

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Adrian Crimmin	14/02/2022 19:38:36	OBJ	how can our council allow such an ugly intrusive scheme to go ahead when it is going to debase light and views from so many aspects just to allow a developer to maximise profits when what should be built is low rise social housing or low rise mixed housing with a good social housing element. Please reconsider this scheme as it will totally disrupt so many loved parts of our community.
2021/3225/P	T. Watson	15/02/2022 08:57:25	COMMNT	I OBJECT to this application in its present form. The proposed development is far too dense and the heights of the buildings are entirely inappropriate so close to the Heath. Also, the local infrastructure - schools, roads, doctors surgeries - cannot absorb the intake of 2000+ new residents in what is already a densely populated area. Please REJECT this application.
2021/3225/P	Chris Hopson	12/02/2022 06:41:21	OBJ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This proposal squeezes too much development into a limited space, which is damaging to the character of the area and will not provide a high quality of life for new residents. 2. High-rise tower blocks are banned in the London Plan outside specific areas, so should not be part of any new development in areas such as Kentish Town and Gospel Oak. 3. The proposed high-rise tower block obscures the protected view of Parliament Hill from outside Kentish Town station. 4. The proposal does not provide enough housing for families.
2021/3225/P	David Levy	12/02/2022 12:20:35	OBJ	<p>This proposed development is a dreadful idea. It will destroy the lovely views from much of the Heath - these are protected views and it is illegal for Camden Council to ignore the laws relating to protected views.</p> <p>One of the flimsy excuses that developers use nowadays is that they will provide affordable housing. In reality, what has been happening is that after developers get permission to build, they subsequently announce that the project is not financially viable if they have to keep to their commitment of affordable housing. This has happened recently with the proposed development at Swiss Cottage. When this happens the council has no way to compel the developers to keep to their promises.</p> <p>There is huge local opposition to this proposed scheme, for example the recent correspondence in the Camden New Journal.</p>
2021/3225/P	mark osborne	12/02/2022 13:04:38	COMMNT	This new development is visually inappropriate for the area. Please reconsider adjusting the size and design of the architecture.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Jessica & Matthew Justice	11/02/2022 15:28:03	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to the outline planning permission. We welcome the redevelopment of the old Murphy's site for residential and business use but we are really shocked by the scale of the redevelopment proposed - both in the excessive number of residential units proposed (seeming to be more about cramming in as many 1-2 bed flats to maximise profit) and industrial/work spaces suggested, but also because the only way to achieve this immense density is by building extremely high and imposing residential towers way above anything in the vicinity and severely limiting natural light to the low rise surroundings - residential and leisure (eg the lido) - and blocking off a protected view - protected both from Parliament Hill towards the City and from Kentish Town Tube station back up to Parliament Hill. If, as suggested, the hope is to provide a car free, environmentally friendly, pleasant place to live, these current proposals seems like the opposite of how to achieve this. Camden needs more homes for families, not more 1-2 bed flats. Surely it would make more sense to come up with a design which integrates better into its surroundings by replicating the lower rise developments that give the surrounding neighbourhoods their character, an opportunity for the developers to work in tandem with Camden and to listen to the input of local residents to create a really forward-looking new neighbourhood that enhances the area while providing good quality, design-led residential and work spaces that speak to the site's industrial heritage. A modern development that enhances its site and its adjacent neighbourhoods instead of literally looming over them and putting profit above quality of life. Less density of building would also lessen the massive disruption to local roads/traffic and the environmental impact of prolonged building works. In short, the density and mass/height of the buildings proposed are totally out of proportion to the available space and surroundings and will permanently alter for the worse the special qualities of this area - the very qualities that might attract future residents to live in this new development.</p>
2021/3225/P	Ms	11/02/2022 10:35:06	OBJ	<p>This proposal will not provide sufficient affordable housing for families or the infrastructure required for such a high density project. The height of the buildings will have a negative impact on views from Parliament Hill and sunlight to surrounding areas, including the Lido. Disruption due to building over a period of 9 years is not acceptable. Low rise affordable family dwellings with appropriate access and infrastructure would be more appropriate.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	S Nicholl	13/02/2022 14:04:21	OBJ	<p>Although I support aspects of the redevelopment of the Murphy's Yard site I strongly object to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The height of the proposed towers of between 13-17 and 19 storeys is much too high and intrusive and the height needs to be radically reduced. The towers will not only dominate the whole area, they will completely ruin the protected and treasured views of the Heath from Kentish Town, from Parliament Hill, Oak Village and Gospel Oak. The towers will also block out daylight and cast shadows on the surrounding areas including overshadowing Kentish Town City Farm. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Camden's independent expert Design Review Panel says: "the bulk, height and massing of residential blocks is excessive and...will 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." - Camden and London's current planning policy states that homes should be: 'seamlessly integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods..built up to a general height of 8 storeys..The view of Parliament Hill from outside Kentish Town Station is protected.' 2. The current proposal is not providing enough affordable housing and needs to radically increase its provision. The development is also woefully low in its provision of much needed family homes (of 3-4 bedrooms). At present the proposal only offers 14 of the 825 proposed new homes to be for 4-bedroom family homes. There is huge opportunity within this development to create beautifully designed lower-rise affordable and accessible homes which genuinely meet the needs of the community and cater for families and a range of ages, including for older and younger people. 3. The high density of the overall development is much bulkier than anything else in the wider area and will damage the unique character of the area by ruining protected views, resulting in a development offering a very poor quality of life which will also negatively impact the wider community. 4. The embodied carbon and lack of adequate insulation and other environmentally ambitious building plans. Camden Council have committed to the Climate Emergency with their Climate Action Plan and from 2020, 'require all major developments in Camden to be zero carbon (London Plan definition).' It is unclear how this can be achieved within a development as dense as this, in particular the height of the of the 13-17 and 19 storey buildings. 5. Increased pressure on local roads and transport services and the increase in traffic both during the construction phase and afterwards will significantly add to the already congested roads (Highgate Road and Gordon House Road in particular) severely affecting air quality, cycling, walking and quality of life for anyone living and traveling locally.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	sophie harris	13/02/2022 09:22:24	COMMNT	<p>Buildings should not be so high, and not so close together. Consideration should be given to the utmost to nature and wildlife and green spaces.</p> <p>Housing should be properly affordable. Workspace kept to a minimum, as a lot of people are working from home now.</p> <p>Don't spoil london skyline and block out light for neighbouring residents/small businesses. Don't create wind tunnels.</p>
2021/3225/P	Valli Murray Brown	14/02/2022 19:09:22	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the development plans for Murphy's yard. Not only will they will destroy the iconic views from Parliament Hill which belong to the whole nation, but more importantly, they will destroy the last remaining piece of open sky in Kentish Town that allow its residents to look out onto the Heath.</p> <p>One cannot stress enough the importance of this to the mental health and general wellbeing of the local population. The tower blocks are far too oppresive and out of scale entirely. The increased population and traffic will add extra pressure.</p> <p>Moreover, the proposed walkway from Kentish town appears to have been thrown in as a fop - but being paved and totaly municipal in nature, it adds absolutely nothing to the local ecology.</p> <p>London is made up of a patchwork of villages and communities. This development will destroy the character of Kentish Town to the detriment of all who live here.</p>
2021/3225/P	Valli Murray Brown	14/02/2022 19:09:28	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the development plans for Murphy's yard. Not only will they will destroy the iconic views from Parliament Hill which belong to the whole nation, but more importantly, they will destroy the last remaining piece of open sky in Kentish Town that allow its residents to look out onto the Heath.</p> <p>One cannot stress enough the importance of this to the mental health and general wellbeing of the local population. The tower blocks are far too oppresive and out of scale entirely. The increased population and traffic will add extra pressure.</p> <p>Moreover, the proposed walkway from Kentish town appears to have been thrown in as a fop - but being paved and totaly municipal in nature, it adds absolutely nothing to the local ecology.</p> <p>London is made up of a patchwork of villages and communities. This development will destroy the character of Kentish Town to the detriment of all who live here.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Lucy Sheppard	12/02/2022 15:13:57	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>The expert Design Review Panel states that 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿ 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. ¿ The development will not provide enough affordable housing, as stated in the developer¿s own reports. ¿ The proposal provides limited services for young people, according to the developer¿s reports. ¿ With its massive structures, the development has a very high level of embodied carbon and is expected to have high energy use due to lack of ambitious insulation requirements. They have not followed good practice for environmental building design, including for natural ventilation and cooling, and will contribute to the heat island effect. ¿ There are better ways to provide housing, jobs and facilities, using low-rise, high-density models. <p>The high rise blocks will cast a shadow on the Lido.</p>
