

From: beverly o'sullivan

Sent: 26 August 2023 14:13

To: Planning

Cc: David Fowler; Anne Clarke; Save Museum Street; Jim Monahan

Subject: Objection One Museum Street 2023/2510/P and 2023/2510/L

I raise my very strong objection to the planning application above. The tiny changes to the scheme still do not make it anywhere near acceptable. As frequent visitors to the British Museum and surrounding area, I am extremely concerned about the future of this historic and beautiful part of London. Its look and its feel. This proposed build will alter all this for me and the many tourists to our great city. I will no longer feel able to take my visiting friends into London, and particularly this, my favourite part of London, with pride. You may think this is a local issue but it is not. I live in an outer London borough but frequently visit central London and this matters to me. It will adversely affect the historic skyline and look of a famous part of our capital.

Whats more this application takes no account for the climate emergency statements from both the GLA and Camden Council. This proposal is a high carbon strategy as it involves demolishing a perfectly usable building which could benefit from a low-carbon retrofit.

Height

The tower is far too big and bulky, an increase of 20.41 metres over the Travelodge which is 53.5 metres high – a grand total of 73.91 metres.

Any new

building should be the same height or lower than the existing Travelodge.

Chopping off two storeys (6 metres) from the initial 80 metre proposal just isn't enough.

The unique architecture of Bloomsbury and Covent Garden should be protected.

The tower will ruin views from Bedford Square, the British Museum and Drury

Lane. The old buildings within the conservation area on West Central and

Museum Streets are to be gutted or demolished contrary to Camden's Conservation Policies.

Housing

The developers plan to build 48 new homes but don't mention the plan to demolish the 18 that exist already!
They are providing only 9 low-cost rent homes (social housing), up from a measly 6, and only 9 "affordable" units, supposedly for local people in need of a home. "Affordable" will require an income of at least £65,000 per year!
The remainder are to be sold at market price

Sustainability
It is bad for the environment to demolish a building that is only 55 years old that could be re-used. Putting up a massive new building uses lots of new concrete, steel and energy. This unacceptable approach contributes significantly to climate change. Older buildings can be brought up to modern standards by retro-fitting, so why demolish?

Beverly O'Sullivan