

Printed on: 27/01/2022 09:10:04

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2021/3225/P | S Grant | 25/01/2022 10:12:04 | OBJ/NOT | <p>We are a family with [REDACTED] living on Savernake Road. Whilst we accept that regenerating Murphy's Yard is in principle a positive thing we strongly object to the density and height of the proposed high rise buildings.</p> <p>One of the reasons for living in a conservation area by the Heath is to have a sense of space, views of the sky and clean air. The view from Parliament Heath is of course protected. Having carefully reviewed the planning documents we are very concerned that the Gospel Oak end of Savernake Road will feel hemmed in by the proposed buildings and this will greatly compromise our home environment. The massing illustrations clearly show the impact and the impact on the view from Parliament Hill. The area can be regenerated with lower rise buildings which won't affect local residents and the area in the same way.</p> <p>We are also concerned about congestion on Mansfield Rd/Gordon House Rd during the years of development. Current fibre broadband works have demonstrated the traffic congestion which makes navigating the roads almost impossible for residents. Gospel Oak school and overground station are also located here and constant construction traffic will make access to both very difficult.</p> <p>Better access for the works needs to be considered by the developers perhaps with main access from the Regis Rd end which is not in a conservation area with a heavy resident population.</p> <p>Please do not allow such an imposing alteration to our landscape in what is after all a conservation area. Please insist that the plans are reduced in scale and bulk for the benefit of existing residents and future generations.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Isabelle Citron | 24/01/2022 20:04:13 | OBJ | <p>The three towers proposed are out of proportion with any of the surrounding environment. They will significantly detract from the view from my garden which is currently clear sky. It will be dominated instead by these unsightly, disproportionate atrocities.</p> <p>The density of housing and office space is out of keeping with current residences.</p> <p>There has been no justification for the demand for such vast amounts of office space in the post COVID era where most companies are letting go of offices and downsizing. If these are vacant there is no proposal as to how the buildings will be used instead.</p> |

Printed on: 27/01/2022 09:10:04

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | Jessica Morrison | 24/01/2022 12:14:14 | COMMENT | <p>I am writing to object to the height and density of the Murphy's yard development. I am a local resident at Oak Village and have lived in Gospel Oak my entire life.</p> <p>The application includes 825 homes in tower blocks up to 19 stories high. This is a massive development, in a very tiny space. The residential towers are planned to be crowded up against each other to the extent that shadows will be cast from one to another. There also appears to be little parking provision for emergency vehicles, deliveries, taxis, trader vehicles and other.</p> <p>The housing development needs to be paired down significantly for social/environmental/aesthetic reasons.</p> <p>I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the findings are that tall tower blocks generate all manner of social problems, and are not conducive to a healthy new community. They are also unsuitable on multiple ecological and safety grounds (see the terrible experiences at Grenfell, for example).</p> <p>There is in addition the question of windshear, which will hardly make for a comfortable living environment.</p> <p>I also point out that the view south from Parliament Hill is a Protected View, as we understand it, and the current development alters this view considerably.</p> <p>The massing is too great in what is a residential area.</p> <p>I also query whether the space itself and landscaping will be well maintained and developed as you see in areas like Kings Cross. I don't see it being cared for in the same way.</p> <p>Access for the building works and then once completed is also unsuitable in Gordon House Road. The congestion in this road at the moment - even before any works is unworkable with huge traffic jams every day of the week. This is adjacent to a local school - Gospel Oak Primary - impacting the air our children are breathing. To add additional traffic pressure on this time turning will cause chaos for the local area.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | Jessica Morrison | 24/01/2022 12:15:20 | COMMENT | <p>I am writing to object to the height and density of the Murphy's yard development. I am a local resident at Oak Village and have lived in Gospel Oak my entire life.</p> <p>The application includes 825 homes in tower blocks up to 19 stories high. This is a massive development, in a very tiny space. The residential towers are planned to be crowded up against each other to the extent that shadows will be cast from one to another. There also appears to be little parking provision for emergency vehicles, deliveries, taxis, trader vehicles and other.</p> <p>The housing development needs to be paired down significantly for social/environmental/aesthetic reasons.</p> <p>I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the findings are that tall tower blocks generate all manner of social problems, and are not conducive to a healthy new community. They are also unsuitable on multiple ecological and safety grounds (see the terrible experiences at Grenfell, for example).</p> <p>There is in addition the question of windshear, which will hardly make for a comfortable living environment.</p> <p>I also point out that the view south from Parliament Hill is a Protected View, as we understand it, and the current development alters this view considerably.</p> <p>The massing is too great in what is a residential area.</p> <p>I also query whether the space itself and landscaping will be well maintained and developed as you see in areas like Kings Cross. I don't see it being cared for in the same way.</p> <p>Access for the building works and then once completed is also unsuitable in Gordon House Road. The congestion in this road at the moment - even before any works is unworkable with huge traffic jams every day of the week. This is adjacent to a local school - Gospel Oak Primary - impacting the air our children are breathing. To add additional traffic pressure on this time turning will cause chaos for the local area.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | Jessica Morrison | 24/01/2022 12:16:00 | COMMENT | <p>I am writing to object to the height and density of the Murphy's yard development. I am a local resident at Oak Village and have lived in Gospel Oak my entire life.