

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	MCAAC	17/02/2022 12:14:19	OBJ	<p>The MCAAC object strongly to the scale of this proposed development. The size of the towers at 17 stories is far too high and therefore imposing, to be acceptable so near to a conservation area that is typified by traditional 3 storey houses. It is hard to understand how the applicants have been so misguided in their design and how the density and bulk, far more appropriate for a central London location, has been arrived at. The strip of tall buildings would present the effect of a solid wall to the view from upper windows within the area that face to the east which currently enjoy a view of the gentle rise to Tufnell Park.</p> <p>In the absence of firm planning policy of a zoning nature this may be inevitable and we would ask Camden to not only refuse this application but to engage further with the developer and site owner in order to ensure that the eventual development is more in keeping with the natural suburban nature of the area. A six storey height limit should be quite sufficient to allow viability and to prevent undue harm to the many CAs and other sensitive neighbourhoods in close proximity.</p>
2021/3225/P	Emma lilley	17/02/2022 20:31:52	OBJ	Please do not build here as the lido will be blocked from the sun for part of the day. This is a wonderful community hub and people will be less inclined to visit if it is in shade all the time, particularly in the winter
2021/3225/P	Kim	17/02/2022 20:33:04	OBJ	The buildings are too tall and shouldn't be allowed to cast shadows on the Lido.
2021/3225/P	Foulla Pashkaj	17/02/2022 20:58:25	OBJ	<p>The proposed plan will make a significant and permanent impact on the look and vibe of the City Farm, a treasured community resource. It is a rare gem offering respite from urban living and is a uniquely tranquil enclave attractive to varied wildlife. There has been free access throughout the farms fifty year history that has seen three generations through the gates.</p> <p>I object to the current plans as two colossal towers will dominate the landscape will loom over the farm, and the local area.</p> <p>The looming towers will also cast a shadow over the Lido and the homes of many people. Sunlight shining into our homes is a blessing, this shouldn't be diminished because of inconsiderate architecture.</p>
2021/3225/P	Juliet young	17/02/2022 21:31:03	OBJ	<p>the Murphy's years development will provide a nice access to Kentish tube f from gospel oak and I am pleased it will be pedestrian friendly. It will open up an under used space</p> <p>But 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. I agree with this view.</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. I also agree with this view</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Rebecca Longworth	17/02/2022 11:59:37	COMMNT	<p>The plans for this development do not meet with good environmental practises.</p> <p>The structures will completely destroy the existing views from Parliament Hill which bring people to the area from all over the city, country, world.</p> <p>The wellbeing of locals is not being considered with this development.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose these plans and implore that the buildings be low-rise, no more than six storeys tall.</p>
2021/3225/P	Belinda Hollows	17/02/2022 12:50:01	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I am a resident of the Gospel Oak area and will be directly affected by these proposals.</p> <p>I use the southern part of the heath on a daily basis and will be affected by loss of sunlight. I regularly swim in the lido - including during winter months when light will be lost to the lido.</p> <p>The traffic on Gordon House Road is already heavy and there are jams at rush hour. The idea that this proposal will elad to less traffic is preposterous and certainly for the 9 years of development there will be more heavy vehicles and noise.</p> <p>The view from Hampstead Heath will be negatively affected. Even if St Pauls is still in view - the enjoyment of views across other London landmarks, which attract s many visitors, will be vastly impaired. The protected view from kentish Town will obviously not be upheld if the development goes ahead with these current proposed heights</p> <p>Camden has made efforts to appear concenr with the climate emergency but building ne w housing that doesn not meet standards of carbon neutrality is a contradiction in policy, as is the creation of 1 bed homes when larger homes are needed (according to Camdens' own assessment).</p> <p>On these grounds I absolutely object to the planning proposal as it stands.</p>
2021/3225/P	Kezia	17/02/2022 13:21:42	COMMNT	<p>I was incredibly shocked and saddened to hear about this development. While we need more affordable housing, I completely disagree with a development of this kind and scale. The local area is special because of the views from Parliament Hill and many people find solace and comfort looking over London. The Parliament Hill Lido is a cherished space all year round and to have the sun blocked by buildings would be disaster. This would really be a tragic development for Hampstead Heath.</p>
