

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2022/0528/P	Lorrie Dannecker	21/04/2022 02:15:11	OBJ	There is too little local infrastructure to support such residential density.
2022/0528/P	Lorrie Dannecker	21/04/2022 02:15:07	OBJ	There is too little local infrastructure to support such residential density.
2022/0528/P	Anna	20/04/2022 18:24:49	COMMNT	Objection to build more flats. Where is the green for our kids. Where is the green to protect our planet.
2022/0528/P	Celine Haenni	20/04/2022 21:20:02	OBJ	Objection
2022/0528/P	Celine Haenni	20/04/2022 21:20:07	OBJ	Objection
2022/0528/P	Patricia McConnell	21/04/2022 09:16:16	COMMNT	A large number of people would be living in the development and there is very little provision for parking. Camden may desire the borough to be practically car free but this is unrealistic. It is very difficult to carry a week's shopping on a bicycle or a bus or on foot. We are moving out of Camden because of the policies of the present Council.
2022/0528/P	John Alexander Bernard	20/04/2022 19:08:40	OBJ	Loss of car park, large supermarket, gym, GP surgery etc providing amenities to the local area.  Added strain on public transport in the area with extra residents incoming and nothing done to compensate for this on buses, underground, rail etc.  Tall buildings will not fit in with current medium/low rise buildings in the area.

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2022/0528/P	Kirill Glukhovskoy	21/04/2022 00:02:39	OBJ	Tall Buildings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Conservation

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

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

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

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

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

“Is human in scale”

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

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

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

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

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

Affordable housing

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

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

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

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

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

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

Car parking

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

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

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

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

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

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

Loss of large supermarket

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

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

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

Community facilities

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

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

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

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

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<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	Mitul Shah	21/04/2022 12:52:55	OBJ	<p>This development is excessive and totally not in line with what the neighbourhoods of Finchley Road and West Hampstead can support.</p> <p>The supermarket at the O2 centre and the garden centre are the only ones of their kind in these neighbourhoods that have access to significant parking space.</p> <p>Without additional transport links, schools and hospital capacity, can the council please clarify how it intends to support the local community?</p>
2022/0528/P	Roland Hartwig	20/04/2022 18:32:19	OBJ	<p>The local area does not have sufficient schools, parking, traffic arteries, etc. to support such a large development in this location. Traffic in the area is already unmanageable. The approval process needs to be moved into a fully transparent forum.</p> <p>Any building permission should be right-sized to ensure that ring-fenced funding for schools, traffic management, medical and transport facilities is commensurate to the size of the development and not diluting existing services. Developments done for profit by private developers may well end up costing our community money when existing residents need to pay higher costs to subsidize failures of poor planning.</p> <p>The plan should be categorically rejected for the benefit of existing residents.</p>
2022/0528/P	Phil Welch	20/04/2022 18:37:10	COMMNT	<p>Camden should re purpose vacant office blocks and have no need to build any high rise anywhere in the borough!</p>
2022/0528/P	Phil Welch	20/04/2022 18:37:15	COMMNT	<p>Camden should re purpose vacant office blocks and have no need to build any high rise anywhere in the borough!</p>
2022/0528/P	K Knight	21/04/2022 23:46:22	OBJ	<p>I would like to formally object to the demolition of the O2 centre and cannot fathom how there is any possibility to service an additional 1800 new residents in an already stretched community. Residents already have to wait 2-3 weeks for a GP appointment for themselves and family, schools are over subscribed, tubes are packed into work and trying to get anywhere in West Hampstead for the constant road and building works is a nightmare, and there are already so many developments such as the new West Hampstead square and the upcoming ex travis Perkins one but at least these have been more tastefully done ans far less high!! Tearing down the only car park, a gym, childrens activities (Gymboree/little gym) and the only large (affordable) grocery store and then put another 1800 people into the mix is beyond bonkers and nothing but a developers money making racket. I don't understand the point of the consultation nor the comments as it seems it's steaming ahead anyway in all it's 15 story (!! ) glory.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	K Knight	21/04/2022 23:46:27	OBJ	I would like to formally object to the demolition of the O2 centre and cannot fathom how there is any possibility to service an additional 1800 new residents in an already stretched community. Residents already have to wait 2-3 weeks for a GP appointment for themselves and family, schools are over subscribed, tubes are packed into work and trying to get anywhere in West Hampstead for the constant road and building works is a nightmare, and there are already so many developments such as the new West Hampstead square and the upcoming ex travis Perkins one but at least these have been more tastefully done ans far less high!! Tearing down the only car park, a gym, childrens activities (Gymboree/little gym) and the only large (affordable) grocery store and then put another 1800 people into the mix is beyond bonkers and nothing but a developers money making racket. I don't understand the point of the consultation nor the comments as it seems it's steaming ahead anyway in all it's 15 story (!! ) glory.
2022/0528/P	Jacob Olenick	21/04/2022 13:29:41	SUPPRT	<p>Just got a leaflet from Labour asking me to share my views. I was considering voting Labour, but now I am wondering: is there anyone I can vote for to make the planned O2 development taller, and built sooner?</p> <p>Dense building is good for the environment and good for affordability. I don't really care what percent of the units are affordable, it's more important that we simply add to the housing supply. It's especially good to see housing being built near several tube stations, and along several bus routes.</p> <p>The O2 centre, as it currently exists, is an unconscionable, backwards, grotesque waste of space, and a giveaway to wealthy exurban motorists who are, each one of them, directly and disproportionately responsible for the destruction of the planet (yes, even the ones with electric vehicles).</p> <p>The redevelopment plans look good. The more houses the better. There's no time to waste.</p> <p>Taller buildings now please.</p>
2022/0528/P	James McGibney	21/04/2022 12:46:05	COMMNT	The plans as outlined are completely unsuitable for the area. Finchley Road is already badly polluted and congested and cannot sustain more vehicles, which is what so many new homes would imply. The designs are not in character with the historic nature of the surrounding streets. The plans do not make up for the loss of valuable local amenities that would be lost in the demolition of the O2 centre. I am completely against the plans, and the O2 centre should either be retained or much more thoughtful alternative plans developed.
2022/0528/P	Paula Zeff	20/04/2022 11:09:31	COMMNT	I'm concerned about the density and height of the residential buildings. Also I wonder how affordable the affordable housing will be? Step-free access at West Hampstead station is good and long overdue but has space on West End Lane pavements been taken into consideration too?
2022/0528/P	Paula Zeff	20/04/2022 11:09:33	COMMNT	I'm concerned about the density and height of the residential buildings. Also I wonder how affordable the affordable housing will be? Step-free access at West Hampstead station is good and long overdue but has space on West End Lane pavements been taken into consideration too?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Catherine Hogel	20/04/2022 14:55:00	COMMNT	Please limit the height of these buildings which are totally out of proportion with the surrounding areas. Also more needs to be done with respect to the fair use of the space. I am also very concerned about the local public transport being completely overwhelmed. Can I suggest that the Metropolitan Line please also stop at West Hampstead as that is the major interchange between the Overground and Thameslink and it would then free up the congestion on the Jubilee line platform and the one stop crush to the Metropolitan Line. Given the land on either side at West Hampstead this doesn't seem like an impossible step of the solution. Thanks.
2022/0528/P	Richard Harris	20/04/2022 21:31:03	OBJNOT	Object to 02 changing from An important community hub of shops and restaurants and car parking which is needed by local residents as well as nearby visitors.
2022/0528/P	Deborah Minshall	21/04/2022 10:16:19	OBJ	I have only recently become aware of this proposed development...why were local residents not fully consulted regarding this? I would like to formally register my opposition to any high rise / densely populated buildings being built on this site ....we do not want to be living in/ near a ghetto! The low rise integrity of the area should be protected.We do not want our skyline views to be obstructed by concrete monstrosities! With 1,800 new dwellings brings at least 3-6,000 additional people to the area, and local infrastructure does not support this! Medical centres, nursery & schooling in the area are already full/ overloaded. This proposed development will ruin the village feel of the area ...we did not choose to live in a high rise, densely populated area deliberately ! This development will negatively impact our daily living environment & property prices .... it must NOT go ahead in its current format !

