

For the attention of
Christopher Heather.

Flat 2
17A Marklin Street,
London, WC2B
5NR.
6th November
2014

Dear Sir

I'm writing to oppose the
alterations to the Sorting Office site
in Holborn.

The height of the proposed
building is dreadful. We do not
want any more tall buildings in the
area. This is a very historic area.
There is no need for it. It's not
beneficial to the locality.

I'm over 80 years of age & was
born in Holborn. Developers seem
to do what they like with the
support of Camden Council!

Please do ~~not~~ not grant this
application

Yours faithfully

Noreen Kent

James Tait
Flat 7, The Alcazar
Phoenix Street
London WC2H 8BS
Email : [REDACTED]

November 5, 2014

Christopher Heather
Camden Planning Department,
2nd Floor, 5 St. Pancras Square
c/o Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

Dear Mr Heather:

2014/5946/P Old GPO sorting office, 21-31 New Oxford Street

I wish to register my objection to the current application to develop the Old Sorting Office site in New Oxford Street. I am a Camden resident and live close to this site. My principal objection to the application is that the housing offered in this application is totally inadequate to the potential that this site offers. When there is such a shortage of affordable housing in Camden and all over London, there should be a major effort to maximize new housing when a suitable site like this comes available.

I agree with the Camden document, Camden Site Allocations, dated 9 September 2013, that states,

This is a large and strategically important site within Camden's Central London area which has significant potential for mixed-use development including the provision of new housing (and affordable housing).

The same document also states,

Redevelopment offers the opportunity to remove a large and undistinguished monolithic building

It therefore surprises me that Camden is even considering an application that provides such a mean portfolio of flats (21 units, 14 'affordable') in relation to the massive size of the site. The application also proposes that instead of removing the old building it should merely be covered with extra cladding and extended upwards and outwards. None of this is either acceptable or desirable and is clearly at odds with your own planning brief.

Once your committee disposes of the current application, I wish to address the consequences for the future of this site. This site was in public hands when it was owned by the Post Office and has had no established use since they left. It has been close to empty for twenty years and developers have only been attracted when they see an easy and quick return upon establishing a largely commercial use.

Camden needs to strongly promote the vision that they have for this site. It is, in your words, *'a large and relatively unconstrained site outside the Conservation Area and it is occupied by a building of little architectural merit.'* Your planning brief, adopted July 2004, and approved in later documents set out very clearly the opportunities that are offered by this site. It speaks of *'great scope for an imaginative approach to its development'*. It states, as an objective, *'a visionary sustainable mixed-use development including a very significant quantity of new residential accommodation.'*

London is a major European capital and this is a prime central and historic location. Camden should be able to actively seek and find designers and developers with a vision that can match these aspirations. This site deserves a world-class proposal showing how a major city and cultural centre might also sustain affordable high-density accommodation. It should be possible to produce a scheme that will match the best designs to be found in Brooklyn, Berlin or Barcelona.

Yours sincerely,



James Tait

Pauline Baker
3 Stedham Chambers
Coptic Street
London W.C.1. A1NL

Planning Department
London Borough of Camden

5th November 2014.

Dear Sirs

Re Application No 2014/5946/P.

I am writing to object to the above application. The proposed three-storey extension would tower above the surrounding buildings and is totally out of keeping with the character of the Conservation Area.

Yours faithfully

Pauline Baker

