recent meeting was misleading to suggest that the site presented just a timber yard and car-park. The planned removal of the supermarket that serves crucially the local and wider community with no planned equivalent (including Homebase), together with the impact on the public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Further here has been no mention of the widespread drug-dealing between West Hampstead and Finchley Road station and the increased crime that goes with it exacerbated in the absence of police presence allows for this to go unchecked with predictably high levels.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Justin Hedley	11/04/2022 19:48:44	INT	<p>I object to the the development plans for the 02 Centre on the following grounds:</p> <p>The high density of the living accommodation proposed 1,800 which equals approximately up to 7,000 residents and therefore unviable in relation to the site's footprint and it current amenities. It is not an appropriate site to put high-rise flats.</p> <p>A Labour member at the recent meeting was misleading to suggest that the site presented just a timber yard and car-park. The planned removal of the supermarket that serves crucially the local and wider community with no planned equivalent (including Homebase), together with the impact on the public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Further here has been no mention of the widespread drug-dealing between West Hampstead and Finchley Road station and the increased crime that goes with it exacerbated in the absence of police presence allows for this to go unchecked with predictably high levels.</p>
2022/0528/P	Justin Hedley	11/04/2022 19:48:49	INT	<p>I object to the the development plans for the 02 Centre on the following grounds:</p> <p>The high density of the living accommodation proposed 1,800 which equals approximately up to 7,000 residents and therefore unviable in relation to the site's footprint and it current amenities. It is not an appropriate site to put high-rise flats.</p> <p>A Labour member at the recent meeting was misleading to suggest that the site presented just a timber yard and car-park. The planned removal of the supermarket that serves crucially the local and wider community with no planned equivalent (including Homebase), together with the impact on the public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Further here has been no mention of the widespread drug-dealing between West Hampstead and Finchley Road station and the increased crime that goes with it exacerbated in the absence of police presence allows for this to go unchecked with predictably high levels.</p>
2022/0528/P	Justin Hedley	11/04/2022 19:48:54	INT	<p>I object to the the development plans for the 02 Centre on the following grounds:</p> <p>The high density of the living accommodation proposed 1,800 which equals approximately up to 7,000 residents and therefore unviable in relation to the site's footprint and it current amenities. It is not an appropriate site to put high-rise flats.</p> <p>A Labour member at the recent meeting was misleading to suggest that the site presented just a timber yard and car-park. The planned removal of the supermarket that serves crucially the local and wider community with no planned equivalent (including Homebase), together with the impact on the public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Further here has been no mention of the widespread drug-dealing between West Hampstead and Finchley Road station and the increased crime that goes with it exacerbated in the absence of police presence allows for this to go unchecked with predictably high levels.</p>
2022/0528/P	Hessam Badamchi	11/04/2022 17:11:11	OBJ	<p>I have serious concerns about putting 15 Storey high rises in Camden. I am not convinced that Camden have enough protections in place for this. We also don't have enough capacity and infrastructure. For example, Finchley Road tube station is already over crowded. There are safety concerns with the station when it does get over crowded and when asked if this is of concern, Camden pushes the problem to TFL. At the same time pavements in this area are narrow and we have seen what traffic issues it caused when trying to expand it.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	andrew dutton parish	11/04/2022 17:11:33	OBJNOT	<p>I object to the environmental permanent damage to the site because of the grossly excessive (greedy) number of housing units proposed , especially the tower blocks over 6 stories high and the lack of green space and tree planting on the site .</p> <p>High tower blocks are very harmful to the environment both in their building materials (especially concrete) and in the unnecessarily high amounts of fuel needed to maintain/live in them e.g. for heating , air-conditioning , lifts ...</p> <p>THERE IS NO NEED NOR JUSTIFICATION FOR BLOCKS HIGHER THAN 6 STORIES , they are never safe , they damage their surroundings and most people in the UK don't want to live in them .</p> <p>Presently the site has a lot of trees and open space , all of which is advantageous . The proposal is so densely over-built there is almost no vital green space planned . For environmental reasons (especially plant & wildlife diversity) green corridors of trees and underplanting are necessary to cross the entire site both north to south and east to west .</p> <p>As planned the site will become an environmental catastrophe at a time when governments are meant to be committed to green policies to improve our environment : global warming , air pollutants , plants life , wild life , psychological wellbeing .</p> <p>ANY PLANNER SUPPORTING THIS SCHEME SHOULD BE ETERNALLY ASHAMED OF THE APPALLING ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE THEY CAUSE.</p> <p>The fact that the proposed atrocity is sure to be demolished within 50 years is little comfort as the damage will have been done and these modern slums will have further degraded London .</p>

2022/0528/P	simon parkin	11/04/2022 18:04:23	OBJ	I object to any building on this site, the services like the supermarket, car park, cinema and gym I use every day.
