

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Poppy Campbell-Gillic	29/07/2021 23:43:28	OBJ	Objection to Development of Selkirk House (Ref: 2021/2954/P)

I am writing to Camden Council's Planning Department to formally object to the proposed development of 1 Museum Street / Selkirk House.

The first reason for my objection is the height of the tower. Predicted to reach over 75 metres in height; apart from Centre Point, no other building in the area is as tall as this, suggesting a building of this height is unnecessary and excessive. Any replacement building should be the same height or lower than the existing one.

My second concern is the increased damage towards global warming and inducing climate change. To demolish a building that could be re-used is very damaging to the environment. Travelodge is only 55 years old; all the steel and energy used to make it will be wasted. Putting up a massive new building in the middle of London uses lots of new concrete, steel and energy, as well as releasing dust particles into the air that people have no choice but to breathe in, making it harder for people with medical conditions, such as myself, to breathe.

My third objection is the detrimental effect of plant traffic in the area as a result of the planned development. Central London is already very congested and the added lorries and bulldozers will make commuting take longer and cause lots of noise for surrounding restaurants / cafes and neighbours. I appreciate this will not be permanent however this construction will be going on for years.

My fourth objection relates to the blocking of light to surrounding neighbours. If the proposed building is built it will significantly reduce the amount of daylight into my property. This is unfair and should be taken into consideration when deciding whether or not to grant permission.

My fifth objection concerns the building's use. There is no need for additional office space to be made available in the area. There is currently a lot of vacant office space available in the location.

My sixth objection concerns the erection of an oversized building in a conservation area. The sky line will be negatively impacted by the proposed structure.

I think it would be appropriate to replace the proposed development of the Travelodge building and Selkirk House with a project that can be utilised by all members of Camden, has affordable housing for all members of London and is aesthetically pleasing to all members of the UK.

Thank you for reading my email, I hope my points will be taken into consideration when granting planning permission for 1Museum Street / Selkirk House.

Poppy Campbell-Gillic, 25 Stedham Chambers, Coptic St., London WC1A 1NJ

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	James Williams	29/07/2021 11:29:18	OBJ	<p>The Lab Selkirk House site is in urgent need of redevelopment but the style and character of the area must be maintained. It contains several buildings that are of significance and a delicate balance must be maintained to ensure that the history of the area is melded with modern high class development. Whilst the narrative of this application demonstrates consideration of such principles, and indeed in certain areas achieves its ambition, the centre piece of the development, One Museum Street, fails miserably. Its massing and height are over domineering in such a sensitive site. It destroys the ambition of the WEP Princes Circus improvements as it looms over both the Shaftesbury Theatre, Sovereign House and the listed Grape Street properties and whilst its elevations will be a great improvement on the former Travelodge building, its height should not be allowed to exceed a building that already sits uncomfortably amongst its neighbours. The offices may have “extended views” but that is of little benefit for those millions of people living and visiting the area every year. It does not, “bring back the sense of human scale.”</p> <p>All buildings surrounding One Museum Street fit within the context of the area, their style and the landscaping that surrounds them is compatible with the area. Indeed, the introduction of Vine Lane is to be welcomed but there is a concern that such an addition to the public space might be short-lived given the suggestion that gates could be installed at a later date; something that must be rejected. Also of concern is the nature of West Central Street which is illustrated as only serving cars but will in fact carry HGV vehicles to serve the businesses in the northern part of Princes Circus and Grape Street; this needs to be better accommodated to ensure a safe environment for pedestrians.</p> <p>Finally, the model being used to assess use of the buildings seems questionable. There is currently a demonstratable oversupply of office space post the Covid pandemic and it seems folly to provide such a large additional amount of office space that could stand empty for many years to come. Likewise, introducing a considerable number of shops to articulate the street areas does not reflect what is evident in both the immediate vicinity and the wider West End. A broader definition of use is needed and should more broadly reflect the leisure and entertainment activities of the area. It is also of concern that such a large development provides minimal residential accommodation. It is the balance between office, retail, leisure and residential that gives the area vibrancy and this proposal fails to reflect this essential mix. Importantly, the development should contain a range of residential properties, not simply the binary “market” and “social” housing. There should be affordable housing for purchase within the mix which would counter the assertion that the market for residential property is difficult. A significant cohort of residents will ensure evening activity in the area and thus lower the potential for antisocial behaviour.</p> <p>To conclude, whilst supportive of elements of the application, the Shaftesbury Theatre urges that it is rejected as it fails to deliver a balanced and sustainable, both materially and from the human perspective, addition for the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Teresa Curnew	29/07/2021 11:26:04	COMMNT	<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed development of the Museum Street area. The proposed building is out of all proportion to other buildings in the area. It is far too high. No one knows whether office workers are going to return to their existing offices after the pandemic. Creating more office space now seems foolhardy. How much better to build homes that people can afford. There is pitifully little provision for living accommodation in the proposals.</p> <p>If these works are completed Vine Lane will be a dark alley just asking for trouble. The whole area is enormously attractive at the moment. No one will want to come to this part of Camden if it is closed in with almost no green spaces and its character ripped out. Surely we are all aware of the dangers of climate change right now! These plans show no apparent awareness of the cost to the planet of demolition work and new building.</p> <p>I am not a resident of Camden, but I'm a Londoner and enjoy visiting this part of town. I hope you will turn down this expensive, wasteful and unattractive proposal.</p>

---