

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Dalgleish Jan	18/04/2022 15:44:53	OBJ	I object to the new planning of flats in the O2 Centre given that aesthetically they will be too high, the traffic and the loss of facilities e.g. Sainburys, Cinema.
2022/0528/P	Dalgleish Jan	18/04/2022 15:44:59	OBJ	I object to the new planning of flats in the O2 Centre given that aesthetically they will be too high, the traffic and the loss of facilities e.g. Sainburys, Cinema.
2022/0528/P	Jon	16/04/2022 19:00:06	SUPPRT	<p>This is a much needed development. London is becoming absolutely unaffordable for first time buyers, with many, such as myself looking to move out of London due to the local planning process being hijacked by NIMBY homeowners solely interested in protecting their own vastly over inflated house values. This alone means you should ignore any objections from people who already own their own homes. London is plagued with decades of underdevelopment, with house prices massively rising due to councils not adding supply when demand is so high. Councillors and homeowners maybe content with the next generation of Londoners spending most of their income lining the pensions of second homeowners, and delaying having children until their 40s as they are restricted to living in HMOs, but it's now time to build build build. Build higher, build denser, BUILD MORE BLOODY HOUSES and FLATS.</p> <p>Finally, why not actually spend all that money that the council get from property developers and build some bloody houses with it rather than just increasing the cost of home ownership?</p>
2022/0528/P	Dalgleish Jan	18/04/2022 15:45:03	OBJ	I object to the new planning of flats in the O2 Centre given that aesthetically they will be too high, the traffic and the loss of facilities e.g. Sainburys, Cinema.
2022/0528/P	Anne McEwan	17/04/2022 18:08:28	OBJ	<p>To whom it concerns</p> <p>I do hope you will be doing everything in your power to prevent our wonderful O2 shopping centre and communal area from being reduced to rubble &amp; 2000, yes 2000 homes being built which will create a concrete jungle and cause crime rates to sore.</p> <p>I want to see you actively promoting the O2 centre as a place where local communities can gather and Socialise . Let me know all your plans to prevent this catastrophe from going ahead. I will help you with your fight to prevent this madness.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely</p> <p>Anne McEwan</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2022/0528/P	Anne McEwan	17/04/2022 18:08:31	OBJ	To whom it concerns

I do hope you will be doing everything in your power to prevent our wonderful O2 shopping centre and communal area from being reduced to rubble & 2000, yes 2000 homes being built which will create a concrete jungle and cause crime rates to sore.

I want to see you actively promoting the O2 centre as a place where local communities can gather and Socialise . Let me know all your plans to prevent this catastrophe from going ahead. I will help you with your fight to prevent this madness.

Yours Sincerely

Anne McEwan

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Celine Castelino	15/04/2022 18:34:03	OBJ	<p>I object most strongly to the proposed application for the redevelopment of the O2 Centre and car park which will is clearly unsustainable and will undoubtedly greatly damage our environment.</p> <p>My objections are on the following grounds and as measured against the principles outlined in the various plans which already exist namely:</p> <p>The London Plan, the Camden Local Plan, the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and Camden's own 2013 site allocations and its 2019 (!) draft Site Allocations:</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>As Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that were it to, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <p>Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification.</p> <p>Furthermore, 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 to capacity and limited in access.</p> <p>The area is not suited to high-rise buildings with 10 storeys an absolute maximum height for the area, in-keeping with the tallest buildings already in the area, eg:</p> <p>The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest in West Hampstead &amp; the 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest in the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>The proposed development contains several buildings that are taller than either of the above. It is thus extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area. Most of our buildings are under 5 storeys. High rise living can be deleterious to residents particularly in cases where the buildings are densely packed which restricts light and air; creates areas with little security for vulnerable groups such as women and children.</p> <p>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 – preferably less - under London Plan policy D9. But as it is not, it should be resisted.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns &amp; Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies namely:

These are low- and medium-rise, the most typical building being three (3) storeys above ground with a lower ground level. They are primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

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

"Is human in scale"

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

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

"Has regard to the impact on local views" as 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. So, another of many reasons that it should therefore be resisted.

Car parking and continuing amenities

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 reprovding existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped.

The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

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

As a long-time local resident, the O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times permanently, rather than just within controlled hours, as was the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site.

#### Viability of amenities

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 under agreement with the Competition & Markets Authority to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand. 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 again is another reason it should be resisted. Many local people, myself included, are committed to maintaining a low carbon footprint so do not have cars. The loss of these retail outlets will severely disadvantage us. We, and the new residents of the O2 blocks will undoubtedly have to resort to online shopping thus increasing traffic pollution further.

#### 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.

Even though Camden 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. Such exceptions with little justification make a mockery of all these plans, and 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. Time and time

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

again developers renege on their commitment to provide 'affordable' housing. As in the case of the Ballymore and Swiss Cottage developments they vigorously market these properties to overseas investors who frequently leave them empty and do little to reduce the housing needs of local people

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 resisted.

In short, there are numerous minuses and barely a single plus for this development for our community as currently proposed .