2021/3225/P	Tim COPPARD	17/02/2022 15:16:26	OBJ	<p>The proposed two towers are too high. They are way out of scale of the surrounding neighbourhoods which they will overshadow in parts. They will also adversely interrupt views south from parliament hill.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Charlotte Beckett	17/02/2022 14:14:22	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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, both for residents of the development as well as the surrounding neighbourhoods, including Gospel Oak, Kentish Town, Dartmouth Park and Tufnell Park. It will also blight the views from Parliament Hill.</li> <li>? 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. 88% of the 825 homes will be 1-bed and 2-bed flats. As a proportion, this is twice as many as Camden's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) says is needed throughout the Borough. Just 14 of the 825 homes will be family (4-bed) houses.</li> <li>The development will not provide enough affordable housing, as stated in the developer's own reports. Camden's policies say that 35% of homes should be affordable, but the planning application claims that this amount of affordable is not viable. ?</li> <li>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. ?</li> <li>There are better ways to provide housing, jobs and facilities, using low-rise, high-density models. This is an unimaginative, financially-driven use of space, not a well thought through solution to the housing and employment needs of the borough.</li> </ul> <p>Come on Camden, we can do better than this</p>
2021/3225/P	Nicola Mayhew	17/02/2022 16:05:34	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed development which I believe will have a severely detrimental impact on many aspects of local life and the character of the area.</p> <p>The massive scale of the development is completely out of keeping with the existing buildings and local amenities, including Hampstead Heath and the neighbouring City Farm which would be overshadowed by the proposed tall and bulky buildings which are also likely to create undesirable wind flows. Many views from the Heath would be dramatically changed for the worse given the disproportionate size of the buildings and their proximity to one of London's greatest and best-loved open spaces.</p> <p>This city desperately needs more and better housing, but what is proposed is massive over-development of the site and does not answer the need for genuinely affordable housing for families.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Komal Bhatia	17/02/2022 15:24:05	OBJ	<p>The proposed development at Murphy's Yard would be an eyesore. It is not in keeping with the architecture, cultural capital and social fabric of Kentish Town, Gospel Oak, and Dartmouth Park. Drawings of the high rise tower blocks look more like something from flashy Dubai than the gentle and tasteful architecture of north London. There is no clear rationale for such tall structures when there are other excellent examples of low-rise dense housing with more respectful, interesting and beautiful architecture. The additional homes will generate more pressure on local services, worsen the already horrendous traffic and air pollution on Gordon House Road, Highgate Road and Kentish Town Road. The health and wellbeing impacts of stretched health and education services, higher quantities of particulate matter from polluting vehicles on local residents, particularly young children, should not be ignored or overlooked. The development would spoil the view of Hampstead Heath from Kentish Town Station. The looming structures would ruin the tranquil experience of a visit to Kentish Town City Farm, with residents of the new development looking down from their luxury flats on local visitors, service users and young children who frequent the farm, often as a result to receive some relief or benefits from adverse circumstances or stressful lives. This is likely to be intrusive, insensitive and stressful for those on the ground. Given the location and orientation of the proposed development, it is likely that the houses will be extremely unaffordable for local residents and first-time buyers in the area, and inevitably many "luxury apartments" will be bought by overseas investors looking to park their money in London rather than live in these homes and contribute to the community feel in the area. The risks and costs to the local community, the potential negative impacts on quality of life of local residents, especially the poorest and most vulnerable, and the insensitive design of the proposal offer little benefit to those who already live here while asking for more than we can reasonably sacrifice. The proposed new development should not be built.</p>
2021/3225/P	becky baur	17/02/2022 10:15:59	COMMT	<p>The plan for development at Murphy's Yard is an outrage. Hampstead Heath is a place of beauty and a well known destination for many Londoners and tourists. The Lido at Parliament Hill is frequented in the early mornings by swimmers from all backgrounds and ages and it will be overshadowed for the morning, cutting out valuable light and views.</p> <p>Hampstead Heath is famous for its clear views over the city and should remain so. I actually reside in Hackney but travel over for its unique views and space.</p>
2021/3225/P	victoria	17/02/2022 10:26:34	AMEND	<p>I no longer live on the area, but travel to the Heath regularly to walk our dog or meet old friends for a swim in Ludo and a coffee. It has been an important place for my family over the years.</p> <p>The new development will cast a shadow over the Hampstead Heath Ludo. in a time when we should be prioritising outdoor exercise for so many reasons, mental health, fitness, community enjoyment of the outdoors. The Lido and its community should be supported and an activity encouraged.</p> <p>Please ensure this important part of our community is safe guarded and not left in the shadows.</p>
