

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 February 2022 08:44
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Application number 2021/3225/P

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

To whom it may concern,

Notwithstanding my support for the creation of affordable housing - I write to underscore the need for imaginative landscaping and the creation of safe and well-designed, low rise, public and green space incorporating the provision of workshop/light industrial space for small businesses and arts and crafts - and for the need for innovative, ecologically sound and attractive architecture that blends organically with the culture and tradition of the area.

In our day and age of increasing crisis, developers and most importantly city planners and those responsible in councils for ensuring that sustainable and responsible building takes place, have a duty, it seems to me, to research and exploit every possibility for zero carbon development and encourage cycling and genuine alternatives to car use through the creation of routes and paths that link up - without ruining Hampstead Heath for walkers.

Regarding the housing proposed for the Murphy's Yard development, this absolutely **must complement** the best of what already exists. The new development should be modelled on the high density blocks that already exist and which I live in (at number 43 Lissenden Mansions). Kentish Town and Gospel Oak are already densely populated, mixed income areas in which owner-occupiers and private and social housing renters co-exist in a decent eco-system that needs to be protected and sustained. And this, from every point of view (education/shops/pubs etc) Please therefore ensure that the proposed development go with the grain of what already exists both architecturally and socially.

As for the proposed size of housing units: why so many small single person flats in an area of London that is crying out for family sized units? Any suggestion that the development prioritises buy-to-let properties, or, worse, cash-boxes in the sky for overseas investors will be met with great opposition, anger and resentment, from local people, as it would rightly deserve.

The current proposal for large bulky tower blocks on the Murphy's yard site that would visually dominate much of Gospel Oak (and beyond) is completely unacceptable. Residents on Highgate Road, Heathview flats, Lissenden and Parliament Hill Mansions and the Gospel

Road Estate will be completely overlooked and shaded for significant parts of the day by these deeply insensitive, architecturally impoverished and selfish proposals. Moreover, the list is long, of the negative impact this massive, looming and dominating block-like exercise in non-imagination would have on the Lido swimming baths and users of Hampstead Heath who quite rightly regard the latter as an important oasis in a city too often distinguished by alienating architecture and planning, the prioritisation of commercial/private interests, and traffic-clogged, polluted streets. We do not need to have experienced the Covid pandemic, to understand how important these oases are for the physical and mental well-being of London's residents, from children, through the young, the not-so young, to the aged.

I would like you to understand that the views I here express are not niche. We have all heard the easy-cynic position: pitting supposedly snobbish and supposedly wealthy and privileged North Londoners wishing to protect their precious Heath views, against the supposedly general public interest. It is easy to refute this binary nonsense. Hampstead Heath is a genuinely public, egalitarian asset enjoyed by people of every demographic and from all over London. The proposed towers and blocks are the very definition of a LOSS of AMENITY to a very large number of people. (Covid has proved to us all how we disregard our physical and mental health at our peril). The sorry state of an argument that suggests that only the wealthy care about the physical and aesthetic quality of the places in which they live and use for leisure and relaxation is a gross insult to us all and a deplorable assumption. The amenity as it currently exists and has existed for decades, is enjoyed locally, irrespective of income and is valued as a necessity, not a luxury. I myself have lived in Lissenden Mansions, since 1999 and brought up children and settled young people here - my young nephews and nieces from the countryside, coming to the city for work ... etc. To defend a nonsense proposition that to oppose these current plans for the Murphy's Yard development, is somehow an alliance of the privileged against the populace, is, frankly, an outrageous insult to intelligence. It is a 'position' fabricated, leveraged and turned against the people of the area, to justify these appallingly overbearing proposals by interests that are transparently entirely, and selfishly, commercial.

Comments by Pascale Lamche of 43 Lissenden mansions, London NW5 1PR