

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Zorika Adams	09/02/2022 18:40:10	OBJ	<p>The proposed heights of the residential tower blocks (19 storeys) and industrial buildings (8 storeys) are unacceptable as these will block sunlight to the surrounding area which will be especially acute during the winter months when the sun is low. This will cause a detrimental affect on the quality of life of those who live and currently enjoy the surrounding area.</p> <p>The development will have a significant and unacceptable impact on important views from Parliament Hill to the north. These can be mitigated if the height of the buildings are reduced and the accommodation redistributed throughout the site rather than in high density tower blocks.</p> <p>The design of the buildings have not followed good practice for environmental building design. They need to include natural cooling and ventilation which will contribute to the heat island effect and will increase the need for increased energy consumption during the summer months to cool properties.</p>
2021/3225/P	Lindsay Fleming	09/02/2022 21:57:13	OBJ	<p>almost 90% of the flats will be 1/2 bedroom. A lower height development with more homes for families would be better and no obstruct the views.</p>
2021/3225/P	Lisa Hughes	09/02/2022 21:03:02	OBJ	<p>I am writing with comments on the outline planning permission for the Murphy's Yard site in Gospel Oak/Kentish Town.</p> <p>While I welcome the redevelopment of the site, I have a number of concerns, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⌚ Some of the proposed buildings are far too tall and will ruin the view from Parliament Hill and of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town, which I believe is protected; ⌚ Some of the proposed buildings are far too tall and will cast shadow not only on the Parliament Hill lido, but, at different times of the day and year, on the surrounding area, including Lambie Street; ⌚ Some of the proposed buildings are far too bulky and completely out of character for the area, as well as being oppressive for residents of the surrounding district; ⌚ The proposed plans do not include sufficient affordable housing or family housing; ⌚ The highest environmental standards need to be achieved, but it is not clear that they will be. <p>In addition, I understand that the actual work to develop the site will take several years and I would like to see pedestrian and cycle access provided through the site and maintained throughout the construction period.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Hoxton Beach Ltd	09/02/2022 13:01:36	INT	<p>Our business, Hoxton Beach, has runs the café in Parliament Hill Fields Lido which is a few hundred metres from the proposed development since 2017. Since we took it over the café has stayed open all the year round and we believe it has become a valued local institution.</p> <p>We have four main objections to the current Murphy's Yard proposals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of sunlight both to the pool and the café. 2. The visual impact, both on the Heath as a whole but especially on the southern end where we are sited. 3. The way the scheme will increase footfall in the lower end of the Heath 4. A lack of transparency on the part of the developers which makes us question whether they should be entrusted with a project that will have such a big impact. <p>Taking these in turn:</p> <p>Shading. Late in January 2022 we did some simple calculations based on the heights of the buildings and the angle of the sun during winter months. It seemed likely that the Lido would be shaded, at least in winter mornings. We then found this confirmed in an annex to an appendix to the planning application. The shading diagrams show the sun in winter will be blocked until some time between 9am and 10am. These diagrams are based on the indicative scheme, not the full heights sought in the planning permission. So the shading problem could be even more severe.</p> <p>The Lido is an unheated swimming pool Grade 2 listed building, laid out in 1938 as a sun trap. It is increasingly popular as the health benefits of cold water swimming become widely appreciated. During the winter it is open from 7am to 1pm. Our café is glassed and south facing, again to maximise sunlight. Even non swimmers gather outside to enjoy the winter sun.</p> <p>The degradation of public space The proposed development transforms the southern fringe of the heath rather as a giant cruise ship does when it moors beside Venice. The passengers - or flat dwellers - enjoy a magnificent view at the same time that they spoil it for everyone else. This strikes us as an example of what has been called 'extractive capitalism', when a public good is turned over for private profit. In addition there has been the loss of views over London which has been commented on by Historic England and other bodies.