Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5946/P	Christopher Prior	5 Parnell House Streatham Street WC1A 1JB	02/11/2014 16:30:09	COMMNT	The additional storeys will block views of St. George's famous steeple. The extra height of the building will be out of character with the other buildings. I can see no benefit for our community.
2014/5946/P	Millicent Villiers	40 Bedford Square WC1B 3HX	03/11/2014 11:29:28	OBJ	I would like to object to these plans being accepted on the grounds that adding additional floors to the building will affect the light and character of the surrounding area. These plans are a missed opportunity for a high quality development with social and cultural uses. There is not a good use of outdoor space.An office building with chain stores is not what the neighborhood needs. Will be a detriment to residents living in the area.
2014/5946/P	julian reade	12 Museum Mansion 63A Gt Russell St Bloomsbury WC1B 3BJ	05/11/2014 23:13:48	COMMNT	Wonderful irreplaceable opportunity to link Bloomsbury & Covent Garden residence + tourist areas. No decent link at present. Nice old residences on opposite side of Museum Street give model height for pedestrian arcade + gardens + surgery + residences + market+ workshops. We already have more than enough offices, mass-market retail and restaurants. Height of current proposal is ugly and intrusive. STOP ADDING HIGHRISE IN OUR VILLAGES.
2014/5946/P	Tom Schuller	27 museum chambers	05/11/2014 15:41:30	COMMNT	I cannot attend the public meeting tonight, but I did attend the previous meeting in Swedenborg Hall. 1. I went out afterwards and looked down Museum St, estimating the visual impact of the proposed building - absolutely terrible: excessive height, depressing outlook. 2. I was also very unimpressed with the proposed use: unimaginative, bringing very little if anything in the way of new or needed facilities. I add my objections to the many you have had. Please reject this placation, and think again about the wonderful opportunity the site presents.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5946/P	Michael Jones	24 Russell Chambers Bury Place London WC1A 2JU	02/11/2014 19:57:17	OBJ	Camden Council Development Control Town Hall Judd Street London WC1

24 Russell Chambers
Bury Place
London
WC1A 2JU

F.A.O: Chris Heather

planning@camden.gov.uk

Planning Reference: 2014/5946/P

Royal Mail Sorting Office: 21/31 New Oxford Street

Dear Mr Heather

I would like to object to this planning application on many grounds, not least of which is because it fails to comply with Camden"s own planning brief for the site - and also the recently approved details as stipulated in Camden"s Site Allocations. As well as this the scheme fails to meet the Council"s development control planning policies.

I object strongly to the proposed structural footprint – and it’s dominating bulk and height. The current building is already big, though what is being proposed here represents a gross and crude overdevelopment of the site – proposing to add around 120,000 sq feet of extra floor-space, some 50% more than there is currently. The huge increase requires the existing large building to be built much higher and most importantly, means that the upper floors have to be pushed right out beyond the current building line – and on all three street elevations. The effect of this is that the proposed development will tower over and dominate both the Covent Garden and Bloomsbury Conservation Areas in a most unsympathetic and characterless way, and will be extremely damaging to the neighbouring listed buildings not least St George"s Church and the British Museum both of which are Grade 1 quality. The proposed tower and bulk of the building along New Oxford Street, High Holborn and Museum Street is excessive and the proposed tower on the corner of Museum Street and New Oxford Street is in my view both ugly and inappropriate, and of a grotesque size that will overwhelm the listed buildings opposite and also the delicate and harmonious scale of all the neighbouring streets.

I’d very much like to see the bulk of the proposed building dramatically reduced in size and kept within the existing profile of the building, as Camden Council"s own development brief for the site stipulates.

I also object to the proposed enormous increase of offices on the site to just under 380,000 sq ft and the introduction of some 45,000 sq ft of retail and restaurant space. None of these uses currently exist on the site - and what is offered in return is a pitiful 21 "affordable" flats, over a third of which are apparently expected to be general needs and have rents that no one locally can afford. The developers acknowledge that their housing proposals fall short of Council policy, and have offered £4.5m in lieu of

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

that. This is a shameful proposal that should not be accepted. Instead, more housing in line with the development brief for the site should be demanded from the developer. Furthermore, the new housing should not be single aspect and should not have its bedrooms and livings rooms being subjected to the continuous noise of High Holborn.

The proposal fails to comply with Council policy to provide new public open space and fails to provide any community space that Camden"s brief requires. This site offers a very unique opportunity to be a truly inspiring and exciting development – enabling a variety of uses combining cultural, social, economic and ethical elements. Uses that reflect the special nature of the Covent Garden and Bloomsbury neighbourhoods and local community, and our position and role within the cultural capital. The site should also have a much more substantial housing content, again as called for in Camden"s planning brief. This is all possible as the site has no current established commercial uses (i.e. no offices or retail) and therefore no established commercial value in planning use terms.

