

From: Moira zanatta
Sent: 19 March 2022 21:04
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 Masterplan (2022/0528/P)

Dear Mr Fowler,

As a resident in Camden and in particular in Hampstead I do not agree on the number of flat for the O2 Masterplan.

The massive influx of people in an already congested area will put a strain in the local community.

West Hampstead Jubilee line station is already a health hazard at commuting time.

Same for Finchley Road.

How do you plan to accommodate the extra people from schooling, Gp surgeries perspective?

I oppose to such a plan.

Many thanks for your kind attention,

Best regards,
Moira

From: Claudine P
Sent: 19 March 2022 20:02
To: David Fowler
Subject: Objection to 1,800 flats at the o2 Centre
Importance: High

Dear Mr Fowler,

I object to the proposal as follows and request your confirmation that each point will be properly addressed - to date each has been evaded. If the o2 development goes ahead with the hideous and jarring build the local area will be aesthetically affected. With c 4,000 more residents on its streets, it could create overcrowding on the narrow streets and on already often overburdened public transport. By monumentally failing to provide any additional amenities to service 4,000 for these new people - it risks their healthcare with a lack of GP surgeries. Please see below

1. Breach of London Plan policy D9:

i, paragraph B “Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans.”

Given that there the 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward and the the 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area, any new building should be capped at 10-storeys -with a refusal for anything higher.

ii paragraph C:

- **Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a “clear and convincing justification”. It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification.**

The development is between the Fitzjohns & Netherhall, Belsize, South Hampstead, and West End Green Conservation Areas. Definitions of these conservation areas are defined by similar characters and development typologies already presented as:

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

The development is proposed is a few metres from a key Conservation Area and slap back, in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area. This contains 'Conservation Area-like' protections in Policy 2, namely development that:

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

Given the above, careful consideration should be given to the impact on conservation but the developer is acting as though it is being located a few metres outside these conservation areas. This should therefore be refused.

iii paragraph C:

- **It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development".**

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

2. Affordable Housing

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

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

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

3.Car parking

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

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

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

4. Loss of large supermarket

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

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

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

5. Community facilities

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

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

However, despite the growth of the population, there is no health provision within the detailed application for the site (i.e. the first part

to be developed). There has only been a vague statement that a healthcare facility may be provided in the non-detailed, outline permission (i.e. the later stages).

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

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

With regards,

Mrs Piggott

NW6 1QQ

From: Amir Aryanpour
Sent: 19 March 2022 18:55
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 Masterplan (2022/0528/P)

Dear Mr Fowler,

Trust you are well.

With regard to the O2 masterplan, I have raised my concerns and objection with the local MPs, Sir Starmer and Mrs Siddiq almost 6 months ago via the email below.

At the same time, I sent the very same email to all local councillors and let them know how terrified I am with the plan that will result in the demolition of the O2 centre.

Whilst all of the local councillors and Mrs Siddiq came back to me with their sympathy and agreed with the points that I raised here (evidence can be provided by request), a few of them indicated that nothing has been submitted **yet**. They suggested resubmitting these points when the plan is alive.

To their point, I would like to inform you how petrified and terrified we are with this plan. I have staffs who are severely upset and seeking medical advice as a result of this plan. Therefore, we would like to strongly propose our objection to the plan.

Dear Mr Fowler, I would like to remind you, the life and death of a few hundred people are in your hands. The decision you make will have a direct impact on their future and could tear apart some beautiful lives. So please, when you make the decision, keep their faces in front of your eyes.

Please respond to my email and outline the steps that you intend to take to address my concerns.

I look forward to hearing your response in due course.

Yours Sincerely

Amir Aryanpour PhD
Director of Gymboree Play and Music

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Amir Aryanpour

To:

Sent: Friday, 15 October 2021, 14:08:57 BST

Subject: Demolition of the O2 Centre

Dr Amir Aryanpour
Gymboree Play and Music
O2 Shopping Centre
255 Finchley Road
Swiss Cottage
NW3 6LU

Dear Mrs Siddiq,

As a business owner at the O2 Centre, Finchley Road, I am terrified by the news that is recently shared with us; The demolition of the O2 centre. As a result, would like to draw your attention to some vital facts that such an act will have on the local communities:

A) The first and foremost affection of the O2's demolition is the mental health of different communities who live/work nearby, including BAME and LGBTQ+ communities of the Swiss cottage area. The centre has been a focal point for these communities for the last two decades.

