

From: veronica watts
Sent: 24 August 2023 09:47
To: Planning
Cc: David Fowler
Subject: 2023/2510/P and 2023/2653/L

From veronica watts: former shop worker in Bloomsbury

I wish to register an **objection** to the revised plans for the redevelopment of the Travelodge site, application 2023/2510/P and 2023/2653/L.

Camden Council produced an expensive booklet campaigning in the fight to save Bloomsbury from the threat of redevelopment for the British Museum Library. All of the reasons **the council** put forward for the protection of Bloomsbury still hold good and I urge them to hold true to them and refuse permission for this development which is completely out of scale with the area.

I append the Bloomsbury Association's considered objections as I agree with all of them.

The Council has a responsibility for housing in the area and should try and give a lead to developers for buildings for this use. Unlike housing stock office spaces are still lying vacant in the area. The cityscape must be kept within human scale of the area.

Reasons for objection:

The tower is far too tall and far too bulky

It will adversely affect local listed buildings such as St George's Church, Bedford Square, and the British Museum. The Conservation Areas of Covent Garden, Bloomsbury and Soho will suffer from its out of scale 74m height.

Putting a taller building on the site will set a precedent for more tall buildings in the neighbourhood, for which Camden will then find it very hard to refuse permission.

The scheme intends to demolish the Travelodge tower and replace it with a brand new much bigger office block. Demolition is contrary to the climate change policies of the UK, Greater London Council and Camden, all of which advocate retrofitting. We commissioned an expert report that proves retrofit is possible.

Our campaign has achieved Grade 2 listed status from Historic England for 6 of the buildings on the West Central St / Museum Street block but the developers still plan to demolish the corner which contains the remains of a 19th century horse stables, thus destroying irreplaceable heritage.

We agree that the site needs improvement but there are other alternatives that are sensitive to the scale and architecture of the area and not based purely on financial greed.

Too little housing is being provided; what is proposed will be dark and with a very badly designed back yard.

Residents in the new housing will be forced to have their electric lights on all day due to lack of daylight