</p> <p>Increase in footfall Murphy's Yard offers the chance to create new public space. But the hundreds of flat will find themselves in more of a concrete jungle - even the supposed green way is hard surfaced. The Heath is there for all Londoners but this area risks becoming a safety-valve for one new development. Overcrowding is already a problem for the Lido during summer months, and the Metropolitan police are frequently called and the pool closed.</p> <p>Issues of transparency and candour It is possible that the only way to fund much needed affordable housing is to offer penthouse views to those</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>who can afford to pay for them. But such a debate needs openness. The developers have offered flattering artists' impressions of views from inside Murphy's Yard. But information on the external impact has had to be gleaned from visual impact reports submitted with the planning application. As Historic England comments these did not follow best practice, using a 24mm rather than the preferred 50mm lens. As noted the shading impact on the Grade 2 listed Lido was buried in an annex to an appendix.</p> <p>As a local employer we want our colleagues to have access to affordable housing and Murphy's Yard offers a great opportunity. But this scheme appears tilted towards the narrow commercial interests of the site owners. We are sure Camden can get a much better deal for local people if it holds its nerve.</p>
2021/3225/P	Ian Lee	09/02/2022 13:10:39	INT	<p>As a Kentish Town resident for over half a century and a very interested (and also professionally experienced) party indeed one would hardly need 30,000 characters to explain an objection to these proposed tower blocks. I think Murphy would turn in his Yard if this development ever went ahead.</p>
2021/3225/P	Andrew Franklin	09/02/2022 19:10:59	OBJ	<p>I am :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * strongly in favour of more affordable housing in Camden. I want the 35% minimum guaranteed * strongly in favour of a better mix of family accommodation to one bed flats * very strongly OPPOSED to the current design plan which, in building will generate huge amounts of carbon * ruin protected and important views from Hampstead Heath * plunge the lido into darkness in the mornings <p>The site, redeveloped sensitively could be a huge gain for Camden. This plan, however promises permanent damage to the borough and London</p>
2021/3225/P	M Dos Anjos	09/02/2022 23:15:41	OBJ	<p>I object to this absurdly dense project that will destroy visually the area.</p>
2021/3225/P	Mauro Giacomazzo	09/02/2022 16:30:42	OBJ	<p>The current proposals have too much dense development in the space allowed. There are too many single bed dwellings when more family dwellings are required. There need to be more affordable homes. The 13-17 story and 19 storey buildings are too high, visually intrusive and inappropriate for this site. They will block all views of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town. These views must be preserved. Likewise, views of the city from Parliament Hill will be largely obscured. Please rethink the plan entirely and build a new one with the people that currently live/use this area.</p>
2021/3225/P	Juliet Rodgers	09/02/2022 11:38:22	OBJ	<p>I am a local resident in gospel oak and my view is that proposal should be rejected. It is far too dense for the area and the buildings, height would impinge on light and spoil the vista. The area is already congested.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this development</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Stefanie Gaisser	09/02/2022 15:15:07	OBJ	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed project in Murphys Yard. I am a resident of Savernake Road and I have several reasons to object to the proposal in its current layout.</p> <p>Firstly, the apartment blocks, especially the very tall ones will ruin the view from Parliament Hill over London. People have been coming here to enjoy this amazing view over so many historic sights of London for decades. This view needs to be protected at all costs.</p> <p>Secondly, the sight of such tall buildings in the Gospel Oak area will have a negative impact on the townscape and therefore on the value of life in our community.</p> <p>Thirdly, creating so many new homes will have a massive impact on the Heath and especially on Kenwood House, the Lido, the ponds, the playgrounds and the Farmer's market. These sites are (especially in the summer month) overcrowded as it is and an increase of visitors of this proportion will lead to massive problems within the community. Furthermore there will be problems with increased air pollution due to more cars and an already difficult parking situation will become desperate.