

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Ali Southey/ Matthew Tibbey	04/08/2021 15:50:31	OBJ	<p>I am writing on behalf of Grand Imperial LTD. as operators of The Old Crown, 33 New Oxford Street. We would like to register an objection to the plan based on its direct negative impact on our business. The building works will result in massive disruption to our business as the plans look to demolish a huge area adjoining our business on two sides. We have concerns about the safety of such work in terms of noise and dust for our staff and customers as well as concerns about access to our venue. I would also have some concerns about the potential impact that these works will have to the foundations of the building as we have our cellar and office below street level.</p> <p>There has been no attempt to directly address us as leaseholders of the property, and having checked with the property owners we believe they have not been contacted either.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you, Kind regards, Alastair Southey/ Matthew Porter Tibbey</p>
2021/2954/P	Anastasia Karseras	04/08/2021 23:48:58	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to this proposed development. I am a resident of West Central Street which (along with Grape Street) is likely to be the most directly affected by the proposed development. There are a number of issues with this proposed development, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The height of the building, which is not in keeping with the local area and its many buildings of historical interest. (2) Sustainability - demolition of the existing building and construction of such a tall building in its place is not environmentally friendly. (3) Building use - given the Covid 19 pandemic there is much less demand for office space, and there is very little affordable housing in the proposed development. (4) Vine Lane - this likely to attract yet more anti-social behaviour to West Central Street, which has a history of such behaviour including drug dealing and drug taking. (5) The proposed building next the Fire Station at 14 West Central Street referred to as 'Vine Lane Office Block': (a) will negatively impact, to a significant extent, the daylight and sunlight which the one-bedroom apartments and the penthouse apartment (including its terrace) in the Fire Station receive; (b) will overlook the one-bedroom apartments and the penthouse apartment (including its terrace) and significantly invade their privacy; (c) will include an electricity sub-station, which creates a risk to the health of local residents. (6) The proposed development will take years to complete and will cause significant disruption to local residents at a time when many of us are working from home due to the pandemic. <p>As a local resident who will be so adversely affected by this proposed development, I am very disappointed with the lack of meaningful engagement and consultation by the developer with the local community.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Wyndham Albery	04/08/2021 10:22:00	OBJ	<p>As a local resident, I must object to the building of a block that grossly towers over everything else. The culture and landscape of a beautiful part of London will be changed for the worse. The shadows and cutting out of natural sunlight to multiple residents will be significant.</p> <p>We are the last generation that can stop the destruction of the community, of London and the environment - these massive buildings though potentially energy-saving mean that transport in and out will massively increase pollution - we have seen the result of climate change in the last year - if we continue this avenue the forecasts are all too horrifying. If anything we need to create a sensitive green area as a statement of what Camden believes in healing and the future.</p> <p>Our roads are already too full, how many more people and vehicles will this pull in to an overcrowded area. The damage to the fabric of society is immeasurable, In a time of climate crisis do we really need another tower to fill with people in the centre of London.</p> <p>Lastly, the building works over the coming years will be unbearable for local residents and businesses alike. I back on to the tower street work which has taken nearly two years and it has been misery, and it is not on the scale of this.</p> <p>Please reflect on the long term future damage to Camden - and how history will judge our decisions.</p> <p>Wyndham Albery</p>

2021/2954/P	Wyndham Albery	04/08/2021 10:22:01	OBJ	<p>As a local resident, I must object to the building of a block that grossly towers over everything else. The culture and landscape of a beautiful part of London will be changed for the worse. The shadows and cutting out of natural sunlight to multiple residents will be significant.</p> <p>We are the last generation that can stop the destruction of the community, of London and the environment - these massive buildings though potentially energy-saving mean that transport in and out will massively increase pollution - we have seen the result of climate change in the last year - if we continue this avenue the forecasts are all too horrifying. If anything we need to create a sensitive green area as a statement of what Camden believes in healing and the future.</p> <p>Our roads are already too full, how many more people and vehicles will this pull in to an overcrowded area. The damage to the fabric of society is immeasurable, In a time of climate crisis do we really need another tower to fill with people in the centre of London.</p> <p>Lastly, the building works over the coming years will be unbearable for local residents and businesses alike. I back on to the tower street work which has taken nearly two years and it has been misery, and it is not on the scale of this.</p> <p>Please reflect on the long term future damage to Camden - and how history will judge our decisions.</p> <p>Wyndham Albery</p>
