

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Lynne Acred	15/02/2022 09:12:33	APP	<p>Since the Tories have been in Government we have had an exponential rise in building works all over London which has contributed to noise pollution, heavy vehicle pollution, air pollution, ill health and general chaos for local communities.</p> <p>In theory, the building of such large projects should benefit local communities, not destroy them. We have a record number of homeless people in this borough which is unacceptable given the fact that, as a whole, we are a very wealthy country.</p> <p>In the small print of this sort of application there is mention of some 'social housing' which it seems is a ploy to get the projects past the planners. Very very little, if any, social housing is ever, in reality, produced. The sunsets at the top of Kentish town are one of the area's best features. Perhaps the land could be used more considerably, effectively, compassionately.</p> <p>Houses with gardens, a park, something that gives our youth a good start in life and an incentive to change future environments for the good of all.</p>
2021/3225/P	Josie Tennant	15/02/2022 11:50:07	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal because I think that the taller buildings are too tall for the area. They are far taller than anything that currently exists nearby. Views from Parliament Hill will be negatively affected, as will the view to the Heath from Kentish Town Road. I am also concerned about how much traffic such a high density development will generate. As it is, Kentish Town road is often choked with traffic.</p>
2021/3225/P	Barbara Storch	15/02/2022 15:58:05	OBJ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Camden is home to state-of-the-art low-rise housing developments - led by visionary Sydney Cook and Neave Brown, having created affordable homes in community settings, and having earned architectural prizes galore. It is clear that the the current leaders in Camden could not be further from the ambitions and vision of leaders such as Cook and Brown: it is about maximising profits for developers through high rise, community destroying developments. The current Camden leaders have no vision for the community and do not set out to serve those who elected them - their local community. 2. We need more affordable housing. This development serves financial needs of developers and property speculators and money launderers, but not the community and those with housing needs, especially families, for whom they are completely unsuitable. 3. High rises are community destroying and targets for crime. <p>For once, why can the planners not take a leaf out of what has been done before, which worked well, do the right thing, and not pander to developers whose ONLY goal is to maximise profits for themselves? These are weak pushovers 'in charge' who are void of vision and ambition for the LOCAL community (not international money launderers/'investors')</p>
2021/3225/P	Kieran Smyth	15/02/2022 10:20:00	OBJ	<p>The buildings as proposed are far too high and will block natural light and important 360 degree views. The density of the population will be too high and ought to be at least halved. Also it needs to have a more meaningful commitment to social housing.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Paul and Evelyn Smith	15/02/2022 10:20:14	OBJ	<p>I was looking forward with some excitement to the transformation of a large drab industrial site to offer affordable housing and imaginative public spaces and facilities - my daughter is a teacher in the borough of Camden, desperate to find her first place to buy at some point - and had high hopes for this development. What is proposed?</p> <p>A cluster of high level tower blocks, the commitments to affordable housing being completely watered down, a mini-Stratford/uglier parts of Kings Cross imposed on the edge of Hampstead Heath, completely at odds with Camden's record on imaginative human-scale social housing - for example the light, terraced, tiered character of Alexandra Estate or the Brunswick Centre - not the brutalist 19 storey blocks being proposed with minimal provision for families or key workers, and casting its morning and midday shadow over Parliament Hill Lido, historically a major recreational facility.</p> <p>Absolutely not opposed to radical new development per se - Parliament Hill School and La Swap has turned out very well with cooperation with local groups - but this is totally ill-conceived and is missing a major opportunity to transform a vacant, derelict area for the better. Please please rethink.</p>
2021/3225/P	James Power	15/02/2022 19:50:09	OBJ	<p>One of the pleasures of being a Kentish Town resident is that the area is very low rise, no more so than at the Canopy by Kentish Town station, with a broad sweeping view of the sky and Hampstead Heath. Are we now to be deprived of that view, our loss to be the profit of the developers, who wish to steal it and replace it with ugly, blunt masses of concrete and glass that will dominate it? These proposals really offer little or nothing of benefit to Kentish Town or its present residents, only detriment. They will merely shoe-horn in an extra population with very few local amenities</p> <p>I hereby make plain my strenuous objection to these proposals and suggest the developers come back with more imaginative and sympathetic plans.</p>
2021/3225/P	Vipavee Chayachinda	16/02/2022 08:19:29	OBJ	<p>As a resident of the area and a mother of a pupil at Gospel Oak I feel it is vital for me to object to the shocking and extremely unwelcome development planned in our area. By now you must have received objections from a number of school parents, grandparents and carers who have raised serious concerns about the planned development at Murphy's Yard on Gordon House Road.</p> <p>Along with many others in this area, I want to lodge an objection to the development on two main grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 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. 2) 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>Additionally, the overall detrimental effect the development will have on quality of life for people in the surrounding areas is unacceptable.</p> <p>Indeed, Camden's independent expert Design Review Panel say, the bulk, height and massing of residential blocks is excessive and have a significant and unacceptable impact on important views from Parliament Hill to the north. The amount of accommodation should be reduced or redistributed, potentially through reduction of other uses on the site.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Hugo Plowden	15/02/2022 11:44:53	OBJ	I object to this application on the basis that the height of the taller buildings means both that iconic views over London from Parliament Hill will be compromised and that views towards the heath from Kentish Town will effectively be ruined. This is a view that is meant to be protected in the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan. I also think that the height of the taller buildings is completely out of character with the area as it currently exists.
