

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	AJ	27/01/2022 15:42:00	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed development.¿¿</p> <p>The proposed buildings are¿so huge and prominent from a number of locations they will be an eye-sore. They are totally out of character with the surrounding areas and will change the views from Hampstead Heath for ever.</p> <p>In this area, low rise development would be suitable.¿¿</p>
2021/3225/P	Kevin Fellingham	27/01/2022 13:48:31	OBJ	<p>The scheme consists of point blocks and short slab blocks, the second least efficient manner of achieving high residential densities, as proven by the mathematician and architect Lionel March at Cambridge University.</p> <p>The design and access statement demonstrates no exploration of alternative urban design strategies, just a shifting around of bulk and briefs in a piecemeal response to community and council inputs- there is no demonstration of the fundamentals of urban form. The buildings do not contribute in any meaningful way to the formation of coherent public space at ground level- the spaces shown as Key Public Open Spaces are leftovers formed in the interstices between building forms driven by the minimisation of internal circulation space and the maximisation of bulk.</p> <p>At a detailed level, these interzones are decorated with agitated bits of planting and paving, clearly designed to discourage any use other than moving on around the next hidden corner, and to keep pedestrians away from the ground level windows of the flats, which have no sense of defensible space between them and passers-by.</p> <p>The towers are tall enough to be obtrusive, and are extremely thick of girth, the worst of all possible compromises.</p> <p>The towers will form the foreground of the view from Parliament Hill. The view shown is taken from the top of the slope, where their intrusion into the skyline is the least marked, but this will not be the case from the popular picnicking site of Parliament Hill Fields where they will largely constitute the view.</p> <p>The annoying jaunty graphics are designed to mislead, placing words for good things which are not evident in the design.</p> <p>In short, it would appear that the many consultants have been brought on board to camouflage a scheme essentially designed by the owner/contractor.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Ruth Evans	27/01/2022 17:01:27	OBJ	I object to the height and scale of the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and the view of Hampstead Heath provides much needed respite in a densely built environment and this view would be substantially lost. Moreover, the addition of significant additional residents and cars to an already congested area will make it even more difficult for residents to travel. Kentish Town Road is a nightmare to navigate by car with sclerotic traffic - and cycling through the High Street which many of us do regularly - is highly dangerous as it does not have any cycle lanes, unlike other parts of Camden. The High Street is unsafe for cyclists and this fact has been represented in copious submissions to the Council. The addition of tower blocks will lead to further overpopulation and the increase in residential cars will only increase the danger and dysfunctionality of our High Street.
2021/3225/P	Ruth Evans	27/01/2022 17:01:31	OBJ	I object to the height and scale of the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and the view of Hampstead Heath provides much needed respite in a densely built environment and this view would be substantially lost. Moreover, the addition of significant additional residents and cars to an already congested area will make it even more difficult for residents to travel. Kentish Town Road is a nightmare to navigate by car with sclerotic traffic - and cycling through the High Street which many of us do regularly - is highly dangerous as it does not have any cycle lanes, unlike other parts of Camden. The High Street is unsafe for cyclists and this fact has been represented in copious submissions to the Council. The addition of tower blocks will lead to further overpopulation and the increase in residential cars will only increase the danger and dysfunctionality of our High Street.
2021/3225/P	Ruth Evans	27/01/2022 17:01:36	OBJ	I object to the height and scale of the proposed development. I live in Kentish Town and the view of Hampstead Heath provides much needed respite in a densely built environment and this view would be substantially lost. Moreover, the addition of significant additional residents and cars to an already congested area will make it even more difficult for residents to travel. Kentish Town Road is a nightmare to navigate by car with sclerotic traffic - and cycling through the High Street which many of us do regularly - is highly dangerous as it does not have any cycle lanes, unlike other parts of Camden. The High Street is unsafe for cyclists and this fact has been represented in copious submissions to the Council. The addition of tower blocks will lead to further overpopulation and the increase in residential cars will only increase the danger and dysfunctionality of our High Street.