- **BAME**

My business, in particular, serves more than 600 BAME families every week who come to the centre to enjoy our site and then use other services which O2 offers. The BAME community was constantly terrified during the last two years with the COVID and once they were about to enjoy their life again, the Camden put them under another mental pressure; O2's demolition, the place that they could come into and enjoy their life. I have families on my site who are worried about the future of their kids as there are no other similar centres in miles once O2 disappeared.

- **LGBTQ+**

The other community that I am even more worried about is the LGBTQ+. My business alone offers jobs to more than 12 young teachers (a good portion of them belong to the LGBTQ+ community). These teachers have already been horrified and depressed by the mental and financial pressure of COVID for the last two years. Now they have to deal with another mental pressure; unemployment. I cannot stress how depressed they are with this devastating news.

B) There is no feasibility study taken place to assess the possibility of the incorporation of the centre into the new building site. The purposed plan only suggests demolition of the site without any reason. Ironically *Royal Institute of British Architects* provided a scientific report recently which suggests demolition of a building with the intention to reconstruct a new modern one (i.e. what LandSecurity is intended to do) is a mistake and adds to **Carbon Emissions** substantially. We all know the importance of Carbon Emissions to the Camden council and in particular to the mayor of London. Camden council cannot claim it tries to cut the carbon emissions from one hand and allows such construction to take place that is scientifically proven to contribute to the pollution caused by carbon emission from the other hand. This is morally wrong and has to stop.

RIBA and RICS report that widely referred to can be found here:

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-57756991>

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-53642581>

C) The architects behind the purposed plan, Alford Hall Monaghan Morris AHMM, have a huge portfolio of projects where they have “reused” an existing building in their new plans. It seems such an approach has not been taken here. The reason is not clear.

We are all well aware of the fact LandSecurity, the owner of the site has the right to construct any structural buildings on their land as long as they follow the rules and guidance provided by the council. We also know that their intention is to replace the centre with 2000 flats.

However, surprisingly their plan contains replacing the centre with a gym, a community venue, a supermarket, cinemas, some restaurants,

some retailers' shops and some green spaces. We currently do have all of these at the Finchley O2 centre!

Based on the above I would like you to ask your colleagues within Camden council to order LandSecurity to come up with a sensible plan that stops the demolition of the O2 centre and incorporate that into their design. This way not only the local businesses will benefit from the construction of the new flats without any interruption in their trading, but the Camden council also truly shows that carbon emission is one of its concerns and takes that seriously whilst paying attention to local vulnerable communities in particular BAME and LGBT+.

Please respond to my letter/email and outline the steps you intend to take to address my concerns. If applicable, please escalate my letter to the relevant parliamentarian or department and keep me informed of any progress.

I look forward to hearing your response in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Amir Aryanpour PhD
Director of Gymboree Play and Music

From: Kay Boyd
Sent: 19 March 2022 17:19
To: David Fowler
Subject: 2022/0528/p

I feel it is imperative to ask the decision makers in Camden Council to disallow this development. It is the responsibility of our local authority to enhance and safeguard the environment within their remit. The pressure from developers and the necessity to boost finances should not justify a plan which is so obviously detrimental and inappropriate to the locality. Having seen the model and despite the reassurances of the architects I can't believe that any planning officer would look at these plans and think that they are of an appropriate scale for their surroundings. It just looks monumental.

Twelve 10-15 story blocks concentrated in such an otherwise low-rise area, will be a blot on the landscape for posterity. Do you want this to be your legacy?

I am fully in favour of linking West Hampstead and Finchley Road in an attractive manner: I am fully in favour of building affordable housing and a community centre on this site: I am not in favour of a development on this offensive scale.

Please reconsider.

Kay Boyd

5, The Mount Square,
London, NW3 6SY

Mr David Fowler
Planning Solutions Team
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square,
London N1C 5AG

19th March, 2022

By email to david.fowler@camden.gov.uk

Dear Mr. Fowler,

Planning Application PL/ 2022/0528/P – O2 Centre Masterplan

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the above application.

This application could play a major role in supporting the Council's objective to promote much-needed affordable housing in the borough.

