

From: Riva G.
Sent: 23 August 2022 13:36
To: David Fowler; Planning Planning
Subject: ref: 2022/0528/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr Fowler, ref: 2022/0528/P Having now received and reviewed a copy of the Planning Representations from the Confederation of Local Community Groups, please accept my own objections to this planning application which are represented by the Confederation's detailed objections which have already been submitted. Riva Gold
<http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/5objection2022-0528O2Centre.pdf>

From: helena
Sent: 22 August 2022 15:04
To: David Fowler; Planning Planning; Meric Apak (Cllr)
Subject: ref: 2022/0528/P
Attachments: 5objection2022-0528O2Centre.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr Fowler,

As someone who participated actively in the development of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan, a key part of the Confederation that has sent you a detailed Objection to the plan for the O2 Centre and which I attach here, I am writing personally to you to express my dissatisfaction and deep disappointment with the process and the proposed outcome.

I have (rather wearily) participated in all the processes relating to the O2 Centre. I wish to echo paragraph 14 of the Objection and feel that the design of the buildings is very poor and it does not appear that much attention has been paid to aesthetics or the need for all new buildings to be carbon neutral and environmentally friendly.

The consultations rather treated us as fools by constantly speaking of the green space around the blocks, while consistently declining to give details of those blocks.

I am also quite shocked by how close together the blocks are. This extreme density will have a **negative effect on quality of life** for residents and people passing through. The diagram on page 10 of the attached illustrates the extraordinary density of dwellings on this site, far higher than for developments elsewhere in London or in other countries.

I believe that Labour developed a draft **master plan** for the area but then chose to forget about it... perhaps partly because it would have required more careful planning and thought about the impacts of new developments on the area concerned.

Empty housing and second homes

I do realise that Camden needs more housing to be available. However, the council and the government could help a lot **by addressing the issue of housing that is left empty for long periods of time**, perhaps because it has been bought as an investment by overseas buyers, something that should be outlawed as it is in Copenhagen, Denmark.

I refer you to this article in the Ham and High, March 2022, that puts Camden **THIRD IN THE COUNTRY** for housing that stands empty:

More than 4,000 properties sitting empty in

Camden <https://www.hamhigh.co.uk/lifestyle/property/camden-has-4181-empty-properties-8747236>

Camden is also 8th in the WHOLE COUNTRY for second homes.

What are you doing about that? This is completely unacceptable in view of the number of people who cannot find housing to buy/occupy. It seems that instead of tackling it, you are promoting poor developments all over the borough that are degrading the quality of life for residents already living there. Examples include 156 West End Lane (in progress), and 187-189 West End Lane, the latter a fine example of very poor quality, highly unimaginative building, the work of a company that has repeated that miserable pattern all over the city.

At this rate, the O2 Centre is going to be just another poor development in the area, of which the council should have reason to be thoroughly ashamed.

I actually voted against the Labour Party in the last elections as a result of this and other problems, such as overcrowding on West End Lane, seemingly used as a through road by a lot of traffic although it is a two-lane **lane. No wonder there are so often problems on it, notably with water supply, as we see right now.**

It seems that whatever people say in public consultations is simply ignored. Worse still, the council seems all too ready to accept plans that are inadequate and that lower the overall quality of living in the area. The recent 'consultation' on 2021/5699/P - 208 West End Lane NW6 – whether it should or should not be converted into a Chipotle restaurant is a clear example, with approval obviously having been given before the consultation closed.

Why is this happening?

Perhaps the Labour council is receiving offers from corporate interests that it finds hard to resist?

Helena Paul,

Cc Meric Apak, Cabinet Member for Better Homes (Camden Council)

From: Beatriz Ungerer Dal Poz
Sent: 22 August 2022 17:20
To: David Fowler; Planning Planning
Subject: ref: 2022/0528/P : LandSec

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr Fowler,
ref: 2022/0528/P

Having now received and reviewed a copy of the Planning Representations from the Confederation of Local Community Groups, please accept my own objections to this planning application which are fully represented by the Confederation's detailed objections which have already been submitted.

I would also like to add my continual disappointment that this proposed development does not include a primary school nor a GP practice, these are two things in which the area already lacks and this development will continue to exacerbate. The area is already colloquially known as a "primary school blackhole". It's extremely disappointing that Camden council continually disregards families that live in the area.

kind regards
Beatriz

--

Beatriz Ungerer Dal Poz

From: Michael Yianneskis
Sent: 03 September 2022 16:01
To: David Fowler; Planning Planning
Subject: Ref: 2022/0528/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr Fowler,

Ref: 2022/0528/P

Having now received and reviewed a copy of the Planning Representations from the Confederation of Local Community Groups, please accept my own objections to this planning application which are fully represented by the Confederation's detailed objections which have already been submitted.