2021/3225/P	Lucy Sheppard	12/02/2022 15:14:03	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>The expert Design Review Panel states that 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿ 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. ¿ The development will not provide enough affordable housing, as stated in the developer¿s own reports. ¿ The proposal provides limited services for young people, according to the developer¿s reports. ¿ With its massive structures, the development has a very high level of embodied carbon and is expected to have high energy use due to lack of ambitious insulation requirements. They have not followed good practice for environmental building design, including for natural ventilation and cooling, and will contribute to the heat island effect. ¿ There are better ways to provide housing, jobs and facilities, using low-rise, high-density models. <p>The high rise blocks will cast a shadow on the Lido.</p>
2021/3225/P	Jill carey	11/02/2022 19:20:18	OBJ	<p>Murphys development plan is not considering the local residents who not in favour of this development which is outdated and not compliant to the carbon foot print, blocking out sunlight to the lido, and nearby residential areas, blocking historic views from Parliament hill, over crowding, no parking causing problems for local residents parking spaces, being taken over. The high rise flats are unsightly and not in line with the area. The flats are private and not considering normal working class people who are the back bone of society, I.e teachers, hospital workers, etc. The building work will pollute the area, making difficult to breathe, dusty dirty environment. These expensive flats are not inline with what people want and I strongly am against it and finding it most upsetting .</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Ellen Gates	13/02/2022 10:22:04	COMMNT	<p>I OBJECT to the referenced application for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment: The proposal is for up to 825 homes and 95,000 sqm of other uses (mainly industrial and employment). This constitutes massive overdevelopment of the site. There is no regulatory requirement for this scale of development. Camden and London planning policy is only that the existing amount of industrial space (c.20,000 sqm) be re-provided. Camden's Kentish Town Planning Framework anticipates 'in the region of 750 homes'. The developer is simply trying to squeeze too much into the site without justification other than profit. There should be a complete re-think on the capacity of the site and the needs of the community. • Excessive height and massing: The proposal for a number of residential towers of up to 19 storeys and very large floorplate industrial buildings of up to 8 storeys creates a development of excessive height and massing. Far from 'integrating' into the surroundings, as claimed by the developer, the development will be far denser, bulkier and higher than anything in the area. The development makes no reference to the generally low-rise character of the surrounding areas and is unsympathetic to the local character. Camden has a long and successful history of low rise, high density development, and that would be a far preferable approach for this sensitive site. • Impact on views and amenity: The consequence of the excessive bulk and height is that the development will loom large in views from all directions, damaging the character of the wider area. In particular, it will have a devastating impact on treasured views to the south from Parliament Hill. Moreover, the buildings will block sunlight to the Lido until 10 am, having an unnecessary impact on the enjoyment of that very popular facility. The development will also virtually block the view of Parliament Hill from outside Kentish Town station, which is a protected view in the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan. • Lack of character: There is little evidence that the developer is committed to high quality design that would create a liveable community integrated with neighbouring areas and that reflects the history of the site and the wider environment. Although the developer makes much of the greenery incorporated in the scheme, large parts of the development in fact consist of hard landscaping with canyon-like ways through the high buildings. This creates a rather sterile environment with no clear character, and one that will not be pleasant to walk through or live in. • Mix of housing: There is an excessive provision of 1 and 2 bed flats, with only a small number of the family homes that the area needs. With an estimated sales price of £950,000 to £1,000,000, even the 2 bed flats will be well beyond the means of many local people. The developer makes no commitment at all at this stage on affordable housing, although it admits that the 35% of affordable housing required by Camden's policies will not be 'viable'. Such a flagrant failure to meet Camden's policies should not be tolerated. • Mix of industrial / commercial space: There is no detailed breakdown of the proposed uses of the industrial and other spaces. This should be spelled out in far greater detail, with binding commitments on uses, rather than leaving this to later planning applications. Retail and food and drink uses, for example, have the potential to adversely affect businesses already established in Kentish Town, which has already suffered negative impacts from Covid. There should also be a re-assessment of how much commercial space will be needed, given recent shifts in working patterns, with a large increase in working from home.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Sean Titley	13/02/2022 15:19:41	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on traffic: Although the residential development will be car free, it is simply inconceivable that there will not be a significant impact on traffic (as claimed by the developer), both during the 9 years of construction and permanently. The proposed new access from Gordon House Road will have potentially dire impacts on traffic on a road that is already narrow and overcrowded during rush hours and throughout the day, and that has very limited space for pedestrians, especially where it passes under the railway arch. There will also be negative impacts on a frequent ambulance route from the Royal Free Hospital. Although the developer cannot control development of the infrastructure outside its site, it should make provision for access solely from Highgate Road, other than for emergencies. Sustainability: The proposals are far from ambitious in addressing environmental issues. The large buildings will have a high level of embodied carbon, and are likely to have a high energy use and create a heat island effect. The additional traffic will add to air pollution, which is already high in the area.
2021/3225/P	Paula Peet	13/02/2022 20:08:27	OBJ	<p>To whom it concerns,</p> <p>Due to pressures of work I missed the original opportunity to comment on this development but understand that it is still possible to object to the proposed development. I am strongly against this development because of the height of the tower blocks and the lack of affordable housing and housing that meets the requirements of Camden.</p> <p>- Any block over 6 floors is going to be completely out of keeping with the local area and the 19 storey block will be a really ugly eye sore. I was stunned when I found out through the local paper this was happening. Looking at the highly misleading brochure the developer produces there are pictures of blocks with 4 to 6 floors of housing which doesn't seem unreasonable although 4 is a more human height.</p> <p>-it is impossible to buy in Camden at a reasonable price and all these one and two bedroom flats are just going to become piggy bank investments for the worlds rich or air bnb investments</p> <p>- Camden needs family, 4 bedroom and 3 bedroom houses, the proposed apartments are unsuitable</p> <p>- and I suppose lastly is the Council really sure the local infrastructure can cope with this high density accommodation, with climate change will water, energy, transport be able to cope.</p> <p>Im not anti the development in general although the buildings look like unimaginative chicken coops in the sky, hugely out of keeping with the beautiful Victorian housing in the area but the height of the buildings is absolutely wrong and will ruin the skyline for all who live in the area for generations to come and the architecture is dull and boring.</p> <p>I seek that Camden insists on significant changes to a much lower, greener and people friendly designs, regardless of their wealth.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
2021/3225/P	William gately	14/02/2022 11:04:56	OBJ	<p>These proposed buildings at the heights shown appear to completely change the landscape view from Parliament Hill, obscuring all of the London skyline that local people and visitors love to see. They will also obscure the lovely view of Parliament Hill and the green spaces that are currently seen from busy, noisy, dirty and built up Kentish Town Road.</p> <p>This loss of sky and greenery views will be detrimental to people living in Kentish Town. I object to the heights of the buildings and also to the low number of social housing properties proposed.</p>
2021/3225/P	William gately	14/02/2022 11:04:56	OBJ	<p>The height of the tower is too big and will have a negative impact on the residents from loss of sun light and all those using the park and the views which must be protected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Jayson Smallcombe	11/02/2022 15:45:17	OBJ	NOT THIS VERSION.
2021/3225/P	Anna Haworth	11/02/2022 18:20:09	OBJNOT	A horrible, horrible scheme that flies in the face of the excellent architect driven developments that Camden built in the 1970s - tall towers amassing in a huge area that could have contained a village-like low rise development similar to that on Mansfield Road instead of looming towers that will overshadow part of the Heath including the Lido - a public space that was fought for over many years to be sacrificed to the greed of developers. The almost total absence of family sized accommodation will further erode school numbers in Camden, leaving it a borough of the rich and the childless.