PLEASE can Camden think about what human beings need for healthy sustainable living - open space, green space, trees, community facilities, adequate infrastructure, supermarkets, daylight/sunlight not shaded 'wind tunnel' paths between high rise buildings... PLEASE don't just think about 'box-ticking' to meet the government arbitrary house building quotas or Section 106 and CIL payments - think long term about how development of the area is going to impact the community.

Significant harm is being done by over development of the area and it is to be hoped that Camden will finally listen to its residents, rather allowing profit hungry developers ride rough shod over us and destroy our community.

I would really appreciate it if you would listen to your voters and Council tax payers.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Celine Castelino	15/04/2022 18:34:06	OBJ	<p>I object most strongly to the proposed application for the redevelopment of the O2 Centre and car park which will is clearly unsustainable and will undoubtedly greatly damage our environment.</p> <p>My objections are on the following grounds and as measured against the principles outlined in the various plans which already exist namely:</p> <p>The London Plan, the Camden Local Plan, the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and Camden's own 2013 site allocations and its 2019 (!) draft Site Allocations:</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>As Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that were it to, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <p>Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification.</p> <p>Furthermore, 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 to capacity and limited in access.</p> <p>The area is not suited to high-rise buildings with 10 storeys an absolute maximum height for the area, in-keeping with the tallest buildings already in the area, eg:</p> <p>The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest in West Hampstead &amp; the 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest in the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>The proposed development contains several buildings that are taller than either of the above. It is thus extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area. Most of our buildings are under 5 storeys. High rise living can be deleterious to residents particularly in cases where the buildings are densely packed which restricts light and air; creates areas with little security for vulnerable groups such as women and children.</p> <p>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 – preferably less - under London Plan policy D9. But as it is not, it should be resisted.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns &amp; Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies namely:

These are low- and medium-rise, the most typical building being three (3) storeys above ground with a lower ground level. They are primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

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

"Is human in scale"

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

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

"Has regard to the impact on local views" as 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. So, another of many reasons that it should therefore be resisted.

Car parking and continuing amenities

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

The council will consider retaining or re-providing existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped.

The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

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

As a long-time local resident, the O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre



Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times permanently, rather than just within controlled hours, as was the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site.

#### Viability of amenities

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 under agreement with the Competition & Markets Authority to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand. 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 again is another reason it should be resisted. Many local people, myself included, are committed to maintaining a low carbon footprint so do not have cars. The loss of these retail outlets will severely disadvantage us. We, and the new residents of the O2 blocks will undoubtedly have to resort to online shopping thus increasing traffic pollution further.

#### 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.

Even though Camden 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. Such exceptions with little justification make a mockery of all these plans, and 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. Time and time

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

again developers renege on their commitment to provide 'affordable' housing. As in the case of the Ballymore and Swiss Cottage developments they vigorously market these properties to overseas investors who frequently leave them empty and do little to reduce the housing needs of local people

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 resisted.

In short, there are numerous minuses and barely a single plus for this development for our community as currently proposed .

PLEASE can Camden think about what human beings need for healthy sustainable living - open space, green space, trees, community facilities, adequate infrastructure, supermarkets, daylight/sunlight not shaded 'wind tunnel' paths between high rise buildings... PLEASE don't just think about 'box-ticking' to meet the government arbitrary house building quotas or Section 106 and CIL payments - think long term about how development of the area is going to impact the community.

Significant harm is being done by over development of the area and it is to be hoped that Camden will finally listen to its residents, rather allowing profit hungry developers ride rough shod over us and destroy our community.

I would really appreciate it if you would listen to your voters and Council tax payers.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Celine Castelino	15/04/2022 18:34:09	OBJ	<p>I object most strongly to the proposed application for the redevelopment of the O2 Centre and car park which will is clearly unsustainable and will undoubtedly greatly damage our environment.</p> <p>My objections are on the following grounds and as measured against the principles outlined in the various plans which already exist namely:</p> <p>The London Plan, the Camden Local Plan, the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and Camden's own 2013 site allocations and its 2019 (!) draft Site Allocations:</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>As Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that were it to, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <p>Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification.</p> <p>Furthermore, 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 to capacity and limited in access.</p> <p>The area is not suited to high-rise buildings with 10 storeys an absolute maximum height for the area, in-keeping with the tallest buildings already in the area, eg:</p> <p>The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest in West Hampstead &amp; the 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest in the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>The proposed development contains several buildings that are taller than either of the above. It is thus extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area. Most of our buildings are under 5 storeys. High rise living can be deleterious to residents particularly in cases where the buildings are densely packed which restricts light and air; creates areas with little security for vulnerable groups such as women and children.</p> <p>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 – preferably less - under London Plan policy D9. But as it is not, it should be resisted.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns &amp; Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies namely:

These are low- and medium-rise, the most typical building being three (3) storeys above ground with a lower ground level. They are primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

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

"Is human in scale"

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

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

"Has regard to the impact on local views" as 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. So, another of many reasons that it should therefore be resisted.

Car parking and continuing amenities

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 reprovding existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped.

The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

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

As a long-time local resident, the O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times permanently, rather than just within controlled hours, as was the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site.

#### Viability of amenities

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 under agreement with the Competition & Markets Authority to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand. 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 again is another reason it should be resisted. Many local people, myself included, are committed to maintaining a low carbon footprint so do not have cars. The loss of these retail outlets will severely disadvantage us. We, and the new residents of the O2 blocks will undoubtedly have to resort to online shopping thus increasing traffic pollution further.

