

From: NEGI JANANI  
Sent: 28 March 2022 15:09  
To: David Fowler  
Subject: 2022/0528/P - O2 Centre

Dear Mr Folwer,

I am writing to you regarding the major development planned for O2 and would like to object to such planning .

The area already is congested and lack of good schools and parking and clean air etc.... Is a major issue!

Please kindly take to consideration that people like me who already live in the area are struggling with the present issues and by adding another 1800 units which will bring many more people to the area is nothing but disaster !!!

Best wishes

Negi Janani

**From:** Hunadda Sabbagh  
**Sent:** 28 March 2022 15:20  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** Objection to planning application 022/0528/P

Dear Mr Fowler,

I am a resident of West Hampstead (NW6) and I **vehemently object to planning application 022/0528/P** for the land sitting between West End Lane and Finchley Road. My reasons for objection are listed below.

- 
- **Overshadowing** - the height and density of these buildings is **not in keeping at all with the surrounding architecture** of townhouses and 4 or 5-store mansion blocks, and will significantly overshadow the rows of houses either side of the proposed development (e.g. on Broadhurst Gardens). Pedestrians and other residents of the area also have a **right to light** - this will be taken away from the West End Lane high street area (particularly over the rail bridge) by these rows of buildings that will block the light.
- **Overlooking and loss of privacy** - see above.
- **Layout and density of building** - A 'tall building' is defined as anything higher than 10 storeys. This development **should be limited to 10 storeys under London Plan policy D9**. The area is unsuitable for high rise buildings and this 'new neighbourhood' of sub-standard architecture is more in keeping with an office than a residential setting. The **density is abnormally high** and significantly **exceeds the London Plan Density Matrix even for a site of PTAL 6**.
- **Overbearing nature of the proposal** - As well as the above, it is utterly **unfathomable to me just how this small piece of land stuck between two main roads and a railway will accommodate at least 3-4,000 new residents**. 1,800 homes is a huge number of people to fit into what is a relatively small area in a neighbourhood that is bordered by main roads. West End Lane tube station intersection is already an extremely busy area at the best of times, and the same for Finchley Road Tube. The transport infrastructure will not cope.

Add to that the **HS2 construction in the area** and the proposal is clearly

utterly overbearing. There will be construction pollution and total disruption to the area for years.

- **Landscaping** - the construction will destroy trees and not bring enough green and open space into an area that is sorely lacking it. **The Green Space index for the area is already well below the Green Space Index's minimum standard of provision** (<https://fieldsintrust.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=c633ad3588d3466b8937b110b94120d4>) and this massive and dense construction plan will only add more people and more buildings to an already very un-green and unhealthy living environment.
- **Adequacy of infrastructure and /or social facilities** - there are no social facilities confirmed by the Landsec plans, and they **take away the only large (and therefore affordable) supermarket** in the area. Landsec quote "Space provided for much loved local amenities" which I do not see as possible at all given the density of the proposed housing plans. As well as this, this provides no guarantees whatsoever to local residents.

Further to this, where is the significant and long overdue increase in medical resources in West Hampstead to reflect the needs of **5000+ new users**? NHS England published guidance in February 2018, requiring extended access to GP services, including at evenings and weekends, for 100% of the population by 1 October 2018. **Access to basic health and dental care** for local residents has diminished not increased.

Finally, as stated above, the **pavements of West End Lane and Finchley Road are already overcrowded**, not to mention the **horrendous daily traffic along both thoroughfares**. The entrances and exits of the two tube stations at each end of the plot are also going to become even more overcrowded and dangerous - hotspots for pickpockets, as they already are.

- **Effect on surrounding area (including conservation areas)** - The site is bordered by five conservation areas: South Hampstead Conservation Area; West End Green Conservation Area; Fitzjohns/ Netherhall Conservation Area; Redington/Froggnal Conservation Area; and Belsize Conservation Area and it will negatively impact them all.

As well as those reasons, I have to say that I feel **misled by the planning and consultation process** because I believe that Landsec were allowed to post inaccurate information through my letterbox that led me to a false understanding of their plans. The leaflet I received from them last year depicted **9-storey buildings, which is not what is planned. This to me seems very much like false advertising.**

Not only this, **but a "promise" of 35% affordable housing is paltry.** The minimum of the minimum is promised, and, as we know, this will most likely be reneged upon.

