

From: Tristram Giff  
Sent: 20 March 2022 12:56  
To: David Fowler  
Subject: O2 planning objection

Dear David,

As a resident of some 14 years of the area and someone who uses the facilities in the area I want to object strongly to the grossly overblown plans to develop the O2.

You could have put a proposal in for 750 flats, develop the car park into a proper park, maintain all the shopping facilities and parking to accommodate the area residents filling these units whilst also continuing to provide more than ample facility to current residents. You could have limited the height and design on the project so that no tall buildings were proposed and that the architecture would be wholly sympathetic to the neighbourhood. You did not.

The height proposed is scandalous of course but it means more money for the developers and of course it is a great revenue the bigger it is for the council. Win win I would think you say. But of course for the residents who have lived and invested in the area for decades we are overlooked and forgotten.

You have an opportunity to create something better but you choose to disregard that concept and double down on grossly overdeveloping a site that will

a) take away parking greatly,  
b) remove shopping facilities that serve the neighbourhood and not replace them properly, c) cram so many new units of development into project that it would flood the area whilst taking away the infrastructure of shops and parking and recreation to service them let alone the rest of us.

Do you live in the area David? Will you be directly impacted, I wonder.

What I do know is that I have witnessed developments and worked on some of them in my film capacity for Berkley homes etc and they are more sympathetic to the developments than those that you propose. I suspect it is not in the same level and that the council gain substantially for the granting of permission.

This is a short term view but come the mid term you will cause alot of social problems in the area. Who is accountable for that may I ask?

I would assume in 5 years alot of people would have moved on from their roles in granting this and and adverse effects they would therefore no longer be accountable.

The building need to be no hight than they are now, limited to 750 units or less, provide more shopping than exists currently and underground car parking to replace the lost car park behind the O2.

This project is so unpopular that it could easily become a target for daily protest.

Why the council and developers think they can divide these spoils between themselves is arrogant. What you should have done is truly consult and design alongside a local resident committee to garner full support and everyone represented. You didn't do that.

Tristram

**From:** Patrizia Canziani  
**Sent:** 20 March 2022 11:24  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** OBJECTION - O2 Centre application

Dear Mr Fowler,

I strongly object to the O2 Centre application.

Below are a number of key arguments in objection to the O2 Centre application.

The development is 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.

Best regards,

Patrizia Canziani  
6 Firecrest Drive  
London NW3 7ND



**From:** Ros Eisen  
**Sent:** 20 March 2022 11:10  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** objection O2 new flats

Please please do NOT build these flats or at least consider lowering the number to about 200.

I live in this area, I need Sainsbury and Homebase because I can easily park there, the car wash is also great.

We 'lost' the big Morrisons in Camden a while ago, where else can we shop and park locally ??? Answer = Sainsburys.

QUESTION

Finchely Rd is already so congested, how will it cope if this huge developments goes ahead?

ANSWER

It will not.

Building this area for redevelopment should certainly go back to the drawing board and be rethought.

I strongly object to the current proposals.

Signed

R.B. Eisen (Miss)

3 Belsize Pk Mews NW35BL

**From:** MELVIN Nelson  
**Sent:** 20 March 2022 10:15  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** o2 centre

Both my wife and myself are against the redevelopment of the o2 centre and especially high rise buildings. They are a fire risk just to mention one reason for leaving things as they are. Melvin and Susan Nelson

**From:** James Tomlinson  
**Sent:** 20 March 2022 09:49  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** Planning application 2022/0528/P  
Hi David,

I hope you are well. I am a resident of West Hampstead and quite worried about the new development with the O2 Centre.