#### 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.

Even though Camden 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. Such exceptions with little justification make a mockery of all these plans, and 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. Time and time

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>again developers renege on their commitment to provide 'affordable' housing. As in the case of the Ballymore and Swiss Cottage developments they vigorously market these properties to overseas investors who frequently leave them empty and do little to reduce the housing needs of local people</p> <p>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 resisted.</p> <p>In short, there are numerous minuses and barely a single plus for this development for our community as currently proposed .</p> <p>PLEASE can Camden think about what human beings need for healthy sustainable living - open space, green space, trees, community facilities, adequate infrastructure, supermarkets, daylight/sunlight not shaded 'wind tunnel' paths between high rise buildings... PLEASE don't just think about 'box-ticking' to meet the government arbitrary house building quotas or Section 106 and CIL payments - think long term about how development of the area is going to impact the community.</p> <p>Significant harm is being done by over development of the area and it is to be hoped that Camden will finally listen to its residents, rather allowing profit hungry developers ride rough shod over us and destroy our community.</p> <p>I would really appreciate it if you would listen to your voters and Council tax payers.</p>

2022/0528/P	Anne McEwan	17/04/2022 18:08:42	OBJ	<p>To whom it concerns</p> <p>I do hope you will be doing everything in your power to prevent our wonderful O2 shopping centre and communal area from being reduced to rubble &amp; 2000, yes 2000 homes being built which will create a concrete jungle and cause crime rates to sore.</p> <p>I want to see you actively promoting the O2 centre as a place where local communities can gather and Socialise . Let me know all your plans to prevent this catastrophe from going ahead. I will help you with your fight to prevent this madness.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely</p> <p>Anne McEwan</p>
2022/0528/P	JACKY SCHLOSS	15/04/2022 19:21:51	APP	<p>High rise buildings in the place of the O2 centre will spoil the feel of the area and the amount of people these buildings will bring to the area is not sustainable.</p> <p>There are not enough facilities for these people and it would need a big investment to bring that up to the adequate amount.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	JACKY SCHLOSS	15/04/2022 19:21:56	APP	High rise buildings in the place of the O2 centre will spoil the feel of the area and the amount of people these buildings will bring to the area is not sustainable. There are not enough facilities for these people and it would need a big investment to bring that up to the adequate amount.
2022/0528/P	Samantha Hamilton-Smith	16/04/2022 00:41:41	OBJ	I strongly object to the O2 Centre being knocked down and converted into 2000+ flats. West End Lane has limited pavement space and it is already overcrowded with people spilling onto the roads at rush hour times. The area has had so many new apartment blocks built in the past few years and another one is being developed currently on the old Travis Perkins site. The area will not be able to cope with another 4000+ residents. GP surgeries are already struggling and are over subscribed. It can take up to a month to get an appointment currently unless it is an emergency. My flat was affected by the flooding in July 2021 and from what I understand the strain is already apparent on the local drains. How will Thames Water and the current drainage system be able to cope with another 2000 flats in close proximity in an already built up area especially as we are being warned that heavy rain and flash flooding will become more common due to climate change. The O2 Centre and its amenities have been a great asset to the local community. It has been a safe space for families and teenagers to enjoy the restaurants, cinema and gym plus Sainsburys has been invaluable to the area.
2022/0528/P	Seb Sultan	17/04/2022 01:40:13	SUPPRT	Great development bringing much needed homes. I would like to live in one of these new homes.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Pantelis Los	15/04/2022 17:24:32	OBJ	<p>I am writing to raise strong objections to the proposed application for the redevelopment of the O2 Centre.</p> <p>Like many other local residents, I have legitimate concerns about the density of high-rise tower blocks being proposed, when the local area has been subjected to an onslaught of development over the last few years resulting in already over- crowded pavements, public transport, shops, community facilities such as doctors surgeries, dentists, etc</p> <p>No one is listening to the local residents and the tireless objections being raised. The response from the developer is to submit application after application in an attempt to bulldoze the scheme through regardless of the mass local objections.</p> <p>The government issues arbitrary advice to increase house building and sadly no common sense is applied - no consideration given to the need to upgrade infrastructure BEFORE development, no consideration given to the pressure already on community facilities and GP surgeries where appointments are already hard to come by. No consideration to the amount of flats sitting empty in high rise tower blocks built over the last few years. No consideration given to the fact that there's already a mass development of flats underway on the old Travis Perkins site on West End Lane, which will only make the queues for the tube station and packed pavements in the area even worse.</p> <p>We're penalised for owning a car and yet the proposal does away with a DIY store, supermarket, gym, cinema etc all of which we can currently walk to. If we have heavy shopping then being able to drive and park is essential especially for the elderly or people with children.</p> <p>PLEASE can Camden think about what human beings need for healthy sustainable living - open space, green space, trees, community facilities, adequate infrastructure, supermarkets, daylight/sunlight not shaded 'wind tunnel' paths between high rise buildings... PLEASE don't just think about 'box-ticking' to meet the government arbitrary house building quotas or Section 106 and CIL payments - think long term about how development of the area is going to impact the community.</p> <p>Significant harm is being done by over development of the area and it is to be hoped that Camden will finally listen to its residents, rather than deciding that it knows best.</p>