2021/3225/P	Angela Woods	15/02/2022 21:37:59	OBJ	<p>As a local of 24 years I strongly object to the proposed towers along one side of the Murphys Yard developemnt closest to the overground railtracks between Gospel Oak and West Kentish Town. The bulk and height of many of the towers is out of keeping with the surrounding area. In particular I worry about the residents, businesses and the city farm that are adjacent to the proposed development. The impact on those residents cannot be underestimated. I understand that our city must grow and that housing is needed but the area is being grossly over developed. As a volunteer at the farm I know this will have a devastating effect on the farm that celebrates its 50th birthday this year. There are about 32,000 visitors a year to the farm and it is known as a precious pocket of valued tranquility (despite the trains) full of wildlife and quiet places to escape the pressures of urban life in these post pandemic times. The two largest towers dwarf the horse arena where there is a porgramme of riding for the disabled.</p> <p>The views in the area are protected by two viewing cones as I understand it. One from Parliament Hill where this development would crudely obscure clear views across the city to Canary Wharf and from Kentish Town Underground station the open vista valued by locals will be utterly destroyed.</p> <p>The scheme is also an opportunity for improvement of the area, it will be mean new amenities and bring prospertiy but the over dominance of the towers, and the two highest in particular, cause me real concern.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Daniel Frith	16/02/2022 08:11:51	OBJ	<p>As a resident of the area and a grandparent of a pupil at Gospel Oak I feel it is vital for me to object the shocking and extremely unwelcome development planned in our area. By now you must have received objections from a number of school parents, other grandparents and carers who have raised serious concerns about the planned development at Murphy's Yard on Gordon House Road.</p> <p>Along with many others in this area, I want to lodge an objection to the development on two main grounds:</p> <p>1) 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 Heath Society details this in its objections), the blocking of light to the Lido as a result of the construction of such large tower blocks (see Lido User Group objections) and the overall detrimental effect the development will have on quality of life for people in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Indeed, Camden's independent expert Design Review Panel say, "the bulk, height and massing of residential blocks is excessive and... have a significant and unacceptable impact on important views from Parliament Hill to the north. The amount of accommodation should be reduced or redistributed, potentially through reduction of other uses on the site."</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Lucy Cheetham	15/02/2022 21:58:53	OBJ	<p>I have lived in the local area - Lissenden Gardens and Hemmingway Close for 20 years and have worked at Gospel Oak Primary School for 14 of those. I can therefore say I know the area very well, especially as I work with families at the local primary school.</p> <p>I agree that this project would mean an increase in jobs for the local area, and the prospect of a greener space for travelling to and from Kentish Town is an excellent one and could potentially be a good use of the large space that was Murphy's Yard. The area does need more housing too but mainly for lower income families. I am unsure that this the main objective though..it appears a majority are smaller flats that would cost upwards of 90,000 - this we do not need locally.</p> <p>The plans worry me greatly, dense buildings create problems, and the height is not acceptable, why are the plans not in keeping with the area? The buildings should be no higher than surrounding buildings. As the plan stands, light and views will be blocked for the residents already living here, the roads are already blocked with traffic-affecting the air quality around the school. The work needed for these buildings will impact on the health of our local families-noise, dust and increased traffic. It also appears the enormous buildings are not ecological designed. The designs are not going to improve the local area or it's inhabitants it seems, the negatives far outweigh the positives for us all. These plans need to change for the benefit of the local community: Light, airy, low rise, affordable and social, eco housing, with plenty of green open space around, including amenities for children and the youth of our area. This will be a huge opportunity missed for the local families. This should be a forward thinking development that takes into account the pollution and environmental problems that already exist here - it should not be adding to them.</p>
2021/3225/P	Janet Smyth	15/02/2022 09:46:45	OBJ	<p>The buildings are far, far too tall. I object to the loss of view and light in the area of the proposed development. The additional traffic in the area is not sustainable. Half the height, half the population density and keep the walkway to the Heath open to the public.</p>