2021/3225/P	Steve hughes	12/02/2022 08:32:26	OBJ	<p>1)The critical mass of this development is enormous rising in part to 19 storeys high and is out of keeping for the area. This is substantially a high rise development which will severely impact the views from the Heath facing south east. It would be more appropriate to limit the building heights to 11 storeys to preserve the skyline.</p> <p>2) If this application were allowed to proceed in its current form, it could set a precedent for other future developments of similar height to the fringes of the Heath which could also adversely increase the impact the views enjoyed from the Heath environment.</p>
2021/3225/P	Brendan Massam	14/02/2022 13:46:04	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Team,</p> <p>I aim to avoid NIMBY-ism, London needs new residential space and despite this development likely to create havoc in the area for some time, converting this underutilized land into a mixed use development is a good idea in my view.</p> <p>The thing that I find perplexing is why the developer spent all of the design fees to submit this application for a development that just so far away from remotely in keeping and harmony with the area. Building a collection of 8 & 19 story buildings overlooking Hampstead Heath and in turn blocking a cherished view from the Heath of London beyond is just such an astonishingly bad concept, it beggars belief as to how the developers and their architects saw this scheme as even remotely acceptable. This scheme is somehow trying to ship a kings cross type high-rise type development drop it 3km further North, on the doorstep of Hampstead Heath, where nothing of its scale exists. This proposed scheme desperately requires to be scaled down.</p> <p>Lissenden Mansions, which are 5 stories, sets a reasonable benchmark for new developments that would be in keeping with the area. I could see a development where the closest buildings to the Heath are in line with Lissenden Mansions (i.e. 5 stories) and a gradual increase to 7 & 8 stories towards the South of the site could potentially make sense from my perspective.</p> <p>With kind regards, Brendan Massam</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Keiran Proffer	11/02/2022 10:52:04	OBJ	<p>The height of the planned buildings make it certain that the will cast shade on all the surrounding areas, including part of the Heath. I gather from the Camden New Journal that the shadow will extend as far as the lido in winter. This shows a complete disregard for the well-being of the Heath, the people living nearby, and the City Farm.</p> <p>That the site is being developed is good news, especially if it is going to include affordable housing, but the height of the buildings must be kept within reasoable limits.</p>
2021/3225/P	Ivan Clark	11/02/2022 11:45:13	OBJ	<p>February 11, 2022</p> <p>Murphy's Yard Development</p> <p>Camden Planning Application 2021/3225/P</p> <p>Planning Department</p> <p>As residents of Camden who enjoy walking on Hampstead Heath on a daily basis, we were distressed to learn of the proposed development which will inevitably disfigure the unique rural aspect offered by the Heath despite it being located centrally in a major urban city. The view from Parliament Hill is witness to this aspect, with few tall buildings obscuring the view.</p> <p>Constructing six tower blocks, four of which between 14-19 stories high, to house over 800 flats would add some 2,000 new residents to an area which is ill-equipped to handle such a large influx. This is to be supplemented by office and industrial space. Traffic (particularly along Mansfield Road / Gordon House Road) already suffers from bottlenecks under the railroad bridges.</p> <p>We object to this application which should be reconsidered.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Ivan and Teresa Clark The Pryors (flat 25), East Heath Road, NW3 1BS</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Billy Ford-Langan	11/02/2022 15:47:46	OBJ	<p>The traffic, pollution and footfall on Gordon House Road are already at unacceptable levels and are unsafe for children and families walking to and from school. At peak construction, the work is forecast to add 90 HGV (two way) vehicles per day and 36 LGV (two way) vehicles per day to an already highly congested route. The planning application claims that the traffic generated by the proposed Development will result in a net reduction in traffic currently generated by the site during both morning and evening peaks. We believe this would be surprising given the low level of activity on site now and the number of homes and businesses that will need servicing as a consequence of the development.</p> <p>2) The development will not provide the type of affordable family housing needed in the area since it consists of 1 & 2 bed flats. Lack of affordable housing is already having an effect on pupil numbers at Gospel Oak, which are falling because of families being priced out of the area. The proposed towers are contrary to the need for more affordable housing outlined in the Council's own housing need study.</p> <p>Additionally, there have been many concerns raised about the numbers of people this will bring onto the Lido area of the Heath since there will be no significant green spaces in the development the blocking of light to the Lido as a result of the construction of such large tower blocks and the overall detrimental effect the development will have on quality of life for people in the surrounding areas.</p>
2021/3225/P	Tobin Ireland	11/02/2022 19:51:15	OBJ	<p>I am writing to ask that the Council reject this planning application. I am in favour of a sustainable mix-ed use development o the site, but do not think there is ay justificatio for any high rise elements which (1) change the view from Parliament Hill towards the city of London (2) change the view from Kentish Town towards Parliament Hill (3) have any impact on winter sun hitting the Lido. There should be a large skew towards housing for key workers and the buildig approach should be fully sustainable. I do not believe that there will be a net decrease of traffic with 850+ new homes in the area.</p> <p>Please reject tehse plaing guidelines and make the developer and the sellers (Murphy) submit a plan which will not have such a long lasting and irreversible damagig impact on our amazingn and historical neighbourhood.</p>
2021/3225/P	Jerome Boughton-Mills	11/02/2022 22:49:00	COMMNT	<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. It is also not clear what facilities will be available for the elderly. 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. This level of high rise development must NOT be allowed to happen. It is a historical fact that high rise dwellings often create more social problems than they are intended to solve. The developers and their designers are missing an real opportunity here to create well designed, lower rise dwellings surrounded by more pleasant garden space around the buildings in their drive to create more housing than the borough actually needs. The lack of family size dwellings means that rather than creating a community intent on setting down roots and bringing up families we will likely finish off with a transient population of renters living in flats bought by overseas investors. There must be a re-think for a better design solution instead of this greedy plan.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Geoff	12/02/2022 16:19:59	OBJ	Think about our environment and our community. Crazy idea to build up and destroy our view of London. Not even thinking of social housing. This project is about money. What about the impact on traffic and parking as well. This cannot go ahead.
2021/3225/P	heather Allan	12/02/2022 14:11:01	OBJ	I am objecting to these proposals because of the high rise nature of many of the buildings. They will dominate the view from surrounding Parliament Hill, block light from the Lido, and increase the density of habitation, and traffic flow, in an area especially used by children going to school, dog walkers, cyclists and outdoor recreational pursuits.
2021/3225/P	Guy Jeremiah	12/02/2022 15:17:27	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I live on Lissenden Gardens and have a balcony overlooking the development; I am a regular lido user. In principal, I am in favour of a development in Murphy's Yard. However, the height of the proposed towers and their close proximity to Hampstead Heath will cause irreversible damage to the view from the Heath and the views in and out of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area in which I live.</p> <p>While I appreciate the need for density, I suggest the current proposal be rejected in its current form for reasons of excessive height. The height elements may be more appropriate to the southern end by Kentish Town. I suggest a detailed impact assessment be undertaken on possible overshadowing of the lido.</p>
2021/3225/P	Catriona hale	12/02/2022 16:04:55	APP	<p>The reduction in size of the blocks, less office space. As we know this is not needed as you can work from home.</p> <p>More homes but for families 3/4 bedrooms and make them affordable not just the rich. Insure the imenities are well maintained for all not just the private homes.</p> <p>Suggested use of some space for communal allotments.</p> <p>Since they have no parking will this impact on area surrounding the new development. People will get deliveries so this will be an impact on local area.</p> <p>Insure that the homes built are for not just for overseas investors, who then pay no council tax.</p>
2021/3225/P	Dvorah Kadish	12/02/2022 11:07:43	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed high-rise and high-density development threatens the enduring and unique character of this neighbourhood - the project demonstrates a failure to address environmental and ecological concerns - the sheer mediocrity of the proposed architecture and urban planning reflects a bleak poverty of imagination in what, if implemented, promises to be yet another characterless, soon-to-be shabby development. As such it would be a tragic missed opportunity to create a vibrant and unique inner city quarter meeting both the needs of the locals and embodying exciting new urban planning possibilities. Surely we can aspire to be as innovative as our most forward-looking European neighbours. - it is vital that there is continued commitment to collaboration with local groups in designing this important site

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	SUzanne Garben	13/02/2022 13:19:40	OBJ	<p>I object to the development on the following bases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the development is too high and should be limited to 3-4 storeys 2. the development will over shadow the local area, the park and the Lido which is unacceptable 3. the development should have more family and affordable housing 4. the development will be too dense and create too much traffic 5. the development will have a significant adverse affect on the views of the city, skyline, heath and parliament hill