2022/0528/P	Elena Moynihan	15/04/2022 17:28:45	OBJ	<p>I object to this development, yet again developers are putting forward a highly over development plan that is completely unsuitable for the area.</p> <p>This high density development in an area that is not suited for high buildings seeks to replace incredibly useful local amenities such as a DIY store, a large supermarket, a cinema and popular shops and restaurants, and replacing them with thousands of new residents.</p> <p>No steps are taken to accommodate these new residents with transport, schools, GP Surgeries as well as the aforementioned amenities that are being taken away.</p> <p>The remainder of the area is a brownfield sandwiched between two railway lines and a very busy double carriage road, therefore completely unsuitable to residential accommodation.</p> <p>The whole scheme is misguided, contravenes the London Plan and the Camden Local Plan and should be scrapped.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Anneliese Simeloff	16/04/2022 11:41:26	INT	<p>I live in Goldhurst Terrace in lower ground floor and raised ground floor maisonette. The entire lower ground floor was flooded in July 2021. After several hours the water level was standing at 0.30cm. Initially the water level was at 50cm. Repairs took months and cost £50,000.00.</p> <p>The house consists of 3 apartments and our buildings insurance has increased by £500 per annum. It is now nearly impossible to get buildings insurance for a property in my area. The value of my apartment has dropped considerably since the flooding. This was the 3rd flooding in 50 years.</p> <p>Please note that any actions taken after previous flooding in 2002 have been entirely INEFFECTIVE. The current proposal by Land securities represents ADDED RISK OF FLOODING for South and West Hampstead (including the build proposed) because the measures to increase capacity for water storage and sewerage are insufficient. Camden Council must hold the developer to account and ensure that effective flood prevention measures are included in the proposal and if this is not the case, planning permission should be refused.</p>
2022/0528/P	Elly Baker	18/04/2022 19:44:15	OBJ	<p>Overdevelopment: too many new homes, the masterplan is too dense, and buildings are too tall and large for the capacity of the site and the area's existing local infrastructure.</p> <p>Inappropriate mix of land uses: too much residential floorspace and not enough other uses to sustainably support the increased population after the loss of amenities, services, retail, food &amp; drink uses caused by the demolition of the O2 Centre and Homebase. There will be fewer amenities and infrastructure per person after the development. Sustainable development proposals should increase, not decrease, the sq. m provision of such amenities.</p> <p>Unemployment: already shops have closed down in the O2 centre. There will be many people out of jobs.</p> <p>Inappropriate phasing strategy: healthcare and creche facilities are insufficiently scaled for this scale of development, are not delivered until phase 2, after which already 608 new homes will be added. This critical infrastructure should be delivered in phase 1.</p> <p>Transport capacity: Finchley Road and West Hampstead Stations are already at capacity and cannot support a substantial growth in the local population; the feasibility study is conceded by the developer to make them accessible will not provided any added transport capacity.</p> <p>Sustainability: the demolition of multiple existing buildings is inevitably a more carbon-intensive than a strategy that retains the O2 Centre. The strategy is not circular: it does not maximise reuse and minimise raw material extraction. The large scale of new construction will entail massive carbon emissions and air pollution, contrary to Camden's net zero and environmental commitments. The choice of materials and construction methods will also have substantial embodied carbon; only low-embodied carbon materials should be used with a full life-cycle assessment.</p> <p>Please do not demolish O2 centre, in addition to above, you will take away a safe environment for younger people to go to and gather.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	South Hampstead Flood Action Group	16/04/2022 10:08:24	OBJNOT	<p>The London Plan 2021 sets out the following requirements as part of Policy S1 5 Water Infrastructure:</p> <p>"Development proposals should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) seek to improve the water environment and ensure that adequate wastewater infrastructure capacity is provided</li> <li>2) take action to minimise the potential for misconnections between foul and surface water networks.</li> </ol> <p>Development plans and proposals for strategically or locally defined growth locations with particular flood risk constraints or where there is insufficient water infrastructure capacity should be informed by Integrated Water Management Strategies at an early stage."</p> <p>In July 2021 over 100 properties in South Hampstead were badly flooded. (See appendix below for details.) In some properties the flooding was 1.5 meters deep, resulting in many hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of damage to local homes and businesses, as well as hugely disrupted lives.</p> <p>South Hampstead was also flooded in 1975 and 2002, so many properties have been flooded three times in less than 50 years.</p> <p>Thames Water sewers run through the O2 redevelopment site and directly down to South Hampstead.</p> <p>Given predictions of more extreme weather caused by climate change, we are concerned that this huge redevelopment will significantly add to the pressure on the local sewers that have failed to cope with heavy storms in the past.</p> <p>Thames Water's comments on Landsec's planning application say they have: "identified an inability of the existing SURFACE WATER network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal." They also say: "Network reinforcement works are likely to be required to accommodate the proposed development. Any reinforcement works identified will be necessary in order to avoid sewage flooding and/or potential pollution incidents."</p> <p>The London Plan 2021 states: "Development sites should get as close to greenfield run off rates as possible, depending on the site conditions." As Thames Water say, Landsec's current proposal of a surface water run off rate of 260 litres per second must be reduced to the greenfield rate of 36 litres per second.</p> <p>Although the proposed development would improve the run off rate from the present position, both local vulnerability to flooding, and the likelihood of more extreme weather, make a rate that is seven times the greenfield rate completely unacceptable.</p> <p>In addition Thames Water, Camden Council and Landsec should make the most of opportunity of this development to reduce the risk of future local flooding, including by:</p> <p>* Installing additional Thames Water funded water storage tanks to hold excess storm water then release it gradually, reducing the pressure on the existing sewers in storms.</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