-------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Kate Rich	04/08/2021 10:14:51	APP	All I can say about this development is, one seriously has to wonder if this monstrosity gets passed by Camden, whether your planning officers are being paid by the developers, to allow them to build yet another monstrosity on this side of Camden.. A case in point is the absolutely awful Lego building (name given to it the the local community) your planning officers allowed this to be erected opposite St Giles church. My father commented at the time (due to Mr Piano's Italian heritage) I doubt he would have been given permission in Italy to build it opposite one of their oldest churches..I realise Camden couldn't care less about local residents (you've proved that more than once) but I seriously wonder what possible benefits will be gained by residents should this be allowed to go ahead, other than to block out the sun for the foreseeable future. The fact that it will tower over even Centre Point should have set alarm bells ringing, it will be an eyesore seen for miles..and no real benefit to anyone other than the money hungry developers, who want to build it..As for residential uses just look at the amount of flats for sale in the Lego Building in St Giles, and also the empty shops.. So I urge (along with many others) for the planning committee to do the right thing and give this planning application a resounding Denied! It's too late for St Giles, but not too late for Bloomsbury..
2021/2954/P	SAMANTHA HARRIE	04/08/2021 17:14:31	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed development of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ∩ Repurposing the existing building would serve Londoners better and be on keeping with the existing architecture in the area. ∩ The demolition will be intrusive and environmentally polluting to the local residents. This is a dense area of both social and private housing and the proposed demolition / rebuild would affect a wide area, more than the directly adjacent streets in the area. ∩ Increasing office space in the area is questionable in a post-covid society. ∩ There are far too few affordable housing units when those of us who live in this area are faced with evidence of the London housing crisis every day. ∩ This proposal will destroy the protected views and overshadow listed buildings. ∩ The actions of investors and property developers who see London as endlessly exploitable and operate to the detriment of and at the expense of the people who live here has to be questioned. <p>- The local community has been very vocal in it's opposition to this development on all counts above and the investors / developers are not, in any way feeding back into the local area or in fact London itself.</p> <p>Please see quote from Guardian Article, dated 24th July 2021 below:</p> <p>" (the development)... will overshadow listed buildings, interfere with protected views and wastefully demolish existing structures that could be repurposed. Reasonably, post Brexit and post Covid, the coalition wonders about the need for yet more office space. Who wants to build it? The planning application lists Lab Selkirk House Limited. Who might that be? The company address is a PO box in Guernsey. Two directors are listed. The CEO is an Israeli national who lives in Spain, the chief financial officer is a Lithuanian national who lives in the UK ∩ and has another 100 directorships, mostly in what sound like London property companies. "</p>
2021/2954/P	Louise Coombes	04/08/2021 17:25:01	COMMNT	*

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Kate Rich	04/08/2021 10:15:47	APP	All I can say about this development is, one seriously has to wonder if this monstrosity gets passed by Camden, whether your planning officers are being paid by the developers, to allow them to build yet another monstrosity on this side of Camden.. A case in point is the absolutely awful Lego building (name given to it the the local community) your planning officers allowed this to be erected opposite St Giles church. My father commented at the time (due to Mr Piano's Italian heritage) I doubt he would have been given permission in Italy to build it opposite one of their oldest churches..I realise Camden couldn't care less about local residents (you've proved that more than once) but I seriously wonder what possible benefits will be gained by residents should this be allowed to go ahead, other than to block out the sun for the foreseeable future. The fact that it will tower over even Centre Point should have set alarm bells ringing, it will be an eyesore seen for miles..and no real benefit to anyone other than the money hungry developers, who want to build it..As for residential uses just look at the amount of flats for sale in the Lego Building in St Giles, and also the empty shops.. So I urge (along with many others) for the planning committee to do the right thing and give this planning application a resounding Denied! It's too late for St Giles, but not too late for Bloomsbury..