</p> <p>The application includes 825 homes in tower blocks up to 19 stories high. This is a massive development, in a very tiny space. The residential towers are planned to be crowded up against each other to the extent that shadows will be cast from one to another. There also appears to be little parking provision for emergency vehicles, deliveries, taxis, trader vehicles and other.</p> <p>The housing development needs to be paired down significantly for social/environmental/aesthetic reasons.</p> <p>I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the findings are that tall tower blocks generate all manner of social problems, and are not conducive to a healthy new community. They are also unsuitable on multiple ecological and safety grounds (see the terrible experiences at Grenfell, for example).</p> <p>There is in addition the question of windshear, which will hardly make for a comfortable living environment.</p> <p>I also point out that the view south from Parliament Hill is a Protected View, as we understand it, and the current development alters this view considerably.</p> <p>The massing is too great in what is a residential area.</p> <p>I also query whether the space itself and landscaping will be well maintained and developed as you see in areas like Kings Cross. I don't see it being cared for in the same way.</p> <p>Access for the building works and then once completed is also unsuitable in Gordon House Road. The congestion in this road at the moment - even before any works is unworkable with huge traffic jams every day of the week. This is adjacent to a local school - Gospel Oak Primary - impacting the air our children are breathing. To add additional traffic pressure on this time turning will cause chaos for the local area.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | William Fernandez | 24/01/2022 23:29:27 | OBJ | <p>I am writing to record my objection to the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and I note that the proposed development would significantly block the current view of Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill whilst walking over the bridge. In addition to the visual objections, a demolition stage is envisaged with significant levels of dust, noise and vibrations, all of which cause unnecessary pollution for a project which delivers little by way of benefit to the community. Although not a protected area, demolition ought to be a last resort due to the large amount of construction waste, the majority of which cannot be recycled, which contributes to the growing waste issue in the UK - which is an aspect of climate change. The Camden Council ought to seek to limit construction works to those developments which make a clear effort to offset any emissions/waste produced as a result of the proposed development. I have not seen a clear plan to offset these. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed development.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2021/3225/P | Myra Farnworth | 26/01/2022 17:58:11 | OBJ | <p>I have two serious objections to the Murphy's Yard development. The first is its density and height + the fact its 825 units will provide little of the social or affordable housing Camden needs. The second is the potential danger of adding any further pedestrian and vehicle traffic to Gordon House Road's narrow pavements and road.</p> <p>Regards the DENSE AND MASSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 825 UNITS IN TALL TOWERS REACHING UP TO 19 STORIES, it is hard to see how these will all fit into the tiny triangle of land proposed. The only way is by building the residential towers so close against each other that dark shadows are cast from one to another. Also by abutting blocks close to and overlooking the railway. None of this is likely to make for comfortable living especially when the resulting windshear is factored in. To reach public transport or open space, many residents will have to exit the estate onto Gordon House Road and join the existing crowds of pedestrians and already congested traffic. Added to this is that parking for deliveries, taxis and trader vehicles is planned for some distance from the residential blocks? All this raises the important question of will people actually want to live in Murphy's Yard at all?</p> <p>This development will not provide much of the social or affordable housing Camden desperately needs. And its clear even now that most of these 2 bedroom units will be bought up as buy to let investments, many of which may not be that affordable or attractive to tenants. People don't want to live in tall blocks now that it is well documented they are unsafe and not conducive to happy, healthy living. This might lead to large numbers of units standing empty, and eventually Murphy's selling off the land to another investor. This is not an impossible scenario.</p> <p>Murphy's Yard was a great opportunity for selecting the very best of low-rise housing designs, of which there are wonderful Camden examples, even just round the corner in Cressfield Close and Woodyard Close. These are the grounds on which I object to the planned residential part of the development, and that the tall towers will seriously alter the protected view from Parliament Hill.</p> <p>Regards the POTENTIAL DANGER OF ADDING ANY FURTHER PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICLE TRAFFIC TO GORDON HOUSE ROAD'S NARROW PAVEMENTS AND ROAD, it has to be emphasised that:</p> <p>Gordon House Road is a very narrow road with narrow pavements, heavy traffic and heavy footfall. Neither road nor pavements can be widened; this is an impossibility because of the narrow railway arches through which these run. This road and pavements are wholly inadequate for the current heavy traffic and footfall: the road is a bottle neck, and only two pedestrians can walk abreast the 1.4 metre wide pavement under the arch. Pavement usage includes 100's of school children and families, going to and from Gospel Oak Primary, and Parliament Hill and La Sainte Union secondary schools, along with summer crowds and winter visitors to Hampstead Heath and passengers to and from Gospel Oak Station. This narrow pavement is already a perfect scenario for a crush disaster, and hence a massive Health and Safety risk right now, without the addition of additional Murphy's Yard footfall.</p> <p>Another serious safety risk relates to ambulances. For those living in Dartmouth Park or north Kentish Town, Gordon House Road is the only ambulance route that connects them in emergency with Royal Free Hospital. Also, the Camden Ambulance Station is in Cressy Road right by Royal Free, so ambulances going out to them generally have to negotiate Gordon House Road. This is serious, even at the present time.</p> <p>Murphy's traffic flow modelling of trip rates appears a significant underestimation. There is no question of this, if the units are ever occupied. Far more vehicle and pedestrian movements will be added to Gordon House</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|