2021/3225/P	Patricia Barson	17/02/2022 10:56:09	APP	<p>The proposed development is too high and will wreck the view and dominate the area.....</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Clare Manifold	17/02/2022 16:08:51	OBJ	<p>While I do not object to the development of this site, I do object to this planning application 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> <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>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>
2021/3225/P	Alison and Nigel Jamieson	17/02/2022 16:42:24	OBJ	<p>We strongly disagree with the planning proposals as they stand on the grounds that the new tower blocks would prevent winter sun to the Lido and also because they would be a real eyesore for those of us who live nearby and who also walk on the Heath several times a week.</p>
2021/3225/P	Alice Cheetham	17/02/2022 16:59:34	OBJ	<p>I object to these developments - I am a volunteer and have been involved with Kentish Town City Farm, in the vicinity of these developments, for a number of years. I feel that this development would give a drastic change to the look and feel of the farm, which as one of the oldest city farms in London has long been a focal point for the community. These large buildings would cause overlook the farm, not to mention funnelling wind through the farm.</p>
2021/3225/P	Julie Berk	17/02/2022 10:21:49	OBJ	<p>The scale of the development is too large and invasive for the area.  Will unpleasantly overlook Kentish Town City Farm and other neighbours.  Out of character for the area.  Overdevelopment for the area, concerns about transport links.  Wind will affect the farm and other neighbours as the size and bulk is such a change of scale.  Will affect the amenity of the farm for visitors.</p>
2021/3225/P	victoria	17/02/2022 10:26:19	AMEND	<p>I no longer live on the area, but travel to the Heath regularly to walk our dog or meet old friends for a swim in Ludo and a coffee. It has been an important place for my family over the years.  The new development will cast a shadow over the Hampstead Heath Ludo. in a time when we should be prioritising outdoor exercise for so many reasons, mental health, fitness, community enjoyment of the outdoors. The Lido and its community should be supported and activity encouraged.  Please ensure this important part of our community is safe guarded and not left in the shadows.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	victoria	17/02/2022 10:26:26	AMEND	<p>I no longEr live on the area, but travel to the Heath regularly to walk our dog or meet old friends for a swim in Ludo and a coffee. It has been an important place for my family over the years.</p> <p>The new development will cast a shadow over the Hampstead Heath Ludo. in a time when we should be prioritising outdoor exercise for so many reasons, mental health , fitness, community enjoyment of the out doors. The Lido and it¿s community should be supported and and activity encourage.</p> <p>Please ensure this important part of our community is safe guarded and not left in the shadows.</p>
2021/3225/P	Thomas Orr	17/02/2022 22:20:29	OBJ	<p>2021/3225/P</p> <p>I have lived in Kentish Town for 21 years, and I strongly object to the proposed development at Murphy's Yard for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>Design</b>  Numerous studies have shown that people prefer to live and work in buildings and environments that are traditionally designed. The current proposals are very poor-quality high-rise buildings that have nothing in common with their surroundings, and such developments have been shown to be unpopular.</p> <p><b>Scale</b>  Towers of up to 19 storeys are completely out of scale with the surrounding residential areas. The proposed building at the top of Kentish Town High Street is a good example. The development will also largely block the view of the Heath from the top of Kentish Town High Street. Such developments with tall buildings close together are susceptible to high winds at ground level, leading to an unpleasant microclimates.</p> <p><b>Size</b>  The application demonstrates over-development in the extreme.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b>  Construction traffic and then user traffic for a project of this size will severely affect the amenity of the surrounding areas.</p> <p><b>Affordable housing.</b>  There is a lack of affordable housing.</p> <p><b>Public opinion</b>  The sheer amount of objections received indicates the unpopularity of the proposal</p>
2021/3225/P	Elizabeth Dore	17/02/2022 23:04:51	COMMNT	<p>Objections</p> <p>Block protected views</p> <p>Units tooo small</p> <p>Not affordable</p> <p>High energy design</p> <p>High traffic impact</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2021/3225/P	Elizabeth Dore	17/02/2022 23:04:57	COMMNT	Objections Block protected views Units tooo small Not affordable High energy design High traffic impact
2021/3225/P	Elizabeth Dore	17/02/2022 23:05:21	COMMNT	Objections Block protected views Units tooo small Not affordable High energy design High traffic impact
2021/3225/P	Elizabeth Dore	17/02/2022 23:05:26	COMMNT	Objections Block protected views Units tooo small Not affordable High energy design High traffic impact
2021/3225/P	Elizabeth Dore	17/02/2022 23:05:30	COMMNT	Objections Block protected views Units tooo small Not affordable High energy design High traffic impact
2021/3225/P	Elizabeth Dore	17/02/2022 23:05:36	COMMNT	Objections Block protected views Units tooo small Not affordable High energy design High traffic impact
2021/3225/P	Elizabeth Dore	17/02/2022 23:05:43	COMMNT	Objections Block protected views Units tooo small Not affordable High energy design High traffic impact