2021/2954/P	Azeem Ahmad	04/08/2021 19:24:10	OBJ	I am objecting to this application as although I agree this area needs to be redeveloped I don't agree with the plans submitted. The demolition of a building which is still a good stable structure is extremely bad for the environment. I would support the repurposing of this building by gutting it but retaining the superstructure. I'm also not happy that the height of the new building is higher and this will adversely impact the local area by being out of place and being visible from key local areas such as Bloomsbury Square. The redevelopment needs to have more housing available and less office space as the pandemic has shown that the office is no longer the only place to work. There is already an abundance of office space in this location and this area would benefit from a push towards residential use. I would urge that that this be taken into account especially with affordable housing to include shared ownership.
2021/2954/P	Ellinor Koch	04/08/2021 23:17:28	OBJ	The proposed building is neither fitting of the area nor needed. Office space stands vacant around us. Surely the fact that people are now more likely to be working from home should influence what buildings are being built? And why so high? Why let it over shadow Museum Street and it's surroundings? Bloomsbury is an area of beauty and enormous history, one of the reasons tourists visit London in fact. We cannot let what happened in Liverpool Docks happen in Bloomsbury. It's value and integrity should not only be upheld but more importantly, protected.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Lucinda Beatty	04/08/2021 12:21:08	OBJ	<p>I object to this development on the following basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building a massive new tower in the middle of a Georgian neighbourhood is shortsighted in terms of demolishing several historic and listed buildings, damaging tourism, blocking light, obscuring heritage views - The design brief does not consider long-term sustainability and economic development of existing businesses and communities - The planning does not include a thorough visual impact assessment and will ruin many protected views of historic London - Existing buildings could be repurposed to develop the area without ruining views and demolishing buildings of historic interest - The project favours Lab Tech developers and does not include sustainable housing nor open spaces for the local community, these are mutually beneficial - Disruption to local businesses and communities will extend to years for a project that fails to benefit them in any way - This development will create 60 years worth of carbon emissions, damaging the environment and further endangering the future of the young people in Camden and across the world - If this project goes ahead it sets a damaging precedent for future developments which will destroy this historic area of Central London - Housing - despite a 3,700% increase in office space, the intended development would only provide 12 'affordable' houses, only 6 of which would be available for social rent. That is inappropriate considering the enormous size of the site and damaging for the local community and businesses

2021/2954/P	Mr. W. Williams	04/08/2021 10:34:45	OBJ	<p>I vehemently object to the proposed development on this site which would create years of disruption for a highly undesirable result. The development would bring nothing to the local community and would be an eyesore, incongruous with the area. This kind of lazy, thoughtless planning is a symptom of the same issues that have led to Liverpool losing its World Heritage status.</p> <p>This is a beautiful neighbourhood which requires sympathetic planning. The recent works increasing pedestrian public spaces are a great step in the right direction. Conversely, there is nothing about this development which is attractive, forward-looking or beneficial to the quality of life of the humans who live and work here. Mostly, it is offering to increase office space to a city which is facing a huge drop in demand, which causing years of environmentally damaging demolition, excavation and congestion.</p> <p>Please deny this application in its entirety. Let's work together to build a better, more attractive neighbourhood for all.</p>
-------------	-----------------	---------------------	-----	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Mr. W. Williams	04/08/2021 10:35:00	OBJ	<p>I vehemently object to the proposed development on this site which would create years of disruption for a highly undesirable result. The development would bring nothing to the local community and would be an eyesore, incongruous with the area. This kind of lazy, thoughtless planning is a symptom of the same issues that have led to Liverpool losing its World Heritage status.</p> <p>This is a beautiful neighbourhood which requires sympathetic planning. The recent works increasing pedestrian public spaces are a great step in the right direction. Conversely, there is nothing about this development which is attractive, forward-looking or beneficial to the quality of life of the humans who live and work here. Mostly, it is offering to increase office space to a city which is facing a huge drop in demand, which causing years of environmentally damaging demolition, excavation and congestion.</p> <p>Please deny this application in its entirety. Let's work together to build a better, more attractive neighbourhood for all.</p>
2021/2954/P	Howard Jameson	04/08/2021 17:06:14	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement. 2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets". 3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level. 4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.