| | | | | <p>Road than at present, especially since the 825 residential units are situated at the Gordon House Road end of the estate, and any vehicular access to the residences is planned through the Gordon House Road entrances/exits.</p> <p>Gordon House Road is already highly congested; in essence it is a bottleneck. Hence the impossibility of envisioning how additional vehicular traffic can safely be added.</p> <p>Murphy's Yard plan to add an additional ingress/ egress onto Gordon House Road between the railway bridges as well as retaining the existing one. Visibility splays and sight lines from Murphy's Yard onto Gordon House Road are questionable both for the new and from existing exits, and hence vehicles would have considerable difficulty turning out of the Yard. All this can only hold up traffic and congest Gordon House Road still further.</p> <p>The proposed new Gordon House Road pathway along the southern side may not prove useful. The plan is to widen the current southern pavement from 2.6m to 10m, and is a great idea in theory. BUT the Station, the Heath, Gospel Oak Primary and all the secondary schools are on the north side of Gordon House Road, so that is where the footfall is and needs to be. Also, whilst on the southern path pedestrians would have to cross the new Murphy's entrance/ exit [between the bridges], and then funnel their way from a 10m path through the dark dingy narrow railway arch. The reality is the southern path does not provide any real solution to the heavy footfall under the railway arches.</p> <p>Gordon House Road traffic congestion has been significantly exacerbated by Camden Council's new traffic scheme, preventing through traffic from Gordon House/ Mansfield Roads via Oak Village/ Grafton Road to Prince of Wales Road.</p> <p>Late in the day, Murphy's have understood that Gordon House Road poses a significant problem to local people. They have been at pains to find solutions. But the reality is there are no solutions. Gordon House Road is a traffic-logged road that is also a heavily-used pedestrian thoroughfare, and both road and pavements funnel through narrow, dark, old Victorian railway arches.</p> <p>At this stage, MIGHT MURPHY'S BE WELL ADVISED TO RADICALLY RETHINK THEIR PLANS, and create an environment in which people really want to live in low-rise buildings, rather than the current towers? MURPHY'S YARD AS PLANNED COULD DEFINITELY PROVE TO BE A WHITE ELEPHANT, which does not yield the financial returns required. And meanwhile Camden would be left with a decaying estate, on which people don't wish to live.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------|---|
| 2021/3225/P | William Fernandez | 24/01/2022 23:29:43 | OBJ | I am writing to record my objection to the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and I note that the proposed development would significantly block the current view of Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill whilst walking over the bridge. In addition to the visual objections, a demolition stage is envisaged with significant levels of dust, noise and vibrations, all of which cause unnecessary pollution for a project which delivers little by way of benefit to the community. Although not a protected area, demolition ought to be a last resort due to the large amount of construction waste, the majority of which cannot be recycled, which contributes to the growing waste issue in the UK - which is an aspect of climate change. The Camden Council ought to seek to limit construction works to those developments which make a clear effort to offset any emissions/waste produced as a result of the proposed development. I have not seen a clear plan to offset these. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed development. |
| 2021/3225/P | Daniel Solomons | 26/01/2022 17:25:27 | OBJ | This proposed redevelopment will result in the ruin of a top London attraction: the London Skyline from Parliament Hill. Many people visit the area to enjoy Hampstead Heath, with the view from Kite Hill/Parliament Hill a highlight for most. It is even one of London's Protected View, which may mean this redevelopment is illegal. This protected view if of huge value to both visitors and locals. And especially to local business who support and thrive alongside people who enjoy Hampstead Heath. The local area, which you say will benefit from this development, will clearly be adversely affected by the degrading and marring of this valuable attraction by buildings of this height. |
| 2021/3225/P | G. Alys | 25/01/2022 09:07:32 | PETITNOBJE | I live at Heathview Gordon House Road, London, England, NW5. The proposal for blocks of flats directly behind my block are too high. Please don't. |
| 2021/3225/P | G. Alys | 25/01/2022 09:07:35 | PETITNOBJE | I live at Heathview Gordon House Road, London, England, NW5. The proposal for blocks of flats directly behind my block are too high. Please don't. |
| 2021/3225/P | G. Alys | 25/01/2022 09:07:37 | PETITNOBJE | I live at Heathview Gordon House Road, London, England, NW5. The proposal for blocks of flats directly behind my block are too high. Please don't. |
| 2021/3225/P | H O'Brien | 24/01/2022 11:21:31 | INT | I object to this project for the reasons below: The planned development includes 825 homes in tower blocks up to 19 stories high in a very tiny space. The height and numbers seem overwhelming in such a constrained and small space. The view south from Parliament Hill (which is a Protected View) would be considerably altered for the worse. Gordon House road is unsuitable for additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic during the construction and after completion. This road is a major through route for ambulances to Royal Free Hospital, ambulances from Cressy Road Ambulance Station and fire engines from Highgate Road Fire Station. Both the road and pavements are extremely narrow under the two railway arches, and these cannot be widened because of the railway bridges. The pavements are used by Gospel Oak Station passengers, crowds of pedestrian visitors to Hampstead Heath and hundreds of school children and families going to Gospel Oak Primary School [500 pupils], CFBL [700 pupils] and Parliament Hill and La Sainte Union secondary schools [2,400 pupils between them]. The problem is significantly exacerbated by the recent new traffic arrangements introduced by Camden Council to eliminate through traffic from Mansfield Road via Oak Village/ Grafton Road to Prince of Wales Road. Even assuming new residents would not have their own cars, many more delivery and service vehicles will be using this already crowded area. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | William Fernandez | 24/01/2022 23:29:58 | OBJ | I am writing to record my objection to the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and I note that the proposed development would significantly block the current view of Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill whilst walking over the bridge. In addition to the visual objections, a demolition stage is envisaged with significant levels of dust, noise and vibrations, all of which cause unnecessary pollution for a project which delivers little by way of benefit to the community. Although not a protected area, demolition ought to be a last resort due to the large amount of construction waste, the majority of which cannot be recycled, which contributes to the growing waste issue in the UK - which is an aspect of climate change. The Camden Council ought to seek to limit construction works to those developments which make a clear effort to offset any emissions/waste produced as a result of the proposed development. I have not seen a clear plan to offset these. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed development. |