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Ms Emma Dally	18/02/2022 08:59:19	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this development on numerous grounds, all of which have already been mentioned by other members of the community.</p> <p>J Murphy &amp; Sons say they are proud to have formed part of the Kentish Town community for over 55 years Now they are proposing the most insensitive of plans that will spoil part of Kentish Town for ever.</p> <p>Camden certainly needs more good housing for families and young people at affordable rates. The community can benefit from the sort of low-rise, high-density developments we can see around the borough, not tall tower blocks of small flats will ruin precious ancient views from all around. The view of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town and Leighton Road will virtually disappear; the suggested 'window' shown on the current plans is risible and an insult to the community.</p> <p>This land offers an opportunity for an imaginative development could be admired in its own right while also fitting in with the surrounding areas. Camden has many examples of such visionary and humane developments built over the last few decades. When J Murphy &amp; Sons first revealed the plans in an exhibition in July 2019, many people were shocked by the proposed height of the tall towers and expressed their views. More than two years on and the towers are still there. Not much listening to the community there.</p> <p>It will be heartbreaking and disgraceful if this development goes ahead in this form. The interests of our community will clearly not be a priority. Perhaps not even a concern.</p>
2021/3225/P	Ms Emma Dally	18/02/2022 08:59:22	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this development on numerous grounds, all of which have already been mentioned by other members of the community.</p> <p>J Murphy &amp; Sons say they are proud to have formed part of the Kentish Town community for over 55 years Now they are proposing the most insensitive of plans that will spoil part of Kentish Town for ever.</p> <p>Camden certainly needs more good housing for families and young people at affordable rates. The community can benefit from the sort of low-rise, high-density developments we can see around the borough, not tall tower blocks of small flats will ruin precious ancient views from all around. The view of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town and Leighton Road will virtually disappear; the suggested 'window' shown on the current plans is risible and an insult to the community.</p> <p>This land offers an opportunity for an imaginative development could be admired in its own right while also fitting in with the surrounding areas. Camden has many examples of such visionary and humane developments built over the last few decades. When J Murphy &amp; Sons first revealed the plans in an exhibition in July 2019, many people were shocked by the proposed height of the tall towers and expressed their views. More than two years on and the towers are still there. Not much listening to the community there.</p> <p>It will be heartbreaking and disgraceful if this development goes ahead in this form. The interests of our community will clearly not be a priority. Perhaps not even a concern.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2021/3225/P	Thomas McKay	17/02/2022 21:48:53	OBJ	

