

From: Philip Clapson
Sent: 17 April 2022 22:15
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to O2 Center MasterPlan 2022/0528/P

I am objecting to this development on my own behalf and that of my wife. We have attended various meetings on the topic and our opinion coincides with that of numerous others we have heard in the local area.

Firstly the current O2 Centre with all its facilities (shops, gym, cinema, etc.) and the Homebase building serving the requirements of householders, and all the available parking which enables the local community and beyond, is vital to their lives. That a vast number of new residents without the resources will jeopardise that community. This point has been made extensively and with great vigour. The apparent indifference of Camden and the developers is frankly appalling.

The colossal scale of the development is entirely out of proportion to the nature of the area and its housing. This point has also been made extensively.

I note that the design of the area has been subject to criticism on the probability of more prolific crime in the area.

The problem of the travel resources has also been raised. More people will overload an already existing crowded underground system and buses. Finchley Road and West End Lane are already jam packed.

It has been patently obvious, in attending the meetings and listening to the objections, that all these points, and many besides, are brushed aside with vacuous talk of the proposed benefits. The benefits do not exist for the current residents, and new residents will find the environment totally inadequate for their lives too. It may be that there are Government proposals to increase housing. But this particular plan is quite inappropriate and would be dangerously counterproductive.

Philip Clapson

From:

Sent: 17 April 2022 23:52

To: Planning

Subject: Application number is 2022/0528/P. The O2 Centre

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to raise strong objections to the proposed application for the redevelopment of the O2 Centre.

Like many other local residents, I have legitimate concerns about the density of high-rise tower blocks being proposed, when the local area has been subjected to an onslaught of development over the last few years resulting in already over- crowded pavements, public transport, shops, community facilities such as doctors surgeries, dentists, etc

No one is listening to the local residents and the tireless objections being raised. The response from the developer is to submit application after application in an attempt to bulldoze the scheme through regardless of the mass local objections.

The government issues arbitrary advice to increase house building and sadly no common sense is applied - no consideration given to the need to upgrade infrastructure BEFORE development, no consideration given to the pressure already on community facilities and GP surgeries where appointments are already hard to come by. No consideration to the amount of flats sitting empty in high rise tower blocks built over the last few years. No consideration given to the fact that there's already a mass development of flats underway on the old Travis Perkins site on West End Lane, which will only make the queues for the tube station and packed pavements in the area even worse.

We're penalised for owning a car and yet the proposal does away with a DIY store, supermarket, gym, cinema etc all of which we can currently walk to. If we have heavy shopping then being able to drive and park is essential especially for the elderly or people with children.

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

development of the area is going to impact the community.

Significant harm is being done by over development of the area and it is to be hoped that Camden will finally listen to its residents, rather than deciding that it knows best.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Gore,
14 Keats Grove,
London NW3 2RS

From:

Sent: 17 April 2022 23:52

To: Planning

Subject: Application number is 2022/0528/P. The O2 Centre

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to raise strong objections to the proposed application for the redevelopment of the O2 Centre.

Like many other local residents, I have legitimate concerns about the density of high-rise tower blocks being proposed, when the local area has been subjected to an onslaught of development over the last few years resulting in already over- crowded pavements, public transport, shops, community facilities such as doctors surgeries, dentists, etc

No one is listening to the local residents and the tireless objections being raised. The response from the developer is to submit application after application in an attempt to bulldoze the scheme through regardless of the mass local objections.

The government issues arbitrary advice to increase house building and sadly no common sense is applied - no consideration given to the need to upgrade infrastructure BEFORE development, no consideration given to the pressure already on community facilities and GP surgeries where appointments are already hard to come by. No consideration to the amount of flats sitting empty in high rise tower blocks built over the last few years. No consideration given to the fact that there's already a mass development of flats underway on the old Travis Perkins site on West End Lane, which will only make the queues for the tube station and packed pavements in the area even worse.