To approve the current scheme would impose a hideous monster, forcing residents and visitors alike to have Halloween every day! It would dominate and ruin the vitality and harmony of the neighbourhood , and would also throw away a unique opportunity for a really interesting and once in a life-time development opportunity. What is currently on offer is vulgar and predicable, representing speculative commercial development at the expense of . The site deserves a much more sensitive and responsive proposal that complies with Camden"s brief for the site and planning policies.

I would be grateful if you could please keep me informed of any changes that are made to the current application and would appreciate confirmation that you have received my objection

Yours sincerely

Michael Jones

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5946/P	Monique Maxwell	Flat 16 Museum Mansions 63A Great Russell St London	02/11/2014 18:41:49	OBJ	This is a clear example of over-development: to turn what is already recognised to be an eye-sore into an even more offensive intrusion on this heritage-rich, conservation area environment. Surely, here is an opportunity to mitigate the clumsy, ugly and out-of-place post-office building with a polite, benign, in-scale development that benefits the community and meets local need. The southern view down Museum street is particularly offensive (it looks like a 'finger up', and is an example of what not-do to such a sensitive street scene. The brief is surely to enhance not to detract from this conservation area which continues to serve local inhabitants as well as tourists and businesses. Camden have a statutory obligation to provide for its local indigenous population - rather than meeting the needs of investors. Camden residents have been insufficiently consulted, and the needs of the community not prioritised in the brief.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5946/P	Cathy Ward	Flat 13 1 Little Russell St Bloomsbury London WC1A 2HR	05/11/2014 11:11:43	OBJLETTER	I would like to object to the plans submitted for the redevelopment of the High Holborn Old Sorting Office. This is a building that i, and many other residents look onto & see it every day as do thousands of visitors, tourists & commuters. It"s undoubtedly a very important landmark in the historic Bloomsbury area. The 1960s brutalist design we have at present, though large is cleverly designed for its mass and i think on what plans have already been submitted id prefer the building design now - if it was cleverly re-cladded and re figured retaining it"s 1960s design - over the poorly throughout, unimaginative corporate office building we have been presented by the architect. This opportunity for the architect to have designed something memorable and iconic has been missed We live near Tottenham Court Road station where the great 20th century sculptor Sir Eduardo Paolozzi had his amazing futuristic mosaics installed in the mid 1980s; above it Centre Point, another great 1960s landmark with a beautifully designed lobby. So many artists, writers & visionaries have been so instrumental in this area over the centuries. The opportunity for any architect to use this enormous building surely should have more vision? What we are being presented is a building that would sprawl nondescriply in the financial district of the city as yet another monolithic, glass and stone cladded block. Creating it predominately only office space (which we dont need- there are still unfilled office buildings accross the road on New Oxford St, the other new office block too on NOS & Centre Point was never filled so now converted to luxury flats) What we DO want is a building of great design & vision. Residents need to have shops attracted here to provide us with fresh products, perhaps a market, small unique useful businesses, unique places. we want quality shops that residents can use that are not big chains. We have enough of that and we want something with more character. The building is an amazing opportunity for Camden to insist there is more affordable housing. This is a brownfield site. 21 units is not enough & we insist there are more. We the residents insisted to have gardens which were not in the original plans, we still want access to a public green space. Also affordable spaces for artist designers to work in as these and other creative industries are what bring great forward thinking ideas into an area which ultimately is beneficial; we want to see many green areas on this huge site. Not just glass & cladding. The design, is overcompensating for its lack lustre design by being larger and more intrusive than it should be in this area. Its trying to compete with the other refiguration of the great MOD building opposite which has not been sensitively done. That too has been extended without planning permission. We do not want this building to be this size nor taller than the historic Hawkesmoor church of St George"s Bloomsbury. A land mark that will be dominated by this design. The architect is helping to create a canyon of dark pathways for the area and it will restrict light. We do not feel that we want a big "Mordor" tower dominating the view from the British Museum - (give me what we have already but remodernised anyday over this) It does not enhance any of our historic building. Being 800 yards from the world famous British Museum and at a very important area for the Bloomsbury, Holborn, Covent

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Garden intersection, we expect this building to function aesthetically, to be a great assett to the community; to have meeting rooms we can use; places of cultural interest for visitors & we do not not it aimed solely for business / offices. We want this building to be one the community can have use in varying ways, because it is us that will be living with it for decades to come. Camden Council should ensure that the community deserves better than what we are being presented with this development.