2021/3225/P	Ben R	27/01/2022 19:47:30	COMMNT	<p>I'm a local resident (Caversham Road) and love the Heath, But prefer to enjoy it by going there which a direct and green walkway would be infinitely better than the current busy main road route.</p> <p>The 'view' being saved is actually quite difficult to see without standing on steps / tiptoes. I'm often near the canopy and most of those who have stopped are sat down enjoying a drink, so hardly taking in the view at all; not to mention having to look through a bus window or around a car to see it.</p> <p>I think (hope) the development will bring to the area a new lease of life, connectivity to the Heath, more residents and more space for businesses for us to enjoy and the existing businesses and residents to benefit from.</p> <p>Good luck!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Vanessa	27/01/2022 23:27:04	OBJ	<p>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>
2021/3225/P	Simon Levy	27/01/2022 12:30:48	COMMENT	<p>I was dismayed to discover that the view of Hampstead Heath from Kentish Town Road is under threat. Although I understand that there is great demand for housing at the moment, I feel incredibly strongly that losing Kentish Town's view would be a deep loss for the area.</p> <p>On a personal note - during the last two years, as we've dealt with covid, through various lockdowns and periods of working from home, going for a stretch of the legs and seeing the sun setting over this view - which can be one of the most stunning in London - was often a highlight of my day. On a number of occasions, when my eyes were strained from staring at a laptop screen for hours, this view quite literally relieved the pain of a tension headache. And pre and post covid, I think of people thronging out of the tube station to go to the pub, for a meal out, or to a gig at the Forum, the view catching the eye of every person who passes. How could it not?</p> <p>There's a reason the 'Welcome to Kentish Town' graffiti is where it is. It's because this view is Kentish Town. I'm sure many local residents, sympathetic as we are to the demand for housing, would agree with me when I say that the idea of living in Kentish Town without it is heartbreaking. We'd be losing a communal sense of space, scale, and connection to the natural world. Taking that away from Kentish Town - from those who live here, and those who visit - would be a terrible shame.</p>
2021/3225/P	Christelle Chamouton	27/01/2022 10:15:58	OBJ	<p>I am strongly against this planning permission as it is ill conceived for the area and far too big. Mansfield road and Gordon House road are already overcrowded roads, with constant traffic jams. The roads are narrow and cannot be widened due to the train line. The pollution in the area is above what is acceptable and, with so many schools around, puts children and adults at risks. My son is constantly coughing. Parking is scarce. Schools are overcrowded. The planning proposal is out of scale for the area and will only bring more congestions, more people with children with no schools to go to, more pollution, with no added benefits for the inhabitants or the local area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	E Sheridan	27/01/2022 21:44:53	OBJ	<p>The scheme has a number of very positive points as far as overall design is concerned and in general I am supportive of it. I like the idea of the route through for non-motorised traffic and the elevated cycle way. I like the statement that all dwellings will have their own outside space - balcony or terrace - as well as shared roof gardens and winter gardens. The plans for planting (e.g. wild service trees as street trees, heath style species, rain gardens for flood control) all look great. The mixes of uses looks like it should work well and I was pleased to see the mention of community use and the statement that ground floors need to be animated. I like the open end at the Gospel Oak entrance. I also like the repurposing of the existing buildings.