</p> <p>Fourthly, Gordon House Road is a very important and much used road that connects Hampstead to Highgate and Kentish Town. It is used by ambulances to get to the Royal Free Hospital, by commuters and by many parents who take their children to Parliament Hill School, La Sainte Union and William Ellis School on one side and Gospel Oak School and Fleet School on the other to name but a few. I am a parent myself and drive my children to Golders Green every day. The volume of traffic on this road is already a nightmare causing severe delays and massive frustration. It is a narrow road and simply cannot take large vehicles coming in and out of Murphys Yard for an extended amount of time and we are talking years rather than months of building works here. It is also not an option to enlarge the road to accommodate the increased traffic during and after the building works have been completed due to the restrictions caused by the railway arches.</p> <p>Although we would welcome a project in Murphys Yard that accommodates the area and meets the needs of the current residents I sincerely hope that our area will not be burdened with this project in its current layout (especially with the creation of over 800 new homes) as this is not in the best interest of a peaceful coexistence within our community.</p>
2021/3225/P	Z Khan	09/02/2022 11:03:17	OBJ	<p>I understand the need for housing supply but this plan is detrimental to other homes in the area. It is too tall and will block natural light to a key area of the southern part of the heath. The traffic flow will be increased in an area that already feels like it is over capacity. The scheme should not be a high rise. I greatly oppose this.</p>
2021/3225/P	David Thompson	09/02/2022 11:52:24	COMMNT	<p>We object to this because of the height which is most unsuitable for the area and out of keeping and will obscure views. It should be a low rise development.</p> <p>David Thompson</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	David Pitt-Watson	09/02/2022 17:39:33	COMMENT	<p>I wish to oppose this planning application.</p> <p>I do recognise the benefits of opening up this site, particularly to provide housing. However the specific proposal is problematic.</p> <p>This is already recognised by the Expert Design Review Panel who note:</p> <p>"the bulk, height and massing of residential blocks is excessive and have a significant and unacceptable impact on important views from Parliament Hill to the north. The amount of accommodation should be reduced or redistributed, potentially through reduction of other uses on the site.</p> <p>Hampstead Heath and the view it affords are of benefit to all of London, especially to local people. It is plain that, from the foot of Parliament Hill that amenity will be lost, as will the views of the Heath itself from Kentish town.</p> <p>One might have thought that, with such overbuilding, many new affordable homes will be constructed. But I understand this is not to be the case.</p> <p>Surely the right solution is to develop the land, but in a manner sensitive to its surroundings. That may mean that the price the land is sold for will not be so high, but I am sure nevertheless the owner will make a handsome capital gain. But that gain should not be an excessive one achieved by externalising costs on the community as is currently proposed</p>
2021/3225/P	Charles Robertson	09/02/2022 19:39:26	WREP	<p>The impact of the tall towers on loved and valued views from Kentish Town and Parliament Hill will be appalling. Once lost this can never be got back.</p>
2021/3225/P	Jessica	09/02/2022 22:09:30	PETTINOBJE	<p>I disapprove of this development. This will completely disrupt a historic view of the city which attracts many tourists and is a central part of the area. Housing for families should be prioritised</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Ann Day	09/02/2022 11:57:50	OBJ	<p>This is a huge (19 stores??!) proposed development, totally out of character with the local area. It would cast an enormous shadow on Hampstead Heath in the morning and totally unbalance the view of London currently enjoyed by many from Parliament Hill.</p> <p>Unfortunately its 'green' credentials appear to be for appearances only- the 'green' corridor from Kentish Town Station to Hampstead Heath is a hard paved walkway with isolated bits of vegetation. The four adjoining SINC's will be damaged by building massing and overshadowing of the corridor itself. The addition of 2000 local residents -without additional green space -is bound to put intolerable pressure on Hampstead Heath. There is currently no agreed percentage for affordable housing.</p> <p>I can only imagine that the developers have applied for such huge buildings and numbers of flats etc in the belief that these would be reduced during the planning process still leaving them with a development that would be enormous, and enormously profitable.</p> <p>This is a greedy proposal that pays lip service only to local concerns and should be opposed - at present it is an opportunity lost.</p>
