

Rafi Miah

From: John Newgas [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 February 2022 11:55
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Planning Application 2021/3225/P = Murphy's Yard Proposed Redevelopment

[REDACTED]

I would like to add my voice to the many objections you will be receiving about the scale of the proposed redevelopment of the Murphy's Yard Site off Gordon House Road.

Firstly, I do not oppose development at this site in General. The site is suitable for redevelopment now that the current owners no longer feel it meets their business needs. Again clearly any developments must be economically viable for them and their partners.

Notwithstanding this, the scale of the redevelopment is grossly excessive, as is the approach taken altogether.

Initially my thoughts were about the height of the proposed residential blocks as this would impact the views from the Parliament Hill and the Heath generally as well as having notable shadowing effects.

On deeper consideration, I do not feel that this development can be made acceptable by reducing the number of floors and height, but a substantial reconsideration of the design brief is needed.

I do not think such high rise building is at all desirable. There is some logic for high density inner city centers needing such a style - the Barbican being such a location. However in the surrounding areas, such buildings blight the area for the future and do not provide a desirable mode of living. We have seen the potential safety risk in other high rise buildings which were not originally foreseen.

The nature of such buildings is to require substantial energy input for lighting, lifts etc. The developers should be encouraged to reconsider their strategy and look at low rise residential buildings, as Camden has already done further along the same road.

The population densities envisaged will have an enormous detrimental local impact, and not provide an adequate lifestyle fit for the 21st century. The ecological proposals and suggestions made in the plans are nominal only and are intended to be sop rather than a serious attempt to provide any kind of provision.

Does Camden or anyone really want to see this scale and size of development - particularly where it will be so visually intrusive and cause an inevitable over use of the part of the open Parliament Hill/Heath nearby?

Finally, I would suggest that Camden mandates that any significant size development of three or more floors must include adequate Fire Sprinklers or Automatic Water Misting to each dwelling within as well as to common parts.

John Newgas.