2022/0528/P	Simon Randall	11/04/2022 16:57:41	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am objecting to this development on the basis that this is already an over populated area of London and there is insufficient resources for additional housing in this site area.</p> <p>I am aware a supermarket will be part of the project, however we already have a large Sainsbury's here and it performs a vital role for existing tenants in the area, further expansion of people here is not going to create a more safe environment or reduce congestion on both public transport or the roads, for which there is no way to provision more capacity.</p> <p>In my view, it is an ill-conceived plan to make yet more of London over-populated and decrease the quality of lives further of those who live nearby.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Simon Randall</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	robert stannard	11/04/2022 17:02:18	OBJ	<p>I would like to lodge my formal objection to the proposed scheme on the following grounds.</p> <p>1/ Degradation of the character and style of the area I believe it would represent an over-development of the site - putting too many people into too confined an area - this would no longer be in keeping with the style of the population distribution in the area.</p> <p>2/ Transport There are 3 stations within walking distance, all at near capacity during the busy rush-hour period. Since there are no plans to add additional rail capacity adding another 10,000 people into the area will place unbearable strain on the system.</p> <p>3/ Health Services The health services are already stretched for the existing population. Its difficult to register with a local GP surgery and the waiting times in the local hospitals A&E departments are already very long. Adding an additional 10,000 people into the area without expanding exisiting health services will put unbearable strain on existing services.</p> <p>4/ Schools / Education Schools are already near capacity. How are places going to be found for so many additional children.</p> <p>5/ Supermarket and Leisure Facility removing the exisiting supermarket facility and B&Q will lessen access to food shopping and leisure facilities while at the same time substantially increasing the number of people living in the area.</p> <p>6/ Adding tall towers of the proposed height into the area will be totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Roshanak	11/04/2022 16:58:23	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:
2022/0528/P	Xabier de Beristain Humphrey	11/04/2022 17:28:27	INT	<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>
				<p>I have followed this application with great interest since it was submitted.</p> <p>Whereas I fully understand the need for more housing - in particular affordable housing - in inner London, this current application is just not proportionate.</p> <p>The current application for this project would simply be catastrophic and create a very considerable blight on the skyline of NW3. Any Councillor who enabled such a project to proceed, despite very significant opposition from long-term local residents, would surely be acting undemocratically and would need to be held accountable. More personally, they would surely have to wrestle with their own conscience, if they have one, for the rest of their lives as the damage done would never realistically be undone.</p> <p>The long-term damage inflicted on local residents by this application cannot be justified on any basis. Surely, affordable housing can be introduced via numerous smaller projects without having to destroy the area - both near and far - in which the development is being built on.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Hamed silatani	11/04/2022 17:00:17	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:**

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	Hamed silatani	11/04/2022 17:00:22	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, 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:
2022/0528/P	Tristram Giff	11/04/2022 18:30:43	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	Tristram Giff	11/04/2022 18:30:43	OBJ	<p>I cannot believe that the proposal to build high rises on the site of the O2 was passed by Labour and Lib Dems and not voted down. I have voted Labour or Lib Dem all my life however I am not going to vote for either on the May elections and I will vote conservative in order to have my voice heard.</p> <p>95% of residents, people who actually live here oppose this unlimited high rise, that also has no addition accommodation for amenities, shopping, parking, restaurants and leisure facilities to cater for the increased population that will ensure. In fact we lose a major super market and parking not to mention those amenities that currently exist.</p> <p>You have an opportunity to build something creative and sympathetic to the area yet I feel, as do many people I talk to in the area that the huge fall in revenue that the councils face has made them less careful in approving projects such as these plus there must be a financial gain in doing so.