

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2510/P	Kirsten Kooy	10/08/2023 16:33:12	COMMNT	Hi my concern is that this building will be both too high and too wide for what is a historical area of London, I stay in this area frequently and would not like to see an overpowering tall building which overwhelms its older neighbours.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2510/P	Charles Croft	10/08/2023 10:30:50	OBJ	<p>We are local residents. We walk past Selkirk House on an almost daily basis, as it is between our flat and our child's nursery. We are very supportive of plans to renovate the area and bring some life back into the buildings and shops which have been held empty (presumably due to the developer's hopes to redevelop) for some time. Keeping them vacant, or only offering them on unattractive terms, is obviously not going to lead to a pleasant and vibrant street life. The ex-Travel Lodge is an eyesore and understandably something that might be ripe for retrofitting or demolition.</p> <p>We have some concerns with the proposals as they stand.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing building is already out of step with the surrounding area, even with the recent Post Building. Creating a new, higher tower with greater massing is only going to exacerbate that. Most of the images (particularly street level) studiously avoid showing the full context of the area and the height of the largest building. The heritage nature of the area, with the squares and period buildings beloved by locals and tourists alike, would be affected. It would dwarf the nearby buildings including St George's Church and the nearby Central St Giles development. The skyline currently has a clear focus, being Centre Point, but creating a tower even higher than the existing Selkirk House would unbalance the skyline significantly. 2. The proposals refer to a scheme of "high architectural quality" however the building seems strikingly similar to other cut-and-paste developments; indeed it could very well be Principal Place from the City with a slightly different paint job. It cites the Russell Hotel and the buildings on Grape Street, but what is proposed has no resemblance to them. The proposals seem to do away with the existing attractive period buildings (on West Central Street, Museum Street, and New Oxford Street) and it is unclear what efforts if any have been made to incorporate them into the scheme. Their removal may be preferable from the developer's viability point of view but it will adversely affect the nature of the area – these are attractive buildings even in the state that the developer has let them fall into. 3. The proposals refer to "generosity in public realm" – obviously works to the public space are welcome but the public realm works appear to be tarring up the existing pavements, installing some benches, and removing / planting some trees. This is not very ambitious. The Post Building has an excellent public space on the rooftop but it is notable that it is not well publicised and has been hampered by the fact that every visitor must have their attendance recorded by hand (no pre-booking or electronic system) one by one and food/drink are prohibited on the roof. Even that is a more generous offering than what is proposed here, which appears to be the bare minimum that would be required from any planning proposals here, regardless of how material the works were. 4. High Holborn is already effectively a wind tunnel, conditions much worse on the ground than seem to be noted in Arup's report. Arup's report in relation to High Holborn is extremely light touch and I am unconvinced that the proposals will not exacerbate the existing issues. 5. The design and access statement refers to the Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessment. It is not clear where this is on the portal but the extract of the conclusions refers only to the proposed development being designed to achieve a high level of sustainability performance. It does not comment in the conclusions on the sustainability impact of retrofit vs rebuild. 6. We are concerned that reduction in overall residential will adversely affect the area, which benefits from a

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>combination of tourism, workers, and residents. New Oxford Street is often deserted at weekends and pulling more residents out of the area will obviously affect the businesses in the area, as footfall will be further drawn to the tourist spots alone. An increase of that element of the mixed use would be desirable.</p> <p>Simply put, the building is enormous, does not reflect the surrounding area, and offers very little to the public realm. Combined with the height and massing concerns, plus the damage to the skyline, feels reminiscent of development in Nine Elms in Battersea where there has been a material loss of vibrancy at street level due to the lack of sympathetic development. We ask the that the LPA reject this scheme as it currently stands and push the developer for a proper re-submission with public consultation.</p>
