

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Owen Ward [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 May 2025 18:46  
**To:** Jessica McDonnell-Buwalda  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** 2025/2009/L - No Objection

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Jessica,

This is a fiddly application and very technical. Without knowing the background of this the Bloomsbury CAAC cannot really object or offer many meaningful comments.

I do find it quite unusual, however, that so much invasive work is required on this building, and there is no structural report submitted which justifies why the strengthening is required, nor is there very convincing justification as to why so much invasive work is required to achieve 60 minutes' fire resistance. This seems to be based on a plain English reading of Part B but listed buildings obviously cannot achieve modern standards and this is recognised in 0.17 of Part B(2). Typically one would expect a relaxation of the regs for listed buildings and a 'fire engineered' solution can also be used - and normally it is when planners refuse works that this can be used to justify relaxation of the regulations.

Similarly on the strengthening works it just seems very unusual - the originally submitted engineering report as part of the previous application states no problems with the floor strengths so I do not understand why now everything needs to be strengthened.

Anyway, as I say these are only my comments as I don't know the background and pre-apps sufficiently to submit a formal objection.

Owen Ward MSc IHBC  
Bloomsbury CAAC