</p> <p>You have not listened to our voices or made in any way concessions to make this a palatable proposal. You have steamrolled the local residents with such disdain and clearly do not regard them in the slightest.</p> <p>I work in the media and have also worked with Berkley Homes who developed Rathbone place in the centre of London and they did a great job finding a sympathetic solution that improved the area whilst building flats. I see nothing in your proposal that does the same but the desire to build huge skyscrapers filled to the brim.</p> <p>You have an obligation to the local residents first, NOT the developers no matter the incentives.</p> <p>Please reconsider this proposal, Limit the building to 6 stories and develop the shopping and leisure facilities to accomodate the new populace.</p> <p>I will not be voting Labour or Lib Dem and I know that the feeling is widespread in the area as we feel totally let down by you.</p> <p>Sincerely Tristram Giff</p>
2022/0528/P	Justin Shulman	11/04/2022 16:35:56	OBJ	<p>We do not have capacity on our local transport services (buses/trains/underground) nor doctor's surgery or schools for such a huge scheme. There is a huge development underway in West End Lane (O2 Dominion) and there are numerous other smaller schemes (including the build to rent scheme at 100 Avenue Road) in the immediate vicinity. If Councillors allow this to go ahead and planners approve this they are acting completely irresponsibly and I will never trust our system again!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Matilda Slight	11/04/2022 18:48:29	OBJ	This is not a suitable space for high-rises, and the traffic and pollution on this road is already vast. In addition the current o2 centre provides fantastic local facilities to try and keep quality of life retained in this area. Replacing these with more flats will break the local area. Over 95% of residents that responded to Camden's consultation on this proposal opposed it.
2022/0528/P	Y Yang	10/04/2022 11:15:18	OBJ	Object to the O2 Centre re-development on the following grounds: 1. Tall buildings: completely out-of-the-keeping with the surrounding area 2. Building density: plot-ratio way above local average, will likely cause all sorts of pressure and troubles to local infrastructure and communities 3. Loss of key local retail providers, including hypermarket, cinemas, gym with pool, book store and home furnishing shops, which will be detrimental to local life and vibe 4. Negative social impact when overly-ambitious business plans stomp local communities' interests
2022/0528/P	Giselle Green	11/04/2022 16:19:58	INT	I've lived in the neighbourhood for over 20 years and am seriously concerned by this new development. I understand it will mean the construction of 12 tower blocks each 12-15 storeys high. This will completely change the look of the area, making it feel very enclosed in and oppressive and will be an eyesore on the surrounding neighbourhood. I'm told there will be over 5,000 new residents and am very worried about the resulting overcrowding on the roads, on public transport and in the streets in the locality. This will have a negative impact on the environment. And there will also be a serious impact on already stretched public services.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Anonymous	08/04/2022 16:21:58	OBJ	<p>Public Sector Equality Duty sets out that a public authority must "have due regard to the need to eliminate all forms of discrimination" and "advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it". This power cannot be delegated and so in this case it is for both LandSec and Camden Council to demonstrate their compliance with PSED.</p> <p>The lack of equality impact assessment provided with the supporting documents could evidence a lack of compliance with Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>The plans proposed would certainly not advance equality of opportunity for those with protected characteristics and would not eliminate discrimination, but instead would increase discrimination. I have set out a few examples of this below.</p> <p>Firstly, getting rid of the large supermarket with parking will discriminate against pregnant people, carers, the disabled, those with larger households and the elderly as these groups rely on the parking facilities to gain access to the site. It is worth noting that according to the ONS, women are more likely to be carers. This part of the plan would therefore disproportionately discriminate against people with certain protected characteristics - notably women, the elderly, the pregnant and the disabled.</p> <p>Secondly, LandSec have tried to minimise the consequences of getting rid of the large supermarket and parking by saying that people can and would prefer to shop online or they can travel further afield. Of course, many people cannot travel further because they do not own car and or because of inadequate public transport. In this way, the plans would be discriminatory to the disabled and pregnant who may not be able to access sites further away and to the elderly who are less likely to be able to navigate the internet to shop online.