



**Subject:**

Planning Application - 2020/5774/P Murphy's Yard Kentish Town NW5



MURPHY'S YARD

Application number: 2021/3225/P

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am astonished and appalled at this proposal to put this excessively tall and overpopulated development in the area, dramatically changing the skyline and views of a whole community, overshadowing existing buildings, failing to deal with the Council's own desire to improve the stock of affordable housing, and placing intolerable burdens on services such as health provision.

This application will endorse maximum building heights of up to 19 storeys. Not only would historic views over London, immortalised in paintings, be affected, such structures, and the number of residents in them, will place an intolerable burden on public services such as transport and NHS surgeries.

The planning application is of such size that it is hard for an individual to appreciate the scope and details. This should not be allowed to dampen public opposition or to allow the conclusions that local people are unconcerned or will not be affected. It is simply too large an application to review in its entirety. Developers must not be allowed to override local views simply using a phalanx of consultants. It is the Council's role to prevent both the area and its residents from the major and lasting consequences of such a development.

The fact that this is an initial application with details of sizes and design of buildings to come later means the Council is expected to endorse a development that it cannot hope to understand, setting up future conflicts.

The proposal for such a large amount of small (one and two bedroom) flats is way more than the council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) suggests. The fact that just 14 of the 825 homes are planned as family housing is further evidence of the unviability of the development.

The suggestion that no resident will be allowed to own a car is unrealistic and will not be enforceable, leading to further transport problems. How will the developers be able to police this? My experience of developments in Cambridge and Islington shows that restrictions on car use in high buildings are ignored or circumvented.

There is research referred to by the Council's own Renewal Commission that gives additional reasons to refuse this application. Research based on the British Household Panel Survey and the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey showed that the mental health and wellbeing of home purchasers significantly worsened when housing became unaffordable. The higher levels of stress and anxiety led to poor mental health which, if repeated in this development, would place further unfunded burdens on local services, in addition to education provision, to public transport, and to the environment. In summary, this development should not be allowed to go ahead as proposed, and the Council must refuse the application.

Yours

*Paul Mylrea*