\* Stemming or diverting the old underground streams that flow down the hill from Hampstead, through the O2 development area in two places, meeting in South Hampstead. Currently these streams flow into the sewers adding to the overload in a storm.

This map shows where these streams run:

<http://kilburnwesthampstead.blogspot.com/2020/09/the-kilbourne-stream.html>

Paragraph 6.5.1 of Landsec's Environmental Statement Non-technical Summary states that they have undertaken an assessment of the "likely significant flood and drainage effects on existing nearby sensitive receptors...". From the supporting documentation it is not clear whether Landsec have examined the potential flood risk for South Hampstead, or just in relation to the redevelopment site.

Given Camden Council's role as the local lead flood authority, we trust that, with Thames Water, they will make the most of the O2 development as a chance to enhance local flood protection measures, as part of implementing a local Integrated Water Management Strategy.

Appendix: Details of the South Hampstead flooding

These videos show how severe the South Hampstead flooding was:

[https://twitter.com/lunanana\\_\\_\\_/status/1414620842516959241?s=20](https://twitter.com/lunanana___/status/1414620842516959241?s=20)

[https://twitter.com/lunanana\\_\\_\\_/status/1414620355440914449?s=20](https://twitter.com/lunanana___/status/1414620355440914449?s=20)

Impact on residents and businesses

A 79 year old tenant would have died in his basement flat when he was trapped by water which rose to more than 5 feet. Luckily his upstairs neighbours realised what was happening and rescued him through his window. All his possessions were ruined.

Many residents have had to leave their homes for many months while building repairs are carried out, severely disrupting their lives. As one explains:

"Work has not started on our flat yet as we are still sorting things through with our building insurance. By this rate, we are thinking it will be summer before we are back in. Not being in our own home continues to cause stress everyday, as well as the immense work of dealing with contents and buildings insurance whilst trying to juggle our full-time jobs. I know that everyone affected by the floods will have lost sentimental items that can't be replaced and that is one of the hardest things to try and come to terms with. My father-in-law passed down many items to my husband, which were all ruined. Our adult son's artwork from when he was a child is all gone, photo albums of family members (pre-digital era) are all destroyed and my husband's great-grandmother's artist sketchbook was ruined. Losing these irreplaceable items has caused the most heartbreak for us."

Several elderly women who live alone were flooded, including one in her 90s who has dementia, and others who have various disabilities.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Many businesses were severely disrupted, including a bakery, two dry cleaners, two restaurants, a hairdresser, a welfare association, a laundrette, a pub, a home care agency, a property developer, a clothing shop and a newsagent.</p> <p>Many tenants, and some owners have been so traumatised by the experience they never want to return to their flats again.</p> <p>One commented: "The impact of the flooding following two previous floods has of course been huge, with the financial value of my flat presumably now only a fraction of what it was previously. The consequence of that is that I couldn't now afford to move to a property less prone to flooding even if I wished to. Work is finally about to start on restoring my flat but together with others in the same situation I feel thoroughly trapped, waiting for the inevitable next flash flood."</p> <p>Another told us: "I live (lived!) in a garden flat on Belsize Road. Our flat was very badly damaged because we live opposite the manhole cover that exploded so experienced the full force of gushing water. The insurance loss adjuster said it was the worst flood damage he's seen in his career. We lost most of our possessions and are still waiting to have the flat repaired (the force of the water knocked a hole through one of the internal walls). I am sure we're not the only ones who get a knot in the pit of their stomach every time we have heavy rain."</p> <p>Insurance issues</p> <p>In one block of 13 flats, all three basement flats were flooded. The freehold, which is co-owned by the 13 flat owners, has been told by their insurance broker they cannot be covered for flooding for the next year, when the position will be reviewed. (They had already been required to pay the first £25,000 of any claim.) Others have been told that in future they will have to pay the first £25,000 of any flooding claim.</p> <p>Because most houses in the area are divided into at least four flats they are not covered by the Government's Flood Re scheme, so there is no guarantee that they will be able to get insurance in future.</p> <p>Nearby neighbours are worried too</p> <p>Many others who live nearby are also very worried by the flooding. As one wrote:          "My wife and I write to support strongly the demand for improved flood defences in Kilburn Vale and the roads leading to it, in particular Belsize Road, Priory Terrace and Priory Road.</p> <p>Properties in the three roads named above, very near our home, were absolutely swamped in a cloudburst last July. We narrowly escaped. Since then, we have invested substantially in expert detailed surveys of our property, which reveal that the only real risk of flooding to our flat is if the main drain is overwhelmed, exactly what happened in parts of the three named roads recently. Given the topography of South and West Hampstead, the western ends of these three roads will always be at risk of flash flooding."</p>

2022/0528/P Archie McCann 16/04/2022 20:56:58 SUPPRT

New housing is absolutely necessary throughout this area, and this development promises to deliver this in high quality and numbers.