</p> <p>Thirdly, I asked about the equality impact assessment, especially about access to the site, in one of the online consultations. I was told by LandSec that the plan was a great idea because it "would improve walking". This is evidence of the lack of equality consideration. What about people who cannot walk to the site? What about those with accessibility issues made worse by facilities now being outside?</p> <p>I would also add that there was, to my knowledge, no specific equality consultation. This compounds the lack of equality impact assessment because it appears that no consideration to those with protected characteristics has been part of the planning at any stage.</p> <p>In conclusion, the plans do not seem to comply with the general duty under Public Sector Equality Duty.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Anonymous	08/04/2022 16:22:03	OBJ	<p>Public Sector Equality Duty sets out that a public authority must "have due regard to the need to eliminate all forms of discrimination" and "advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it". This power cannot be delegated and so in this case it is for both LandSec and Camden Council to demonstrate their compliance with PSED.</p> <p>The lack of equality impact assessment provided with the supporting documents could evidence a lack of compliance with Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>The plans proposed would certainly not advance equality of opportunity for those with protected characteristics and would not eliminate discrimination, but instead would increase discrimination. I have set out a few examples of this below.</p> <p>Firstly, getting rid of the large supermarket with parking will discriminate against pregnant people, carers, the disabled, those with larger households and the elderly as these groups rely on the parking facilities to gain access to the site. It is worth noting that according to the ONS, women are more likely to be carers. This part of the plan would therefore disproportionately discriminate against people with certain protected characteristics - notably women, the elderly, the pregnant and the disabled.</p> <p>Secondly, LandSec have tried to minimise the consequences of getting rid of the large supermarket and parking by saying that people can and would prefer to shop online or they can travel further afield. Of course, many people cannot travel further because they do not own car and or because of inadequate public transport. In this way, the plans would be discriminatory to the disabled and pregnant who may not be able to access sites further away and to the elderly who are less likely to be able to navigate the internet to shop online.</p> <p>Thirdly, I asked about the equality impact assessment, especially about access to the site, in one of the online consultations. I was told by LandSec that the plan was a great idea because it "would improve walking". This is evidence of the lack of equality consideration. What about people who cannot walk to the site? What about those with accessibility issues made worse by facilities now being outside?</p> <p>I would also add that there was, to my knowledge, no specific equality consultation. This compounds the lack of equality impact assessment because it appears that no consideration to those with protected characteristics has been part of the planning at any stage.</p> <p>In conclusion, the plans do not seem to comply with the general duty under Public Sector Equality Duty.</p>
2022/0528/P	Adam Jones	12/04/2022 07:40:58	OBJ	I object to the proposed high rise development.
2022/0528/P	Adam Jones	12/04/2022 07:41:00	OBJ	I object to the proposed high rise development.
2022/0528/P	Y Y-W Yeang	11/04/2022 23:31:55	PETITNOBJ E	Support banning of development of high rise flats at O2 Centre.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Mrs Jean Macleod	12/04/2022 08:43:41	COMMNT	infrastructure ie schools, shops, medical centres , roads, parking areas, public transport will not cope with the influx of the occupants of 2000 apartments on the O2 site. It is already a densely populated area. Loss of the Sainsbury supermarket and the facilities in the O2 centre will be the major loss.
2022/0528/P	henna	11/04/2022 20:38:58	COMMNT	comments on planning permission: voting against high rise building at the o2 centre
2022/0528/P	Rebeka Rahman	11/04/2022 17:53:18	OBJNOT	I object to what's about to built in place of the O2 centre . I have lived in this area for many years and the community around it thrive at the shopping mall with popular restaurants and cinemas and home shopping stores . This is a place where all walks of life come together and can enjoy the facilities around . Not only that youngsters and youths actually have somewhere to go . Not enough youth projects are in place to support youngsters and keep them off the road and from committing crimes. This is a place worth saving there is lots of good reasons to keep the O2 going and if anything the O2 should be improved In Better ways if some funding was provided instead of building car parks and building flats for the rich .