2021/2954/P	Mai Lee	04/08/2021 15:06:14	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden,</p> <p>I highly reject this application. I'm sick and tired of Camden council constantly building and being bombarded by construction workers. I live at Matilda Apartments WC2H 8AJ. Do not allow this new development to happen.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Sian Williams LHRA	04/08/2021 18:40:36	OBJ	<p>For attention: Planning Dept, Camden & LabTech</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment of Selkirk Street/Museum Street is inappropriate, unnecessary and will overshadow (literally) the area with a high tower.</p> <p>There is no need to construct a new building when refurbishing the present one would be viable. The height of the tower is completely out of kilter with the area - more suited to the City of London - and won't blend in or complement the buildings already there. A mixture of old and new can work but only with intelligent design and consideration of the existing residents and businesses. Why preserve this area only to add a blot on the landscape?</p> <p>It is over ambitious to think the office space proposed is needed, just look around at the empty offices, greatly increased by Covid-19. There is not enough affordable housing included and the nature of the development is not even suitable for homes. People don't appear to be considered in the development.</p> <p>Looking at the crime assessment - have you even mentioned the drug dealing/using and related crime in this area? Vine Lane looks very inviting for those activities.</p> <p>The years of redevelopment noise, disruption and inconvenience to the area cannot justify this development. Centre Point was a largely empty 'white elephant' for many years and has only recently been refurbished and is not fully occupied now. Camden and the developers need to learn from that and not allow this development to go ahead with such an ill-considered plan.</p> <p>On behalf - Lindsay House Residents' Association</p>
2021/2954/P	K L Westerholt	04/08/2021 22:52:48	OBJ	<p>This is not needed, it is greedy and environmentally unfriendly</p> <p>It blocks out light from my building and the height is unnecessary tall.</p> <p>It's going to take years and the sound and dust will make my and my neighbour's lives a misery, for years.</p> <p>The sound of construction during recent building (The Post Building) completely destroyed my quality of life and mental health. There is no double glazing here. Tjis, being a bigger project will take longer.</p> <p>I just see this as rampant greed that benefits only the developer and not the residents of the neighborhood.</p>
2021/2954/P	Howard Jameson	04/08/2021 17:06:16	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement. 2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets". 3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level. 4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Eric Stuart	04/08/2021 21:55:03	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal which would have a seriously adverse impact on both the Bloomsbury and Seven Dials conservation areas, and which is inappropriate for the site. My objections are as follows:</p> <p>(1) The demolition of the existing car park and Travelodge on the north side of High Holborn and replacement by 1 Museum Street. The 1 Museum Street block is ridiculously tall for the site - it will tower over-powerfully over all of the buildings as well as the neighbourhoods in its vicinity, including the Bloomsbury and Seven Dials conservation areas surrounding the British Museum and Seven Dials. The design of the proposed new tower is unremarkable to say the least - it is not as though it would even add anything of visual interest to the skyline, rather just the looming bulk of an extremely over-massed building. Rather than “distinctive massing . . . a well-considered urban insertion . . . attractive form and profile . . . [and] stepped volumes step up gently and gradually” as set out in section 8.3 of the DAS, the accompanying photo provides the best evidence that 1 Museum Street is far too tall to fit harmoniously into the existing site and any redevelopment should, at the most, be limited to the height of the existing Travelodge building and no taller. Furthermore, complete demolition and construction of a new building is bad for environmental sustainability and it would be far better if the existing tower could be repurposed. Finally, there would seem to be an oversupply of commercial office space in this part of central London, which suffers from acute housing shortages and resulting unaffordable prices. This is exacerbated by the number of flats in the immediate vicinity of the development devoted to short-term holiday lets. Taking away hotel rooms, without a significant increase in the number of housing units, many more than called for by this proposal, will only make this problem worse.