| 2021/3225/P | William Fernandez | 24/01/2022 23:30:22 | OBJ | I am writing to record my objection to the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and I note that the proposed development would significantly block the current view of Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill whilst walking over the bridge. In addition to the visual objections, a demolition stage is envisaged with significant levels of dust, noise and vibrations, all of which cause unnecessary pollution for a project which delivers little by way of benefit to the community. Although not a protected area, demolition ought to be a last resort due to the large amount of construction waste, the majority of which cannot be recycled, which contributes to the growing waste issue in the UK - which is an aspect of climate change. The Camden Council ought to seek to limit construction works to those developments which make a clear effort to offset any emissions/waste produced as a result of the proposed development. I have not seen a clear plan to offset these. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed development. |
| 2021/3225/P | Anne Gravier | 26/01/2022 21:55:23 | OBJ | I strongly object to this project for the reasons below: The planned development includes 825 homes in tower blocks up to 19 stories high in a very tiny space. They are unsuitable on multiple ecological and safety grounds. The view south from Parliament Hill (which is a Protected View) would be considerably altered in a negative way. Tall tower blocks generate all manner of social problems, and are not conducive to a healthy new community. Gordon House road is unsuitable for additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic during construction and after completion. It is very busy today and is a major through route for ambulances to Royal Free Hospital, ambulances from Cressy Road Ambulance Station and fire engines from Highgate Road Fire Station. Both the road and pavements are extremely narrow under the two railway arches; and these cannot be widened because of the railway bridges. The pavements are used by Gospel Oak Station passengers, crowds of pedestrian visitors to Hampstead Heath and hundreds of school children and families going to Gospel Oak Primary School [500 pupils], CFBL [700 pupils] and Parliament Hill and La Sainte Union secondary schools [2,400 pupils between them]. The problem is significantly exacerbated by the recent new traffic arrangements introduced by Camden Council to eliminate through traffic from Mansfield Road via Oak Village/ Grafton Road to Prince of Wales Road |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | William Fernandez | 24/01/2022 23:30:39 | OBJ | I am writing to record my objection to the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and I note that the proposed development would significantly block the current view of Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill whilst walking over the bridge. In addition to the visual objections, a demolition stage is envisaged with significant levels of dust, noise and vibrations, all of which cause unnecessary pollution for a project which delivers little by way of benefit to the community. Although not a protected area, demolition ought to be a last resort due to the large amount of construction waste, the majority of which cannot be recycled, which contributes to the growing waste issue in the UK - which is an aspect of climate change. The Camden Council ought to seek to limit construction works to those developments which make a clear effort to offset any emissions/waste produced as a result of the proposed development. I have not seen a clear plan to offset these. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed development. |
| 2021/3225/P | William Fernandez | 24/01/2022 23:30:55 | OBJ | I am writing to record my objection to the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and I note that the proposed development would significantly block the current view of Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill whilst walking over the bridge. In addition to the visual objections, a demolition stage is envisaged with significant levels of dust, noise and vibrations, all of which cause unnecessary pollution for a project which delivers little by way of benefit to the community. Although not a protected area, demolition ought to be a last resort due to the large amount of construction waste, the majority of which cannot be recycled, which contributes to the growing waste issue in the UK - which is an aspect of climate change. The Camden Council ought to seek to limit construction works to those developments which make a clear effort to offset any emissions/waste produced as a result of the proposed development. I have not seen a clear plan to offset these. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed development. |
| 2021/3225/P | William Fernandez | 24/01/2022 23:31:05 | OBJ | I am writing to record my objection to the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and I note that the proposed development would significantly block the current view of Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill whilst walking over the bridge. In addition to the visual objections, a demolition stage is envisaged with significant levels of dust, noise and vibrations, all of which cause unnecessary pollution for a project which delivers little by way of benefit to the community. Although not a protected area, demolition ought to be a last resort due to the large amount of construction waste, the majority of which cannot be recycled, which contributes to the growing waste issue in the UK - which is an aspect of climate change. The Camden Council ought to seek to limit construction works to those developments which make a clear effort to offset any emissions/waste produced as a result of the proposed development. I have not seen a clear plan to offset these. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed development. |
