

From: Anne Pritam
Sent: 28 March 2023 00:33
To: Planning
Subject: 2022/0528/P

Objection to Planning Application - 2022/0528/P

The O2 Masterplan Finchley Road London NW3 6LU

*From Anne Pritam
Address 65, St Gabriels Road, London NW2 4DT*

I write to comment on the above application which remains open to comment by way of email.

As a local resident I object to the plans for the following reasons:

This area undoubtedly needs more housing: affordable, long-lasting, human scale, eco-friendly and sympathetically designed housing. These plans show none of those qualities.

In short, too many dwellings are planned for a site and area which cannot support them.

The design of the development is retrograde and reflects a style of architecture which has been proven to be over-intense and dehumanising. The height of the buildings is excessive and out of keeping with the surroundings.

There is no planned realistic replacement for the loss of amenities at the O2 - no large affordable supermarkets (without the large Sainsbury's, new occupants and current residents will be forced into the limited local stores many of which are high price outlets).

Nearest Cinema provision on the scale of the O2 is a long way (by polluting drive) away.

The developers have made inadequate commitment to maintain greenery - an opportunity lost to regreen the borough.

The length of time of the building programme, even by the developer's estimate (which is no doubt optimistic) will cause excessive disruption and result in major loss of jobs and amenities. A lower scale low rise greener development would not.

Inadequate provision for cars - councillors should be realistic that car use is not in decline and the electrical revolution will mean thousands of new residents having multiple new vehicles. Road and traffic infrastructure in the vicinity is already at breaking point. Pollution is a current issue but overcrowded roads, inadequate parking and elec-charging facilities will remain a problem: these plans make inadequate provision for parking, charging, increased road use and resulting road safety risks.

Local schools, medical esp GP services (Landsec is very vague about what its "health facility" COULD be) and transport hubs, as well as policing, are overstretched and new occupants with growing families could not be adequately served without significant local or national investment which shows no sign of appearing in the near future.

Creating a few green spaces which together, apparently, equal the size of the current car park will not be sufficient recreation space for the hundreds of children and elderly who will live in these blocks. The plans should be smaller lower scale and incorporate better outdoor space and natural light.

The shape of the land and proposed placement of buildings creates a funnelling effect. Policing has proved difficult in old estates where there are only two real entry points.

Councillors should bear in mind the full lifecycle of blocks of this type: they are costly to maintain and will cease to command high rental and sale values, long term. These will not be shiny yuppy blocks for ever.

Those who can afford to leave a "concrete jungle style" like this will do so - these flats are not being designed as homes for life. It is not inconceivable that the estate will become a penned-in, poor area in the medium term future with all the likely problems that would bring. That would be a vast disservice to those who desperately need quality new long-term homes and is hardly a legacy any councillor should wish to leave.

I encourage councillors to reject the current application and/or demand very significant changes to its current form.

Yours faithfully

Anne Pritam