However, it involves a major strategic site and it is therefore essential that decisions on its future are plan-led and have regard to the site's sustainability and the impact of development in the longer term, whatever the immediate benefits.

The key concerns are [a] the proposed building heights of up to 16 storeys, which appear out of sympathy with the surrounding area, [b] the associated housing density of 1,800 homes, almost double the figure of 950 set in the most recent site allocation, and [c] the enclosed nature of the site, lack of through access and absence of multi-use access routes, which will increase the sense of isolation and fear of crime as highlighted in the response from the Metropolitan Police.

Building Height and Housing Density

Although not referred to in the Camden Local Plan, the requirement to keep building heights consistent with the prevailing street scene is made clear in national planning policy, the neighbourhood plan and in the London Plan 2021. Of these, the London Plan 2021 is the most recent statement of planning policy and it requires that *"boroughs should determine if there are locations where tall buildings may be an appropriate form of development"*, that such locations should be *"identified on maps in Development Plans"* and that tall buildings should only be developed in those locations and not elsewhere.

The reasons for this plan-led approach are understandable. The visual, functional and environmental impacts of tall buildings are set out in Policy D9 of the London Plan, which makes clear that tall buildings need to be planned carefully. They should only be placed on sites which have been previously earmarked to receive them, and those sites need to have received careful scrutiny through proper consultation before being incorporated explicitly into development plans.

The current planning application does not provide sufficient evidence that this process has been followed. The tall buildings which it proposes appear to be a function of the high density of 1,800 homes proposed for the site, but this is not a result of planning policy. As late as November 2019, the Council set an indicative figure of 950 homes for the site in its Site Allocation Plan, which informed the emerging Camden Local Plan. The previous Site Allocation Plan did not anticipate use of this site for housing.

/cont'd.....

- 2 -

David Fowler,
London Borough of Camden, N1C 5AG

Whatever has occurred to increase this figure to 1,800 between 2019 and the present date, it is clearly not the process of careful scrutiny and consultation contemplated by the London Plan.

Until such time as the site is specifically designated for tall buildings of the type proposed, following the process established by the London Plan, it seems clear that development cannot be approved.

Sustainability

From national level to neighbourhood level planning policy stresses the need to ensure that developments are designed to promote place-making and to create sustainable, accessible communities where crime (and fear of crime) does not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

Creating a development of 1,800 homes on the site, the size of a large village or neighbourhood will create a new community and the needs of that community must be addressed from the outset.

The site's long, narrow layout does not help with place-making. Significantly, the hard boundary around the perimeter of the site, punctuated occasionally by one of five walkways into the development, reinforces a sense of isolation and containment. The sense of segregation is reinforced by the height, design and layout of the buildings, all of which speak to a lack of integration with the surrounding residential areas.

But it is not just the impact of the buildings. The entire Masterplan design reinforces rather than addresses these issues. In particular:

- the site is served by a single access road, creating a massive cul-de-sac.
- all routes within the development are along pedestrian/cycle paths rather than inclusive, multi-access routes which benefit from vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements.

As the Metropolitan Police have noted, access routes need to be well-used, open and overlooked. By contrast, many of the footpaths illustrated in the Masterplan appear isolated and enclosed, with poor visibility of their immediate surroundings. Rather than designing-out crime, they appear to design it in, particularly as the 'cul-de-sac' approach will reduce through movements, which play a vital part in ensuring that public spaces are well-used.

These issues are critical to place-making and it is bewildering that the Metropolitan Police should note that they have only had one interaction with the applicant so far.

The objective to create sustainable communities is fundamental to the planning system and it is clear that these defects cannot be addressed by condition. The purpose of the application is to approve the site's Masterplan, which in turn will inform all future design and development matters. At the present time the Masterplan falls far short of addressing the challenges presented by the site and there seems little doubt that addressing the criticisms made by the Metropolitan Police will require some substantial re-working to both access and design.

/cont'd.....

- 3 -

David Fowler,
London Borough of Camden, N1C 5AG

In the circumstances, there really seems no alternative other than to refuse the application to allow this overhaul to take place. The necessary redesign should ideally be based on thorough consultation with the Metropolitan Police, Camden Council and the local community, who are ultimately the best judges of what will and what will not work.