| 2021/3225/P | William Fernandez | 24/01/2022 23:31:19 | OBJ | I am writing to record my objection to the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and I note that the proposed development would significantly block the current view of Hampstead Heath/Parliament Hill whilst walking over the bridge. In addition to the visual objections, a demolition stage is envisaged with significant levels of dust, noise and vibrations, all of which cause unnecessary pollution for a project which delivers little by way of benefit to the community. Although not a protected area, demolition ought to be a last resort due to the large amount of construction waste, the majority of which cannot be recycled, which contributes to the growing waste issue in the UK - which is an aspect of climate change. The Camden Council ought to seek to limit construction works to those developments which make a clear effort to offset any emissions/waste produced as a result of the proposed development. I have not seen a clear plan to offset these. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed development. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | MAIER | 24/01/2022 10:17:54 | SUPPRT | This looks a great re development of the Kentish Town area. Go ahead with this plan! |
| 2021/3225/P | Jack Morrison | 24/01/2022 16:03:27 | OBJ | I wish to comment on two areas of concern regarding this planning application. 1. The additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic both during the construction phase and following completion. Gordon House road is already heavily congested. Both road and pavement are very narrow under bridges and cannot be widened. Pedestrian footfall is already very busy with pupils from local schools, visitors to the heath, commuters to and from station. The road is also a major through route for emergency vehicles to and from The Royal Free and Highgate Road Fire Station. This planned site access for this development on Gordon House Road is totally unsuitable and will cause major traffic gridlock and unsafe / overcrowded pedestrian walkways Following completion of the development this problems overcrowded pavements and increased traffic congestion will remain. 2. Density and Scale of Development - planned towers are too high in scale and density of homes creating following issues - Social problems associated with high rise developments - Road and pavement congestion on Gordon house Road. - Windshear effect between towers - Views effected from Parliament Hill. |
| 2021/3225/P | mr boudewijn Dierick | 24/01/2022 09:24:53 | COMMNT | as a local resident, I support the application to build more houses in an environmental way with direct footpath, cycle access to the heath from Kentish Town. I do not mind the loss of direct view on the heath from KT station. (to be honest I have never noticed this view in the 10 years I live in the area and never seen anybody stopping to enjoy it). only possible point of debate/criticism is the height of some of the buildings which is more than rest of the buildings in the area but otherwise a well prepared proposal. hopefully it can start soon without too much local disturbance. |
| 2021/3225/P | Rhiannon Rosenberg | 25/01/2022 13:31:04 | OBJ | I strongly object to the proposal to build Murphy's Yard on the grounds that a 19 story building will destroy the views not only on Hampstead Heath but throughout North London. North London is an incredibly historic place filled with natural beauty and this development will cast a shadow over it. I am a resident in Highgate and have the most incredible views from the top of my road of the city, your development will be a mark against this. I also am strongly against adding 750-825 homes in Kentish Town. The area itself is already overpopulated (as is much of London) and adding approximately 1000-1500 more people (based on multiple occupancy homes) into such a small area will put an enormous pressure on the surrounding infrastructure. I urge you to please consider a low-rise building, to preserve the natural beauty of the area, that has fewer homes and therefore lessens impact on the already stretched infrastructure. Please also consider lessening the commercial space in favor of more community space, we don't need additional offices that aren't in use, we need doctors surgeries, pharmacies, dentists, nurseries, playgrounds and suchlike. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2021/3225/P | Sumaya Partner | 25/01/2022 13:31:32 | OBJ | <p>I wish to express my grave concerns over the proposals for Murphy's Yard. I live on Mansfield Road, which is an extension of Gordon House Road, and we already suffer from terrible traffic fumes and queues of cars at regular intervals throughout the day. This has worsened since the end of access through Grafton Road and Saverlake Road and would be considerably aggravated if construction goes as set out in the plans. Months of building works will come as an additional imposition on our lives.</p> <p>I do not oppose having new homes built in Murphy's Yard, but I strongly object to the high density, high rise proposal put before us. There isn't the infrastructure for such a large increase in population, with the inevitable rise in the number of cars (electric and petrol) and foot traffic that will spill out onto the pavements and narrow confines of Gordon/Mansfield Road. As residents we already have to deal with a high volume of people who come to Gospel Oak (by train, car, bicycle, bus) to visit Hampstead Heath. The plans as they stand will mean we will have far more congestion to contend with.</p> <p>But perhaps above all, I am appalled at the prospect of the high-rise buildings proposed. If those are allowed to go ahead it will be an act of extreme vandalism: it will wreck the landscape locally and, more crucially, the outlook from Parliament Hill - a protected view.</p> <p>One of the reasons I chose to live in this area is that there is a sense of space and outlook. These contribute to a decent quality of life. High rise housing is not the answer here. Surely there is a way of utilising the site without destroying the fabric of the area. Low-rise, low-density housing will be better for everyone concerned. The new buildings that have gone up behind Murphy's Yard, off Kiln Place, are well proportioned, visually sympathetic and are a good example of how new housing can benefit the surrounding area. What is planned for Murphy's Yard would be to the detriment of the surrounding area and those of us who live here. Please re-consider the plans. A public consultation (well publicised) with local residents would be a great start.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Lisa Baglin | 25/01/2022 08:08:16 | COMMNT | <p>Objecting to 19 storey flats which will destroy view from Hampstead Heath as well as being unpleasant to live in. Why not do low rise flats ?