2022/0528/P	Anna G	09/04/2022 15:17:18	OBJ	I am a resident of West Hampstead and object strongly to this application for the following reasons: 1. The proposed tower blocks are too tall and too many for the capacity of the site and the existing infrastructure. 2. The amenities currently provided by the O2 centre and Homebase are much needed by local residents, so losing these will be disastrous given the number of residents who currently use them. The redevelopment will remove a supermarket (with parking!), garden centre, cinema, shops, gym and swimming pool. This will result in fewer amenities and infrastructure per person - even before the significant increase in density caused by the new residential units. 3. Local transport hubs are already over-stretched and cannot support a substantial growth in local population. 4. Local services (healthcare, education, policing) will not be able to cope with the increase in residents, and the proposals are inadequate for this scale of development. 5. The height and density of the towers are not in keeping with the character and heritage of the local area and will cause significant loss of daylight and sunlight to existing homes behind and around the development site.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Shereef Abdallah	07/04/2022 14:53:41	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I would like to oppose this development. It will overwhelm the surrounding buildings and damage the community, infrastructure and local environment. This is because current services are already at maximum stress without additional demands.</p> <p>The loss of O2 Centre, Sainsburys and public green space will be detrimental to the community.</p> <p>I appreciate the need for housing, however, this is not the solution, it doesn't address the need for affordable starter homes and places an unnecessary burden on the local community. Instead it creates more unaffordable rental investment properties.</p> <p>Many thanks and kind regards, Shereef Abdallah</p>
2022/0528/P	Maria Lombardo	11/04/2022 16:52:44	OBJ	<p>I object to this development that doesn't take into account of the wellbeing of people leaving in the area and people who will be leaving in the area in the future. The development will take away green spaces, light due to the high rise nature of the building, create hazard to the population living in and around the building. Take away food shopping facilities and bringing too many people that the area could absorb, creating more traffic around schools and already very congested Finchley Road. Contributing to pollution and high rise in emissions by building heating, cars and overall cementification of our urban spaces.</p>
2022/0528/P	Lucy Clark	11/04/2022 16:52:48	OBJ	<p>I find it incredibly that despite a majority of residents who responded to your 'consultation', objecting to high rise developments and the proposed numbers of new flats, which will lead to such a large increase in the density of our present population, you continue to ignore us and go ahead with your plan. What, I wonder, are you if not our representatives? Clearly you think you are above listening to us, who must be seen as unimportant even though we pay your salaries and will be the ones affected by your dreadful plans. Where will all these people park, shop, school their kids, commute from etc etc??? And still not enough affordable housing for our public service employees who we underpay as it is!!!! Disgusting!!!!</p>
2022/0528/P	A.L. RICHMAN	11/04/2022 18:23:53	COMMNT	<p>I cannot believe that Camden Council would give permission to allow developers to build high rise blocks of flats on this site in such a populated area. The area would firstly, look disastrous - the traffic would become even more congested - in fact to saturation point. The services for schools, doctors' surgeries, contractors and ambulance areas needs to be carefully situated for the amount of dwellings proposed. How can it be justified to allow these high tower blocks in this area. I trust the Councillors will agree that this Scheme must be modified - if it is to grant a mix of housing and commercial space in a GREEN environment and not a concrete jungle.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Riccardo Cumerlato	07/04/2022 13:13:35	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>While I support the development of the parking lot into residential buildings, I have four main objections to this proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The proposal doesn't fully recognise the impact of 1,900 new flats on the surrounding streets and transportation networks. Pedestrian traffic on West End Lane is already very heavy, with people being forced to walk on the street at peak times. What will happen when 5,000+ people are added? Similar considerations apply to the Finchley Road tube station and bus stops- The loss of an affordable supermarket (i.e. cheaper than Waitrose) with parking space will disproportionately impact less well-off families and elderly people, who live in the area- The demolition of the O2 Centre will have a large and unnecessary carbon footprint. A re-development is a much greener option, in line with modern real estate standards- The size of the development (up to 16 storeys high, 1,900 flats) is completely out of character for the area <p>I kindly ask to you reconsider the details of this proposal, focussing less on short-term wins (profits for the developer, big number of new flats for the council) and focussing more on the long-term impact of this project on the area.</p> <p>Best regards Riccardo Cumerlato</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Jill Henry	11/04/2022 18:23:24	OBJ	<p>I am objecting to this absolutely outrageous, greed-led 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 (literally) local Infrastructure, Utilities and Community Assets • Impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets • Overbearing height, mass and form – <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. Camden's Local Plan policy A2 requires a minimum open space of 9m2 per occupant, implying an open space of 40-45,000 m2.</p> <p>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. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.'</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	sara salah	10/04/2022 14:26:24	APP	<p>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.'</p> <p>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 Advise by Historic England</p> <p>Safety: The Met police has commented raising concerns over safety due to the development being car-free and also the density will make it dark and unsafe.</p> <p>The plan allows for one staircase in each building, this too is potential a health and safety hazard especially for escape of fire.</p>
<p>plan to house more people in the area is beyond the capacity of transport, sewage, pavement and street space, schools , fire department and police.</p>				