

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Michele Smith	23/02/2022 21:40:35	COMMNT	I visited the Kentish Town farm today, and really enjoyed the "rural" feel right in the middle of London, even between 2 railway lines, which actually makes it even more unique. Surely a city farm that is 50 years old and does SO much good for the community (and the animals) should be allowed to keep the much needed view they currently have to be kept. Once again, profit over communities seem to be the key issue here. Shame on you. To make it clear I work in Kentish Town.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3225/P	Ancira Roose-McClew	21/02/2022 21:20:11	OBJ	<p>This planning application is completely unacceptable and is an insult to those who live in the neighbourhood. Camden Council has a duty to ensure that it is looking after the needs of its residents and trying to improve the lives of people in the local area. This planning application, if approved, will severely undermine that.</p> <p>The amount of square metres of living space that the proposal is trying to fit into such a small area is ridiculous. Having people living in small, box-y apartments on top of each other is not good for anyone other than the developers who seek to profit by making such sardine-esque living conditions. It will increase traffic in the neighbourhood and pollution. Mansfield / Gordon House Road is already choc-a-bloc with unmoving traffic most days. I already spend the days I walk along the road I live on breathing in fumes, particularly at rush hour. How do you think this development will impact that? And how will it impact the school children who will be breathing in the excess pollution? There are several schools in the area very close to the roads. Think of them.</p> <p>The size of the proposed flats is concerning. We do not need more smaller living spaces, we need larger homes for families, so that it is actually viable for them to live in Camden and we need affordable housing. It is worth noting that this proposal does not meet Camden's own stated policy of wanting more social, affordable, family-sized housing in the area. Surely Camden should be enforcing its own policy rather than kowtowing to the financial interests of profiteering developers?</p> <p>Moreover, I wonder what proportion of the flats will be sold off abroad. I know that other council's have approved projects in London that have seen similar flats sold as financial investments to people living abroad, further exacerbating London's housing price crisis. I am sure the Murphy's Yard development is creating so many tiny flats with this in mind. They want to both squish more people than is viable into one area and make money selling flats abroad.</p> <p>Why isn't Camden council partnering with organisations to create housing that helps society, rather than housing that harms it. I myself live in a property owned by South Camden Housing Cooperative in Camden. Members of the coop have attended consultation meetings and requested to have further housing created in the site, housing which is actually affordable to its members, but the requests have fallen on deaf ears.</p> <p>The height of the buildings is also hugely problematic - it means they will not only be an eyesore from the heath, they will also block out the Lido's winter sun and the winter sun on the playing field's behind it. And it will block the view of the heath from Kentish Town. How can this be justified? The buildings do not need to be that tall. The developers of Murphy's Yard would be better off making smaller buildings, with larger living spaces, and actually ensuring they are sold to people living in the UK and are fully occupied. Camden Council should be doing everything possible to do the same. Time and again it seems like money speaks louder than people's needs when it comes to Camden council and the country in general. It is not only disappointing, it is dangerous. For a democracy to function and be healthy, people's voices need to matter and need to be taken into account.</p> <p>And, despite the false claims to the contrary, it will not be 'green'. The supposed 'green corridor' will be paved. Furthermore, the developers are not using appropriate insulation design and are not following good practice for environmental building design. We are in a climate and ecological emergency, which is in large part due to profiteering companies influencing government bodies to act against people's interests. I am afraid that the Murphy's Yard proposal is another clear instance of this.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>I am completely flabbergasted that Camden Council is considering allowing such an unnecessary, money-grabbing and unsuitable project to go ahead. It will cause serious harm to the neighbourhood and to everybody who lives within it.</p> <p>We need councils to lead bravely in difficult times as this, not to bow to financial interests. When this happens, everybody loses.</p> <p>Come on Camden, be brave. I want to be able to continue being proud that I was born and raised in this borough.</p>
2021/3225/P	Vivienne Taylor	23/02/2022 10:33:25	OBJ	<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>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>
2021/3225/P	Jane Hives	22/02/2022 18:13:10	OBJ	<p>This outline planning permission should be refused. I object to the proposed development as its mass is too dense and towers, of anything more than modest height, are entirely inappropriate in this neighbourhood. The proposals would harm the environment, disrupt the protected views from Parliament Hill and are unsuitable in the historic setting of so many listed buildings.</p>
2021/3225/P	Silvie Jacobi	21/02/2022 16:54:09	OBJ	<p>The project does not satisfy Camden Council's policy requirements for 50% affordable housing, which is under 35%. The building height does not consider the surrounding environment.</p>