2021/3225/P	Ollie	09/02/2022 21:31:37	COMMENT	<p>To whom this may concern,</p> <p>I have lived in Kentish Town all my life! The access to the heath has been paramount to my [REDACTED] especially over these past 18 months. While your plan isn't damaging my access to the park, it does damage one of the most scenic views that KT has to offer. There's something wonderful about leaving the Underground station and looking out on the view, knowing that soon enough you'll be spending time amongst its trees and greenery. These building plans are not only ugly, not needed and harmful to the view. It feels forced and claustrophobic. A terrible idea, that needs axing ASAP.</p>
2021/3225/P	Ollie	09/02/2022 21:31:40	COMMENT	<p>To whom this may concern,</p> <p>I have lived in Kentish Town all my life! The access to the heath has been paramount to my [REDACTED] especially over these past 18 months. While your plan isn't damaging my access to the park, it does damage one of the most scenic views that KT has to offer. There's something wonderful about leaving the Underground station and looking out on the view, knowing that soon enough you'll be spending time amongst its trees and greenery. These building plans are not only ugly, not needed and harmful to the view. It feels forced and claustrophobic. A terrible idea, that needs axing ASAP.</p>
2021/3225/P	Ollie	09/02/2022 21:31:43	COMMENT	<p>To whom this may concern,</p> <p>I have lived in Kentish Town all my life! The access to the heath has been paramount to my [REDACTED] especially over these past 18 months. While your plan isn't damaging my access to the park, it does damage one of the most scenic views that KT has to offer. There's something wonderful about leaving the Underground station and looking out on the view, knowing that soon enough you'll be spending time amongst its trees and greenery. These building plans are not only ugly, not needed and harmful to the view. It feels forced and claustrophobic. A terrible idea, that needs axing ASAP.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Sasha Maisel	09/02/2022 09:30:51	OBJ	I am writing to object against the above planning, on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The mix of housing does not reflect the need for more family units - The mix of housing does not reflect the need for more affordable housing - The high rise nature of the buildings will obscure views and light to the Heath and other surrounding areas - There are not enough services (particularly for young people) to support this increase in housing
2021/3225/P	craig rebuck	09/02/2022 11:08:28	OBJ	Whilst I approve in principle of some development of this area, I strongly object to the size of the buildings and the increased volume that will impact on this tight socially and environmentally sensitive area. I believe that asking for large volumes is a way of negotiating for more before having to curtail plans. Plans should reflect a more sensitive and realistic usage, almost 5 x the amount of developed space is unrealistic. More open space for wellbeing and less development please
2021/3225/P	Cherry Cookson	09/02/2022 21:38:00	COMMNT	As a local Resident, I am appalled by the plans outlined in this new development. The open vista from Kentish Town Road across towards the Heath and Hampstead in the distance is one of the most valued things for both people who live here and visitors to the area who often comment on how lovely the view is across the railway tracks towards the Heath. It is a wonderfully open view as witnessed recently with some spectacular sunsets. The buildings proposed are far too high. There seems to be no allowance for parking, ideas on where the additional families will be schooled or how they will be cared for regarding health services in the area which are already over-stretched. This seems an entirely profit-making scheme and will result in yet more 'non-affordable' housing and these buildings will be empty as with so many other similar schemes in London. These buildings will completely destroy the whole feel of Kentish Town with its open skies. I strongly object to these plans.
2021/3225/P	Stephanie	09/02/2022 17:49:43	PETITNOBJ E	Apart from ruining the view of the Heath from the busiest hub of Kentish Town, this proposed development is architecturally un-challenged and socially inappropriate. The area outside the tube and train station of Kentish Town is already highly congested with pedestrians and traffic. It is often very difficult to navigate, and increased population on this particular spot could be disastrous. It's also a missed opportunity to provide a community friendly development, something greener and carbon-neutral. Something that could delight the eye and provide a restful oasis, with low-rise housing, trees and meeting places. And even a delightful walk through to Hampstead Heath? It doesn't have to cost more - but it needs architects with imagination and vision.