We're penalised for owning a car and yet the proposal does away with a DIY store, supermarket, gym, cinema etc all of which we can currently walk to. If we have heavy shopping then being able to drive and park is essential especially for the elderly or people with children.

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

development of the area is going to impact the community.

Significant harm is being done by over development of the area and it is to be hoped that Camden will finally listen to its residents, rather than deciding that it knows best.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Gore,
14 Keats Grove,
London NW3 2RS

From: Anthony Lustigman

Sent: 20 April 2022 11:44

To: Planning

Subject: 2022/0528/P The O2 Masterplan Site Finchley Road London NW3 6LU

Importance: High

Dear Sir

I wish to add my objection to the many already sent on the Planning Application above.

I have lived in Kings Gardens, a few minutes' walk to the O2 centre, since 2001.

The area is constantly under development, including the recent West Hampstead square site on Heritage Lane and, currently, the Travis Perkins site on West End Lane. The Travis Perkins site is for one and two-bed apartments as is 96% of the 1800 flats in the proposed O2 'Masterplan' site, Finchley Road. This encourages the transient, non-family residents that make up much of the West Hampstead population and discourages the fabric of community.

The increase in local population by approximately 4,000+ will also significantly increase demand and thereby undermine local amenities and facilities including GP surgeries, dental surgeries and put increased pressure on transport.

I urge the planners to deny this application.

Yours faithfully

Anthony Lustigman
14 Kings Gardens
London NW6 4PU

From: Camden Digital Site Notice

Sent: 22 April 2022 12:27

To: Planning

Subject: New feedback for planning application 2022/0528/P

New feedback for planning application 2022/0528/P

Feeling

Happy

Feedback

It brings much needed housing

New homes

I have a young son who wants to live locally

Open space

i can't easily get to my local park

Postcode

se4 1sz

From: Camden Digital Site Notice

Sent: 21 April 2022 10:07

To: Planning

Subject: New feedback for planning application 2022/0528/P

New feedback for planning application 2022/0528/P

Feeling

Meh

Feedback

nn

New homes

xxx

Postcode

W5 5NS

From: bob.akhurst
Sent: 22 April 2022 09:56
To: David Fowler
Subject: Planning Application 2022/0528/P

Dear Chief Planning Officer,

I am contacting you to lodge an official opposition to the proposed development of

the O2 Centre Site and land from West End Lane to Finchley Road.

I query the impartiality of Camden Council's ability to decide this matter on fair grounds given that the land is owned by the Council, and the developer is The Council's chosen developer. Due to the fact that there was no Master Plan or strategy for the West Hampstead area we now appear to be in a position whereby the O2 Centre development being used as a possible solution to previous planning errors, thereby resulting in a totally inappropriate development

for reasons listed below.

West Hampstead as you are aware is an area characterised by Victorian and Edwardian (mostly) red-brick individual and terraced housing, with some mansion blocks. The area is home to a number of designated heritage assets. This of course is an important factor to bear in mind when considering the style and nature of any proposed developments.

I refer you to paragraphs 126 and 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework which must apply to all proposed developments. Paragraph 126 for example states:

"Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account: – the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; – the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring; – the desirability of new development making

a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and – opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place”.

Having considered the policy in full I am of the view that no proper account has been taken of the policy and feel this is partly to do with the way in which the proposed plans have been hastily put together. I would also draw your attention to the “color:blue" lang="EN-US">Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, Local West Hampstead: Shaping the Future” plan for West Hampstead issued by Camden Council expressly sets out that the area is “well loved for its village feel” and that the Council commits to “enhancing the distinctive village character” and to provide “support for local business”.

The proposed project is in breach of these commitments.

The proposed development is completely out of keeping with the character of the surrounding residential buildings. It completely disregards the environment around it and the character of other buildings.

The houses in the local area– for example – are three storeys high, the development in its existing form will tower over these properties blighting their light, use and enjoyment of their properties.

The plans are not in keeping with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area.

The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents’ right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Broadhurst Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property.

The obvious consequence of this development will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area.