2021/3225/P	Margaret Picken	13/02/2022 15:26:16	COMMT	<p>I strongly object to this application. The current proposals are not in keeping with the neighbourhood. They will not provide the sort of housing that the area needs. And they will destroy one of most beautiful views of our city which is enjoyed and treasured by residents throughout North London, and beyond.</p>
2021/3225/P	PJ White	14/02/2022 13:39:41	OBJ	<p>I wish to object strongly to this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>it is inappropriate and represents over-development it would provide too many small flats and not enough housing for families it does not provide enough affordable housing or any social housing its massive and too high structures demonstrate excessive high energy use it does not follow good practice for environmental building design the entrance on Gordon House Road will put too much stress on this road and Mansfield Road both during the building work and forever afterwards the proposed buildings are too high and will cast long shadows, bulky obtrusive views over the Lido and Hampstead Heath the bulk, height and massing of the residential blocks is excessive for this site adjacent to Hampstead Heath and has an unacceptable impact on this part of Camden as well as blocking important views. The plan presents an over- cramped site which should be avoided. no building should be higher than 8 storeys this plan is contrary to the Local Plans, Neighbourhood Plan, London Plan and national policies</p>
2021/3225/P	Nathaniel Copsey	13/02/2022 19:30:51	OBJ	<p>Overall, I welcome this application to develop Murphy's yard but object to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The height of the towers which will ruin views from Kentish Town and Parliament Hill as well as depriving streets and green spaces of daylight; - The change that the reduction in light will bring to Mortimer Terrace Nature Reserve; - The lack of affordable or social housing which will affect the socio-economic mix of the neighbourhood adversely.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Rachel	13/02/2022 10:44:11	OBJ	<p>I urge you to reject this planning application.</p> <p>I support the idea of redeveloping this site, and accept that redevelopment involves change and disruption. But this specific design is greedy, ugly, and entirely unfit for purpose.</p> <p>Specific points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Damage to protected views. This identikit egg-box-type development has no intrinsic merit of its own - these will be dull and ugly blocks to look at. They will completely obscure the protected view identified in the KT Neighbourhood plan (the view was 'redefined' by the architects in a shocking example of instrumental self-interest). The view from Parliament Hill will also be damaged by these unpleasant new blocks.2. Shading. The high blocks at the northern end of the site will cast Parliament Hill Lido into deep shade. This will entirely change a place that is of enormous local importance. No shading, at any time of day or year, of the Lido, should be contemplated.3. Over-development. 825 dwellings PLUS 4.5 times as much industrial/office space as exists at the moment - this is an entirely unwarranted and unjustifiable level of greed and over-development.4. Inappropriate mixture of dwellings. Far too little social and so-called affordable housing is proposed. Unless legal safeguards are put in place, the private market flat will be lock up and leave investments, that may never be occupied. The balance of benefit - 62 new council dwellings, for all this horror - is simply not right. Camden MUST demand more for us. We need proper housing for local families, and we need this to be an area where people actually live.5. Expectation of under-use. The 'child yield' from this development tells its own tale: 262 under-18s are expected to live here. If we assume that each of the 4 bed dwellings is occupied by 4 children (likely, given rules about siblings sharing), and the 3-bed dwellings by an equal mixture of 2 and 3 children, then you can see that the expectation is that BARELY A SINGLE privately owned flat will be occupied by families with children (255 children will live in 100 3 and 4 bed houses).6. Unsustainable buildings. These massive structures have an entirely inappropriate level of embodied carbon, and do not fit with Camden's declaration of a Climate Emergency. They will have high energy due to poor insulation, and by not following good practice for environmental building design (eg for natural ventilation and cooling) they will bake in high energy use, and contribute to the heat island effect. <p>Camden planners and councillors, with all my heart I urge you to reject THIS VERSION of the development plans. This is such a significant site that a new version will, without doubt come forwards, which will be better for Camden people, for the built environment, and in terms of environmental damage.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Daniel Alicandro	13/02/2022 20:24:48	OBJ	<p>I am concerned about this development for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the impact of the large development in a limited footprint to the local area and height of the towers on the local area including the sunlight available to the local lido - the emphasis on (potentially cramped) 1 to 2 bedroom flats rather than three much needed affordable housing for families - the general commitment to affordable housing is lacking and without detail
2021/3225/P	Simon farnaby	11/02/2022 09:51:13	OBJ	<p>I have studied the plans and find many many problems with the application. Foremost is the height of the proposed buildings. This will block out the sun for my flat in lissenden gardens and the parliament hill Lido . Also it is an eyesore in an area that is used by tourists to parliament hill. Also I don't understand where all the traffic will go? It's already a traffic nightmare along gordon house road. I understand the need for housing . If we need this development it just not breach the skyline in such a destructive way . Best Simon</p>
2021/3225/P	Simon farnaby	11/02/2022 09:51:15	OBJ	<p>I have studied the plans and find many many problems with the application. Foremost is the height of the proposed buildings. This will block out the sun for my flat in lissenden gardens and the parliament hill Lido . Also it is an eyesore in an area that is used by tourists to parliament hill. Also I don't understand where all the traffic will go? It's already a traffic nightmare along gordon house road. I understand the need for housing . If we need this development it just not breach the skyline in such a destructive way . Best Simon</p>
2021/3225/P	Justin Nuttall	11/02/2022 12:46:28	OBJ	<p>As a resident of Parliament Hill Mansions and a year-round swimmer at Parliament Hill Fields Lido, I strongly object to the scale and height of the proposed residential development, which I understand will overshadow both my property and the lido, causing significant reduction in light and potentially completely blocking direct sunlight to the lido for large parts of the day, including most of winter opening hours when the sun is at a lower trajectory.</p> <p>The Parliament Hill Fields Lido is an important community amenity, distinctive in having a stainless steel lining which reflects the sun's rays - creating a unique outdoor swimming experience which, along with recreational use of the terraces and other outdoor spaces, will be significantly affected by the overshadowing impact of the proposed development.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Mary Lynne Ellis	14/02/2022 16:54:13	OBJ	<p>I , along with many people I know, feel strongly that this application should be rejected by Camden Council. I am extremely concerned about the (low) percentage of the new flats which would be affordable and the fact that the area urgently needs more 3/4 bedroom low-rise accommodation (rather than 'off the shelf' 1/2 bed flats) The current plans include a number of high-rise tower blocks, which would essentially cut off the view from Parliament Hill over the City. It would also significantly increase the traffic in the surrounding area and increase pollution, including from traffic noise.</p> <p>Tower blocks of this height are not in keeping with the existing architecture in Kentish Town and would dominate the area in a way that would be profoundly alinating. The buildings would block out light for many properties nearby. It will obstruct views for residents in and outside their homes and also for walkers on the Heath.</p> <p>My own view is that the area would benefit from re-development, but that the current proposals are exceptionally inappropriate for the Kentish Town area for the reasons stated above.</p>
2021/3225/P	Catherine Keshishian	14/02/2022 17:14:54	COMMNT	<p>I support the proposal and am not against losing the 'view' from Kentish Town Road. It will be wonderful to have a greener route to get to the Heath from Kentish Town. Please ensure that materials are as sustainable as possible, that buildings are sympathetic and planting is natural and good for wildlife.</p>
2021/3225/P	James Knowles	11/02/2022 12:14:08	OBJ	<p>What drew me to move near the Heath 25 years ago, was its feeling of countryside with lovely long views in all directions. To be fair, there has always been one scar in the vicinity which all locals have united against: Bacton Tower. Its inappropriate height gives a looming impact which jars against the otherwise low-rise neighbourhood.</p> <p>That the Murphy's Yard development proposes 6 blocks of 11 to 19 storeys is a horror that must be prevented.</p> <p>Views from as far as Kenwood will be ruined by these unnecessarily tall buildings. More immediately, their looming, mass and overshadowing nature at the bottom of the Heath and the Lido in particular will also ruin the light and atmosphere of these highly used public amenities.</p> <p>Hopefully this is some tactical attempt by the developers to propose something truly terrible, intending to be 'pushed back' into something only horrendous.</p> <p>Creating new housing in a brown field sight is to be commended and encouraged. Critically though, it must respect the surroundings that it is coming into and complement it, not profit off its existing beauty and be the carbuncle that everyone has to look away from in disgust.</p> <p>Thank you for respecting the views of the existing neighbours and visitors, and keep developers confined to improving neighbourhoods, not profiting from them.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Stroma L Cairns	11/02/2022 13:59:35	OBJ	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. With its massive structures, the development has a very high level of embodied carbon and is expected to have high energy use due to lack of ambitious insulation requirements. They have not followed good practice for environmental building design, including for natural ventilation and cooling, and will contribute to the heat island effect. There are better ways to provide housing, jobs and facilities, using low-rise, high-density models!