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2022/0528/P	Emma Casey	16/04/2022 21:06:22	SUPPRT	Development of this site is long overdue, so I'm forced to support this, as any proposal is better than none. But I do worry that a prime site with excellent transport links is being somewhat squandered. Far more market rate housing, and associated amenities could have been included. The proposed density is far lower than could be hoped for from a site like this, and lower than we need if London is to keep pace with her population.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	John Mayo CBE	16/04/2022 12:28:44	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Application number 2022/0528/P</p> <p>I object to the proposed development on the following grounds and as measured against the principles outlined in the various plans which already exist namely:</p> <p>The London Plan, the Camden Local Plan, the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and Camden's own 2013 site allocations and its 2019 (!) draft Site Allocations:</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>As Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that were it to, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <p>Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification.</p> <p>Furthermore, 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 to capacity and limited in access.</p> <p>The area is not suited to high-rise buildings with 10 storeys an absolute maximum height for the area, in-keeping with the tallest buildings already in the area, eg:</p> <p>The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest in West Hampstead &amp; the 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest in the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>The proposed development contains several buildings that are taller than either of the above. It is thus extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.</p> <p>As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys – preferably less - under London Plan policy D9. But as it is not, it should be resisted.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns &amp; Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies namely:</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

These are low- and medium-rise, the most typical building being three (3) storeys above ground with a lower ground level. They are primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

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

"Is human in scale"

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

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

"Has regard to the impact on local views" as 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. So, another of many reasons that it should therefore be resisted.

Car parking and continuing amenities

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 reprovding existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped.

The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

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

As a long time local resident, 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 permanently, rather than just within controlled hours, as was the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

redevelopment site.

Viability of amenities

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 under agreement with the Competition & Markets Authority to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand. 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 again is another reason it should be resisted.

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.

Even though Camden 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. Such exceptions with little justification make a mockery of all these plans, and 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 resisted.