The impact on the local residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population.

West Hampstead has benefited from an influx of young families, the population of

children has steadily grown in recent times. The proposed development and its impact on the environment will be have a detrimental effect on the well-being of those in near and surrounding areas.

The proposed buildings themselves will have a considerably negative impact on the conservation area which the planned development adjoins.

The development proposes to house 5000+ residents. There is simply insufficient infrastructure to support this number of additional residents into West Hampstead; there is already one development due to complete later this year, 156 West Hampstead End Lane – the impact from this development is yet to be seen alongside other developments in Blackburn Road, Iverson Road, and Liddell Road.

We respectfully submit insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental impact of so many developments in such a short space of time.

There is already insufficient parking capacity in the surrounding areas. The burden on parking may in turn assist applicants wishing to convert front gardens into drives, thereby completing spoiling the entire area.

The development will result in a substantial increase in footfall in what are already overcrowded surrounding roads.

The footfall on the underground, trains and buses – without yet taking additional traffic from 156 West Hampstead Lane into account – is already at close to maximum level.

Another new development will shunt public transport levels on the tubes and trains to dangerously high levels, thereby putting public safety at risk.

We support the use of space for developmental purposes, but any proposed development must be viable and properly benefit the community.

The current O2 Centre shops are long-standing business and significant local employer

The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on GP services, of which there are fewer in the area, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.

The proposed project is located on the immediate border of a conservation area. A conservation area is defined in Section 69 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and

Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as an area of “special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance” and that

the project is irreconcilable with the Council’s duty to ensure such preservation.

The plans are also in direct contravention of the policies outlined in the Neighbourhood Development Plan for this area.

The proposed plans are opposed in their entirety by the combined forces of

Save West Hampsteadcolor:black" lang="EN-US">, Lymington Road Residents’ Association, Crediton Hill Residents ’West Hampstead Gardens’ & Residents’ Associationcolor:black" lang="EN-US">, and the

West End Green Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

I would like to reiterate my absolute opposition to the proposal and expect all of my

above points to be considered, addressed and responded to appropriately.

Your faithfully,

Mr Robert Akhurst

Flat B

8 Lymington Road

West Hampstead

London

NW6 1HY

22nd July 2015

From: Ian Birksted

Sent: 01 May 2022 22:37

To: Planning

Subject: Re.: Planning Application Number: O2 Centre , 255 Finchley Road, London, NW3 6LU 2022/0528/P

Dear Camden,

I strongly object to the proposed development on the following grounds and as measured against the principles outlined in the various plans which already exist namely:

The London Plan, the Camden Local Plan, the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and Camden's own 2013 site allocations and its 2019 (!) draft Site Allocations:

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."

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

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.

Furthermore, it must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is "capable of accommodating the quantum of development". It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched to capacity and limited in access.

The area is not suited to high-rise buildings with 10 storeys an absolute maximum height for the area, in-keeping with the tallest buildings already in the area, eg:

The 11-storey Lessing building is the tallest in West Hampstead & the 12-storey Ellerton tower is the tallest in the Fortune Green & West

Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The proposed development contains several buildings that are taller than either of the above. It is thus 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 – preferably less - under London Plan policy D9. But as it is not, it should be resisted.

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 namely:

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

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

“Is human in scale”

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

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

“Has regard to the impact on local views” as identified in A11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This designates views southwards, out of the

Neighbourhood Plan Area across South Hampstead: views that would be obliterated by the development.

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

Car parking and continuing amenities

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

The council will consider retaining or 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'.

As a long time local resident, the O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times permanently, rather than just within controlled hours, as was the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site.

Viability of amenities

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently

provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted under agreement with the Competition & Markets Authority to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand. Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

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

Affordable housing

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

Even though Camden has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. Such exceptions with little justification make a mockery of all these plans, and the London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

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

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

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a 'social-affordable' rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable

(being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

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

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

I hope this is not just a box ticking exercise and that the above objections will halt this development as currently constituted in its tracks.

