

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Xanthos Yianni	14/07/2021 22:14:47	OBJ	<p>Having lived in this area for over 40 years, Camden Council has basically ignored the local community whilst allowing developers destroy the area.</p> <p>Only recently they signed off on the redevelopment of the old Post Office sorting office in New Oxford Street which has resulted in yet another anonymous monstrosity, while at ground floor there remain plenty of empty retail outlets.</p> <p>Numerous experts have assured us that the whole work situation has changed permanently since Covid, and with many people now working remotely, the need of office space has fallen dramatically.</p> <p>It is bad enough that it is yet another speculative office space, but the sheer size of it beggars belief. There is absolutely no architectural merit to this scheme, which will tower of the area and all for a building that is already redundant before it has even been built.</p> <p>To cap it all, there is little affordable housing on offer, plus it offers absolute no benefits to the local community. The only people that benefit from this ridiculous development are the developers and the coffers of Camden Council.</p> <p>If ever there was a symbol of a Camden Council's greed, this is it, as there is no sane reason for this building in the present working and financial environment.</p>
2021/2954/P	Peter Marsh	14/07/2021 19:16:46	OBJ	Objection.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Friends of Lincolns' Inn Fields	14/07/2021 09:40:18	OBJ	<p>One Museum Street—ex Travelodge Site</p> <p>Re 2021/2954/P London Borough of Camden: Planning Applications Register</p> <p>“The Committee of Friends of Lincoln’s Inn Fields (‘FLIF’) considered this application at its meeting on 7th July 2021.</p> <p>Lincoln’s Inn Fields (‘LIF’) is an important square in a Conservation Area. There are many listed buildings in and around the square. LIF is important both to the many nearby residents who live in an area of open space deficiency and also to internationally important institutions such as the London School of Economics and the Royal College of Surgeons. FLIF objects to the application. It does not, in order to avoid unnecessary repetition, repeat the many points of objection by other heritage and community organisations. It wishes to emphasise the following:</p> <p>First: the height and design of the proposed building would be such that it would have an intrusive, harmful effect on the setting both of Lincoln’s Inn Fields and of the listed buildings within and around it. Views towards the North West from the Fields and Lincoln’s Inn itself (for example the Benchers Drawing Room, the New Library building, Stone Buildings and its gardens and squares) especially after leaf fall, will suffer from the adverse effect of the incongruous and unattractive addition to the skyline above the listed and other buildings within the conservation area on the west and north of Lincoln’s Inn Fields. The Court of Appeal made clear that considerable weight and importance should be given to such considerations in <i>Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v E.Northants DC</i>, <i>English Heritage</i>, <i>National Trust &amp; SSCLG</i> [2014] EWCA Civ 137</p> <p>Second: the applicant’s analysis of visual impact (‘Zone of Visual Influence’ document) is deficient in that it ignores views from within listed buildings and buildings within conservation areas. The prominence of the proposed tower block is greater from these generally higher viewpoints. These are important omissions both in respect of the affected settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of the affected conservation areas.</p> <p>Third: while the visual impact of the proposed building would be unacceptably harmful in itself, in addition the cumulative impact of other developments, pressure for which it would encourage, and which would be indistinguishable in impact, is a further reason for refusal (see <i>Collis Radio v SSE</i> 29 P &amp;CR 390 where the Lord Chief Justice confirmed that precedent is a material planning consideration)”</p>