Professor Michael Yianneskis

From: John Lawrence
Sent: 09 September 2022 09:58
To: Planning Planning; David Fowler
Subject: ref: 2022/0528/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr Fowler,

Having now received and reviewed a copy of the Planning Representations from the Confederation of Local Community Groups, please accept my own objections to this planning application which are fully represented by the Confederation's detailed objections which have already been filed.

Regards

John Lawrence

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2022/0528/P | Lynne and Steve Jones | 18/10/2022 13:43:23 | OBJ | <p>The amendments do not correct the issue which we Object to.</p> <p>We object to the removal of an INDOOR PLAZA (the O2 centre) which provides a safe indoor community space for daytime and nighttime enjoyment safely by residents. Including an Indoor Pool and leisure centre of quality. If the O2 is to be demolished these amenities must be replaced before removing them as they are essential for the community. This has also been po8ntd out by the local MP and the GLA so please amendment this application.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2022/0528/P | Lynne and Steve Jones | 18/10/2022 13:43:23 | OBJ | <p>The amendments do not correct the issue which we Object to.</p> <p>We object to the removal of an INDOOR PLAZA (the O2 centre) which provides a safe indoor community space for daytime and nighttime enjoyment safely by residents. Including an Indoor Pool and leisure centre of quality. If the O2 is to be demolished these amenities must be replaced before removing them as they are essential for the community. This has also been po8ntd out by the local MP and the GLA so please amendment this application.</p> |

David Fowler
Regeneration and Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

Dear Mr Fowler,

Re: O2 Centre Planning application (2022/0528/P)

I am writing on behalf of West (Fortune Green and West Hampstead) Branch of the Hampstead and Kilburn Labour Party to comment on the revised application for this site. Our comments are the outcome of a branch working party and have been approved by branch officers.

1. Timing

The lack of clarity on the timing of the community benefit sections of the development plan remains a major problem. There is still no news as to whether Landsec can acquire the VW/Audi garages and the Builders Depot for phase 2. All of these businesses have objected to the scheme. The key issue for the outline planning permission for phase 2 of the scheme (other than loss of employment) is that there appears to be no agreement or way forward by which Landsec can acquire this land. Without this land, the whole scheme is degraded.

This application fails to consider the possibility that only phase 1 gets built or that there is a long interval between phase 1 and completion of the later stages. This would leave the phase 1 blocks isolated from West Hampstead by the garages, only accessible via an insecure footpath and a narrow pavement in Blackburn Road. There is a risk that the West Hampstead entrance to the site will remain as big an eyesore as it is currently.

The benefits in the phase 2 scheme green playing space and health facility - would be lost. Access to Finchley Road and its station would be via a steep and narrow roadway or via escalators in the shopping centre when open, and then via a narrow and congested stretch of pavement.

Yet the planning applications talks as if this acquisition is a done deal. It is legal to apply for planning permission for land you do not own but surely there must be some evidence presented that there is a means by which it could be acquired.

We would therefore urge that if planning permission is granted, it must be a condition that phase 2 is built first. As things stand the application paints a rosy picture of the development as a whole without considering the impact of project staging.

2. Community benefit

The following issues need to be addressed with urgency. More than a year has passed since the public were able to question Landsec about the progress of these issues:

- i. *Step free access to the tube stations at each end of the development.*

Essential for modern travel in any event, it must be a priority for this development of 1800 new homes, planned without parking on the back of the proximity of its amazing travel connections – including two TfL tube stations, Finchley Road and West Hampstead. The development also includes 10 per cent of homes with wheelchair access.

As yet there is no information available on the progress or even existence of negotiations between Landsec, Camden and TfL. There is an urgent need for transparent negotiations between these three organisations.

- ii. *Pedestrian access generally to both tube stations and bus stops.*
Access to public transport cannot be left to the last minute. The Greater London Authority (GLA) estimates there will be 220 extra tube passengers and 136 extra bus journeys during rush hours. As well as ensuring that these transport systems will hold up (at a time of cuts in bus services), it's essential to ensure easy access from within the development, thus avoiding the congestion that is a daily problem on Finchley Road and West End Lane.

