London Borough of Camden Regeneration and Planning 2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE 15 July 2015

**Dear Sirs** 

## Planning application for illuminated advertising screen at St Giles Hotel [Application 2015/3210/A]

We are writing to comment on the proposal to add a two-storey high advertising hoarding to the western façade of the St Giles Hotel.

As long term residents of this area we are of course aware of the likely scale of change that will occur to our neighbourhood as a result of the greatly enhanced passenger numbers using Tottenham Court Road station. We welcome the opportunities this gives for improvements to the quality of the urban realm that can result from significant investment in new high quality buildings supported by well-designed public space at ground level.

We do however live within a Conservation Area that contains large sections of intact fabric from early times and whose amenity is enjoyed not only by residents but the many thousands of tourists of come to visit the British Museum and en route enjoy our squares and streets.

This presents the Council with a significant design challenge particularly at the interface between these two eras of urban development; one of acknowledged beauty and quality the other with enormous potential to become so.

The present application represents a significant intervention at this interface that will potentially set the tone of much of how the area will feel in years to come. It seems incredible therefore that it should considered for approval under delegated powers without a full examination by the Planning Committee.

We consider that as first step the Council should request a full planning application that considers this as a significant modification to an existing building rather than a piece of advertising. This should be supported by a much fuller appraisal of the proposals, which accurately tests the visual impact of the proposed media wall over its visible area. It should also evaluate other environmental effects including light pollution, traffic and pedestrian safety.

Given that this application is likely to trigger other similar proposals in the area it should ideally be considered in the wider context of other emerging proposals for the public spaces surrounding the new station. It is this type of urban design study that should be the subject of public debate prior to allowing individual applications of this type to be progressed in isolation.

May we therefore register our strong opposition to this specific application as now presented and urge the Council to insist that interventions of this scale are fully considered by the Planning Committee, as part of conscious policy to manage the future character and quality of the new public spaces that are now being created around the upgraded station.

In particular we ask that these policies should consider most carefully the interface between the new spaces and the surrounding Conservation Areas. It might well be that this site is considered too remote from the core of the new space to warrant vibrant use of moving imagery 24 hours per day.

Yours faithfully

John Hare MA RIBA Prof Lisa Jardine CBE FRS