2021/3225/P	G. Hawting	15/02/2022 14:04:39	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed density of the scheme (human and buildings) would adversely affect Kentish Town by increasing pressure on existing services and resources and by blocking views to and from Parliament Hill. - The preponderance of one or two bedroom flats, and the very limited provision of affordable homes, would likely lead to a further imbalance of the local population towards young adults without children and away from families and older residents. That in turn is likely to increase the demand for fast food outlets and restaurants, which already proliferate in the area, at the expense of other retail facilities. - Construction traffic, noise and pollution, would adversely affect many local residents over many years, at the same time as other schemes (such as HS2, and the redevelopment of Regis Rd.) are in progress. -The proposal pays scant attention to green issues such as the need to limit the emission of CO2 and other gases responsible for global warming. - With appropriate planning and imagination, the site could be developed in a way that would enhance Kentish Town as whole, but this proposal seems only to be aimed at making huge profits for the developers.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Susan Rose	15/02/2022 15:21:58	OBJ	<p>This development is against the Council's own policies; what is the point of having them if they are then disregarded wholesale? The tower blocks are particularly inappropriate for this site ;blocking protected views ,crammed with small flats (again against Council policies and needs estimates) and entirely out of sympathy with the neighbourhood. It is shocking to realise that the buildings proposed do not conform to sustainability standards; again why set out these standards only for them to be ignored? There are other issues regarding traffic in Gordon House Road, the burden to be placed on the ecology of the Heath , the whole matter of destructive over -development which need to be addressed. At the moment the site owners need to read , understand and follow the Council's own policies and then there might be some hope of an acceptable solution to the problem of the correct use of this site.</p>
2021/3225/P	Lesley Stevas	15/02/2022 12:18:22	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the above application. This project is a threat to the environment near “metropolitan open land”. The Mass, density and height of the proposed six tower blocks, of between 11 to 19 stories will ruin the openness of the Heath from the Lido and nearby playing fields. Cause the loss of views of distant skyline, specifically the south-eastern views from Parliament Hill. The buildings will be an eyesore when seen from the viewing plaque on the top of Parliament Hill. They will block the distant vista and will be very ugly.</p> <p>This proposal is to build on the site of up to 825 residential homes for (2,000+ new residents, with no agreed percentage for affordable housing) plus within this proposal, offices and industrial buildings. A lack of green space for all the thousands of people who will use these buildings and homes can only result in their gravitating to the only green spaces available such as the heath and Parliament Hill. Although in theory there is plenty of room on the heath and Parliament Hill for all the new occupants and workers, sadly the reality is that everything will be trampled, tree roots become impacted, as we have seen during the recent lockdowns. More dogs to be exercised, possibly scaring the wildfowl and natural wildlife inhabiting the heath. The paths become slippery and dangerous muddy quagmires from all the footfall, forcing people like myself with impaired mobility to stay home or just walk around the street inhaling toxic traffic fumes.</p> <p>The resulting devastation to the heath and Parliament hill will be the direct outcome, if the proposal to build these homes on the site and offering no substantial green leisure space within this development, is granted. The biodiversity corridor good idea if implemented thoughtfully, unfortunately on viewing the plans it is seen to be a hard-paved walkway with a few flowerbeds and insignificant trees of no ecological value. The claims that it will be contribute towards a green infrastructure is not true but will be damaged by overshadowing high rise buildings. Do take note of a similar failure of the Marble Arch Mound, costing millions. Please let's not have another over ambitious architect's failure.</p> <p>Impact on services also: The doctor's surgeries are already overwhelmed and some have closed recently or amalgamated with other practices. Dental services will be more overwhelmed. Schools will be more oversubscribed.</p> <p>If this application is granted it will set a shocking and unchangeable precedent for high-rise building on the edge of the Heath. This application must be refused.</p>
2021/3225/P	Gad Heuman	15/02/2022 16:36:35	COMMNT	<p>I am opposed to this development.</p> <p>It does not offer the type of housing the community needs or that local residents could afford to buy.</p> <p>Environmentally, I also think it would create problems of light for the residents of Gospel Oak.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Gad Heuman	15/02/2022 16:36:38	COMMNT	<p>I am opposed to this development.</p> <p>It does not offer the type of housing the community needs or that local residents could afford to buy.</p> <p>Environmentally, I also think it would create problems of light for the residents of Gospel Oak.</p>
2021/3225/P	Gad Heuman	15/02/2022 16:36:40	COMMNT	<p>I am opposed to this development.</p> <p>It does not offer the type of housing the community needs or that local residents could afford to buy.</p> <p>Environmentally, I also think it would create problems of light for the residents of Gospel Oak.</p>
