

From: Belinda Lees

Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2023 7:10 pm

To: Sue Vincent (Cllr); Tom Simon (Cllr); Will Prince (Cllr); Andrew Parkinson (Cllr); Liam Martin-Lane (Cllr); Lloyd Hatton (Cllr); Nasrine Djemai (Cllr); Danny Beales (Cllr); Lotis.Bautista; Edmund Frondigoun (Cllr); Heather Johnson (Cllr)

Subject: Objection to the Proposal by Landsec to redevelop the O2 centre and surrounding area

Dear Councillors

As a local resident of over 20 years, I would like to object most strongly to the proposed redevelopment by Landsec of the O2 Centre and surrounding area. The primary reason for denying this application for ~1,800 homes, is to fulfil the many assertions in the Camden Plan and SPD that this will be a “design-led” solution of “the highest quality”: this proposal fails for the primary reasons of: a) Excessive and unnecessary height, to the detriment of the future residents and the surrounding conservation areas b) Excessive and unnecessary density, primarily to the detriment of the future residents, but also to the surrounding neighbours due to the poor social design of the development c) Insufficient and poorly utilised usable green space, to the detriment of the future residents, and due to the poor design concept d) The unnecessary and environmentally damaging demolition of the existing O2 Centre, to the detriment of the future residents, the surrounding neighbours, and to the Climate Emergency.

According to Camden's own Planning Policy

"The Council will seek to secure high quality design in development. The Council will require that development:

*a. respects local context and character; **this proposal fails due to excessive height & poor design***

*b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 **this proposal fails due to excessive height & poor design***

*c. is sustainable in design and construction, incorporating best practice in resource management and climate change mitigation and adaptation; **this***

proposal fails as traditional concrete and brick construction is in contradiction to sustainability, and the application is absent significant climate change mitigation

d. is of sustainable and durable construction and adaptable to different activities and land uses; this proposal fails as uses standard concrete and masonry construction and no effort to propose really-sustainable construction. Fundamentally poor design as regards both land use and green space.

e. comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; this proposal fails the design is a hackneyed sub-pastiche of the local character

f. integrates well with the surrounding streets and open spaces, improving movement through the site and wider area with direct, accessible and easily recognisable routes and contributes positively to the street frontage: this proposal fails as the site is overfilled with blocks in a "Soviet-style" proximity. The east-west route is described as a "linear park" and, in reality, is little more than a narrow path at the foot of 12 storey towers, failing the dictionary definition or any common understanding of a "park" & misleading inexperienced consultants with "sales-speak"

g. is inclusive and accessible for all; this proposal fails by applying to demolish the O2 Centre and replace it with a wall of apartment buildings along the Finchley Road, the development removes the existing inclusive hub, cuts itself off from the existing community, and takes away any reason the community might wish any access to the site.

h. promotes health; this proposal fails as the consequence of poor site design is insufficient provision & poorly-utilised green space, buildings too close together, and no significant features to promote health.

i. is secure and designed to minimise crime and antisocial behaviour; this proposal fails the most important feature of a design to minimise crime and anti-social behaviour is for the residents to feel they have been respected by the design, and ideally to fall in love with the design and the place. This design is about maximising profits and there is no respect and no placemaking to love: "first we shape our buildings – then our buildings shape us". In spite of a pre-application consultation with the Metropolitan Police "Design Out Crime Office", the application has failed to listen to their

concerns either, and the official Police Response opens with the comment "I cannot support this application in its current form . . ."

j. responds to natural features and preserves gardens and other open space; this proposal fails as instead of trying to maximise the open space, this design fills the site in a Soviet-style proximity, too close together, & most of the open space has ended up in narrow, overlooked, & unappetising corridors between the buildings*

k. incorporates high quality landscape design (incl public art, where appropriate) & maximises opportunities for greening for example through planting of trees and other soft landscaping; this proposal fails having failed to create a significant basic landscape in the site at all, further "high quality landscape design" is an important aspiration but it is essentially irrelevant to this design as it is compromised from the start.

l. incorporates outdoor amenity space; this proposal fails as the little outdoor amenity space is very limited compared to the outdoor amenity space which could be available with a different site concept. Further, Para 10.42 of the Planning Statement confirms that, under this particular design concept "the Proposed Development is unable to meet the full policy requirement in respect to open space"

m. preserves strategic and local views; this proposal fails by achieving density through a high-rise vs mid-rise concept, this plan is destructive of strategic and local views, and not preserving of them

n. for housing, provides a high standard of accommodation; this proposal fails as high-rise buildings, too close together, excessively overlooked & overshadowed, & predominantly single-aspect

o. carefully integrates building services equipment. This proposal is neutral

FThe Council will resist development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions."

I would urge you to reject this application and request that Landsec resubmit a revised application that complies with Camden Policy D1 which commits to "resisting development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities

available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions".With kind regards

Belinda Lees