As local residents, a young family living very close to the site, we would like to express our incredibly strong objection to the proposals as laid out for the development of Murphy's Yard. The reasons are laid out specifically below, and we seek to address the specific objections relating to planning regulations as unemotionally as possible.

Nevertheless, I think it is worth saying that, while we understand emotional reasons are not relevant in these decisions, the level of fear, anxiety and upset caused by the nature of these proposals in the local area is off the charts and we would lobby as vehemently as possible for these proposals to be vastly scaled back, particularly in relation to the insane height and scale of the proposed development.

To the specific policy-related objections:

Firstly, 88% of the 825 homes will be 1-bed and 2-bed flats. As a proportion, this is twice as many as Camden's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) says is needed throughout the Borough. Just 14 of the 825 homes will be family (4-bed) houses. So the claim that this will be serving local families and ameliorating the community is as cynical as it is misleading.

Secondly, Camden's own policies say that 35% of homes should be 'affordable', but the planning application claims that this amount of 'affordable' is not viable. So it is unclear what proportion will be 'affordable', but the developers are arguing that it must be less than the required 35%.

The developer's Viability Assessment assumes that a 2-bedroom flat in one of the towers will cost around £950,000 to £1,000,000 at today's prices which I'm no way can be described as affordable.

In terms of disrupted views, the development will loom large in views from all directions, including Hampstead Heath and Oak Village. Worst of all, and of deep, deep concern, is the fact that the protected view of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town will be largely blocked.

The architects claim: "The Proposed Development to integrate with the existing built environment." This is an insane and disrespectful claim and is very clearly untrue. Projection images of the proposed site show this to be entirely false.

As you will know, Camden's own 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."

Regarding traffic : the 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. This would be surprising given the low level of activity on site now and the number of homes and businesses that will need servicing. So again this seems at best naive and at worst wilfully misleading.

It is worth saying that 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 and will ruin treasured and protected views and result in a development with a poor quality of life both for those moving into the overly populated development, and of course for the existing residents, whose quality of life will undoubtedly be

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

significantly reduced in terms of traffic, pressure on public services, disruption from the lengthy proposed works, the removal of protected views and light disruption among many other things.

The ludicrously and unnecessarily tall 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.

On the subject of the towers insane height, they change, disrupt and adversely impact the existing natural landscape in so many ways, disrupting views from so many angles and destroying one of the last areas of the city that is not hampered by high rise living.

Moreover, from an environmental perspective, 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. The developers have not followed good practice for environmental building design. Camden make much of their commitment to sustainable construction and we would ask you to take this matter incredibly seriously, as we do as local residents.

It seems obvious that, even as a non-professional, there are better ways to provide housing, jobs and facilities, using low-rise, high- density models. As such we are vehemently opposed to the proposed development and would ask you in the strongest and most respectful way to take all our concerns on board and reagency the proposals for Murphy's Yard.

Many thanks

Tom McKay and Elie Zaccour

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2021/3225/P	Elie Zaccour	17/02/2022 21:49:36	OBJ	

As local residents, a young family living very close to the site, we would like to express our incredibly strong objection to the proposals as laid out for the development of Murphy's Yard. The reasons are laid out specifically below, and we seek to address the specific objections relating to planning regulations as unemotionally as possible.

Nevertheless, I think it is worth saying that, while we understand emotional reasons are not relevant in these decisions, the level of fear, anxiety and upset caused by the nature of these proposals in the local area is off the charts and we would lobby as vehemently as possible for these proposals to be vastly scaled back, particularly in relation to the insane height and scale of the proposed development.

To the specific policy-related objections:

Firstly, 88% of the 825 homes will be 1-bed and 2-bed flats. As a proportion, this is twice as many as Camden's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) says is needed throughout the Borough. Just 14 of the 825 homes will be family (4-bed) houses. So the claim that this will be serving local families and ameliorating the community is as cynical as it is misleading.

Secondly, Camden's own policies say that 35% of homes should be 'affordable', but the planning application claims that this amount of 'affordable' is not viable. So it is unclear what proportion will be 'affordable', but the developers are arguing that it must be less than the required 35%.

The developer's Viability Assessment assumes that a 2-bedroom flat in one of the towers will cost around £950,000 to £1,000,000 at today's prices which I'm no way can be described as affordable.