2021/3225/P	Hugh Long	15/02/2022 12:27:21	COMMNT	<p>In respect of the Affordable Housing Statement, I wish to draw your attention to the statements implying that individual balconies and terraces will substitute for inadequate ground level open public space and the opportunities for communal recreation.</p> <p>The height of the residential building is too great. Lowering the maximum height to 11 floors will do less damage to view from the slopes of the Heath retaining the feeling of space for visitors. This will also eliminate very a damaging precedent in the case of any future development applications.</p>
2021/3225/P	George Webster	15/02/2022 13:44:30	COMMNT	<p>My partner and I, both local residents, strongly believe these works should be reappraised for the reasons below.</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. See precedents in another part of London here (Wimbledon developments here: https://www.theguardian.com/business/2022/jan/01/epic-match-beckons-as-wimbledon-locals-take-on-tennis-club-expansion). Unfortunately, the defence against the expansion was unsuccessful. Let's not allow the same mistake to be made in Kentish Town.</p> <p>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.</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>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.</p> <p>There are better ways to provide housing, jobs and facilities, using low-rise, high-density models.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Natasha Pogson-Michell	15/02/2022 15:30:15	OBJ	<p>In principal, I am in favour of a development in Murphy's Yard. However, the height and density of the proposed residential 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>Therefore, 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. In addition, I suggest a detailed impact assessment be undertaken on possible overshadowing of the lido, and the spoiling of views from Parliament Hill.</p>
2021/3225/P	mauzima Bhamji	15/02/2022 10:53:47	COMMNT	As a Kentish Town resident our view is that the vista should be preserved.
2021/3225/P	NIGEL STEWARD	16/02/2022 00:11:58	OBJ	<p>I support the objections from the Heath & Hampstead Society and those being submitted by the City of London this week .</p> <p>I find it staggering that this application was made with the support of the Camden Council Planning Department after pre app discussions last year .</p> <p>It seems that Camden are totally influenced by the number of new dwellings , regardless of the size, mass & density of the tower blocks and have no agreed percentage for affordable housing .</p> <p>The very adverse implications for the local infrastructure seem to have been largely ignored a walk along Gordon House Road , even outside the rush hours , by Cllr Adam Harrison with the planning documents in his hands might damage his health and his environmental policies !</p> <p>Where are the green spaces and gardens ?</p> <p>I am shocked that Camden can let these documents see the light of day in this form it must be back to the drawing board .</p>
2021/3225/P	Harriet Craven	15/02/2022 14:14:46	APP	<p>.i am disappointed there appears to be so little green space or for tenants to have an allotment.</p> <p>Green space and growing vegetables, flowers & fruit are fundamental requirements for mental health, physical recreation & exercise. Mental health should be high on this agenda</p> <p>19 floor appartments lock residents in, obliterate views fro Kentish Town to the Heath & have nothing to recomend them.</p> <p>Lower buildings, Heath views with green & growing space should be a top priority for this proposal in an already densely populated area in NW5.</p>
2021/3225/P	Conan Hales	15/02/2022 16:25:46	OBJ	<p>Mansfield Road and Gordon House Road are regularly congested at peak times today. How will increased traffic volumes for the draw to be expected by a new development be managed?</p> <p>There is a lack of cycle connectivity and footpath connectivity of the development to neighbouring Gospel Oak ward to the west, despite there being policy of integration with neighbourhoods. Please do not let the railway continue to form a boundary and make it possible to access via Hemmingway Close and/or other roads.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Margaret Dickinson	15/02/2022 19:36:37	OBJ	<p>I object to aspects of the proposed development but agree with the general aim of providing for a mix of residential, industrial, office and social space and particularly the inclusion of a pedestrian/cycle route from Kentish Town to Gospel Oak.</p> <p>Reasons for objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The housing will not address priority needs in Camden because the units are too small and too expensive. With 88% to be one or two bedroom flats provision for families is minimal. There appears to be no provision for social housing and at most 35% for "affordable." With 2 bed flats expected to cost around £1000,000 they will be out of reach for most people who work in the arts, all but the most senior nurses, teachers and academics and certainly for bus drivers, construction workers and carers. Rather than serving those who work in Camden they are likely to be bought as buy-to-let investments and as pied-à-terres for the very wealthy. 2. The inclusion of 18 story blocks will result in an unacceptable carbon footprint for the project. See research on the carbon footprint of buildings of different heights eg. