

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0484/P	Andrew Lowe	22/02/2025 22:27:11	OBJ	<p>I strongly oppose this planning application, on the basis of the development being too tall and dense for the area.</p> <p>The developer has consistently ignored community feedback over substantive issues for many years now as part of this development proposal and makes only token gestures to amend its planning proposal in response to community feedback. The developer must materially amend their plans by reducing the density and height of the proposed residential towers to make it more appropriate to the area and so local infrastructure can better support this development.</p>
2025/0484/P	BM Shaughnessy	23/02/2025 19:45:07	OBJ	<p>We object to this second application for the O2 Masterplan project Under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as it does not conform to generally acceptable revisions to an existing/granted planning application.</p> <p>Changes to internal floor heights result in significant and unacceptable external height changes. The height changes of 2 stories breach the legislation limits. Minor increases in height should be typically up to 1-2 meters. These are 5.9m higher,</p> <p>The Density Changes: are also in breach of the legislation, increasing units fundamentally changes the scheme's overall character.</p> <p>The reconfigurations of internal layouts (blamed on Fire regulations and standards which were in place at the time of the first application) is overt and cynical "project creep" - as are adjustments to unit mix (e.g., changing some 2-beds to 1-beds)</p> <p>Section 73 defines the following key limitations to an application under the statute: Changes must not substantially increase overshadowing or overlooking. These changes clearly further negatively impact the access to light the dwellings to the north of the site - Rosemont and Lithos Roads and significantly harm neighboring amenity</p> <p>Major increases in height or density typically need a new full planning application and to allow this application under Section 73 would compromise Camden's Planning integrity and be unjustifiable. It should be refused and Landsec required to submit a new planning application.</p>