In terms of disrupted views, the development will loom large in views from all directions, including Hampstead Heath and Oak Village. Worst of all, and of deep, deep concern, is the fact that the protected view of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town will be largely blocked.

The architects claim: "The Proposed Development to integrate with the existing built environment." This is an insane and disrespectful claim and is very clearly untrue. Projection images of the proposed site show this to be entirely false.

As you will know, Camden's own 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."

Regarding traffic : the 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. This would be surprising given the low level of activity on site now and the number of homes and businesses that will need servicing. So again this seems at best naive and at worst wilfully misleading.

It is worth saying that 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 and will ruin treasured and protected views and result in a development with a poor quality of life both for those moving into the overly populated development, and of course for the existing residents, whose quality of life will undoubtedly be

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>significantly reduced in terms of traffic, pressure on public services, disruption from the lengthy proposed works, the removal of protected views and light disruption among many other things.</p> <p>The ludicrously and unnecessarily tall 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>On the subject of the towers insane height, they change, disrupt and adversely impact the existing natural landscape in so many ways, disrupting views from so many angles and destroying one of the last areas of the city that is not hampered by high rise living.</p> <p>Moreover, from an environmental perspective, 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. The developers have not followed good practice for environmental building design. Camden make much of their commitment to sustainable construction and we would ask you to take this matter incredibly seriously, as we do as local residents.</p> <p>It seems obvious that, even as a non-professional, there are better ways to provide housing, jobs and facilities, using low-rise, high- density models. As such we are vehemently opposed to the proposed development and would ask you in the strongest and most respectful way to take all our concerns on board and regency the proposals for Murphy's Yard.</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>Tom McKay and Elie Zaccour</p>

---

2021/3225/P	Cathy Elliott	17/02/2022 11:05:25	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed redevelopment because the density and height of the buildings would block the view to and from Kentish Town to the Heath/Parliament Hill Fields. It is not in keeping with the local environment. Whilst I welcome the development of the site with housing, high rise buildings do not complement the other buildings in the wider area. The volume of buildings would remove light and any feeling of space. Furthermore, the commercial implications for Kentish Town High Street do not appear to have been properly considered nor the increase in traffic during and post construction.</p>
-------------	---------------	---------------------	-----	---

