

Rafi Miah

From: Kate and Martin Webster [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 February 2022 19:19
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Proposed Development Murphy's Yard - Application Number 2021/3225/P

Dear Sirs

As a member of The Heath & Hampstead Society and a frequent user of Hampstead Heath, I am writing to object to the proposed development of Murphy's Yard (Application Number 2021/3225/P) for the following reasons.

1. The mass, density and height of the six tower blocks, of between 11 to 19 storeys, will have an overwhelming adverse impact on the openness of the Heath from the Lido and nearby playing fields, and entail the loss of views of a distant skyline and specific south-eastern views from Parliament Hill, including the view, from the plaque, of approximately one half of the buildings depicted on the viewing plaque on the very top of Parliament Hill. The illustrations provide as part of the Application pack are misleading, using coloured outlines only which diminish the probable real-life effect of these bulky buildings against the skyline.

2. The proposal is to construct on the site up to 825 residential homes (for 2,000+ new residents, with no agreed percentage for affordable housing), 48,000 sq metres of industrial floor space, and 70,000 sq metres of office and r&d space. It must be understood that nowhere on the site itself are there to be gardens or significant green public spaces to where residents and workers can resort. The certain consequence of this grossly excessive density is that the new thousands of residents and workers will come onto the Parliament Hill area of the Heath in their reasonable search for the nearest (and only nearby) green open space.

Whilst there can be no in principle objection to the public coming onto the Heath. However, the new residents and workers will enter and congregate on this particular area of the Heath in such numbers that the area will be seriously and permanently degraded. We all witnessed the temporary degradation, right across the Heath, from covid-lockdown crowds. This certain damage will be the direct result of the developer's proposal (i) to build too many new homes on the site and (ii) to provide no significant green recreational space within the development itself.

3. One mitigating proposal from the developer was to construct a "green" and ecologically enhancing "corridor" from Kentish Town Station to the entrance to the Heath at the Lido, the so-called "Heath Line". The proposal is however revealed to be a hard-paved walkway with occasional flowerbeds and isolated trees of negligible ecological value. Four adjoining Camden Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation, ("SINCs"), one of which is the Heath, will not be "joined up" green infrastructures as the developer claims, but will be damaged by building massing and overshadowing of the corridor itself. This is an inexcusably missed opportunity to create a biodiversity corridor linking the Heath to local communities.

Thank you for your consideration of this objection.

Martin Webster