

From: Donald Clark
Sent: 19 March 2022 11:39
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 Masterplan (2022/0528/P)

I object very strongly to the proposal. I recently attended the recent presentation at O2 centre and was astonished and dismayed that no one from Camden was there. Frankly it reeks of cowardice. On questioning the presenter it is very clear that there is very little provision for families and the provision for affordable housing is quite low. The loss of amenities is shocking - there will be a supermarket but a small and expensive one. The loss of parking has serious consequences for elderly and disabled/ infirm people. We were told quite airily that we could go by taxi. Your response please. D A Clark

From: Catherine Becker
Sent: 19 March 2022 11:35
To: David Fowler
Subject: Severe Objection to O2 development

I strongly object to the development of plans shown by O2 on following basis:

1. High rise flats
2. Over-population of area with already overfull tubes/buses/car traffic in area and lack of schools/hospitals/shops to service extra people
3. Reduction of much needed car parking and space
4. Reduction of shops in O2 centre to allow for it
5. Walk path from Finchley Road to West Hampstead to public
6. I have been a resident here for 24 years. O2 centre was best thing to happen to area and this is worst.

Best wishes
Catherine

Catherine Becker
Garden Flat (left hand side entrance to building), 35 Maresfield Gardens,
London NW3 5SE

From: Andreas Utermann
Sent: 19 March 2022 11:18
To: David Fowler
Subject: Support for O2 Masterplan

I am fully supportive of the plans submitted for the redevelopment of the O2 site. London and Camden need more dense urban development and the opposition to this snacks of nimbyism.

Best wishes,

Andreas EF Utermann
13 Bracknell Gardens
Hampstead
London NW3 7 EE

From: Jonathan Blair
Sent: 21 March 2022 09:42
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 Masterplan (2022/0528/P)

Dear David

I am a resident of West Hampstead.

I strongly object to the conversion of the o2 into 1800 flats.

The impact on the community in terms of the underground, schools , parking etc will be severe as too the loss of the O2 centre in terms of shopping and amenities .

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Blair



SECURITY ALERT

Please do not rely on any notification of bank account changes without direct verbal confirmation from a trusted source.

The information in this email and any attachments is **CONFIDENTIAL**. If you are not the named recipient, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to another person or take copies.

Simkins LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under registration number OC311400 and is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. A list of members is available for inspection at the registered office of Simkins LLP, Lynton House, 7-12 Tavistock Square, London WC1H 9LT.

Whilst we run anti-virus software on all emails, neither we nor the sender accept

any liability for any loss or damage arising in any way from their receipt or use. You are advised to run your own anti-virus software in respect of this email and any attachments. Please note that communications sent by or to any person through our computer systems may be viewed by other members of this firm.

 **Please consider the environment before printing this email.**

From: Ming Lee
Sent: 21 March 2022 10:17
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 Centre Application

Dear Mr Fowler,

I hope this finds you well.

I am emailing to send my objection against the O2 Centre application of the current plans.

The majority of people have objected to the vast plans to change the land to 1,800 flats, though I am confused why the thoughts of the community have not been listened to or considered.

My objections are as follows:

The area is sandwiched between many conservation areas with strict planning parameters. This does not make sense to allow such vast and high rise buildings whilst the surrounding areas are guarded with such strict rules. This will also devalue the surrounding areas property values.

Loss of car parking facilities which currently serves many families in the area who use the supermarket and DIY merchant for essential functions. With the red route being implemented on Finchley Road on a permanent basis, this further increases the inability to park for locals and visitors within the area.

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 reproviding 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'.

Loss of a large supermarket and DIY merchant in Sainsburys and Homebase - this currently serves the majority of the North West Hampstead and Camden areas that are both popular and used regularly by residents. The change to a smaller supermarket will increase costs for residents by up to £320 per year for

the same products. With the current increase in cost of living, this further increase will see many residents struggle to feed their families and have the same quality of living.

The failure to provide a large supermarket and DIY merchant would also lead to an increase in traffic to farther areas like Brent Cross or similar locations, impacting the local air pollution.

There should be further thought into providing community facilities like GP surgeries which would cater for the growth in the population of the area. The current GP's already struggle with work load and increasing the local population without healthcare plans is irresponsible. Any redevelopment should include a healthcare plan within the first stages for consideration of the surge of new people.

My considerations:

The redevelopment plans should maintain the large supermarket for residents in the surrounding NW Hampstead and Camden areas throughout the build as well as after the build, along with a car park big enough for expected shoppers. Existing patterns of car park usage should be considered. These are both essential to the local community.

The number of flats being built should be reduced by half with plans put in place for healthcare facilities in any growth of population.

I appreciate your reply and acknowledge receipt of my objection to the O2 Centre application.

Regards,

Ming Lee

Resident of South Hampstead Conservation Area, NW6

From: Surekha
Sent: 22 March 2022 10:43
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 centre application for flats - objection

Dear Mr Fowler

I am writing to raise my concerns about the plans to allow high-rise flats on the present O2 centre site.

I am a resident in Eton Avenue and I'm dismayed that Camden has allowed high-rise developments at 100 Avenue Road and other sites. My property is Grade II listed and I am not allowed to make the smallest changes to my property, yet just down the road, there will be a development which will be completely out of character for this area.

Similarly with the O2 centre site. I accept that we need to build new housing but it needs to be the right quality. High density, high rise is not the right quality. We need to nurture the sense of community, and crucially, we need investment in local services that reflects new housing developments.

With the local council elections on the horizon, I have bumped into people canvassing for both parties. I've been very frank. I would love to vote Labour but the main reason stopping me is the council's approach to housing developments.

I do hope that views like mine will be given their due weight.

Regards
Surekha

From: Helen Femi Williams
Sent: 22 March 2022 11:41
To: David Fowler
Subject: 02 centre campaign

Hi David,

Me and my family have lived in camden for 30+ years we are very against the demolition of the 02 centre for flats because what value does that add to the community

Thanks

From: Paivi Bjorklund
Sent: 21 March 2022 21:08
To: David Fowler
Subject: 2022/0528/P

Dear Mr Fowler,

I support the O2 Centre application objection for the following reasons:

1) The development should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9.

2) Car Parking

As the the applicant has said that it intends to retain a commercial involvement, at least part of the car parking area should be retained.

3) The development does not include the provision of a GP surgery in the detailed part.

Kind Regards,
Paivi Bjorklund

From: Michael Storchak

Sent: 21 March 2022 22:13

To: David Fowler

Subject: O2 Centre re development - reference number 2022/0528/P

Dear Mr Fowler,

I would like to voice my objection to the proposed O2 centre redevelopment plans.

The development must be assessed against:

- The [London Plan](#)
- The [Camden Local Plan](#)
- The [Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan](#)
- Camden's [2013 Site Allocations](#) and (sadly) its [2019 draft Site Allocations](#)

Although it is not in a conservation area, also of relevance are the [Fitzjohns & Netherhall](#), [Belsize](#), [South Hampstead](#), and [West End](#) Green conservation area statements, which protect the areas surrounding the site.

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:

- "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 reproviding 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.

Yours sincerely,
M Storchak
(Swiss Cottage Area Resident)

From: Chris McDonagh
Sent: 19 March 2022 11:38
To: David Fowler
Subject: O2 Masterplan (2022/0528/P)

Dear David,

I have been given your email details to express my disappointment & objection to the proposed development at the O2 Centre on Finchley Road.

After looking at the plans & application - I strongly feel that the proposals are not in keeping & inappropriate for the area & what the community needs!

Kind regards,

Chris