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Carol Ford	17/02/2022 18:03:59	COMMNT	<p>1) The visual impact and loss of privacy on residents of Hemmingway Close, Meru Close, Kiln Place and Cressfield Close.</p> <p>- We think that the impact on their visual amenity due to the overbearing mass of the adjacent buildings will be extreme and highly likely to be unacceptable. No views are shown from these homes and they are not mentioned in the 432 page design and access statement- there is only the attached section</p> <p>As a local resident I have the following reservations about the development while acknowledging the need for new sustainable housing</p> <p>2) The visual impact and loss of privacy on Kentish Town City Farm does unacceptable damage to this green oasis which has provided a sanctuary for local people over 50 years. No images are shown from within the farm</p> <p>3) There will be increased traffic movements in and out of the site from Gordon House Road which will increase air pollution on Mansfield Road</p> <p>4) Loss of the green corridor created by trees and shrubs along the railway lines which is important for wildlife and provides some screening on the western side of the development</p> <p>5. Inevitable increase in cars and pollution</p>
2021/3225/P	michael coveney	17/02/2022 18:28:05	OBJ	<p>This proposal is clearly a serious threat to the environs of Hampstead Heath and creates an ugly eyesore on the London skyline as viewed from the heath, one of the most characteristic and indeed world-famous attributes enjoyed by visitors and all local residents for whom the heath is indeed the lungs of London. It's an ugly, invasive and inappropriately large-scale development for the area and its proximity to the heath.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	robert dye	17/02/2022 11:46:36	COMMNT	<p><b>Height of Towers:</b>            Although Camden Council appears to have no specific policy against tall towers, the MY development residential towers are inappropriate in scale in this location. I live in Mansfield Conservation area, which is part of a series of urban villages and (the tower scale) is not suited to our neighbourhoods, rather would be appropriate to a city centre location and where public transport intersects.            The overbearing height and location of the towers will cause sunlight and daylight loss detrimental to our local neighbourhoods (e.g. City Farm, the Lido), acutely so in winter months.            The towers and their over-ambitious height will cause loss of (long-established and important) views from the lower parts of Parliament Hill, such as across to Kentish Town station, to its church spire.            The proposed towers will have an overbearing presence, looming over the surrounding residential (ow-rise) neighbourhoods; they will create a sense of enclosure that would be detrimental to the urban and spatial character of the area.</p> <p><b>Residential mix:</b>            Camden's policies require a suitable residential mix of family housing. I believe Camden and Kentish Town urgently need family accommodation whereas the MY development has a very poor balance of accommodation with too many one and two bedroom flats. I urge Camden to require further viability reporting before granting even an Outline Planning Permission, but I also ask: can this be Conditioned if a consent is to be granted at Outline stage?            Camden Council should require a suitable mix of affordable family homes, and the exemplar developments in recent times have integrated these across sites, neither of which does this development provide in my view.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure / road transport and pedestrian traffic:</b>            Mansfield / Gordonhouse Road traffic is already very congested at rush hour times so I do not find credible the developer's claim that traffic will be reduced when deliveries and servicing will be added to the use of this highway.            Pedestrian access from the development across the already congested Mansfield and Gordon House Road crossings towards Gospel Oak station and the Lido seems inadequate to cope with the increased footfall that the scheme would engender.            Access into Gospel Oak station from the Kentish Town side is already compromised by a very busy road that has to be crossed. It would be appropriate for the MY Yard developer to be required to give funding for improvements to the Station access, e.g. from both east and west approaches.</p> <p><b>Sustainability (embodied carbon):</b>            Camden Council has a policy expectation for development to 'optimise resource efficiency by using materials with low-embodied carbon content', so if a consent is to be granted, I ask that this developer be held to this at Outline Planning stage by beforehand demonstrating how it intends so to do, with a Planning Condition placed on this commitment.</p>
2021/3225/P	Simon Irving	17/02/2022 19:09:35	OBJ	A plan to add hundreds of extra people without ant addition to the infrastructure shows lack of foresight

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Nancy Buchanan	17/02/2022 20:01:13	OBJ	This proposal is excessive, in height and density. It does not commit to the minimum level of 'affordable' housing and has too few family homes. The development would completely block the protected view of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town station.
2021/3225/P	Denise Rowley	17/02/2022 20:23:14	COMMNT	I should like to register my strong objection to this scheme. I live in Hampstead and use the Heath. The view of London from Parliament Hill is unique and the vista of varied buildings, landmarks and sights is outstanding and should be preserved now and for the future. The proposed development should not be allowed to block and dominate this panorama. It is too big a development and too densely populated. the buildings are too high. The development maximizes income potential for the developers at the expense of the occupants by having so much built space and so little open communal and green space. Residents and workers are bound to make use of the heath which is already under stress from increased use. Please decline this application.
2021/3225/P	Emily	17/02/2022 20:26:46	OBJ	<p>This development will block the sunlight for much of the day (probably all of it in winter) from Parliament Hill Lido. This will be a tragedy as it is a magical place which is made so special by the fact it is light, open and the sunlight provides much-needed warmth all year for swimmers in the unheated pool. It will be an eyesore and spoil a unique and beautiful place.</p> <p>Not only that, it does not seem from the plans that the housing being built will cater for the great need for family housing as they seem to be majority small flats</p>
2021/3225/P	Sara Whyte	17/02/2022 11:47:15	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the current plan for Murphy yard. The amount and height of the tower blocks, several 19 storeys, will completely dominate the surrounding area. Visually it bears no relation to nor does it show any sensitivity towards its unique position.</p> <p>The proposed 825 homes will mean an average of around 2,000 residents and although the area is planned as 'car free' it will mean a vast increase in the amount of traffic, both footfall and vehicular as deliveries and utility services will put an unacceptable pressure on the already narrow and often congested Gordon House road. No mention is made of the amount or projected impact of the 'industrial employment' which is a concern. More information is needed.</p>