</p> <p>My concerns + objections + ideas for improvement below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The buildings are too high and will break up the wide view of the horizon coming out of Kentish Town station. I note that the way this is specified in the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan allows for interpretation as a corridor of buildings with view lines but I feel the spirit of this is to maintain the feel of the wide open horizon and the current design goes against this. 2. View from Parliament Hill. This view is loved by residents and visitors alike - the currently proposed buildings present a big blocky structure in the foreground and interfere with the view of St Pauls - they need to be smaller if this iconic London view is to be kept as it is. 3. Landscaping on the site. There is too much hard surfacing and I feel it would be better if this was minimised. The plan mentions that trees must be able to survive in a sealed surface but also that this will be porous. The whole thing needs to be porous and it would be better to have planted areas under most trees to allow leaf mould to break down and improve soil / capture carbon in situ. Also need more informal seating areas for groups to meet, with tables. 4. The commercial buildings on the side by the railway are too big and too close together making a dense clump which detracts from the existing buildings and outside spaces. 5. Sustainability. Given this is Murphy's global HQ it would be better to aim high e.g. carbon negative over all rather than just complying with current regulations. It would be good if the design could be future proofed against extreme weather as well as including advanced ventilation systems in view of current and future pandemics. More planting e.g. on the sides of buildings like Bosco Verticale in Milan and food production on site would be good to include. Planting forest trees for foraging e.g. Walnut, Pear and Chestnut and smaller edible hedge species would be good. 6. Community use - this is mentioned but I would like to see some specifics at this point so they don't disappear down the line e.g. sports facilities, a climbing wall, community halls, repair café, community workshops and art / craft facilities, facilities for older people and those with disabilities to meet and do activities, spaces for evening and exercise classes etc 7. Affordable housing. It is not clear if there is going to be any genuinely affordable housing for those in low income lines of work to be able to afford to live here and raise a family. e.g. it mentions "social affordable rented" - but does not make it clear what exactly this refers to. I don't feel the residential development of the site is worth doing at all unless it delivers a large number of genuinely affordable homes i.e. not just "affordable" at 80% of currently exaggerated market rates. I feel that social and/or genuinely affordable homes should make up a high proportion of the build - nearer 50% of the total. 8. The neighbourhood plan mentions provision of homes for older people. I couldn't see any sign of this in the current application. 9. Number of housing units - this could be reduced overall to enable the blocks to be made lower. A possibility instead of having several medium - high-rise buildings as proposed could be to make them much lower but with a single iconic higher building. 10. Building materials. These seem fairly standard - brick, concrete etc with high embodied energy. I would

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

like to see use made of novel material with better ecological credentials.

11. Transport. The application says that traffic in the surrounding streets will be no more than Murphy's was fully operational at the site. Traffic was really bad in those days and I would hate to see a return to this. This is especially as I imagine it would be mostly heavy service vehicles given the residents won't have cars. This would make surrounding roads noisy, unpleasant and dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians. I also don't feel that the impact on local rail and buses has been properly assessed. It might help if the Kentish Town Rail station was upgraded as part of this including lifts and importantly more of the Thameslink trains stopping at the station that currently. Running more Overground trains might also be necessary.

12. There is some mention of cleaning and security. In my opinion the through routes need to be adopted by the council. Otherwise there is a risk that it will end up like Kings Cross -attractive design, lovely planting and materials but sterile, corporate and full of wandering security guards and canned music which make you feel unwelcome and disinclined to stay for long. It would be a real shame to have a beautiful new development where local residents felt unwanted and excluded.