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/energy/news/2017/jun/ucl-energy-high-rise-buildings-energy-and-density-research-project-results In addition to the general problem that height increases carbon footprint the design does not follow good practice for insulation and the use of natural ventilation and cooling. 3. The scale of the buildings is inappropriate and damaging to adjoining neighbourhoods. The concentration of high rise buildings is not only out of keeping with the surrounding areas but the proposes residential buildings, especially the 18 story towers, will block protected views from Hampstead Heath and of Hampstead Heath. Residents of Kentish Town, Gospel Oak, the Dartmouth Park area, the Mansfield Road area and the Queens Crescent, Lismore Circus area will all be negatively affected. 4. The concentration and height of the buildings will militate against the quality of life within the development. The designs will result in an environment which is dingy, chilly and claustrophobic. The blocks will overshadow and overlook each other and any nearby public space. Space close to tower blocks is rarely well used because it feels overlooked, the aspect is dominated by walls rather than greenery and the blocks often concentrate wind and cast heavy shadows producing an unpleasant microclimate. Thus although green spaces are included in the development they may end up as sterile areas. The problem isn't just ratio of green space to dwellings because in high density low rise districts small landscaped squares and mini parks can be well used. 5. The size and height of the residential blocks will increase cost of construction and maintenance and therefore may be partly responsible for high price of accommodation. Many town planners argue that a relatively low rise mix of houses and flats can house as many people as tower blocks but even if this is not the case, fewer but cheaper units, including more family dwellings, could do more to ease the housing crisis. 6. The size and probable cost of the industrial/office space may exclude the kind of businesses most needed by Camden residents and most appropriate for the area. There is a severe shortage of suitable premises for people working in the arts and crafts, the media and related areas. Many sole traders or small companies engaged in such work have been forced out of Camden owing to the high cost of premises. Therefore, unless

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the proposed spaces will be less expensive than existing ones, it is unlikely that they will serve this need. Similarly, while the developers makes much of makerspaces, they provide no evidence that proposed units would in practice meet the need.

A relevant factor is that Camden used to have workshops round the corner from Murphy's Yard on Vicar St, off Grafton Road but these were recently demolished to make way for flats. If these spaces were demolished because redundant or unviable then this may provide clues as to the potential for workshop spaces in the new development.

7. The size and probable cost of the industrial/office space may attract businesses which would have a negative impact on residents in the development and neighbouring areas. For example one of the kinds of business likely to be able to afford such premises are dark kitchens which are relatively profitable because of poor labour practices coupled with the high demand for delivered food. The developers even mention dark kitchens as likely users. Apart from the poor labour practices which make such businesses undesirable employers, they are notorious for creating local environmental problems including kitchen fumes, high volumes of waste and constant noise and pollution from vehicles collecting deliveries.

8. The provision for social/recreational space are too vague. With a development of that size it would be important to include not only play spaces for infants and children but a range of facilities for adults including rooms for meetings and social events, and spaces for activities such as tennis, table tennis, boules, an outdoor gym and swimming. It should be noted that Parliament Hill Lido is crowded for much of the year as are the nearby tennis courts and children's playgrounds. The plans provide no assurance that the increase in local population will be at least matched by an increase in recreational space and facilities.

9. The impact on transport, traffic and parking are inadequately considered. Retail will require deliveries. Depending on use, the industrial and office units might generate a lot of new motor traffic. The plan to make the residential development car free is excellent in theory but how will it work in practice? Residents who can park at work may simply park in neighbouring roads avoiding the controlled hours. This will be a problem as night time parking is already oversubscribed in parts of the controlled zones. The price of the flats suggest residents will be wealthy enough to use ubers to go to work which will generate twice as many journeys as the same people using their own cars. What provision is there for bicycles? Bicycles would only be a manageable travel solution if every flat is to be provided with indoor, secure bike parking spaces on the ground floor adequate for all likely residents of the flat to keep a bike. (This is a common expectation in Holland but London has only recently begun to take bikes seriously)

Conclusion.

