

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5946/P	Jan Hauger	70 Great Russell Street London WC1B 3BN	14/12/2014 22:44:20	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>My two main objections are 1) the architecture and 2) I believe there should be more housing (no matter if low-income or not).</p> <p>I am very glad that the monstrosity that is the old sorting office will be remodelled externally. The proposal is a step in the right direction. It is only a shame that the architecture is not more traditional and beautiful. The proposal is simply another 'cool' non-beautiful building. Is it better than what is there now? Yes. But I find that it would be better if the foundation stories (ground/1st) were made of something more substantial such as stone or brick. As proposed, it'd be yet another rather uninteresting building to walk past. London is becoming too full of buildings without personality or warmth.</p> <p>My objection is NOT about its massing. I think the site can handle the massing. It is simply about the architecture not being very 'London-like'. This building could be anywhere in the world. It is simply rather corporate and banal. It'd be better to have a more traditional 'bridge' between Bloomsbury and Covent Garden. I think the site has enough boring buildings around it!</p> <p>Anyway, all that aside, I do look forward to change there and am glad that a developer is having a go. I simply wish the building were something decent to look at, like St George's Church, Somerset House, or most Georgian or Victorian facades.</p>
2014/5946/P	David Cook	Flat 7 14 West Central Street London WC1A 1JH	12/12/2014 13:59:51	COMMNT	<p>If this application is to build an extra floor, I, as someone that has the misfortune to overlook the current eyesore, would be against it,</p> <p>It would stop the rising morning Sun shining on my flat and be a ridiculous height to a building that already is out of place.</p> <p>We already have the very ugly Travelodge in Museum Street, I feel it is time that planners should be sensitive to local buildings such as the St Georges Church and The British Museum. If I wanted to live in "Canary Wharf" I would move there.</p>
2014/5946/P	Luke Hughes	10a Stukeley Street Covent Garden LONDON WC2B 5LQ	15/12/2014 19:15:53	OBJ	<p>The site certainly needs developing but it is highly regrettable that the architects and their clients have not heard the local concerns about the excessive massing of the proposed building, the poor design treatment of the facade and the canyon-like effect the proposed building will have at street level.</p>
2014/5946/P	David Cook	Flat 7 14 West Central Street London WC1A 1JH	12/12/2014 13:59:51	COMMNT	<p>If this application is to build an extra floor, I, as someone that has the misfortune to overlook the current eyesore, would be against it,</p> <p>It would stop the rising morning Sun shining on my flat and be a ridiculous height to a building that already is out of place.</p> <p>We already have the very ugly Travelodge in Museum Street, I feel it is time that planners should be sensitive to local buildings such as the St Georges Church and The British Museum. If I wanted to live in "Canary Wharf" I would move there.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5946/P	David Cook	Flat 7 14 West Central Street London WC1A 1JH	12/12/2014 13:59:36	COMMNT	If this application is to build an extra floor, I, as someone that has the misfortune to overlook the current eyesore, would be against it, It would stop the rising morning Sun shining on my flat and be a ridiculous height to a building that already is out of place. We already have the very ugly Travelodge in Museum Street, I feel it is time that planners should be sensitive to local buildings such as the St Georges Church and The British Museum. If I wanted to live in "Canary Wharf" I would move there.
2014/5946/P	Timothy Barnes	47B Gower Street London WC1E 6HH	15/12/2014 13:56:28	OBJ	Dear LBC,  It is disappointing that at the review stage, the developers of this site were not able to make more extensive changes to their plans in light of the very real concerns felt by local residents. There is no objection to redevelopment of the site in principle, but the specifics of this proposal are excessive. It is too big, does not address real needs for social housing and first time buyers and is not sympathetic to its immediate surroundings including the local conservation status. It is shame that a proposal so second rate in its aspiration and so complete in its lack of ambition for meeting local priorities, has been allowed to get this far.  As they stand, these proposals should be rejected.  Many thanks.
2014/5946/P	Anthea Maybury	16 Downham Rd Ely Cambs CB6 1AF	16/12/2014 00:29:21	OBJEMAIL	These revisions as far as I hear have not seriously addressed the concerns originally raised, of scale, size, visible impact, lack of affordable housing etc. The development remains unsuitable for the historic surrounding area