

Parnjit Singh

From: Joseph Biesterfeld <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 20 February 2022 17:56
To: Planning Planning
Subject: 2021/3225/P

Dear Camden Planning Team,

I write to strongly object to the outline planning permission application (2021/3225/P) made in respect of Murphy's Yard (the "Proposed Development"). Whilst some form of redevelopment of Murphy's Yard would be beneficial to the area and local residents, the plans submitted for the Proposed Development are unsuitable and grossly disproportionate in their negative impacts on local residents and the wider area.

I herein refer to the Camden Local Plan and the London View Management Framework.

Murphy's Yard represents an extremely valuable opportunity to the Kentish Town/Dartmouth Park area. The Proposed Development, however, would squander that opportunity and materially impair the quality of life for current area residents (both during construction and thereafter). In particular:

(1) The proposed development is almost entirely geared towards the provision of 1/2 bed flats to young professionals. Demand for these flats is highly questionable post-COVID and in any case the wider area caters for such flats through the Kings Cross re-development (in addition to other existing stock). The area's lack of 3/4 bed room houses (particularly for young families otherwise forced to relocate) is not addressed by the Proposed Development. Nor does there appear to be any agreed level of affordable housing.

(2) The Proposed Development is totally out of keeping with the local area. The Kentish Town/Dartmouth Park area is low rise (with only a couple of high rise developments further afield in Belsize Park), with the highest buildings being around 5 stories. Paragraphs 3.33 and 3.34 of the Camden Local Plan make clear that in considering the developments, focus should not be on high rise options when out of character for the local area (as it would be here) and that the Density Matrix (as defined in the Camden Local Plan) should be interpreted flexibly within the context of the local area (which in this case is entirely low/medium rise and no high rise). As a result, the Proposed Development is not in accordance with the Camden Local Plan which sets parameters for the consideration of approval of planning decisions Camden Council.

(3) The Proposed Development will entirely block and ruin the view from Parliament Hill south toward the City of London and (the inverse) from Kentish Town toward Parliament Hill. In paragraphs 2.35 and 7.26 of the Camden Local Plan it is made clear such views are of vital local importance and should be protected. Paragraph 2.9 of the local plan expressly states that protected views (see below) are to be a consideration in respect of the density of any development. As a result, the Proposed Development is not in accordance with the Camden Local Plan which sets parameters for the consideration of approval of planning decisions Camden Council.

(4) The view from Parliament Hill over the City of London, which would be entirely blocked by the Proposed Development, is (in addition to the Camden Local Plan) specifically listed as a Protected Vista under the London View Management Framework. Two Protected Views are referred to (from view points 2A and 2B). Section 2 and paragraph 93 of the London View Management Framework describe the views in

detail and paragraph 99 specifically states that the panorama is sensitive to large-scale development in the foreground (which this would be) and paragraph 101 says new development should "preserve and enhance" the view (the Proposed Development does the total opposite). The Proposed Development clearly contravenes the Protected Vista status of the view from Parliament Hill and, as such, should be rejected (the London View Management Framework is part of the London Plan, to which the Camden Local Plan, guiding planning decisions in Camden, is then a sub-part).

(5) The scale of the Proposed Development is vast and will have a materially negative impact on the life quality of current residents of the area (without, as per point 1 above, providing meaningful improved accommodation options to current residents). The development will result in close to a decade of increased pollution, road traffic and noise disturbance. With the consequent impact on a carbon footprint and air quality. Air quality impact is particularly vital, given the large number of pupils at local schools who would walk past the development site twice a day.

(6) Gospel Oak station is already a highly used station and would arguable be over-whelmed, both by the construction stage of the Proposed Development (including materially increased traffic in the immediate vicinity) and by increased footfall due to the inappropriately high-density of the Proposed Development if completed.

(7) Gordon House Road will be overwhelmed by the construction traffic for the proposed development (the only access point appears to be the turning off Gordon House Road near Gospel Oak station). This would cause major and inappropriate issues for local residents - increasing air pollution due to backed-up traffic (see above), congestion and the impact on the main route between Dartmouth Park and Belsize Park which is often used by ambulances going to/from the Royal Free Hospital.

As the above shows, the Proposed Development is grossly inappropriate in its current form and should be rejected. The Murphy's Yard site is a wonderful opportunity for the right development, but this is very much the wrong one.

From personal conversations with area residents (including those living and/or working in Gospel Oak, Dartmouth Park, Kentish Town, Belsize Park and Chalk Farm), there is almost universal agreement that the Proposed Development represents a whole out of character and disproportionate development and one which cannot be approved in its current form.

In particular, the Parliament Hill view is a genuine public good accessible by all. Local residents and a huge number of people all around North London and the wider city cherish that view (from autumn walks or to high-summer). In the aftermath of COVID, the value of public amenities such as that view for the lived quality of life of resident should be understood and re-emphasised.

The Proposed Development should be rejected.

Kind regards,

Joseph Biesterfeld