

Re Planning Application 2021/3225/p - Murphy's Yard

**Bartholomew Estate and Kentish Town CAAC** has reviewed this mammoth application for 825 units of housing, offices and other buildings to be built on what is referred to as **Murphy's Yard Land**.

The CAAC has a major objection to the loss of the protected view from Kentish Town caused by the building of three tall blocks of flats in the centre of the site and by various shorter but still substantial blocks nearer Kentish Town Road. We also object to the huge number of housing units proposed, which constitutes over-development of a fragile site. See further detail: -

The CAAC particularly objects to the plan to build three tall towers (the highest being 19 storeys), which would obscure the view from Kentish Town to the Hampstead Heath, in particular from the end of Leighton Road which is in the CA. Such a loss of the current open view of the Heath is wholly unacceptable. This view maintains Kentish Town's character by adding an open vista of the Heath and trees. All that would be seen following on the proposed development would be a mass of tower blocks (view 12a, b in TVIA ). The developers appear thus to have ignored the general well-being, both physical and mental, of existing local residents and workers.

In June 2016 Kentish Town residents voted on and ratified The Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan, and Camden Council adopted the Plan later in the same year. Design Policy D1: The View of Parliament Hill from Kentish Town is an integral policy in the Plan, and the View is protected within it.

Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area Statement (BE1) says " all developments should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area". Towers would not enhance the Conservation Area, and, being out of keeping with general building heights in Kentish Town, would degrade its character. Socially, Kentish Town is desirably mixed, with privately owned houses cheek by jowl with similar houses acquired by the council 50 years ago and converted to flats or maisonettes. Yet what is proposed for this site appears to separate expensive flats from 'affordable' or social housing. This surely contravenes established social principles.

The lack of medical and recreational facilities on the site would impact already overcrowded existing facilities - some of which are in the conservation areas. In addition, a Traffic Management Plan for the proposed development is something the developers do not seem to have considered - but we have. If we assume each of the 825 housing units will need one delivery per week this equates to about 120 deliveries per day. If we add to this taxis, perhaps one a week for one unit in 5, we should say another 25, so we get to 145 without the, bound to be needed, plumbers and builders. And where are access and clear paths for emergency services? The development would also cause an unacceptable increase in traffic though the CA and Kentish Town Road, a thoroughfare which is already a byword for congestion and is a major route from South to North.

We agree that *some* housing and offices could be put on the site. The addition of a walkway through the site to the Heath, providing direct connection between the Heath and Kentish Town, is locally seen as one positive aspect of the plan - but it needs to be wide enough for both cyclists and pedestrians to use it safely.

We **object** to the scheme, which is ill thought through, lacks a great deal of substantial detail regarding access and the effect on surrounding districts, including the CA, and shows no general regard for the established character of the area. **The conclusion can only be that the plans as currently proposed must be rejected.**

.David Goreham, Chair' - on behalf of the committee