

---

**From:** Simon Inglis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** ref: 2022/0528/P Planning Objection to Landsec's proposals for O2 site

Dear Mr Fowler

**ref: 2022/0528/P**

I have reviewed a copy of the Planning Representations from the Confederation of Local Community Groups, and wish to state that my objections to this planning application are fully represented by the Confederation's detailed objections which have already been submitted.

My objections are exactly in line with those of the Confederation in the following respects:

1. Having attended two events (one live, one online) at which the plans have been explained by Landsec, I take particular exception to their claim that the scheme offers over 50 per cent open space. Technically this assertion is correct - 50 per cent of the site would not be covered in buildings. But that does not mean that the undeveloped space is 'open'. Does a pavement count as 'open space'? I repeat the statement that, '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."

I also wish to repeat, and reiterate, that as stated in the Confederation report "the real, usable, and recreational green space under this application is of fundamentally poor quality and is a miserable 0.68ha out of 5.77ha, or 11.7%.'

2. This development is clearly trying to pack too many people and too many flats into the space available. As a resident of West Hampstead since 1984- nearly 40 years - and a member of both WHAT and GARA, I have seen crowd densities around the tube station reach worrying proportions. This development will only add to those densities. My understanding is that a density of 947 person per hectare is Landsec's aim. Even if this density were to be halved, this would still represent a density level way above the Camden average. Would any of the individuals involved in this submission wish to live in such a densely populated development?

3. The application should be withdrawn or rejected pending a redesign in compliance with the Neighbourhood plan, and in genuine cooperation with the FGWHNF and the adjacent community. I strongly feel that there has been no *meaningful* co-operation or consultation. We were repeatedly told at the meetings that as local residents we should be excited by this development and that we will benefit from it, yet I do not know a single local resident who is anything other than worried and resentful of the proposals, particularly as pressures continue to

build on water usage, sewerage, medical facilities, schools and open space. This is not simple 'nimbyism' but genuine concern.

4. The proposals are described as 'mixed use'. No they are not. The vast majority of the development (89%) consists of residential use. Only 270 sq m are allocated to community use. Do they think we are stupid?

I therefore concur most stringly with the Confederation's assertion that the Landsec scheme fails owing to the excessive heights of the proposed flats, the density of construction, the poor design of both the proposed buildings and their masterplanning, and the insufficient provision of green space amenity.

To repeat, and reiterate a statement from the Confederation report:

'it is clear that this is in fact a plan which is entirely guided by commercial interests instead, and is basically "human warehousing", absent respect for the future residents or for the surrounding communities, and we trust it will be rejected as such, particularly when a high-quality, designed solution is available.'

Yours

Simon Inglis  
1 Aldred Road, London NW6 1AN



---

**From:** Rory Devlin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 31 August 2022 17:07  
**To:** David Fowler; Planning Planning  
**Subject:** ref: 2022/0528/P

[REDACTED]

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 strong objections to this planning application which are fully represented by the Confederation's detailed objections which have already been filed. I endorse and support the Confederation's own statement of objections for the reasons they give.

This proposal represents a massive overdevelopment which is going to lead to a poor quality environment for the new residents and our neighbourhood. The density of the development (in particular building height) will also impact the surrounding conservation areas and the South Hampstead skyline (one of the key objectives of the Confederation's response is to force a building height reduction). The proposed development will lead to an unacceptable overshadowing which will extend as far as Broadhurst Gardens and the top of Fairhazel Gardens.

The size and scale of the proposed development will also have a major impact on local infrastructure and services, tubes, buses etc. Further, the duration of the proposed development, and associated noise, traffic, air quality pollution and disruption, over a 10-15 year period, is an unreasonable burden to impose on the adjacent neighbourhoods and streets.

Finally, it is important to note that little or no adequate consideration has been given to climate impact of the buildings, their materials and construction.

Please keep me informed of the process for this development and explain local residents right to object on aspects of this development.

