

THE MARKHAM SQUARE ASSOCIATION

Objection to Planning Application No PP/21/01425

81 – 103 (odd) King's Road

In addition to the major disruption and disturbance to local residents and businesses during the redevelopment of the site, we are concerned about the loss of amenities for local residents and the negative impact on the area.

The proposed redevelopment, which will provide for yet more shops, food outlets and offices, is bulky and overbearing for its location. It will be considerably higher than the existing building and will impact negatively on nearby residential properties, as detailed in objections by those immediately affected. It should not be considered on a stand-alone basis. There is an incremental increase in the height of each new major development along the King's Road; together they alter the look and feel of the famous King's Road and diminish its special appeal.

Deliveries to and collections from the planned retail units, food outlets and offices will occur much more frequently and haphazardly than now. Logistical co-ordination of deliveries and collections, including customer collections, between the various occupants will be impossible. Resulting blockages of the loading bays and access route will cause an increase in kerbside deliveries and collections, within and outside permitted loading periods. These will not be monitored, will interfere with pedestrian traffic, and obstruct the traffic on the King's Road.

We are not convinced that this proposed new development has a long-term future. Shopping along the King's Road tends to be linear; shoppers want to be on the King's Road and not in a shopping mall (which could be anywhere). A nearby shopping mall, a retail failure for many years, is now under redevelopment as a different concept.

The proposed "Landmark" building will be at the cost of another landmark, the King's Road, and the surrounding area. Local residents will suffer the loss of amenities and be subjected to more traffic, increased pressure on parking, noise and disturbance.

We therefore object to this proposal.

26 04 21