2021/3225/P	Sara Reex	11/02/2022 18:38:41	OBJNOT	<p>Whilst I am supportive of regeneration of a currently unused site, I am lodging my objection to the following proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - height of the buildings and subsequent blocking of the protected view of parliament Hill from Kentish Town as well as projected light impacts on Parliament Hill Lido - low percentage of affordable housing - low percentage of housing for families - lack of satisfactory plan to manage the increase in vehicular traffic in the area during and after construction - lack of evidence this development will have low environmental impact and buildings will be sustainably built with high energy efficiency <p>If this development goes ahead as currently planned, I think based on the above objections it would have a negative impact on the existing area and residents.</p>
2021/3225/P	Daniel Pick	13/02/2022 19:24:01	OBJ	<p>I am dismayed from all I have seen by the unacceptable height and brutal design of the three tower blocks.</p> <p>While pleased to hear of a development, housing, access route, cycleways, shops etc., the scheme needs to respect the aesthetic of the area, not jeopardise precious and historic views from the Heath, and provide accommodation at human scale, and a suitable density, not as here squeezing every last inch of space to maximise profit.</p> <p>I believe an acceptable density can in fact be achieved With much lower rise buildings than this !</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Debbie Cook	14/02/2022 19:33:58	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this development these grounds.</p> <p>The proposal is for a series of residential towers of up to 19 storeys and a row of very large floorplate industrial buildings of up to 8 storeys. The bulk, height and massing of residential blocks is excessive and the development will have a significant and unacceptable impact on the quality of life of local residents and ruin protected and treasured views from both Parliament Hill and Kentish Town.</p> <p>This Kings Cross corporate estate style development it will fundamentally destroy the unique character of our neighbourhood and irreversibly and detrimentally effect the entire surrounding area. The overshadowing and resultant removal of sunlight from residents and the users of the Heath and Parliament Hill lido is criminal damage. The development does not meet Camden's policy of 35% affordable housing, the needs of Camden's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in regard to family homes and there are limited services for the young and elderly.</p> <p>This for profit scheme is totally unacceptable in its current form. Any development must use low-rise high-density models.</p>
2021/3225/P	Tony Ghilchik	14/02/2022 21:11:48	OBJ	<p>I object to this application because of its impact on Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>The mass, density and height of the six tower blocks, between 11 and 19 stories high so near the Heath, will have a significant adverse impact on the openness of the Heath from the Lido and nearby playing fields, and of the view from Parliament Hill and from the southern end of the Heath.</p> <p>Indeed, because of this impact on the Heath they contravene the planning requirements, not only of various local Neighbourhood Plans, but of the Camden Local Plan (Policy A2) and the Mayor's London Plan 2021 (Policies G3 and G6).</p> <p>Although I live by the northern edge of the Heath I often walk to Parliament Hill and the Lido, as do the many visitors from all over London, to enjoy the openness of the Heath and the viewpoints such as Parliament Hill.</p> <p>I therefore oppose the development proposals in their current form and ask that permission be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Nicholas Barnett	11/02/2022 17:39:06	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>I wish to object to the application on the following grounds:</p> <p>It is an "overdevelopment". The proposal is insensitive to the identity of the neighbourhood. It will completely alter the precious and highly regarded positive character of the area - which is one of low density housing and a community atmosphere.</p> <p>The proposed towers are far too high creating an inner-city feel to the area rather than the local town atmosphere which prevails. This type of development is also highly inappropriate being situated on the borders of the unique natural environment and skyline of Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>The already congested roads and pavements will suffer from unacceptable levels of crowding, traffic delay and pollution - a particular issue with so many nurseries and schools being located nearby.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Department and our locally elected representatives to use the power and responsibility accorded to them to reject this application and insist upon one that does not provoke such widespread disquiet and upset amongst local residents.</p>
2021/3225/P	Brigitte Ascher	14/02/2022 16:22:08	OBJ	<p>The development as planned is too dense and too high. IT severely damages the view from Kentish Town as well as the other way, down from Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>I would be yet another modern development of high rise buildings that could be anywhere in London, or indeed in the world. There is no architectural merit that binds the design to this specific area. It is simply an attempt to maximise the number of flats squeezed into a fairly small area. A 19-storey, or even 17-storey building is not the way to go, plonked as it would be into a substantially Victorian neighbourhood with typical storey heights of four to maximum five floors.</p> <p>This development must be scaled down.</p>
2021/3225/P	alke schulkes	13/02/2022 14:45:07	APP	<p>It will ruin the Lido Most people can not afford to live there. It is way too high</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Anita Overland	12/02/2022 15:15:43	OBJ	<p>We would like to see a scheme that does the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scale: Provides building massing and layout that i. responds to the local context, including 5 conservation areas, and ii. creates a liveable, human-scale place for a mixed population to thrive in. 2. Mix: Includes a mix of housing tenures and types, including co-op housing, cohousing and family housing, reflecting local tenures and need, and a good mix of uses. 3. Views: Respects the cherished, protected view of Hampstead Heath from Kentish Town, as set out in the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan, as well as panoramic views from Hampstead Heath. 4. Links: Keeps the best elements of the scheme as it stands, such as the pedestrian and cycle links between Kentish Town and the Heath, and creates connections across the railway. 5. Sustainability: Is an exemplar of healthy, sustainable and genuinely zero carbon development. 6. Character: Provides at the outset a clear sense of intended style and design, as well as a commitment to architectural excellence, that shows how a sense of place will be created that reflects the industrial nature of the site preceded by market gardens. <p>Camden is renowned for low-rise, high-density development and we believe that this should be the starting point for a re-think, alongside a more realistic assessment of site capacity. What we do not want to see is a divided area with high quality housing on tree-lined streets in neighbouring areas, and cramped lower quality housing on the site.</p> <p>We are a group of local organisations and individuals with an interest and significant expertise in design and sustainability. We offer to Murphy, and their talented design team, our time for a meaningful co-design exercise to turn this area into an exemplary neighbourhood, a great place to live and a fitting legacy that Murphy leave to the community.</p> <p>We believe that, together, we can arrive at a proposal that has wide support, rather than the current designs that are causing alarm in the community and surely will not be granted planning consent.</p>
2021/3225/P	Sabrina	13/02/2022 15:17:55	COMMNT	<p>It's so ugly, too big and thoughtless! It's not appropriate if day light is diminished as we don't get enough sunlight as it is. It can be built somewhere else and not where it interferes with outdoor activities and health.</p>
2021/3225/P	Hilary King	13/02/2022 15:53:07	OBJ	<p>I object to this scheme for the following reasons:</p> <p>The high rise tower blocks are grossly out of scale and character with the surrounding area and intrude significantly on the view as seen from Parliament Hill . This view is "protected".</p> <p>Kentish Town has remained a mixed community but there is no agreed percentage of affordable homes and no evidence of secure play areas for children.</p> <p>There are no significant green spaces within the plan and a preponderance of hard surfaces Building this scheme will cause traffic chaos in the already heavily used access roads to the site.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Lisette Groves	13/02/2022 16:01:36	OBJ	<p>Proposed development would: block, or diminish the impact of, views of London from Hampstead Heath block views of the heath from Kentish Town increase traffic block sunlight onto the heath.</p> <p>Also: too many small flats limited services for younger people proposed height of buildings is not in keeping with the neighbourhood</p>
2021/3225/P	Ms Alison Richards	14/02/2022 14:08:44	OBJ	<p>This is a greedy and insensitive application. Too many large bulky blocks, no variety of building size 19 story blocks are too high, more than twice the local standard, which is 8 stories. The impact on the unique protected views from Hampstead Heath would be terrible. The proposed density is excessive, there is virtually no much needed green space planned for on site. there is no affordable housing offered, there should be at least 34% it is out of keeping with the local leafy low rise housing. The local roads and public transport are already crowded, the additional 1000s of residents and workers would severely overload both. The fact that residents would not be permitted vehicles would lead to many cabs, and add to the delivery vans on site. Who would want to live in this overcrowded, development, in low spec, under insulated apartments with no green space and industrial neighbours?</p>