Regards,  
Rory Devlin  
47 Fairhazel Gardens  
NW6 3QN  
[REDACTED]

-----  
Rory Devlin  
Columna Capital LLP  
7 Cavendish Square,  
London W1G OPE

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Columna Capital LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**

This communication is from Columna Capital LLP. Columna Capital LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England, Partnership Number OC345976, Registered Office: 40 Queen Anne Street, London W1G 9EL. Columna Capital LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority to provide investment advisory services to qualified investors. This email is neither an offer to sell nor a solicitation to invest. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this e-mail and any attachments which do not relate to the official business of the firm are neither given nor endorsed by it. This e-mail is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s) please note that any form of disclosure, distribution, copying or use of this communication or the information in it or in any attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

**From:** David Stevenson  
**Sent:** 01 September 2022 16:41  
**To:** David Fowler; Planning  
**Subject:** O2 Development plans

"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.

Kind Regards,

David Stevenson

**From:** Samantha

**Sent:** 01 September 2022 16:28

**To:** David Fowler; Planning

**Subject:** Re: O2 planning application Ref No.2022/0528/P

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 filed.

As a resident of Greencroft Gardens and my basement flat being affected by the floods last July 2021, I cannot understand how this application could even be considered with Thames Water's infrastructure already struggling with the drainage system of flash flooding and the amount of residents already in the area as is.

Also, one cannot walk on the thin pavements on West End Lane during rush hour with all the new developments already built in recent years and another one in the process of completion, our area and its services cannot cope with another 5000 residents.

With regards,

Samantha Hamilton-Smith

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

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  
15 Fawley Road  
London NW6 1SJ

**From:** Elizabeth Shields  
**Sent:** 05 September 2022 16:22  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** O2 centre site development

Planning Application 2022/0528/P

I am writing to object very strongly to the proposed redevelopment of the O2 Site in Finchley Road.

The proposed new site would be extremely overcrowded putting a big strain on local services such as schools and GP practices. There would be too few affordable starter homes. The loss of the O2 Centre would mean the loss of a valuable supermarket with parking and the Virgin active health club which has a swimming pool. Altogether I think the proposal is excessive and unnecessary, and only Landsec would benefit.

Elizabeth Shields, local resident and current daily user of the Centre.



**From:** Jerry Dawson  
**Sent:** 06 September 2022 21:07  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Subject:** Ref 2022/0528/P. O2 Centre

Dear Mr Fowler,

Ref 2022/0528/P. O2 Centre

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.

Yours sincerely

Jeremy Dawson

84 Hillfield Road, NW6 1QA

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

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  
Priory Road

**From:** John Craig Gray  
**Sent:** 11 September 2022 15:37  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** O2 Centre: Proposed LandSec Redevelopment

Dear Mr Fowler

**Ref: 2022/0528/P**

I have previously raised objections to this proposal during the (somewhat stage-managed) 'public consultation' events.

The full grounds for refusal are too long to list here, but my primary objection is that the LandSec proposal is rank overdevelopment. The local plan had earmarked a total of 950 homes for this site. That is already plenty! Given the extremely desirable location within London and the relatively straightforward site conditions, it is clear that the provision of 950 new homes on this site would represent a highly profitable enterprise (and that's assuming 50% of these would be affordable). So for the developer to attempt double that number of homes and to reduce the proportion of affordable to just 35% is so profligate as to be insulting to both the local neighbourhood and Camden Council's Planning Policies.

And having now received and reviewed a copy of the Planning Representations from the Confederation of Local Community Groups, I would like to reconfirm my strong objection to this planning application which are fully represented by the Confederation's detailed objections which have already been submitted.

Kind regards

John Craig Gray  
93 Ravenshaw St, NW6 1NP

---

**From:** Ann Eardley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 August 2022 11:13  
**To:** David Fowler  
**Cc:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** O2 Centre propoposed

**[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.

Ann Eardley  
[REDACTED]