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0528/P	Lorna Greenwood, Richard Olszewski and Marcus Storm	21/04/2022 12:23:39	COMMNT	<p>We are writing as a Fortune Green Labour Councillor and two Labour candidates on behalf of local residents who have raised significant concerns about Landsec's O2 Centre development.</p> <p>Whilst we recognise this is an area that has potential to positively contribute new housing and amenities we are concerned about the plans in their current form.</p> <p>First, and most importantly, we urge you to push the developers, Landsec, on the affordable housing provision, particularly family-sized three-bedroomed housing. There are currently 7,000 families on the council's housing waiting list. The council must push hard for 50% affordable housing aligned with Camden Council's policy. Additionally, 60% of that should be at low-cost social rents (again, aligned with council policy).</p> <p>Secondly, we demand good quality, large public green areas and open space. Plus a large, affordable supermarket in place of the large, affordable Sainsbury's currently in situ. Other amenities we demand commitment from Landsec to in phase one of the development include step-free access at West Hampstead Tube, a new medical centre, and community and leisure facilities to not only benefit the whole community but to also support the increased population. Residents' concerns about height must also be responded to.</p> <p>Finally, we are asking Landsec and Camden Council to work with local residents, understand the strong feelings locally and ensure they are listened to as the process continues.</p> <p>Lorna Greenwood, Richard Olszewski and Marcus Storm Fortune Green Labour Party</p>
2022/0528/P	Matteo Sotti	21/04/2022 16:58:47	PETITNOBJ E	<p>The proposed development is simply "insane" from a public policy perspective, I cannot find any other words for it. An ugly modern new city in the middle of historical conservation areas.</p> <p>The thousands of additional residents will increase population density to abnormal levels in this part of our city and borough, with severe implications for road traffic, schools and hospital places, further congestion of public transport.</p> <p>Furthermore there will be the loss of the main local supermarket and DIY store, and the loss of the recreation O2 centre which characterises the site with its restaurants, cinema, gym and so on.</p>