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>In short, there are numerous minuses and barely a single plus for this development as currently proposed.</p> <p>I hope this is not just a box ticking exercise and that the above objections will halt this development as currently constituted in its tracks.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>John Mayo CBE</p>
2022/0528/P	Nicholas Curtiss	16/04/2022 17:10:43	OBJ	<p>This proposal if it were to be approved would be both reckless and irresponsible for any Planning Authority to adopt. Strong and very valid objections can be made using the formal criteria for objections to be made - but in essence it is a case of overdevelopment with little to no thought or at least inadequate thought as to long term impact on local infrastructure and the local environment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the sheer density of what is being proposed is excessive and overwhelming - the scale is excessive;</li> <li>2) the development is surrounded by a number of conservation areas - how does this scheme fit in with such neighbourhoods without putting an unreasonable burden on those neighbourhoods existing infrastructure as well as destroying the unique cultural heritage of those areas;</li> <li>3) the development does not have any proposals for carparking - it is just ludicrous to believe that because the scheme excludes such provision that no attempt will be made by new residents in the development to use neighbouring parking facilities in nearby residential streets. There are no proposals to increase the controlled hours in the neighbouring Controlled Parking Zones to combat this very likely problem.</li> <li>4) there is the loss of local amenities such as the O2 Centre and a supermarket from a major food chain with plenty of car parking spaces. It is simply a loss of amenities without any adequate replacement or form of measurable gain;</li> <li>5) the amount of public green space is totally inadequate given the size and volume of the development.</li> </ol> <p>This proposed development should not be approved - it is an exceptionally poor and unrealistic set of proposals. A more appropriate scheme which could be supported by local residents should be developed. For the avoidance of any doubt this should be read as an objection to the application.</p>
2022/0528/P	Anne Kollar	17/04/2022 17:11:27	OBJ	<p>I have read that the the only way to lodge an objection with weight is to appeal to the legalities being breached, however since I am not qualified to do that, I hope I can express my strong emotional reaction to this application. This work will be taking place in my home. It will affect my lifestyle, my shopping choices, my ability to use public transportation, my foot access to my preferred gym, cinema, supermarket, garden centre, hardware shop, meeting places, and restaurants, forcing me increasingly inside my home because I can't walk to the services I require. It will affect my neighbourhood on a daily basis with increased traffic on an already deeply polluted Finchley Road, it will increase the CO2 in my area, affecting my health and subjecting me to noise, disruption, increase in crime, loss of parking spaces, overcrowding of schools, doctors offices, Royal Free services and many other amenities, ALL of which are negative. As a long-term taxpayer and a senior citizen with increasing needs, is it really OK for the council to destroy my life patterns and those of my neighbours with what seems like NO sympathy or consideration? Thousands of people crowded into a packed high-rise development just down the road partnered with an actual decrease in shops, transport options and services will destroy what has been working - even if a bit clumsily - for those of us who already live here, pay taxes here, and elect representatives here. Please don't do this to us.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Olivia Woodthorpe	15/04/2022 17:30:22	OBJ	<p>I am writing to raise strong objections to the proposed application for the redevelopment of the O2 Centre.</p> <p>Like many other local residents, I have legitimate concerns about the density of high-rise tower blocks being proposed, when the local area has been subjected to an onslaught of development over the last few years resulting in already over- crowded pavements, public transport, shops, community facilities such as doctors surgeries, dentists, etc</p> <p>No one is listening to the local residents and the tireless objections being raised. The response from the developer is to submit application after application in an attempt to bulldoze the scheme through regardless of the mass local objections.</p> <p>The government issues arbitrary advice to increase house building and sadly no common sense is applied - no consideration given to the need to upgrade infrastructure BEFORE development, no consideration given to the pressure already on community facilities and GP surgeries where appointments are already hard to come by. No consideration to the amount of flats sitting empty in high rise tower blocks built over the last few years. No consideration given to the fact that there's already a mass development of flats underway on the old Travis Perkins site on West End Lane, which will only make the queues for the tube station and packed pavements in the area even worse.</p> <p>We're penalised for owning a car and yet the proposal does away with a DIY store, supermarket, gym, cinema etc all of which we can currently walk to. If we have heavy shopping then being able to drive and park is essential especially for the elderly or people with children.</p> <p>PLEASE can Camden think about what human beings need for healthy sustainable living - open space, green space, trees, community facilities, adequate infrastructure, supermarkets, daylight/sunlight not shaded 'wind tunnel' paths between high rise buildings... PLEASE don't just think about 'box-ticking' to meet the government arbitrary house building quotas or Section 106 and CIL payments - think long term about how development of the area is going to impact the community.</p> <p>Significant harm is being done by over development of the area and it is to be hoped that Camden will finally listen to its residents, rather than deciding that it knows best.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Elizabeth Mayo	16/04/2022 12:32:49	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Application number 2022/0528/P</p> <p>I object to the proposed development on the following grounds and as measured against the principles outlined in the various plans which already exist namely:</p> <p>The London Plan, the Camden Local Plan, the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and Camden's own 2013 site allocations and its 2019 (!) draft Site Allocations:</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, "Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans."</p> <p>As Camden has not designated anywhere in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that were it to, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:</p> <p>Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a "clear and convincing justification". It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification.</p> <p>Furthermore, 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 to capacity and limited in access.</p> <p>The area is not suited to high-rise buildings with 10 storeys an absolute maximum height for the area, in-keeping with the tallest buildings already in the area, eg:</p> <p>The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest in West Hampstead &amp; the 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest in the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>The proposed development contains several buildings that are taller than either of the above. It is thus extraordinarily tall compared to the surrounding area.</p> <p>As a result, while Camden has been derelict in not designating areas as suitable or not, the factors specified in the London Plan would lead an objective observer to conclude that the area is not suitable to tall buildings and that a 'tall building' is defined as anything taller than 10 storeys. As a result, the development should be limited to 10 storeys – preferably less - under London Plan policy D9. But as it is not, it should be resisted.</p> <p>Conservation</p> <p>The development is sandwiched tightly between the Fitzjohns &amp; Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. These conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies namely:</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

These are low- and medium-rise, the most typical building being three (3) storeys above ground with a lower ground level. They are primarily red- or yellow-brick terraces and mansion blocks. Unrendered brick is the absolutely dominate material in the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

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

"Is human in scale"

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

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

"Has regard to the impact on local views" as 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. So, another of many reasons that it should therefore be resisted.

Car parking and continuing amenities

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 reprovding existing car parking where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers intend to return to the development after it is redeveloped.

The applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement and management of the site, so it is a redevelopment.

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

As a long time local resident, 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 permanently, rather than just within controlled hours, as was the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

redevelopment site.

Viability of amenities

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 under agreement with the Competition & Markets Authority to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand. 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 again is another reason it should be resisted.

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.