My points below:

- 1) How would West Hampstead Tube / Finchley Road be upgraded to allow the increase in 5000+ residents? Currently there is overcrowding on the tube platforms at both stations in the morning and I am worried about health and safety issues
- 2) I am wondering why the large supermarket (Sainsbury's) cinema (Vue) and gym (Virgin) have to be knocked down to create a new large supermarket, cinema and gym? Could the development not incorporate these existing elements?
- 3) 5000+ new residents is 6-7 times Camden's Average Density. Would this make both areas uninhabitable? I.e overcrowded pavements, services, shops etc
- 4) is the artist impression below accurate?



kindest Regards  
James Welsby Tomlinson

**From:** frank384

**Sent:** 20 March 2022 09:04

**To:** David Fowler **Subject:** Planning application 2022/0528/P

I think the plan for the O2 centre are terrible and myself and everyone I know are against it please stop it

Frank and Bernadette Hawkins

1 st Mary's mews NW6 3RF

**From:**

**Sent:** 20 March 2022 08:08

**To:** David Fowler

**Subject:** planning application 2022/0528/P

Dear Mr. Fowler,

I object to the proposals in the above planning application.

The density of what is proposed, the reconstruction of the 02 centre and the consequent loss of amenities arising from both factors will damage the good of all who are currently resident in the West Hampstead area.

I hope you will refuse the planning application.

Yours sincerely,

John Shinebourne

From: James Bland  
Sent: 20 March 2022 08:11  
To: David Fowler  
Subject: Objection to the O2 Centre application

Dear Mr Fowler,

The plan to erect this number of dwellings in place of a large supermarket, car park, cinema and shops shows complete disregard for the local population and their needs.

The large supermarket caters for many customers in the area by virtue of its car park. This facility also enables people to perform errands at the post office, bank, tube station pick-up and local shopping.

By removing this parking facility you will starve the shops of their customers. You will also make it harder for locals to lead their normal lives.

The input of this number of new dwellings cannot be accommodated by the local schools, nurseries, GP surgery or (already-busy bus route and tube station) This is on top of the removal of the 82 bus route and no space for a cycle lane.

The o2 is a social hub for the community providing entertainment, restaurants, coffee shops, classes, a gym and somewhere to park to meet.

I strongly object to this planning permission.

Regards,

Dr J Bland

**From:** yvette pole <[ypole@hotmail.com](mailto:ypole@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** 20 March 2022 07:00

**To:** David Fowler <[David.Fowler@camden.gov.uk](mailto:David.Fowler@camden.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Objection to planning application for O2 Centre Site (Application Number2022/0528/P)

- **Objection to Application Number2022/0528/P**

- The Camden high rise development is totally unacceptable as it will damage the look and feel of the local South Hampstead area which is Victorian Terrace low rise buildings.
- The new development will thereby be an eyesore for the area, as it's far too high, and thereby it will damage the asset value of local South Hampstead property owners own residences in the South Hampstead area.
- It will impact on the enjoyment of what has been to date a protected Victorian terrace residential area with Victorian fronted local shopping, and therefore will negatively affect local property owners.
- A maximum of three stories in the new development in Victorian style would be far more in keeping with the area, and would better maintain the Victorian heritage of the area.
- Camden council has breached its own planning laws for the local area in both the height, style and design of the new development. South Hampstead is a local conservation area and the Victorain heritage style of the area should be protected.

Regards

Yvette Pole

37A Goldhurst Terrace

[Ypole@hotmail.com](mailto:Ypole@hotmail.com)

0787943015

**From:** Steven Bruck  
**Sent:** 20 March 2022 13:35  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** Proposed development of O2 centre, Finchley Road

Dear Mr Fowler,

We are writing to express our extreme concern about the proposed development at the O2 centre with regard to the effect on shopping facilities at what is a major centre and facility for local residents in Hampstead, West Hampstead and Swiss Cottage.

We are “senior citizens” who rely on Sainsbury with its parking facilities for our weekly shop. During the Covid crisis we used click and collect available at the site. We also use the Homebase for homeware purchases. We understand that any replacement for these stores will, under existing plans, have no parking facilities. The only other equivalent local store is Waitrose which has limited/cramped and difficult parking. We will therefore be obliged to travel much further afield in future, with consequential negative environmental impact. It really does seem absurd to remove local facilities rather than incorporating them into the plans. Replacement parking could make provision for electric chargers for cars which are badly needed in Hampstead/Camden and could therefore have a major beneficial environmental effect, as well as benefitting local residents.

Please register our objection and take account of the needs of local residents so that a proper balance is struck.

Yours sincerely

Steven and Mirela Bruck  
**21A Carlingford Road**  
**Hampstead**  
**London NW3 1RY**