Why Camden Council - a Labour-led council and therefore in theory a socially progressive one - cannot seem to bring itself to insist on a **more socially beneficial and progressive plan for this site** I do not know. **The area needs open and free sports facilities and outdoor green space, NOT rows upon rows of unaffordable high-rise flat blocks.** What kind of life are you proposing with this plan for the children already resident in the area, as well as those who will move in to the development?

As a hitherto Labour voter, I am really very disappointed and am wondering whether my **support for Labour at local and national level is a waste of time.**

**I hope that you take my objections seriously and do not let this plan go ahead.**

Yours sincerely,

Hunadda Sabbagh,  
NW6 2NA

**From:**

**Sent:** 29 March 2022 08:26

**To:** David Fowler

**Subject:** Objection to planning application 2022/0528/P (02 Centre, Finchley Road)

Dear Mr Fowler

**PLEASE REDACT ALL MY PERSONAL DETAILS**

As a local resident in West Hampstead I have serious concerns that the proposed development will seriously and negatively affect life in the local area and the quality of life of residents overall. In particular I have concerns the proposed development will negatively impact:

- local infrastructure, in particular transport, drains, transport routes (paths and roads);
- stretch street space, schools, policing;
- increase crime and pollution in an already relatively high risk and polluted area.

I therefore object to the proposal.

With regards,

**From:** Maidhc And Sherrie  
**Sent:** 24 March 2022 15:12  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** Objection

**I object to the planning application for the O2 Centre site, which proposes demolishing the O2 Centre and building 1,800 flats**

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, 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 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.

**Kind regards**

**Maidhc Gill Flat 2 95 Redington Road, NW37RR**

**From:** Rol  
**Sent:** 29 March 2022 17:33  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** planning application O2 centre site

Roland Grimm  
  
22A Hilltop Rd  
  
London NW6 2PY

Dear Sir,

Re:Objection to planning application O2 centre site

I have lived in West Hampstead since 1970. Since then the local environment, especially along the rail lines, has seen one building after another getting crammed into every patch of ground that had previously never been built on or had been ground level only trading facilities useful for local people.

I object to the proposed over development because it is a dramatic monstrous plan that, if allowed, would cause serious permanent harm to everybody living, working or commuting in the area.

Pavements and open spaces in the area are over already over crowded. The loss of the O2 Centre, Sainsbury and Homebase would be an irreplaceable loss for myself and thousands of other local people now and in the future.

I sincerely believe this plan has been made exclusively for the profit of the irresponsible land owners without the slightest regard for people who live in the surrounding area.

Please refuse this application.

Yours sincerely

Roland Grimm

From: david kilbourn  
Sent: 29 March 2022 12:01  
To: David Fowler  
Subject: Planning application 2022/0528/P

Good morning David,

I write to you, as I am sure many others do, to object about planning application 2022/0528/P.

This huge development scheme is wholly unacceptable on so many levels it beggars belief that Camden Council is backing it.

Over 5,000 new residents are being crammed into such a small area, with densities at over 6 times Camden's average.

The infrastructure, which includes stations, trains, pavements, power supply, drainage, sewerage and shops etc, will not be able to cope. Where is the green space that we so desperately need to digest the significant amount of extra CO2 which will be created?

12 tower blocks of 12 to 15 storeys? Who wants to live that far above the ground?...no one in truth. Also they will be a eyesore, ruining the area.

The O2 has been a great success for the local community, providing essential facilities including a super market with parking, cinema, DIY store, garden centre and 2 car showrooms with servicing. Now Camden Council along with greedy Land Securities want to demolish it for a huge and unwarranted housing development, which will have no amenities included.

You need to abandon this ridiculous and inappropriate scheme immediately.

Regards  
David

**Rafi Miah**

---

**From:** Avie Littler [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 March 2022 15:39  
**To:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** Re: Comments on 2022/0528/P have been received by the council. REDACT PERSONAL DETAILS

[REDACTED]

Please REDACT my personal details.  
Avie Littker

Sent from my iPhone

> On 30 Mar 2022, at 15:33, planning@camden.gov.uk wrote:

>

> This is a monstrous plan for a predominantly low rise terrace house area already densely occupied. We already have constant road up from Thames Water, GPS overloaded, West End lane is already a dangerous wind tunnel and these blocks would make it worse. What are Camden thinking of?!!! The height! The numbers of extra people at the tiny tube entrance! Presumably no parking permits allowed although they are privately purchased to get around this! And extra visitor cars! However could you even think to approve such a plan? We all agree the carpark ( mostly used by Audi showroom) is a waste of space but no no no to that many more homes and a totally disproportionate height. Scrap it and listen to your local voters or you won't be in power any more the next time a planning application comes around. Who could vote for such local insensitivity to the wishes of the residents of WestHampstead.