Yours sincerely,



From: Paul Tomasic
Sent: 19 March 2022 15:09
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 Centre Application Objection

Hi David,

I have been a resident of Camden (Belsize Park) for over 20 years and have a major objection to the O2 Centre Application. I think its an absolutely terrible idea.

London Plan policy D9, paragraph B states, “Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans.”. This area is unsuitable. Where hard is done to heritage asset, there must be ‘clear and convincing justification”. This plan would do clear significant harm to the surrounding conservation area with justification.

Moreover, the transport network is clearly not “capable of accommodating the quantum of development”. Please ride the current local underground station and you will see that its already over-burdened.

I have a number of other objections and ask that you re-consider your position here and object to his development.

We love our area and are keen to not destroy it with project such as this ...

Paul

Paul Tomasic
Garden Flat
6 Lyndhurst Gardens
London NW3 5NR

From: Belinda Lees
Sent: 19 March 2022 14:30
To: David Fowler
Subject: 2022/0528/P (02 centre development)

Dear Mr Fowler

As a local resident I would like to object most strongly to the proposed development at the 02 centre for the following specific reasons:

Tall Buildings

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

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

- Where harm is done to heritage assets, there must be a “clear and convincing justification”. It does do significant harm to the surrounding conservation areas without such a justification.
- It must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is “capable of accommodating the quantum of development”. It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched in capacity and limited in access.

A common theme in the feedback to Camden’s recent consultation on its Site Allocations Local Plan is that the area is not suited to high-rise buildings. Furthermore, a recurring theme was that in the local area, 10 storeys is considered the maximum height for a building in the area.

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

- The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest building in West Hampstead ward.
- The 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest building in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.

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

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

Conservation

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

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

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

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

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

Affordable housing

The 35% of housing provided on site that is affordable is significantly below the policy target of 50% specified in Local Plan policy H4. This requirement

specifically strengthened by Policy 1(i) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

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

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

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

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

Car parking

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

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

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

result in a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and the functioning of the Town Centre’.

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

Loss of large supermarket

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

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

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

Community facilities

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

Policy C1 of the Local Plan states that Camden "will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, in line with Camden’s Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements". Policy 10 of the

Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan says that there should be additional "primary health care facilities, particularly in or near the West Hampstead Growth Area".

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

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

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

With kind regards

Belinda Lees

From: Krishna Hathi
Sent: 19 March 2022 14:28
To: David Fowler
Subject: OBJECTION: O2 Masterplan (2022/0528/P)

Dear Mr Fowler,

I live in this area because I love my access to a local gym, the cinema and an easy access affordable supermarket. I have a wonderful community in my building and local area.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE this planning application for building flats in place of the O2 centre on Finchley Road for the following reasons:

FIRE HAZARD: Given the flats are to be built between two train lines, in the event of a disaster, there is no evacuation plan for these flats (likely 6,000 people). This is a huge hazard. What is a legitimate evacuation plan not risking the lives of all these people????

FINCHLEY ROAD AIRPORT BUS AREA: the airport bus pickup outside the O2 sees huge CROWDS of people. I already cannot walk past these crowds with a buggy. More people will cause me more hazards on my walk with a young child.

LIGHT: I already have limited light through my windows - building these tall buildings will completely decimate my access to natural light from my first floor flat in Frogal Court.

LOCAL TRANSPORT: If you've been to the local tube/train stations recently you'll see just how packed they're becoming again. I have had to wait for two tubes to pass by in order to get on in the past week because of how many people there are in the mornings. With the changes in transportation since the pandemic, there is no room for more people.

SUPERMARKET ACCESS: As many people in Camden DO NOT own a car, supermarkets are necessary within walking distance. Sainsbury's is a requirement for myself and my family. Other local shops do not stock the products or have the capacity to accommodate more people in number

I urge you to object to these plans or bring the numbers of flats to a reasonable level. 1,800 flats seems insane!!!

Thank you,

Krishna Hathi

From: Malgorzata Pszenicki
Sent: 19 March 2022 23:40
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 redevelopment objection

I wish to object on the following grounds: some of the proposed buildings are too high and completely out of character with the local area; the provision of subsidised housing is below the target set by Camden; there appears to be no provision for parking for future residents and underground parking must be provided as otherwise surrounding streets will become clogged; the 2 adjoining underground and 2 rail stations should be provided with step-free access.

--

Malgorzata