Regards,
Ian Birksted
NW3

From: Jacob and Marina Nell

Sent: 02 May 2022 18:27

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Number: O2 Centre , 255 Finchley Road, London, NW3 6LU 2022/0528/P

Dear Camden Planning

We are residents at NW3 5NL and we want to raise an objection against development on the place of O2 centre. O2 Centre is a center of our communal work and both we and our children attend lots of excellent classes there. We also do shopping there and go for a coffee. If you remove a communal centre the place will be fearless, people will have to travel far for services and traffic jams on Finchley, which are already bad, will become horrific.

Please stop and don't do it!

Marina Nell

From:

Sent: 17 April 2022 19:18

To: Planning

Subject: 2022/0528/P

15 Arkwright Mans NW3 6DE

Dear sir/madam

I object to the proposed development on the following grounds and as measured against the principles outlined in the various plans which already exist namely:

The London Plan, the Camden Local Plan, the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and Camden's own 2013 site allocations and its 2019 (!) draft Site Allocations:

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."

As Camden has not designated anywhere

in the borough as suitable for tall buildings, it would be reasonable to assume that were it to, it would designate this area as unsuitable. This is based on the factors specified in paragraph C:

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.

Furthermore, it must be demonstrated that the capacity of the transport network nearby is “capable of accommodating the quantum of development”. It clearly would overburden the local Underground stations, which are already stretched to capacity and limited in access.

The area is not suited to high-rise buildings with 10 storeys an absolute maximum height for the area, in-keeping with the tallest buildings already in the area, eg:

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

The proposed development contains

several buildings that are taller than either of the above. It is thus 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 – preferably less - under London Plan policy D9. But as it is not, it should be resisted.

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 namely:

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

the conservation area, and both palette and materials are traditional in nature.

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

“Is human in scale”

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

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

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

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

developer has acted as though it being located a few metres outside these conservation areas means that it does not have to have regard to conservation. So, another of many reasons that it should therefore be resisted.

Car parking and continuing amenities

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

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

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

This is particularly the case where the car park supports the functioning of a town centre. In this case, the O2 Centre is within

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

As a long time local resident, the O2 Centre fulfils an essential function for shoppers at both the O2 Centre and Homebase. Furthermore, Transport for London has recently designated the red route along Finchley Road as applying at all times permanently, rather than just within controlled hours, as was the case before 2020. This has put greater importance on the car park for shoppers at commercial premises other than the redevelopment site.

Viability of amenities

The loss of a large car park will have a particularly harmful effect on the sustainability and viability of amenities. The large supermarket currently provided by Sainsbury's is an important destination for shoppers across north-west Camden, being the largest supermarket in the area. In the absence of being able to park at the site, Sainsbury's have been clear that they

do not intend to take on a large store.

This makes the commitment to provide a supermarket meaningless, as there is both a quantitative and qualitative difference between large and small supermarkets. For example, smaller branded supermarkets are permitted under agreement with the Competition & Markets Authority to charge higher prices than larger supermarkets of the same brand. Furthermore, the failure to provide a large supermarket or DIY merchant on site would lead necessarily to trips being made by Camden residents to Brent Cross or similar locations: increasing, rather than reducing, traffic and climate change impact.

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

Affordable housing

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

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

Even though Camden has admitted that few developments within the borough hit this target, it is still the policy target, and divergence should only be justified by compensatory factors. Such exceptions with little justification make a mockery of all these plans, and the London Planning Authority should not accept being short-changed.

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

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

Policy H4 specifies that London Affordable Rent is a 'social-affordable' rent levels. However, it is clearly the least preferred of social-affordable (being on average 30%-55% higher than social rent and being available only to households that are eligible for those – lower – social rents). All

social-affordable units proposed are London Affordable Rent: thus meaning the offer is the least preferred under the Local Plan.

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

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

I hope this is not just a box ticking exercise and that the above objections will halt this development as currently constituted in its tracks.

Thank you

D.Roberts