</p> <p>(2) The demolition of the buildings on West Central Street. The existing buildings on West Central Street are architecturally very interesting, fitting in with the adjacent buildings on New Oxford Street and Museum Street in terms of size, scale, materials and detailing. Although not part of the Bloomsbury or Seven Dials conservation areas, these are heritage assets and every effort should be made to retain them rather than demolish them. Looking at the photos and text of section 7.6 of the DAS, it is difficult to see how the proposed replacement buildings tie in with the mansion blocks and other buildings of the surrounding conservation area other than in empty phrasing to justify a design that is otherwise out of place.</p> <p>Although I do not have many specific objections to the High Holborn building or to the Vine Lane Building, I note that they could be made more visually interesting with contrasting colours to some of the vertical or horizontal detailing - referencing the use of lighter off white tones in the neighbouring historic buildings to offset the red of period brickwork.</p> <p>I am however pleased to see the retention of the buildings on the south side of New Oxford Street</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Katherine Dee	04/08/2021 10:02:46	COMMNT	<p>As a nearby resident I strongly object to this scheme, which will tower above our area of Covent Garden, and cause shadowing and increased ground winds, in addition to being too bulky for the site and completely unnecessary.</p> <p>The development is said to be 70% of the height of Centre Point, and far bulkier. As a pedestrian, walking round Centre Point and the tall buildings at St Giles, the streetscape is given a dark, dystopian and extremely windy feel due to the tall buildings. Despite numerous attempts at improving the surroundings of Centre Point, they have all in my opinion failed. The same fate will fall on the Museum Street site and its surrounding streets.</p> <p>There is no need for another office block, or more retail, with the numerous empty office and shops already in the area.</p> <p>Having been resident in the area for many years, the last year in particular has shown how those in the area who live in flats should value the little light they can still access in their homes. Those in ground floor flats already need their lights on all day on the sunniest of days. More tall buildings will make this situation worse.</p> <p>Selkirk House is already too tall for the site, to the detriment of that part of Museum Street. The building should be no taller than the Post Building next to it.</p>
2021/2954/P	Selwyn Hardy	04/08/2021 10:07:29	COMMNT	<p>The massive scale of this proposed development is wrong for this location. It would dominate parts of Covent Garden and Bloomsbury. The proposed amount of affordable housing is insufficient and the site would be otherwise perfect for a large residential block to be built, I suggest, by the council or by a housing association.</p>
2021/2954/P	Julian Date	04/08/2021 10:11:57	OBJ	<p>I have lived on Monmouth Street (a stone's throw from the proposed development) for the past 21 years, and wish to express my horror at this project. One of the joys of the Covent Garden/Bloomsbury area is that it is relatively low rise, and other recent developments have respected this and maintained the overall skyline. Centrepoint is of course an exception, but it is the fact that it contrasts so strikingly with its surroundings that make it such an icon. The height of the proposed development on Museum Street will destroy the landscape. It is totally out of keeping with the surrounding network of historic buildings, including the British Museum itself. The area relies on visitors for its livelihood, and anything which makes the area less attractive - which this monstrosity will - will damage that livelihood.</p> <p>Camden Council is keen to emphasis its green credentials. Refusing this application is a very good way of putting that into practice. The destruction of so much existing built environment and replacing with new-build flies in the face of the need to re-use and recycle - this applies even more with buildings than it does with domestic rubbish.</p> <p>The centre of London now needs to attract visitors back. Having a massive building project going on for several years, with all the attendant noise, dust, and traffic congestion, is not going to help that. And with the pandemic's shift away from city centre living and working, there is no evidence at all that this part of town needs additional building space for whatever use.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this.</p>
2021/2954/P	Mrs Gray	04/08/2021 11:47:58	OBJ	<p>This proposed discusting monster would be terrible for this precious heritage area. Absolutely NO.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Nat	04/08/2021 16:01:07	COMMNT	Too much redevelopment, interference, noise, pollution, interactions, change of new eclectic not in style to the Victorian face of the area. Too busy area as my surgery and chemist is there, difficult to get to them. Object.
2021/2954/P	Howard Jameson	04/08/2021 17:05:54	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement. 2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets". 3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level. 4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.
