

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Gillian Darley OBE	26/07/2021 12:03:00	OBJ	<p>I am extremely concerned by the proposals for 'No 1 Museum Street'. I am the immediate past president of the Twentieth Century Society and a local resident for the last thirty plus years. I would like to register the strongest possible objection to the development which proposes demolition, and the subsequent extreme bulking up of the scale and height of the existing (Travelodge etc) buildings. To build another speculative office block, with a miniscule housing component, overlooking Camden's commitment to much needed social housing, is to fly in the face of logic, let alone reality in a post Covid shrunken office market. Retrofitting and close attention to Conservation Area guidelines in this most delightful of central London districts are forceful arguments. The current proposals show no sympathy with the city that I know, nor with the larger picture. On a micro, as on a macro, scale, this development is entirely out of order. Centre Point is the single listed point block of quality in this area. It deserves, just as the small scale Museum Street area does, the respect of developers in terms of setting and environs which planners must do their damndest to reinforce. If Lab Tech and their architects (strapline "the City is our Client" placing 'people to the fore of what we do') had any deep knowledge of what makes our London WC1 so special and noteworthy they would not have proposed this hugely unwelcome interruption to the skyline (eg Centre Point, British Museum, St George's Bloomsbury), fabric (modest height and scale over several blocks), character and use (mixed business and residential). There must be another way to refresh the site of the redundant hotel and car park which does not ride roughshod over the locality, let alone ignore the urgency of our commitment to the next generation to provide sustainable urban fabric. I rest my case.</p>
2021/2954/P	Shiona Harris	26/07/2021 22:31:25	OBJ	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed plans for the redevelopment of Selkirk House. The tower is far higher than the existing building, almost as high as Centre Point and far higher than all the surrounding buildings. The pictures I have seen of the current and planned look seek to disguise the enormosity of the new structure which will dominate the skyline of the neighbourhood for no apparent gain for local residents or indeed its' visitors.</p> <p>Camden has a responsibility to look after the beautiful old buildings in Bloomsbury and Covent Garden and this development is totally out of character. Visitors come to see the beautiful architecture, not a giant, ugly blot on the landscape.</p> <p>The social housing provision falls far short of that which should be expected from a development of this scale, what little housing there is is largely for private and not low-rent/public and we simply do not need any more office space in this post-pandemic world where many office workers are seeking a hybrid working model which will reduce the overall need for commercial offices in the centre of the city.</p> <p>The open space is a pitiful sop which does not provide nearly enough room for the number of workers which would be using the proposed 250,000 sq ft of office space and the play space for the suggested housing is dark, small and squashed in as some sort of afterthought.</p> <p>It is moreover, extremely bad for the environment to demolish a building which could be repurposed. What ever has happened to "Reduce, Reuse, Recycle?" All the materials used in the original building will be wasted and the demand for new materials to replace is obscene in this day and age when we are all encouraged to use less of our precious resources in order to try to help preserve the planet for future generations.</p> <p>I urge the council to turn down this hideous application - if it goes ahead those who allow it to happen either through a positive choice or not fighting hard enough against it should hang their heads in shame that they permitted this on their watch.</p> <p>Please don't be that person!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Sarah E	26/07/2021 17:45:49	OBJ	Objection to this proposal
2021/2954/P	Julian Reade	26/07/2021 16:33:25	OBJ	<p>I often walk past this site. I object to the proposed building.</p> <p>There are masses of empty offices round here already.</p> <p>The proposed building will be visible from many streets and many private and other windows. The application does not seem to offer any justification for such an intrusion into people's space. It will also throw shadow.</p> <p>This whole area of London, comprising Bloomsbury, Covent Garden and Soho, whether or not strictly within a "conservation area", generally has a traditional low-rise scale of architecture. It offers a series of welcoming environments, ranging from lively to relaxed and residential, for residents, workers and visitors.</p> <p>I do not see how the proposed high-rise building would make any positive contribution to the area that could not be provided equally well by adaptation of the buildings already on the site.</p> <p>The applicants, in a previous public discussion, cited Centrepoint as a high-rise precedent in this neighbourhood. But Centrepoint was approved as part of a traffic gyratory system, and anyway seems to have been virtually empty for long periods (cf. Wikipedia).</p> <p>I seem to recall that a comparable application to build at the south end of Bloomsbury Square many years ago was rejected.</p> <p>Should the application address the debate on possible psychological effects of living in and among high-rise buildings?</p>
2021/2954/P	Sarah E	26/07/2021 17:45:59	OBJ	Objection to this proposal