2021/3225/P	Julia Horan	12/02/2022 16:55:11	OBJNOT	<p>I am totally against this development. The scale is unsuitable, the buildings are too high and will dramatically alter the views and skyline in Kentish Town. The proposal is environmentally harmful, does not provide the housing needed in the area (not enough family homes, too many small flats), will not provide the appropriate amount of affordable housing. It will be a blight on the area for years to come. The local community must not be forced to live with these eyesores. The construction is environmentally unsound. There is not enough provision for young people. This development must not happen</p>
2021/3225/P	John Veal	14/02/2022 17:25:59	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the plans submitted as they threaten the Kentish Town skyline. At present my bedroom and balcony have unobstructed views over the rooftops towards the Heath, which I can see clearly. I was brought up in the country but moved to Kentish Town forty years ago. One of the main reasons for moving here was the close presence of Hampstead Heath and living in a property that gave me a view that escaped the claustrophobic confines of building surrounding my view of the sky, which as a child I had been used to. The beneficial effects of living in a low rise area has already been acknowledged by previous planning enquiries and policies. I do not wish this to be sacrificed for greater financial profit of developers who can surely profitably add to the local amenities for living and work without destroying something that can never be recovered.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Julia Horan	12/02/2022 16:55:15	OBJNOT	I am totally against this development. The scale is unsuitable, the buildings are too high and will dramatically alter the views and skyline in Kentish Town. The proposal is environmentally harmful, does not provide the housing needed in the area (not enough family homes, too many small flats), will not provide the appropriate amount of affordable housing. It will be a blight on the area for years to come. The local community must not be forced to live with these eyesores. The construction is environmentally unsound. There is not enough provision for young people. This development must not happen
2021/3225/P	Julia Horan	12/02/2022 16:55:17	OBJNOT	I am totally against this development. The scale is unsuitable, the buildings are too high and will dramatically alter the views and skyline in Kentish Town. The proposal is environmentally harmful, does not provide the housing needed in the area (not enough family homes, too many small flats), will not provide the appropriate amount of affordable housing. It will be a blight on the area for years to come. The local community must not be forced to live with these eyesores. The construction is environmentally unsound. There is not enough provision for young people. This development must not happen

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	J.Williams	14/02/2022 18:25:19	OBJ	<p>For the attention of Camden Planning Department: 2021/3225/P 'Murphy's Yard' application</p> <p>I object strongly to this application and write to ask that it be turned down as it stands and extensively modified in the light of this and the many other objections it has provoked.</p> <p>The density of housing proposed and the scale of the buildings is out of all proportion to the area. Increasing the population of the area so greatly can only have a damaging effect on just about every aspect of local life. A huge increase in vehicular traffic would be inevitable with corresponding hold ups and a major increase in pollution.</p> <p>The application claims that the amount of affordable housing required is not 'viable'. On this ground alone the application should be refused. Kentish Town is well supplied with educational facilities, and with its excellent communications could offer a good base for families who could not possibly afford the likely cost of the units. To be useful to families, a need recognised by Camden, more three bed units should be provided as affordable housing.</p> <p>Inner city developments should provide actual green space, not just one concreted area after another. The Heath and Hampstead Society in its excellent report point out that the vaunted 'green corridor' amounts to 'a hard-paved walkway with occasional flowerbeds and isolated trees of negligible ecological value'.</p> <p>The Heath of course is the prime example of the value of green space in crowded cities; it was already described around 1830 as the 'lungs of the capital' and with these green spaces come open views but the dense outcrop of buildings, some towers being 17 stories high, would block the view of Parliament Hill and hem in inhabitants of Kentish Town, replacing openness with enclosure (see Fig 504) and trapped pollution.</p> <p>The Heath itself could only be adversely affected by this project. The 1871 Hampstead Heath Act was unequivocal in its demand that the Heath should be preserved 'in its natural aspect and state' for the enjoyment of the public. The damage to the Heath during the many months of lockdown, with possible long term consequences, has been well documented. That heavy use ended, but this would be permanent, and lead to permanent 'degradation'.</p> <p>A smaller, more sympathetic, family friendly development which respects the long term contribution of the Heath to our city could make a valuable contribution to Kentish Town. I urge the Council to refuse this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Tabitha Dean	14/02/2022 10:04:00	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the scale of the Murphy's Yard development, in particular its height. The proposed height of some of the buildings is completely out of character for the surrounding areas where there are hardly any buildings higher than 6 storeys. The proposed buildings taller than that will over shadow the area, ruining view between Hampstead Heath and Kentish Town Road, the spectacular views from Kentish Town station railway bridge with such big skies, brings joy to so many people on otherwise dull days, to lose it would be very sad. The tall buildings would also overshadow Parliament Hill Fields lido with the result that no sun will fall on it until 10am in the Winter months when the sun is low in the sky. As a regular all year swimmer there, losing the morning sunlight would completely impact the experience of swimming there. Such dense housing in tall blocks is rarely successful, often lacking the community cohesion that is easier to develop in lower housing where it's easier to get to know each other. Finally, the proposed access road on to Gordon House Road will bring even more traffic on to a road that already has high levels of pollution due frequent traffic jams. I am not against the development of the Murphy's Yard site, but it needs to be less dense, much less high and much less greedy. The disruption in noise, dirt, traffic and pollution in the area of the next decade will be enormous if it's allowed to go ahead as currently planned.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	J.Williams	14/02/2022 18:25:24	OBJ	<p>For the attention of Camden Planning Department: 2021/3225/P 'Murphy's Yard' application</p> <p>I object strongly to this application and write to ask that it be turned down as it stands and extensively modified in the light of this and the many other objections it has provoked.</p> <p>The density of housing proposed and the scale of the buildings is out of all proportion to the area. Increasing the population of the area so greatly can only have a damaging effect on just about every aspect of local life. A huge increase in vehicular traffic would be inevitable with corresponding hold ups and a major increase in pollution.</p> <p>The application claims that the amount of affordable housing required is not 'viable'. On this ground alone the application should be refused. Kentish Town is well supplied with educational facilities, and with its excellent communications could offer a good base for families who could not possibly afford the likely cost of the units. To be useful to families, a need recognised by Camden, more three bed units should be provided as affordable housing.</p> <p>Inner city developments should provide actual green space, not just one concreted area after another. The Heath and Hampstead Society in its excellent report point out that the vaunted 'green corridor' amounts to 'a hard-paved walkway with occasional flowerbeds and isolated trees of negligible ecological value'.</p> <p>The Heath of course is the prime example of the value of green space in crowded cities; it was already described around 1830 as the 'lungs of the capital' and with these green spaces come open views but the dense outcrop of buildings, some towers being 17 stories high, would block the view of Parliament Hill and hem in inhabitants of Kentish Town, replacing openness with enclosure (see Fig 504) and trapped pollution.</p> <p>The Heath itself could only be adversely affected by this project. The 1871 Hampstead Heath Act was unequivocal in its demand that the Heath should be preserved 'in its natural aspect and state' for the enjoyment of the public. The damage to the Heath during the many months of lockdown, with possible long term consequences, has been well documented. That heavy use ended, but this would be permanent, and lead to permanent 'degradation'.</p> <p>A smaller, more sympathetic, family friendly development which respects the long term contribution of the Heath to our city could make a valuable contribution to Kentish Town. I urge the Council to refuse this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Tim Doolan	14/02/2022 16:30:25	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs / Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to highlight a number of concerns that I have with regards to the Murphy's yard planning application, dated January 2022. Although, living in Mansfield Road, I am in principal delighted that this currently hidden industrial site, is being redeveloped, the current proposals are completely out of character for the area and could potentially have a highly detrimental impact on the quality of life for people in surrounding areas, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Scale - It is completely unacceptable that they are proposing to build what amounts to a wall of 8 towers rising to 19 floors. This is out of sync with the surrounding residential housing and would be a negative contribution to the area in general.