2021/2954/P	K Beatty	04/08/2021 16:00:10	OBJ	<p>I object to this development on the following basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building a massive new tower in the middle of a Georgian neighbourhood is shortsighted in terms of demolishing several historic and listed buildings, damaging tourism, blocking light, obscuring heritage views - The design brief does not consider long-term sustainability and economic development of existing businesses and communities - The planning does not include a thorough visual impact assessment and will ruin many protected views of historic London - Existing buildings could be repurposed to develop the area without ruining views and demolishing buildings of historic interest - The project favours Lab Tech developers and does not include sustainable housing or open spaces for the local community, these are mutually beneficial - Disruption to local businesses and communities will extend to years for a project that fails to benefit them in any way - This development will create 60 years worth of carbon emissions, damaging the environment and further endangering the future of the young people in Camden and across the world - If this project goes ahead it sets a damaging precedent for future developments which will destroy this historic area of Central London - Housing - despite a 3,700% increase in office space, the intended development would only provide 12 'affordable' houses, only 6 of which would be available for social rent. That is inappropriate considering the enormous size of the site and damaging for the local community and businesses
2021/2954/P	Christopher Catherine	04/08/2021 22:13:09	COMMNT	I object to this proposal. The 1 Museum Street tower is far too tall and would have a seriously adverse impact on the Bloomsbury and Seven Dials conservation areas. The historic buildings on West Central Street should be retained and not demolished.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Ashtar Al Khirsan	04/08/2021 10:45:26	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed development of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ∩ The demolition will be intrusive and environmentally polluting to the local residents. ∩ Repurposing the existing building would serve Londoners better. ∩ Increasing office space in the area is questionable in a post-covid society. ∩ There are too few affordable housing units when those of us who live in this area are faced with evidence of the London housing crisis every day. ∩ This proposal will destroy the protected views and overshadow listed buildings. ∩ The actions of investors and property developers who see London as endlessly exploitable and operate to the detriment of and at the expense of the people who live here has to be questioned.
2021/2954/P	Sanam khan	04/08/2021 11:45:41	OBJ	<p>this is the wrong scheme for this site. We do not need more office buildings or large over toweing buildings in the area. We are losing a sense of community in the area and are being taken over by corporate buildings.</p>
2021/2954/P	Sanam khan	04/08/2021 11:45:42	OBJ	<p>this is the wrong scheme for this site. We do not need more office buildings or large over toweing buildings in the area. We are losing a sense of community in the area and are being taken over by corporate buildings.</p>
2021/2954/P	K Beatty	04/08/2021 16:00:11	OBJ	<p>I object to this development on the following basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building a massive new tower in the middle of a Georgian neighbourhood is shortsighted in terms of demolishing several historic and listed buildings, damaging tourism, blocking light, obscuring heritage views - The design brief does not consider long-term sustainability and economic development of existing businesses and communities - The planning does not include a thorough visual impact assessment and will ruin many protected views of historic London - Existing buildings could be repurposed to develop the area without ruining views and demolishing buildings of historic interest - The project favours Lab Tech developers and does not include sustainable housing or open spaces for the local community, these are mutually beneficial - Disruption to local businesses and communities will extend to years for a project that fails to benefit them in any way - This development will create 60 years worth of carbon emissions, damaging the environment and further endangering the future of the young people in Camden and across the world - If this project goes ahead it sets a damaging precedent for future developments which will destroy this historic area of Central London - Housing - despite a 3,700% increase in office space, the intended development would only provide 12 'affordable' houses, only 6 of which would be available for social rent. That is inappropriate considering the enormous size of the site and damaging for the local community and businesses

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	K L Westerholt	04/08/2021 22:52:47	OBJ	<p>This is not needed, it is greedy and environmentally unfriendly It blocks out light from my building and the height is unnecessarily tall. It's going to take years and the sound and dust will make my and my neighbour's lives a misery, for years. The sound of construction during recent building (The Post Building) completely destroyed my quality of life and mental health. There is no double glazing here. Tjis, being a bigger project will take longer.</p> <p>I just see this as rampant greed that benefits only the developer and not the residents of the neighborhood.</p>