It is rare that such an opportunity comes up for a development on this scale. Whatever is done will have a lasting impact on life in a large part of Camden and some long term influence on London's environmental problems. As argued above, the present plans do not make the best possible use of the opportunity: they result in an unnecessarily high carbon footprint; they do not adequately address Camden's pressing problems of affordable housing and work places; the bulk and height of the design is not conducive to a high quality of life within the development and will reduce quality of life in the surrounding areas. I therefore urge Camden to reject the plans as they stand.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Greg Rubinstein	15/02/2022 15:15:36	OBJ	<p>The information and plans that have so far been made public suggest that the development, in this form, is not appropriate. My key observations, both positive and negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too many ill-positioned blocks of excessive height, which would largely block the protected view of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town Station, and which would greatly (and negatively) change the atmosphere of the southwards views from the lower slopes of Parliament Hill and the area near the Lido. - No obvious infrastructure provisions to support the addition of so many new housing units (on top of those already recently added as a result of the conversions to residential use of several previously industrial buildings on and around Highgate Road) - Proportion of small flats is much higher than is recommended/required by Camden, who want new developments like this to have a higher proportion of larger, family units. - It will be good to open up this large, inaccessible area to more general access, but there needs to be greater emphasis on community spaces, recreational facilities, small businesses etc, to make it a living hub, rather than a cash-generating scheme for the developers, that leaves behind a soulless desert of high-rise apartment buildings.
2021/3225/P	Marie-Noelle Swiderski	15/02/2022 10:56:02	OBJ	<p>We feel strongly that the proposed new development will spoil not only the view and aesthetics of the area, but will not be adding much to the neighborhood in terms of affordable housing or community life. Indeed the existing area is comprised of many residential streets, all at human / low to mid-rise level which suit the atmosphere and dynamism of the socio-economic demographics. Kentish Town is not made of tower blocks. It is a village and should remain so, while still hugely conveniently located to reach central London in a matter of minutes. We feel it is more important to regenerate the existing neighborhood and its amenities rather than create brand new ones that will deface the landscape and detract from what is a bustling area of one of the most beautiful zones of the capital.</p> <p>More importantly, allowing this new development to be built will further eat into the emerald necklace that surrounds the area, causing the lung of Hampstead Heath to be further cut off from our residents, separated by ever-growing pockets of concrete and metal. Please reconsider granting permission to this pernicious addition to the slippery slope of industrialisation in one of many absolutely lovely, unique and life-enhancing areas of North West London. It is a matter of life!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Anthony Tomei	15/02/2022 19:42:49	OBJ	<p>I am in favour in general of the proposal to develop this site.</p> <p>However the specific proposals need seriously to be reconsidered. The following features in particular seem rethinking (I am quoting from the DPNF report):</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The development will not provide enough affordable housing, as stated in the developer's own reports.</p> <p>I am also concerned by the following. Clearly this is a technical matter, but if the analysis is true then it certainly needs to be rethought:</p> <p>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.</p>
2021/3225/P	Caroline Bloch	15/02/2022 19:58:29	OBJ	<p>I object most strongly to this proposed development on the site of Murphy's Yard.</p> <p>This is on the grounds of inappropriate high-rise buildings in this area which will take light and views from many surrounding houses and streets. They will also obscure important views over London from Parliament Hill and views to the greenery of Parliament Hill which give this part of Camden much of its charm. The proposal also seems to be an over-development of the site which would be much more pleasant to live in with lower buildings.</p> <p>The development seems to run counter to many of the ideas set out in your own Camden Plan</p>
2021/3225/P	Ryan Roberts	16/02/2022 08:36:44	OBJ	<p>Although I'm glad to see housing being built within the area I have concerns about the scale of development and whether it's appropriate for the surrounding neighbourhood. This proposal is looking to include 800+ homes in a limited space, resulting in a cluster of buildings that are too tall for their surroundings and will damage the protected view of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town station. I'm also disappointed in the proposed ratio of one and two bedroom flats to the number of family homes, which the Council's housing needs study outlines as necessary for the community. Based on the forecasted £1M+ cost of a 2 bedroom flat, I worry that this proposal will deliver expensive investor-owned assets that leave the area under-utilised, rather than delivering meaningful housing stock to Kentish Town. I'm broadly in favour of developing Murphy's Yard but I'd like to see the proposed height reduced, an increase in family homes, and a reduction of overall density.</p>