- Views - The development doesn't respect the cherished, protected view of Hampstead Heath from Kentish Town, as set out in the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan, as well as panoramic views from Hampstead Heath.- The development proposals are not sufficiently diverse to Include a good mix of housing tenures and types, including co-op housing, cohousing and family housing, reflecting local tenures and need, and a good mix of uses.- The development would appear to be in breach of a number of vital and important planning regulations, and it is imperative that these are strongly defended to ensure that the development provides a positive contribution to the neighbourhood. <p>The redevelopment of the Murphy's yard creates a fantastic opportunity to provide a much needed boost to the severe housing shortage within Camden. It is clearly important that Camden council ensures that the current plans are re-submitted to take into account the significant concerns from local residents and organisations, and that the development is not allowed to run roughshod over existing planning law and guidance that are surely there to protect and enhance the current environment...let's not let a fantastic opportunity go to waste.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Tim Doolan	14/02/2022 16:30:29	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs / Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to highlight a number of concerns that I have with regards to the Murphy's yard planning application, dated January 2022. Although, living in Mansfield Road, I am in principal delighted that this currently hidden industrial site, is being redeveloped, the current proposals are completely out of character for the area and could potentially have a highly detrimental impact on the quality of life for people in surrounding areas, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scale - It is completely unacceptable that they are proposing to build what amounts to a wall of 8 towers rising to 19 floors. This is out of sync with the surrounding residential housing and would be a negative contribution to the area in general. - Views - The development doesn't respect the cherished, protected view of Hampstead Heath from Kentish Town, as set out in the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan, as well as panoramic views from Hampstead Heath. - The development proposals are not sufficiently diverse to Include a good mix of housing tenures and types, including co-op housing, cohousing and family housing, reflecting local tenures and need, and a good mix of uses. - The development would appear to be in breach of a number of vital and important planning regulations, and it is imperative that these are strongly defended to ensure that the development provides a positive contribution to the neighbourhood. <p>The redevelopment of the Murphy's yard creates a fantastic opportunity to provide a much needed boost to the severe housing shortage within Camden. It is clearly important that Camden council ensures that the current plans are re-submitted to take into account the significant concerns from local residents and organisations, and that the development is not allowed to run roughshod over existing planning law and guidance that are surely there to protect and enhance the current environment...let's not let a fantastic opportunity go to waste.</p>
2021/3225/P	paul goward	14/02/2022 18:10:12	OBJ	<p>The height and bulk of the proposed development is excessive in the context of the surrounding area - and will block views in all directions. Whilst accepting the need for more housing - developers should be required to take account of the surroundings and the impact on local residents. The proposed development is completely out of proportion to its location.</p>
2021/3225/P	David Owen	11/02/2022 15:06:26	OBJ	<p>I am worried that the deveolpment includes buildings that are too high and will take light away from the lido in the morning.</p>
2021/3225/P	julie major	12/02/2022 15:42:58	OBJ	<p>Hi</p> <p>This development will ruin a much loved area of London. The buildings are too tall for the environment and will make many people who use the Lido and the heath very depressed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	M A Taylor	11/02/2022 19:07:43	OBJ	Delighted to see that a brownfield site is being redeveloped, but very disappointed that the development seems to focus on foreign investment and people in the top 2% of earners. This does nothing to address housing shortages. I'm also troubled by the height of the blocks and the inevitable reduction in daylight within the iconic Lido. Finally the density of the development seems to have failed to have acknowledged the mental health impacts of reduced community and isolation inevitable in high rise blocks that have been observed previously. In short, build on the land, build apartments and houses that address the local populations needs not investors and the extremely wealthy and build apartments that are in keeping with the local areas existing building sizes
2021/3225/P	Clare Roebuck	13/02/2022 14:05:00	OBJ	<p>My objections to the planned development at Murphy's Yard on Gordon House Road are on two main grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The traffic, pollution and footfall on Gordon House Road are already at very high levels. With families and children walking to and from school and work, and with many old people in the area, during peak construction with the forecast of increased traffic from vehicles - this is going to make it very unsafe. 2. The development will not provide the affordable family housing so badly needed in the area as it consists of 1 & 2 bed flats. Lack of affordable housing is pricing families out of the area, there are less and less school age children. The council has a responsibility and policy to provide affordable housing which is not being delivered. <p>I also have concerns about the numbers of people this will bring onto the Lido area of the Heath as there are no significant green spaces in the development. It will affect the quality of life for people in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>And the height and scale of the development is worrying considering how it will affect the view from Parliament Hill, not just for local people but the visitors (including overseas tourists) to the Heath who come for the stunning and iconic view over London.</p> <p>This is all very worrying!</p>
2021/3225/P	J Stevens	13/02/2022 14:43:18	OBJ	I wish to object most strongly against this very greedy and totally insensitive application. The proposal represents gross overdevelopment of the site. It is noticeable that there is no agreed percentage for social housing offered, and even if there were you can be quite sure that were permission to be granted the developers would - as elsewhere in the borough eg 100 Avenue Rd - try to get out of any such commitment. Worst of all this appallingly badly designed development proposal would without doubt incur irreversible damage to Hampstead Heath including the spectacular and important views across London from Parliament Hill. It is beyond belief that developers care nothing for the importance of the Heath. It is also clear that no thought whatsoever has been given to the requirement that the Heath should be protected from such developments eg by the Hampstead Neighbourhood plan, Camden local plan and other planning policies concerning this area. Once built the damage would be irreversible and regrettable for centuries ahead. Please refuse outright.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Tatyana Guveli	13/02/2022 19:06:24	OBJ	It is great to know that Murphy's yard can be developed but I am against tall towers, flats that are way too small and too expensive. I object to the potential damage to Mortimer Terrace nature reserve. The development is too ambitious and not enough centred on the needs of the community.
2021/3225/P	Rebecca Crum	14/02/2022 09:35:12	OBJ	While I welcome the idea of making proper use of the Murphy's yard plot, there are huge issues with the plan as it stands. 19-storey tower blocks and huuuuuge industrial buildings are totally inappropriate for the area - where is the precedent for this? Not only will it look incredibly ugly and block out light from many people's properties, but how on earth would the local infrastructure cope with this amount of people - the roads, public transport, GPs, schools? What thought has been put into that? This development should be human-scale, not greedy-developer scale. Also, London is already overrun with 'luxury flats' that ordinary people can't afford to buy; post-pandemic the market is over-supplied. And at a million for a 2-bed flat, this development is being planned to provide pied-a-terres for the international super-rich, not for ordinary Londoners. Not to mention the fact that it's very difficult to get a mortgage over 5-6 floors - what does that say about who the developers expect their potential buyers to be? And how many Londoners really want to live in a tower after Grenfell and the cladding scandal? These flats will just become another bank vault for hedge funds and overseas investors, at the expense of ordinary people who need affordable family homes and green space. I don't buy the developer's opinion that they 'can't afford' to obey the planning rules for affordable housing. They need to go back to the drawing board. This is the kind of development that people really need - or some form of compromise between this kind of thing and 19-storey towers https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2019/oct/08/stirling-prize-architecture-goldsmith-street-norwich-co-uncil-houses
2021/3225/P	Joel McDonald	13/02/2022 15:38:57	OBJ	I object to the development for the following reasons: 1. the development is too high and should be limited to 3-4 stories 2. the development will overshadow the local area, the Heath and the Lido. This is unacceptable 3. the development should have more family and affordable housing 4. the development will be too dense and create too much traffic 5. the development will have a significant adverse affect on the views of the City, skyline, Heath and Parliament Hill
2021/3225/P	Ryan	13/02/2022 15:39:35	COMMNT	Just NO- Stop it. The population increase will impact badly in this square mile. Camden and its 8.5 square miles is already mushrooming at 32k per square mile. That's double the density of Tokyo! Imagine that!