It would be relatively easy to access the Finchley Rd tube via the development from the Sainsburys delivery area beside the O2 building as there is a gap between the Finchley Road station building and the housing beside it.

A solution to providing step free access must be found for West Hampstead, probably involving demolition of the small shops on the north side of the tube station which are on TfL land. If these areas are not incorporated then Blackburn Road, the West Hampstead entrance to the site, will remain as big an eyesore as it is currently.

As GLA noted, there is also a need to consider how cyclists and pedestrians can safely access southbound and northbound Finchley Road. The traffic lights at the junction of the existing O2 access road and Finchley Road are dangerous and complex for pedestrians.

To ensure that this car-free development does not cause safety issues, Landsec must be crystal clear from the get go, that it is

reserving any land that is needed for safe access to tube and bus journeys for new residents and local people generally.

iii. NHS and community centre

There appears to be no news on either of these developments. What is happening about the negotiations we were told a year ago were happening with the NHS? This area is deficient in health facilities and the growing population will add to the strain on resources. As things stand the health facility is in phase 2, which may never be built.

Likewise, the development will mean that the community space in the O2 centre is lost, but we have no information on what will replace it and how it will be managed.

iv Green Space

The application is still deficient in green space – and there is concern that Landsec might offer a financial settlement to Camden Council in mitigation of the failure to meet the council's requirements on green space. This would be abhorrent. West Hampstead and Fortune Green wards are among the most deficient in open space in the borough. There is really not enough space for children to run around and play – not enough grass, no playground. This is especially true of phase 1, which will have a social rent/low rent housing element.

3. Mix of tenure and size

It's noted - and to be welcomed - that Landsec have increased the number of affordable homes by 4. This means that there will be 107 low rent flats out of a total of 608 in phase 1.

Landsec may defend such a small increase by pointing to the demands on its purse for funding community benefits, notably in step free and general access to tube stations. Yet that defense hardly stands when there is as yet no progress in discussions on Landsec's contribution to step free and improved access to Finchley Road and West End Lane tube stations. This just seems to be an excuse when there is no progress on the land acquisition needed for phase 2.

We make the point above that phase 1 may be built in isolation or with a long interval before the other phases. This would leave just 107 low rent flats in the development. Is it worth imposing such a massive and overbearing development on our area for the sake of such a small number of (albeit very badly needed) low rent homes?

4. Density and height of the development

The GLA has given lukewarm approval to the density and height of the development despite local concerns about its visual impact. We are concerned about the height of the development. There is as yet no sign in this application that local concerns about height and density are being balanced by the provision of community benefits as outlined here.

Attention should perhaps be focused on the amount of light reaching individual homes including the number of single aspect units, ensuring – as the GLA has suggested – that none are north-facing. The development is also out of keeping in size and style with the late nineteenth and early twentieth century character of the surrounding area and adjacent Conservation Areas.

5. Retail

The issue of a low cost supermarket on the site should be kept in focus. This redevelopment is a long way down the road at a time when patterns of shopping are changing.

We therefore conclude that the Planning Committee should reject the application in its current form. It should recommend to the developer that phase 2 should be built before phase 1 of this application given the many uncertainties that its benefits will otherwise ever happen.

Yours faithfully,

Virginia Berridge

Vice Chair, West (Fortune Green and West Hampstead) Branch, Hampstead and Kilburn CLP and chair of the O2 working party.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2022/0528/P | Ranjit Prasad | 29/11/2022 15:58:23 | OBJ | <p>We have discussed the proposals at length and as a family are strongly opposed to them as set out. These proposals will increase the density of population in the vicinity by 5000+ people without providing a sufficient increase in already stretched common resources including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Schools2. GPs3. Public transport infrastructure including tube station and buses and sidewalks4. Parking5. Open areas and public spaces including green spaces and children's play areas6. Shopping facilities including Sainsbury's, Waterstones7. Gym facilities including Virgin Active <p>The increase in paved area and the average dwelling height are both damaging in increased water logging and carbon footprint.</p> |

From:
Sent: 23 August 2022 14:26
To: David Fowler; Planning Planning
Subject: Objection to O2 centre development

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr Fowler,

ref: 2022/0528/P

Having now received and reviewed a copy of the Planning Representations from the Confederation of Local Community Groups, please accept my own objections to this planning application which are fully represented by the Confederation's detailed objections which have already been submitted.

I feel the developers just want to maximise the number of flats and have not proposed any useable community space.

Michael Jennings