

Rafi Miah

From: Max Lack [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 February 2022 11:37
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Application number 2021/3225/P

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[REDACTED]

I am writing in relation to the planning application 2021/3225/P. I sent a message via the planning application portal also, but wanted to be sure that it reached you.

The development of Murphy's Yard is a fantastic opportunity to revitalise the area, to draw in new residents, and to improve the lot of the existing community. I am all in favour of increasing the local housing stock (as long as it actually meets local housing needs, which the proposal clearly does not). It also has the opportunity to increase local interconnectedness with new bike paths etc. In short, it could be the making of the area.

Nonetheless, I am concerned by the details of the Murphy's Yard Development Plan.

1) Camden has managed to preserve its character as a low-rise neighbourhood despite many challenges over the years, and this proposal would undo all of that good work. The proposal for so many high-rise buildings (in the local context, anything over 6 to 7 storeys is high-rise) would damage the neighbourhood in the long-term for little short-term gain.

2) Relatedly, these high-rises, as illustrated in the development plan, would destroy multiple treasured view lines from Hampstead Heath, which is barely acknowledged in the proposal. These view lines are some of the area's most important features, drawing people from all across London, and once gone they can't be restored. The trade does not make sense. Moreover, it is telling that the proposal ignores rather than seeks to address this issue. The scheme's architect's claim that the development will have "no adverse effects in relation to townscape and visual impact" is frankly insulting, when their own illustrations make clear the extent of the impact.

3) The design is generic and clearly does not have aesthetics or quality of life at its heart. For a borough with such a great tradition of innovative and efficient housing solutions, like Rowley Way (which could have served as a fantastic model, given the dimensions of Murphy's Yard), this paints a depressing picture, which will age poorly. I would suggest that they simply need to be told to do better and to broaden their focus beyond profit if they want custodianship of such an important site.

4) The proposal to build so many 1 and 2 bed flats appears to be cynically aimed at the corner of the market with the highest margins. This doesn't match the area's needs at all, where there's a well-documented lack of proper family homes, which will be politically controversial and further damage social cohesion in the neighbourhood.

5) The proposal only pays lip service to the idea of green public space. They've essentially taken the minimum necessary space between the buildings, laid down some cursory flower beds, and designated it green space.

I appreciate that Murphy's need to be able to develop the site profitably, and there is always a middle ground, but the generic high-rise development they have proposed resembles nothing so much as a desire to cash out of the area with sole concern for Murphy's own interests. I do strongly believe that it is incumbent upon the local authority

to prevent them from doing so in this case and to strive for a solution that is both commercially satisfactory and: (i) safeguards the character of the neighbourhood; (ii) ensures the development of sustainable housing stock that meets community needs; and (iii) protects local heritage and view lines. Thank you.