Overall I feel too much is being crammed into a fairly small site which will detract from the quality of site itself and put pressure on local transport and other infrastructure. I think the plans need to be scaled back and re-submitted to make the new development properly integrated in the local area, with a focus on more non-commercial uses of parts of the site to benefit people who already live in the area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Richard Keep	27/01/2022 17:43:52	OBJ	<p>It is hard to digest the amount of information provided in this set of documents however I have 5 principle points:</p> <p>Point 1 _ Scale</p> <p>The proposal seems to have been designed at the wrong scale, which appears to be determined by the large plot sizes set out at inception. The buildings look dense and reasonably proportioned when set against each other in the plans, but even dwarf the large industrial buildings being retained on the site. The blocks more resemble the scale of the Crick Institute and Kings Cross Landscaper rather than the more human scale buildings which typify the area.</p> <p>A more human scale of development would better assist in forming the communities the preamble speaks of but this is sadly lacking. The scale of these buildings will greatly affect the public spaces they enclose which are vast, open and lack subtlety and joy which could be provided by a mixture of scales of space and routes. Spaces feels soulless and while images of lots of planting can be seductive, the feeling of a public space is determined by the building enclosing them rather than planting levels.</p> <p>While I understand and support the need to create a dense development in such a key and desirable site it is not the right location for another Kings Cross .</p> <p>Point 2</p> <p>Is there any reason the areas are zoned between employment and residential ? This results in specific areas busier during the day but not at weekend and residential areas quieter during the day. Mix of both brings more vibrancy and life both during the week and at the weekend</p> <p>Point 3</p> <p>No consideration for wider links to adjacent communities and development sites. This site should be thought about in tandem with Regis Road and the connectivity joined up thinking would bring. There is a huge desire for a better pedestrian link from Kentish Town to Queens Crescent, to join up more isolated communities. The railways currently carve up these communities and these development opportunities should be helping to bridge these gaps not turn their backs on them as this proposal is doing. This seems to be a real missed opportunity to rethink this whole area on a larger scale. Has any consideration by the Council given to enclosing the railway cutting to increase connectivity.</p> <p>Point 4</p> <p>Location of the run of towers against the railway will also cast very large shadows over most of this green route to the Heath.</p> <p>Point 5_ Car Access</p> <p>While all new developments should be designed to heavily promote car-free travel it strikes me that this may also be a missed opportunity to resolve some of the existing congestion issues in the immediate area. The location of these large private sites directly below the heath funnels all east-west traffic flow along Mansfield Road. The lack of a clear route then pushes the heavy traffic along the very narrow Chetwynd Road and the small residential roads in Dartmouth Park. Ruling out any car access to the Murphys site will make matters worse as there will be 750 new homes and large business footprint businesses putting additional pressure on</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>this already unsatisfactory infrastructure. Creating a new east-west vehicular link below Mansfield Road may go a long way to remediating this issue if carefully considered and thought about critically in tandem with Regis Road.</p> <p>Point 6_ Housing types The provision of affordable dwelling is incredibly low. Part of beauty of Kentish Town is the vast mix of communities and the emphasis here is for the higher return 1 and 2 bedroom apartments rather than housing for families which also help to build more permanent communities.</p>
2021/3225/P	Sarah Allen	27/01/2022 13:12:31	OBJ	<p>I am mostly very concerned ref additional traffic and congestion along Gordonhouse/Mansfield Rd during the long construction period and would urge you to use alternative access to the site, as the road is already almost impossibly congested, both with traffic and pedestrians (especially at school start and finish times). The road is a main thoroughfare route for ambulance and emergency vehicles to the Royal Free Hospital, and any further congestion could prove calamitous. Please find an alternative access!</p> <p>I think there is way too much high rise in the proposed plans. I hope the density of new homes will be supported by new services - schools /Drs etc otherwise the many new residents may find themselves unable to access essential services. Also it would be a shame to ruin the view from Parliament Hill.</p> <p>Having said all that, I would welcome a gentle and well considered new neighbourhood, and a pedestrian route up from Kentish Town to Gospel Oak, so if the development would be carefully considered as above, then I think there would be positives for the area.</p>