Even though Camden 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. Such exceptions with little justification make a mockery of all these plans, and 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 resisted.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>In short, there are numerous minuses and barely a single plus for this development as currently proposed.</p> <p>I hope this is not just a box ticking exercise and that the above objections will halt this development as currently constituted in its tracks.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Elizabeth Mayo</p>
2022/0528/P	John Bradley	16/04/2022 19:37:06	AMEND	The area badly needs new housing preferably affordable and with a large element owned by a registered social landlord. The area has tried to exclude large chunks of the population for many years requiring those who provide the vital services in the area to travel in, which is expensive for these low wage earners, time-consuming and has a large carbon footprint. To fight global warming people need to be close to their place of work, preferably within walking distance.
2022/0528/P	Helena Mayo	16/04/2022 12:44:37	OBJ	As a teenage girl, I see the O2 centre as a safe place for young people to socialise in a positive environment. I go to the cinema there, eat there, shop there, be with my friends there, and it's easy to get to, so if the O2 centre does get demolished to be replaced by ugly and unnecessary blocks of flats, then Camden will be taking away a key part of young people's lives and wellbeing. It will also create huge amounts of toxic pollution for years, which have not been fully included in the assessment. If Camden does get rid of the O2 centre, it will become clear to me what their priorities are, and I will know for sure that developer's profits are at the top, and the wellbeing of Camden's future is at the bottom.
2022/0528/P	Freddie Poser	16/04/2022 18:53:23	COMMNT	I am writing in SUPPORT of this development. This will deliver badly needed new homes and a vibrant area for businesses. As a resident, I look forward to using the amenities myself and to the new neighbours. The plans are absolutely appropriate for the area and are very close to brilliant public transport links.
2022/0528/P	Helen Weavers	17/04/2022 08:23:13	COMMNT	I write in support of the comments made by the South Hampstead Flood Action Group. My ground floor flat was flooded during the heavy rainfall event last July; we were stunned by the very large amount of water flowing down various roads from the O2 centre area towards the properties of South Hampstead and the inability of the drainage system to cope even after a short time. Please please please take action to control the water run-off from and through the new development; it sounds like storing storm water for gradual release could be a good solution. This is another opportunity for this development to really improve our area; please take advantage of this opportunity and hence get more support from local residents who are wary of the plans.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Lesley Stevas	15/04/2022 22:14:43	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposed application for the redevelopment of the O2 Centre.</p> <p>All of us residents have legitimate concerns about the density of high-rise tower blocks being proposed. The local area has been subjected to an onslaught of development over the last few years resulting in already over- crowded pavements, public transport, shops, community facilities such as doctors surgeries, dentists, etc</p> <p>No one is listening to the local residents and the tireless objections being raised. The response from the developer is to submit application after application in an attempt to bulldoze the scheme through regardless of the mass local objections. Please consider what locals might need.</p> <p>The government issues arbitrary advice to increase house building and sadly no common sense is applied - no consideration given to the need to upgrade infrastructure BEFORE development, no consideration given to the pressure already on community facilities and GP surgeries where appointments are already hard to come by. No consideration to the amount of flats sitting empty in high rise tower blocks built over the last few years. No consideration given to the fact that there's already a mass development of flats underway on the old Travis Perkins site on West End Lane, which will only make the queues for the tube station and packed pavements in the area even worse. We're penalised for owning a car and yet the proposal does away with a DIY store, supermarket, gym, cinema etc all of which we can currently walk to. If we have heavy shopping then being able to drive and park is essential especially for the elderly or people with children.</p> <p>PLEASE can Camden think about what human beings need for healthy sustainable living - open space, green space, trees, community facilities, adequate infrastructure, supermarkets, daylight/sunlight not shaded 'wind tunnel' paths between high rise buildings... PLEASE don't just think about 'box-ticking' to meet the government arbitrary house building quotas or Section 106 and CIL payments - think long term about how development of the area is going to impact the community.</p> <p>Significant harm is being done by over development of the area and it is to be hoped that Camden will finally listen to its residents, rather than deciding that it knows best.</p>
2022/0528/P	Judith Gittoes	17/04/2022 11:43:08	COMMNT	<p>I object to the development of the O2 Centre, as proposed. The buildings are too tall and are too densely packed and are out of character with the existing housing in West Hampstead.</p> <p>Also, the development would put too much strain on existing transport facilities. A requirement for provision of step-free access to West Hampstead Underground should be mandated as part of the scheme.</p> <p>I strongly object to the loss of Sainsburys supermarket. Without any provision whatsoever for parking a replacement supermarket of comparable size would not be feasible. Some parking could be provided for in an underground carpark. I use this supermarket regularly and access it by foot. Once it is gone or replaced with a smaller food shop those, like myself, who do not drive would not have access to supermarket of this size with its greater range and choice of products. Also, whilst any building is in progress safe pedestrian access from West End Lane via Blackburn Road should be required.</p> <p>Any development providing for a large number of new residents would require provision for a new surgery. Merely providing space for a surgery would not be sufficient.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Thomas Davis	18/04/2022 22:51:09	COMMNT	I am opposed to this application on the grounds that it will not fix the housing shortage that local residents have been crying out for over the last 20 years as nobody on the average London salary would be able to afford any of these flats. It would also get rid of many essential services which local residents rely on including the cinema and the big Sainsburys which locals use to buy products in bulk. Furthermore for the amount of housing proposed there would need to be an increase in local infrastructure which is not covered in the submitted proposal.
2022/0528/P	Thomas Davis	18/04/2022 22:51:14	COMMNT	I am opposed to this application on the grounds that it will not fix the housing shortage that local residents have been crying out for over the last 20 years as nobody on the average London salary would be able to afford any of these flats. It would also get rid of many essential services which local residents rely on including the cinema and the big Sainsburys which locals use to buy products in bulk. Furthermore for the amount of housing proposed there would need to be an increase in local infrastructure which is not covered in the submitted proposal.
2022/0528/P	Anne McEwan	17/04/2022 18:08:45	OBJ	<p>To whom it concerns</p> <p>I do hope you will be doing everything in your power to prevent our wonderful O2 shopping centre and communal area from being reduced to rubble &amp; 2000, yes 2000 homes being built which will create a concrete jungle and cause crime rates to soar.</p> <p>I want to see you actively promoting the O2 centre as a place where local communities can gather and socialise. Let me know all your plans to prevent this catastrophe from going ahead. I will help you with your fight to prevent this madness.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely</p> <p>Anne McEwan</p>