</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Rod Allison | 25/01/2022 11:00:34 | COMMNT | <p>My main concern is that Gordon House Road is not fit at present for the massive additional traffic the development will generate in construction (but also when occupied). Added to existing traffic, horrendous traffic jams will build up. Some solution needs to be found to the problem of overload on this road.</p> <p>I also disagree with the high-rise buildings planned. Low-density housing is much better & more characteristic of the neighbourhood, and if properly planned can provide just as many homes.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2021/3225/P | Christine Guedalla | 26/01/2022 20:05:35 | COMMNT | <p>I raise two issues both concerning the loss of heritage views from public viewpoints. These are important to the life not only of the people of Kentish Town, where I have lived for many years, and which my family would miss were they to be lost, but also visitors from around the world who head for these views when they are in Central London, arriving on the 88 and 214 buses and overground trains. They bring business to the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The view southwards from Parliament Hill should continue to include a clear view of the dome of St. Paul's cathedral as well as of various of London's iconic landmarks such as the St. Stephen's Tower at Houses of Parliament, (this may also be the Elizabeth Tower). It has the clock at the top with the bell known as Big Ben, familiar round the world. It would be appalling to lose this. 2. The wide view of the south face of Parliament Hill from the railway bridge at the junction of Kentish Town Road and Leighton Road. <p>Some of the blocks in the development are far too high to fit in with the local area. The buildings could take up more ground space and still be pleasant for the occupants.</p> <p>The development in general I welcome but not if it detracts from our attractive environment.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Josephine | 25/01/2022 09:19:47 | COMMNT | <p>Dear CFBL families and Hampstead Heath friends,</p> <p>There is a new horrendous development which is planned to take place very soon in the area. In a nutshell: 825 homes in tower blocks up to 19 stories high on a very tiny space. Located between Kentish Town, Gospel Oak, and Tufnell Park areas. The planned development includes 825 homes in tower blocks up to 19 stories high in a very tiny space. They are also unsuitable on multiple ecological and safety grounds. The view south from Parliament Hill (which is a Protected View) would be considerably altered. Tall tower blocks generate all manner of social problems, and are not conducive to a healthy new community. Gordon House road is unsuitable for additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic during the construction and after completion, while this road is a major through route for ambulances to Royal Free Hospital, ambulances from Cressy Road Ambulance Station and fire engines from Highgate Road Fire Station. Both the road and pavements are extremely narrow under the two railway arches; and these cannot be widened because of the railway bridges. The pavements are used by Gospel Oak Station passengers, crowds of pedestrian visitors to Hampstead Heath and hundreds of school children and families going to Gospel Oak Primary School [500 pupils], CFBL [700 pupils] and Parliament Hill and La Sainte Union secondary schools [2,400 pupils between them]. The problem is significantly exacerbated by the recent new traffic arrangements introduced by Camden Council to eliminate through traffic from Mansfield Road via Oak Village/ Grafton Road to Prince of Wales Road.</p> |

Printed on: 27/01/2022 09:10:04

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | Rod Allison | 25/01/2022 11:00:41 | COMMMNT | <p>My main concern is that Gordon House Road is not fit at present for the massive additional traffic the development will generate in construction (but also when occupied). Added to existing traffic, horrendous traffic jams will build up. Some solution needs to be found to the problem of overload on this road.</p> <p>I also disagree with the high-rise buildings planned. Low-density housing is much better & more characteristic of the neighbourhood, and if properly planned can provide just as many homes.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Rod Allison | 25/01/2022 11:00:44 | COMMMNT | <p>My main concern is that Gordon House Road is not fit at present for the massive additional traffic the development will generate in construction (but also when occupied). Added to existing traffic, horrendous traffic jams will build up. Some solution needs to be found to the problem of overload on this road.</p> <p>I also disagree with the high-rise buildings planned. Low-density housing is much better & more characteristic of the neighbourhood, and if properly planned can provide just as many homes.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Christopher Legge | 25/01/2022 11:04:29 | OBJ | <p>The need for high rise blocks is not right. It would destroy any sense of community and well being. The site plan is too dense and unsuitable for the area - apart from of course being a eyesore from the surrounding areas including Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>The plan should also include provision and encouragement for local shops, churches and social amenities.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Christine Guedalla | 26/01/2022 20:05:42 | COMMMNT | <p>I raise two issues both concerning the loss of heritage views from public viewpoints. These are important to the life not only of the people of of Kentish Town, where I have lived for many years, and which my family would miss were they to be lost, but also visitors from around the world who head for these views when they are in Central London, arriving on the 88 and 214 buses and overground trains. They bring business to the area.</p> <p>1. The view southwards from Parliament Hill should continue to include a clear view of the dome of St. Paul's cathedral as well as of various of London's iconic landmarks such as the St. Stephen's Tower at Houses of Parliament, (this may also be the Elizabeth Tower). It has the clock at the top with the bell known as Big Ben, familiar round the world. It would be appalling to lose this.</p> <p>2. The wide view of the south face of Parliament Hill from the railway bridge at the junction of Kentish Town Road and Leighton Road.</p> <p>Some of the blocks in the development are far too high to fit in with the local area. The buildings could take up more ground space and still be pleasant for the occupants.</p> <p>The development in general I welcome but not if it detracts from our attractive environment.