2021/3225/P	Neville Purssell	27/01/2022 18:44:51	OBJ	<p>We write to object strongly to the proposed development in this application. The plans outlined show high rise tower blocks which are grossly out of scale with the existing neighbourhood. It will dominate the historic landscape of Kentish Town and Gospel Oak and will destroy the views from Parliament Hill and Kentish Town Station. The Kentish Town Planning Framework public engagement feedback summary (March 2019) published on your website makes it clear that 'there was clear preference for mid-rise developments , with strong opposition to buildings over 6 storeys' (see p.16). It goes on to say that 'there were numerous responses in support of preserving the view to Hampstead Heath and Parliament Hill, and ensuring new development considers neighbouring existing buildings.' The proposals here completely ignore these points. The current cast iron Victorian canopy by Kentish Town Station clearly points towards the Heath. The view from there is so important for the health and wellbeing of Kentish Towners as they exit the tube or the High Street. It should be protected. The proposed development will enclose us with high rise buildings and break the visual and historic link of this area with the Heath. This would be detrimental to our mental health and wellbeing and will overwhelm and degrade the neighbouring conservation areas of Victorian housing and street character.</p> <p>The redevelopment proposals will bring significant traffic, both during the construction phase and after with significant increased population. The current road infrastructure will be overwhelmed. These are already busy narrow and polluted roads.</p> <p>We are not against development of the site in principle, but we are strongly objecting to the current proposals in this application which will, if permitted, destroy the character of Kentish Town and is totally out of proportion.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Baukjen	27/01/2022 10:35:25	OBJ	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I have concerns regarding the planning permission for this project. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impacting and limiting the current view lines, proposing high rises well beyond acceptable heights - the project does not reflect the character of the area, by any standards; - not an improvement to the wider neighbourhood - not meeting the set requirements of 35% affordable housing - 'green buildings' not planned which is unacceptable in this day and age. 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, than the proposal could be suitable.</p>
2021/3225/P	J.Voit	27/01/2022 12:10:27	COMMNT	<p>The developers and owners of the land want to make maximum amount of money from the site, without any care for interest of current or future population.</p> <p>Murphy yard produce so much noise and pollution and now wants to bring even more pollution and misery to the area.</p> <p>What is needed is more green and recreation space for residents with affordable housing attached.</p> <p>Kentish Town rd is congested most of the times. Gordon house rd is also jammed on regular bases and ambulances have difficulty to reach hospital.</p> <p>Claim that no car ownership will be allowed on development site is just a laughable.</p> <p>How this will be policed/ checked???</p> <p>People will have cars , some will be entitled to use vehicles. Massive increase in car use will follow. Businesses will need transportation.</p> <p>This will make Kentish Town rd and Gordon house rd a nightmare!</p> <p>And how about impact on local schools, doctors surgery's etc. They are already overprescribed, how those thousands new residents will be accommodated?</p> <p>The proposed development is just sheer GREED etc to make as much cash as possible. It's a hellish vision of the future. Let's hope that Camden stops such irresponsible development.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	J.Voit	27/01/2022 12:10:29	COMMNT	<p>The developers and owners of the land want to make maximum amount of money from the site, without any care for interest of current or future population.</p> <p>Murphy yard produce so much noise and pollution and now wants to bring even more pollution and misery to the area.</p> <p>What is needed is more green and recreation space for residents with affordable housing attached.</p> <p>Kentish Town rd is congested most of the times. Gordon house rd is also jammed on regular bases and ambulances have difficulty to reach hospital.</p> <p>Claim that no car ownership will be allowed on development site is just a laughable.</p> <p>How this will be policed/ checked???</p> <p>People will have cars , some will be entitled to use vehicles. Massive increase in car use will follow. Businesses will need transportation.</p> <p>This will make Kentish Town rd and Gordon house rd a nightmare!</p> <p>And how about impact on local schools, doctors surgery's etc. They are already overprescribed, how those thousands new residents will be accommodated?</p> <p>The proposed development is just sheer GREED etc to make as much cash as possible. It's a hellish vision of the future. Let's hope that Camden stops such irresponsible development.</p>
2021/3225/P	Gillian Edwards	27/01/2022 10:41:16	OBJ	<p>The impacts of squeezing too much development into a limited space is damaging to the character of the area will ruin treasured and protected views and result in a development with a poor quality of life.</p> <p>The resulting towers will lead to too many small flats and not enough housing for families, which the Council's own housing need study concludes are needed.</p>