>

> Comments made by Avie Littler of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

>

> Comment Type is Objection

**From:** Andrew G  
**Sent:** 31 March 2022 08:14  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** O2 Masterplan (2022/0528/P)

I am writing to object to the massive and wholly inappropriate development at the )2 centre.

I am a resident of Platts Lane Hampstead but the impact till still be very serious.

It is a massive overdevelopment by any standards bringing additional traffic to an already seriously over congested area.

It is ludicrous to suggest that there won't be at least one car per unit - one way or another - with associated congestion and pollution.

I have no objection to a development of say 500 flats - accommodation is needed but this is a disgrace.

Andrew Greystoke 29 Platts Lane.



From: Howard  
Sent: 30 March 2022 18:25  
To: David Fowler  
Subject: Planning Application 2022/0528/P

Dear Mr Fowler,

I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the current proposals for the O2 Centre between West Hampstead and the Finchley Road. The proposals, as they are currently structured, will impose upon an already crowded area with an additional 12 Tower Blocks between 12 and 15 stories. This is far too dense and will make this area an overcrowded urban nightmare reaching the density of Hong Kong not London.

The plans will increase traffic, and because Camden is refusing sufficient parking places for these new tenement blocks, it is inevitable that many residents will just leave their cars on local streets. The tube and main line stations in West Hampstead are already overcrowded in the rush hours and this will become far worse with an additional 5,000 residents. Local amenities such as shops and streets are now at capacity and the removal of the O2 shopping centre with its supermarket plus the additional people living in the proposed development will make matters far worse.

The plans indicate an ugly, concrete jungle of densely placed tower blocks with little light and even less green space. The areas below the towers will rapidly deteriorate into a slum. These plans breach all that would be considered good urban planning: with no consideration given to local residents, a detrimental impact on infrastructure, insufficient affordable housing, a complete lack of communal amenities and green spaces.

This is an ill-conceived plan and should be rejected.

With best regards,

Dr Howard Radley  
NW6 1AB

Peter Lush

56 Purley Avenue, London NW2 1SB

To: Mr David Fowler  
Planning Officer  
London Borough of Camden  
5, Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

25 March 2022

Dear Mr Fowler,

**Re: Planning Application 2022/0528/P**

I/We are writing to object to the above planning proposal in its present form. We have the following concerns, particularly as older people:

**The blocks of flats:** The whole development is too big for the surrounding area and will put enormous pressure on local services, transport facilities and services, local amenities and shops. The blocks of flats should be no more than eight stories high. They should have two staircases to allow for occupants to escape in the case of an emergency. This is particularly important for older people, and people with mobility problems or disabilities. There should be a mix of sizes of flats, including family accommodation, and at least one third should be 'affordable'. There should be small private gardens for the ground floor flats.

**Public areas and facilities:** The green space on the development should have benches and be well lit. The community building should be used as a medical centre, and include both GP services and community medical facilities, such as blood tests, dentist, optician, chiropodist, midwife services and a room that could be used for classes including keep-fit. This will help alleviate the pressures that already busy local GP services could face with the growth in population from the development.

**O2 shopping centre:** This centre is around 25 years old, and is an important facility for local people, particularly the supermarket. It should not be demolished. If the planning committee agrees to demolition, then the new centre should include a supermarket of similar size. There should also be publicly accessible toilets. There should also be parking for people with disabilities.

**Services:** Local social services, schools and nurseries are already under severe pressure, and would need to be expanded if the development goes ahead. The local library provision should continue, and there is a need for local youth club provision.

**Transport:** Local services are already under pressure, particularly at rush hour. There is a need for better bus services, particularly the C11, and for lifts to be installed at West Hampstead and Finchley Road underground stations.

If the development goes ahead, during the construction work, there should be arrangements for the construction traffic to be kept to main roads, and that the emergency services access to the area is not restricted.

Please consider all the above issues when making a decision on the planning application.

  
Peter Lush  
(Chair Kilburn & W. Hampstead Pensioners Action Assn)