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | Christine Guedalla | 26/01/2022 20:05:49 | COMMNT | <p>I raise two issues both concerning the loss of heritage views from public viewpoints. These are important to the life not only of the people of Kentish Town, where I have lived for many years, and which my family would miss were they to be lost, but also visitors from around the world who head for these views when they are in Central London, arriving on the 88 and 214 buses and overground trains. They bring business to the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The view southwards from Parliament Hill should continue to include a clear view of the dome of St. Paul's cathedral as well as of various of London's iconic landmarks such as the St. Stephen's Tower at Houses of Parliament, (this may also be the Elizabeth Tower). It has the clock at the top with the bell known as Big Ben, familiar round the world. It would be appalling to lose this. 2. The wide view of the south face of Parliament Hill from the railway bridge at the junction of Kentish Town Road and Leighton Road. <p>Some of the blocks in the development are far too high to fit in with the local area. The buildings could take up more ground space and still be pleasant for the occupants.</p> <p>The development in general I welcome but not if it detracts from our attractive environment.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Christine Guedalla | 26/01/2022 20:06:12 | COMMNT | <p>I raise two issues both concerning the loss of heritage views from public viewpoints. These are important to the life not only of the people of Kentish Town, where I have lived for many years, and which my family would miss were they to be lost, but also visitors from around the world who head for these views when they are in Central London, arriving on the 88 and 214 buses and overground trains. They bring business to the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The view southwards from Parliament Hill should continue to include a clear view of the dome of St. Paul's cathedral as well as of various of London's iconic landmarks such as the St. Stephen's Tower at Houses of Parliament, (this may also be the Elizabeth Tower). It has the clock at the top with the bell known as Big Ben, familiar round the world. It would be appalling to lose this. 2. The wide view of the south face of Parliament Hill from the railway bridge at the junction of Kentish Town Road and Leighton Road. <p>Some of the blocks in the development are far too high to fit in with the local area. The buildings could take up more ground space and still be pleasant for the occupants.</p> <p>The development in general I welcome but not if it detracts from our attractive environment.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | G Arend | 26/01/2022 22:38:36 | COMMNT | <p>Dreadful - completely out of character for this area. Spoils the beautiful view from Parliament Hill. Will overcrowd Gospel Oak station. Very bad idea.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | Mr Richard Atkins | 26/01/2022 22:58:09 | OBJ | <p>This is a large scale proposed development, and therefore needs to be put under a lot of scrutiny. Obviously the buildings themselves are intended to be used for many decades to come, this is 2022 and therefore the standard of building design, materials and efficiency should be extremely high.</p> <p>One key area of concern to me is the energy required to heat and cool the proposed buildings. Kings Place was finished in 2008 (14 years ago) and featured excellent insulation, fresh air displacement ventilation, and significant cycle parking spaces. Similar features should be the minimum requirements for all buildings at this site also.</p> <p>The proposed cycle route linking Gordon House Road to Kentish Town Road, is itself excellent. It must, however be noted that both Gordon House Road and Mansfield road, especially with the narrow underpass of the 2 bridges are unpleasant and potentially dangerous roads to cycle on.</p> <p>This may sound drastic, however considering the bridge underpass being so narrow, really it would make sense to only allow one direction of traffic under the bridge to provide space for both normal vehicles and bicycles.</p> <p>I have often seen various cyclists using the pavement because the road is congested and dangerous to cycle on. I personally always use the road, but do understand why others are put off.</p> <p>If this new cycle path goes ahead without tackling the heavy traffic on Gordon House Road and Mansfield Road and the lack of space for cyclists, then the new cycle path will be under used.</p> <p>It must also be noted that the Hampstead Heath entrance by the lido is not permitted for cycles onto the Heath, and without establishing decent cycle paths on the roads, this new cycle way may encourage more people to flout the rules of the Heath in their new-found journeys.</p> <p>If someone wishes to walk to the newly developed site from Gospel Oak Station, they will find the journey short but unpleasant given the narrow pathways, which are already overly congested for current school runs and unsubstantial crossings as they are, so the existing crossings may need to be made wider, more accessible and moved further along the road.</p> <p>I propose the following checks/changes to the existing proposals;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All construction site traffic to flow inbound via Sanderson, outbound via Gordon House Rd. - Every building: substantial provision for secure sheltered bike storage - No private car ownership (except blue badge etc) - More 3/4 bed housing ratio than proposed - Actively engage a sustainability authority such as passivhaustrust.org.uk for recommendations to improve the design - Setup B518 & Highgate Rd intersection as box junction with camera - Make bridge underpass single-file with segregated 2-way cycle lane - Improve cycle path at junction of Mansfield Rd and Elain Grove - Introduce speed cameras on Mansfield and Gordon House Rd |

Printed on: 27/01/2022 09:10:04