2021/3225/P	Wendy Garfinkle	13/02/2022 19:11:45	OBJ	I support car free developments, but the public transportation in the area that this proposed building will be built is already very congested. In addition, a building of 14-19 stories high will seriously impact views from Parliament Hill and the Heath. Those views are precious. Please don't.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Lucy Scott-Moncrieff	13/02/2022 17:03:54	WREP	<p>I write to object to the application for outline planning permission. I am not a planning expert, so rely on comments I have read by those who do have relevant expertise, and, to a certain extent, on my own experience as someone who lived on Gordon House Road in the 1980's and 90's; drives along it if I have to, and looks out from the Heath from Parliament Hill.</p> <p>My points are:</p> <p>a. Regardless of the intention not to provide parking to residents, the development will greatly increase traffic, during construction work and subsequently in servicing the businesses and residents on site. As one of the roads directly edging the Heath, it is always busy, and often jammed or inching along (and the relief during the pandemic is now just a memory), and as there are no realistic options for many journeys, the traffic will get worse.</p> <p>b. The proposed buildings are completely out of scale for the area, which, presumably, is to maximise profit, as the residential buildings are not in line with the Camden requirements. This makes it all the more strange that the developers claim that they can't afford the required 'affordable' housing, and suggests that they are gold plating the development and are not interested in their civic responsibilities.</p> <p>c. The development will not only affect those who live and travel by car in the area, but also the people who enjoy the Heath, who will be faced with an obtrusive eyesore bang in the middle of much loved views. The willingness of the developers to seek to give views of the Heath to their customers by blocking the view of the Heath of those who live in Kentish Town is really unpleasant.</p> <p>c. As I say, I am not a planning expert, but the many and obvious deficiencies in this application, by people who presumably know exactly what they are doing, makes me wonder if they are putting in a ridiculously unrealistic application in the expectation that, when it is rejected, they can come back with a fresh application that still fails to take account of the facts on the ground, but which they put forward as a generous attempt to meet the housing needs of Londoners despite the selfish objections of locals.</p> <p>I therefore hope any revised application will be treated with the same scrutiny and rigour as it would have been if it were the original application.</p>
2021/3225/P	Joanne O'Brien	13/02/2022 18:54:48	OBJ	<p>I am very unhappy with the proposed development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is too high rise - towers that are 19 stories high breach local recommendations and will block light and views. The plan should be for low-rise and high density housing. 2. There is not enough family housing. Most of the development (88%) will be 1 and 2 bedroom flats which we don't need in this area. We need family accommodation. 3. Ugly development design, a missed opportunity. 4. Poor insulation, does not use latest technology for heat preservation in buildings and for ventilation. 5. Where are plans to extend the local transport infrastructure to cope with such large numbers of new residents near Gospel Oak and Kentish Town Stations? Kentish Town Station is totally packed in the mornings and evenings during normal weekdays. 6. There appears to be little provision for young people. 7. I agree strongly with the comment by the DPNF expert Design Review Panel which states that 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. 8. It will also bring an excessive amount of traffic to the area, despite the fact that it is proposed residents may not own cars. What about deliveries and servicing of such a huge new community?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	D Connell	11/02/2022 21:14:25	OBJ	<p>I absolutely object to Murphy's Yard proposed development. I object to the idea of a large development being forced into a limited space. It will damage to the character of the area. It will ruin treasured and protected views and result in a development with a poor quality of life. Totally incongruous.</p> <p>The ridiculously tall, ugly towers will create small flats and not enough housing for families.</p> <p>The development will not provide enough affordable housing, as stated in the developer's own reports.</p> <p>The proposal provides limited services for young people, according to the developer's reports.</p> <p>Due to these massive structures, the development has a very high level of embodied carbon and is expected to have high energy use due to lack of ambitious insulation requirements. They have not followed good practice for environmental building design, including for natural ventilation and cooling, and will contribute to the heat island effect.</p> <p>The number of people possibly living in these flats will need access to doctor's surgeries, dentist's, the Royal Free Hospital, parking etc., All these things are already oversubscribed in this area. There's isn't the infrastructure. This planning request needs to be rejected. Camden is keen to look after the quality of air yet they chop down trees and now they want to desimate the area. No!</p>
2021/3225/P	James	12/02/2022 13:00:43	OBJ	Blocking the sunlight to the lido is unacceptable
2021/3225/P	James	12/02/2022 13:00:48	OBJ	Blocking the sunlight to the lido is unacceptable
2021/3225/P	Daniel Pick	13/02/2022 19:24:05	OBJ	<p>I am dismayed from all I have seen by the unacceptable height and brutal design of the three tower blocks.</p> <p>While pleased to hear of a development, housing, access route, cycleways, shops etc., the scheme needs to respect the aesthetic of the area, not jeopardise precious and historic views from the Heath, and provide accommodation at human scale, and a suitable density, not as here squeezing every last inch of space to maximise profit.</p> <p>I believe an acceptable density can in fact be achieved With much lower rise buildings than this !</p>
2021/3225/P	Sarah Dewis	14/02/2022 11:19:48	COMMNT	<p>I object to the proposed development because:</p> <p>It puts too many people and activities into a modest-size site</p> <p>The 19 storey height of some of the buildings would affect strategic views of central London from Parliament Hill</p> <p>In some seasons the Lido would be in complete shadow and not enjoyable to swim in.</p> <p>These building would loom over neighbouring residential areas</p> <p>The increased traffic would worsen circulation and increase pollution levels in neighbouring areas</p> <p>Current plans do not include 'Kentish Town Square' or new public space</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Belinda Wakefield	14/02/2022 18:30:58	OBJ	<p>I object to the development as it is currently presented for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Massing/density: the overall massing is very dominant and the number of large tall and bulky buildings creates the feeling, in many areas, of an overdeveloped canyon like site. The line of buildings along the r/way line (F, G, H,I) present an unbroken solid block which is very unattractive and imposing. This massing should be broken up. 2. Shed 3: the large development of shed 3 dominates the centre of the site as a large blockage breaking the site in two. It is far too tall and cumbersome in design and is far too close to plot I, the healthcare site. It is not sensitively designed and is overwhelming from all directions. It also creates a big shadow. This needs radical rethinking. 3. The tower blocks, plots J and S: these are far too tall and dominant and are positioned at the narrowest point of the site thus emphasising the feeling of a canyon. Such tall buildings are not in the character of the surrounding area. They are visible from everywhere. My own neighbourhood will have their amenity damaged by seeing these towering above the Highgate Studios area. (See sec 5.3.3. Fig 512, verified view 7). The nearby blocks at plot K likewise are too tall and not in the character of the surrounding area. 4. Existing views: it is important in such a dense urban area as Kentish Town to retain an open aspect. At present the view from near the canopy outside Kentish Town station gives all residents and visitors a wonderful sense of well-being and beauty. The proposed development will ruin this. All the modelled photographs show a line of solid blocks of buildings of massive density and height. (See e.g. figs 517 and 518, verified views 12a and b.) The heights need to be reduced and the block like massing needs a radical rethink. Likewise the same applies to views south from Hampstead Heath. These views are very important for everyone and need to be preserved. 5. Landscaping: I like the variety of habitats that you propose but more could be achieved if the buildings were less dense. I feel there is not enough green space to counteract the density of large buildings. In particular I would like to see more space for community allotments. As has been illustrated through the periods of Covid lockdowns, being able to grow vegetables and participate in gardening is very beneficial for mental health. In addition I see no provision for any water features in the site. I think water provides a wonderful sense of peace and calmness, again beneficial for mental health, as well as being extremely attractive. 6. In terms of the proposed breakdown of types of residential homes, there should be more emphasis on social/affordable and rental housing as there is a big need in this area for such housing. 7. I am concerned that basically having one main vehicular entrance to the site from Sanderson Close will create unacceptable levels of traffic on Highgate Road, Lady Somerset Road, Burghley Road, with knock on effects on Kentish Town Road (already a traffic bottleneck) and other nearby residential streets.
2021/3225/P	Cara Lee	11/02/2022 09:41:24	COMMT	<p>I object to the development on the basis that it will ruin the views in the area. Why does it need to be so tall? It will cast an awful shadow over the historic lido and ruin the heath for everyone who enjoys it. It's unacceptable to ruin the views of one of the oldest and most beautiful remaining natural parks in London for the sake of the developer's profits. These are luxury apartments designed to make as much profit as possible (1-2 bed flats) off prime land, under the guise of providing affordable/needed housing. There is absolutely no justification for such large towers. Stop being greedy! We need the development to be altered so that it takes into account the increased population numbers it proposes in the area, and make sure the buildings address the issue of rising temperatures in the city (self cooling etc) instead of blindly and selfishly adding to the problem in the name of capitalism. Shame on the council if they let this go ahead as planned. We need to stand up to this.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Cara Lee	11/02/2022 09:41:27	COMMNT	I object to the development on the basis that it will ruin the views in the area. Why does it need to be so tall? It will cast an awful shadow over the historic lido and ruin the heath for everyone who enjoys it. It's unacceptable to ruin the views of one of the oldest and most beautiful remaining natural parks in London for the sake of the developer's profits. These are luxury apartments designed to make as much profit as possible (1-2 bed flats) off prime land, under the guise of providing affordable/needed housing. There is absolutely no justification for such large towers. Stop being greedy! We need the development to be altered so that it takes into account the increased population numbers it proposes in the area, and make sure the buildings address the issue of rising temperatures in the city (self cooling etc) instead of blindly and selfishly adding to the problem in the name of capitalism. Shame on the council if they let this go ahead as planned. We need to stand up to this.
2021/3225/P	Audrey Mandela	11/02/2022 14:49:35	OBJ	<p>I object to plans for the proposed development in Planning Application 2021/3225/P, Street Record, Sanderson Close, London, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development's density, bulk and height are excessive and completely out of character with the surrounding area. 2. It would ruin views of the area, particularly views from Hampstead Heath. 3. It would block light for a number of local residents. 4. It would put pressure on local services, increase noise and traffic, and have a serious negative effect on the environment. 5. Allowing this type of development would set a bad precedent for high-rise buildings close to the Heath. <p>I urge you to refuse this application. Thank you.</p>
2021/3225/P	Patricia Potter	12/02/2022 09:50:22	OBJ	I object to the height and scale of this development. The view from Parliament hill MUST be protected. The lido will be cast into shadow. The traffic will be unbearable on a road that is already largely at a standstill. Once it is done it will be there forever and adversely affect our beloved part of London always. Please please don't let this happen.
2021/3225/P	heather Allan	12/02/2022 14:10:57	OBJ	I am objecting to these proposals because of the high rise nature of many of the buildings. They will dominate the view from surrounding Parliament Hill, block light from the Lido, and increase the density of habitation, and traffic flow, in an area especially used by children going to school, dog walkers, cyclists and outdoor recreational pursuits.