

**From:**

**Sent:** 21 October 2023 22:34

**To:** Planning

**Cc:** Peter Bloxham

**Subject:** planning and listed building applications 2023/2510/P and 2023/2653/L

**Re: Composite Planning and Listed Building Applications (*Composite Applications*) in respect of proposals for the development of a series of plots bounded by High Holborn, Museum Street, New Oxford Street and West Central Street including Selkirk House, Museum Street (formerly Travelodge) (now reference 2023/2510/P and (listed building) 2023/2653/L), originally Labtech application 2021/ 2954/ P)**

Dear Sirs

This is an additional submission in opposition to the above Composite Applications. I make this as a local resident.

It relates to one specific aspect of the proposal, namely the elimination of the car park facility in Museum Street. I object to this.

This is a very valuable community facility and all the more so as the number of on street parking spaces in the area continues to reduce. I make this submission as a resident who does not own a car but who needs to provide parking facilities to visitors and service providers and to those who come to carry out maintenance and repairs to my home. Facilities such as Zipcar need local parking spaces.

In addition, increasingly there will be a need for charging facilities for electric vehicles, which could usefully be provided in a car park, and there would be merit in moving some of the bike parking spaces off the limited pavement areas. The increased take up of electric vehicles will reduce the environmental arguments against car and van use.

In a retrograde step, the applicant has already closed the useful and ecologically desirable facility within the site which was used as a hub for local deliveries by electric vehicles. Such a facility should be reinstated.

The applicant does not propose to provide any alternative parking facilities.

I consider that the car park should be retained or, at the least, that public parking facilities should be incorporated into the proposed scheme.

It is absurd to propose to increase both office and residential density in the area but to reduce the number of parking spaces.

Regards  
Peter

**Peter Bloxham**