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | H O'Brien | 24/01/2022 11:22:58 | INT | <p>I object to this project for the reasons below:</p> <p>The planned development includes 825 homes in tower blocks up to 19 stories high in a very tiny space. The height and numbers seem overwhelming in such a constrained and small space.</p> <p>The view south from Parliament Hill (which is a Protected View) would be considerably altered for the worse. Gordon House road is unsuitable for additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic during the construction and after completion. This road is a major through route for ambulances to Royal Free Hospital, ambulances from Cressy Road Ambulance Station and fire engines from Highgate Road Fire Station.</p> <p>Both the road and pavements are extremely narrow under the two railway arches, and these cannot be widened because of the railway bridges. The pavements are used by Gospel Oak Station passengers, crowds of pedestrian visitors to Hampstead Heath and hundreds of school children and families going to Gospel Oak Primary School [500 pupils], CFBL [700 pupils] and Parliament Hill and La Sainte Union secondary schools [2,400 pupils between them]. The problem is significantly exacerbated by the recent new traffic arrangements introduced by Camden Council to eliminate through traffic from Mansfield Road via Oak Village/ Grafton Road to Prince of Wales Road. Even assuming new residents would not have their own cars, many more delivery and service vehicles will be using this already crowded area.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Jack Morrison | 24/01/2022 16:02:12 | OBJ | <p>I wish to comment on two areas of concern regarding this planning application.</p> <p>1. The additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic both during the construction phase and following completion. Gordon House road is already heavily congested. Both road and pavement are very narrow under bridges and cannot be widened. Pedestrian footfall is already very busy with pupils from local schools, visitors to the heath, commuters to and from station.</p> <p>The road is also a major through route for emergency vehicles to and from The Royal Free and Highgate Road Fire Station.</p> <p>This planned site access for this development on Gordon House Road is totally unsuitable and will cause major traffic gridlock and unsafe / overcrowded pedestrian walkways</p> <p>Following completion of the development this problems overcrowded pavements and increased traffic congestion will remain.</p> <p>2. Density and Scale of Development - planned towers are too high in scale and density of homes creating following issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social problems associated with high rise developments - Road and pavement congestion on Gordon house Road. - Windshear effect between towers - Views effected from Parliament Hill. |

Printed on: 27/01/2022 09:10:04

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/3225/P | geoff | 26/01/2022 22:07:30 | OBJ | <p>Strongly opposed to the current proposal!</p> <p>The proposed development is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proposing high rises well beyond acceptable heights - limiting the current view lines which are not just cherished by all but consistently enforced by planners in any other planning application; - not in keeping with the character of the area, by any standards; - not an improvement to the wider neighbourhood - not meeting the set requirements of 35% affordable housing - not even planned as 'green buildings' which, frankly is unacceptable! If nothing else, this must be a condition of any consent. <p>If the above is taken into account and in particular the (height) scale is more than halved, and any development meets the highest environmental standards and ambitions, then the proposal could be suitable. Until then, no thanks to this 'Canary Wharf on the Heath'.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Duhem | 26/01/2022 22:27:20 | COMMIT | We should not damage nature and space. We need to preserve environment for the future generations |
| 2021/3225/P | Annie Sayer | 25/01/2022 11:39:13 | OBJ | <p>I am not against the principle of developing the Murphy's Yard site to provide housing. It is to be expected that flats will be in blocks that will rise several stories but the proposal for buildings of up to nineteen floors is totally inappropriate. This development is not that of a city centre where the new blocks will be seen alongside buildings of a comparable height. Here the buildings will be more than twice the height of those that surround them and will tower over and dominate the neighbourhood. They will block neighbourhood views in a highly obtrusive way and furthermore will greatly change that well known, historic and much loved one from Hampstead Heath, which, by any measure is a valuable community amenity and once changed, can never be restored. They will also destroy the almost unique view, given the urban context, of the wooded skyline of the Heath seen as you leave Kentish Town, replaced by one of architecturally wanting and overly tall buildings. A development on this scale needs more consideration of scale, height and impact on the existing community. In the proposal, much is made of the closeness of the site to cycle routes and public transport but, at peak times, trains and buses are often already full by the time they get to Kentish Town or Gospel Oak and the idea that another 1000 or so passengers could be carried by the system is unrealistic.</p> <p>We don't yet know the long term consequences of Covid and the effect on our living, working and travelling patterns, but while so many businesses are looking for smaller office spaces, many buildings around London remain at least partially empty and may in the future be repurposed for housing. Surely, at this point of uncertainty further thought should be given particularly to the proposed height of the tower blocks and the destruction of historic views to and from Hampstead Heath.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2021/3225/P | Samir Shah | 25/01/2022 07:53:34 | COMMENT | <p>I object to the height of the proposed towers. High rise towers are very much outbid character with the area.</p> <p>I appreciate there are one or two council high rise blocks built in the middle of the 20th century, but it is recognised these now need replacing with low rise.</p> <p>If this development had low rise instead, no more than 4-5 storeys, then I think it would gain wider acceptance in the community.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | Samir Shah | 25/01/2022 07:53:34 | COMMENT | <p>I object to the height of the proposed towers. High rise towers are very much outbid character with the area.</p> <p>I appreciate there are one or two council high rise blocks built in the middle of the 20th century, but it is recognised these now need replacing with low rise.</p> <p>If this development had low rise instead, no more than 4-5 storeys, then I think it would gain wider acceptance in the community.</p> |
| 2021/3225/P | mr boudewijn Dierick | 24/01/2022 09:24:23 | COMMENT | <p>as a local resident, I support the application to build more houses in an environmental way with direct footpath, cycle acces to the heath from kentish town. I do not mind the loss of direct view on the heath from KT station. (to be honest I have never noticed this view in the 10 years I live in the area and never seen anybody stopping to enjoy it).</p> <p>only possible point of debate/criticism is the height of some of the buildings which is more than rest of the buildings in the area but otherwise a well prepared proposal. hopefully it can start soon without too much local disturbance.</p> |