2021/2954/P	Elizabeth Jack	04/08/2021 12:18:32	INT	<p>This proposed development will dwarf the surrounding buildings and its height is far too tall. This area of London is full of small streets and beautiful squares an to impose an enormous building like this in the middle is totally inappropriate. Why not convert the existing buildings? It would retain the character of the area. Once an enormous building like this goes up there will be applications for yet more in the area and the entire charm of Holborn and Covent Garden will be lost. This is the last remaining part of London which has not been wrecked by high rises.</p>
2021/2954/P	Elizabeth Jack	04/08/2021 12:18:34	INT	<p>This proposed development will dwarf the surrounding buildings and its height is far too tall. This area of London is full of small streets and beautiful squares an to impose an enormous building like this in the middle is totally inappropriate. Why not convert the existing buildings? It would retain the character of the area. Once an enormous building like this goes up there will be applications for yet more in the area and the entire charm of Holborn and Covent Garden will be lost. This is the last remaining part of London which has not been wrecked by high rises.</p>
2021/2954/P	Francis Bock	04/08/2021 12:52:53	COMMNT	<p>Out of keeping with the architectural integrity.</p> <p>Not wanted by the local community</p>
2021/2954/P	Howard Jameson	04/08/2021 17:06:54	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement. 2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets". 3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level. 4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Richard Friedhoff	04/08/2021 15:33:02	OBJ	<p>Realization of these grandiose and brutal plans will forever, and fundamentally, alter the special character of the intimate, and historic streets that constitute this part of Covent Garden, and High Holburn. One has only to wander a few streets away, to the office towers adjacent to, and including, CentrePoint, to see the way that such a development obliterates and makes desolate neighborhoods that were once charming, thriving and full of neighborhood life.</p> <p>Were this just any historic neighborhood in the UK, the plans would be objectionable, but let us remind ourselves of the historical uniqueness of nearby Covent Garden and High Holburn, and the miracle that a sufficient amount of the historical fabric has survived to the present era.</p> <p>The character of the institutions in this neighborhood, the theatres, museums, parks, libraries, educational institutions, produced by an amazing and unique history, are what make it an attraction for visitors from all over the country and the world, which make it and thus a vital engine of the economy at a vital time, in addition to being a wonderful neighborhood in which to live.</p> <p>This miracle of preservation only happened because of the advocacy of generations who resisted similar attempts at destruction over the decades. The preciousness of what we have in our hands, of what we have inherited, should never be taken for granted, and we owe it to the nation, and to previous and future generations to continue to defend it. Once it is turned into another office park, there is no going back.</p> <p>How can anyone doubt that such anonymous office buildings, with their simplistic economics, fitting in as much as they can for as low a cost as they can, are attempting to take advantage of the appeal of the neighborhood at the same moment they are fundamentally violating it. Canary Wharf has its own modernist aesthetic, and would be a fine area in which to develop such a project. There are others. Overlaying this on an historic neighborhood is a shameless attempt to exploit the virtues of the neighborhood, even as the developers are destroying it.</p> <p>This project is completely inappropriate for the proposed location, and it would permanently and irrevocably damage a neighborhood that is an historic, and precious miracle of preservation unique in country, and, indeed, in the world.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Noel Gordon	04/08/2021 22:00:42	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the proposed One Museum Street development for the following reasons.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY:</p> <p>This proposal is at odds with the Camden Local Plan and is contrary to current thinking on the repurposing/retrofitting of existing buildings with reference to climate change and net-zero carbon emissions. It is widely accepted that the built environment is a major contributor to environmental pressures and the repurposing and retrofit of existing buildings is crucial to supporting and meeting net-zero targets, demolishing an existing building achieves exactly the opposite.</p> <p>It beggars belief that a scheme such as this would be put forward in a built up environment without taking into account the impact upon those who live and work here never mind those who will be visiting again in a post covid era.</p> <p>By all accounts the works are estimated to be going on for 4 years and as most of us are only too aware estimated times for large building projects are invariably underestimated.</p> <p>The applicant states in their own construction management plan that it is estimated that 25 HGV vehicles will be coming to site on a daily basis, but during peak times 50-55 HGV vehicles will be coming to site daily. These vehicles will be marshalled along Museum Street into West Central Street. It doesn't take too much thought to realise that this will cause traffic chaos in an already busy congested area and will subsequently lead to increased pollution in an area that already exceeds World Health Organisation for Nitrogen Oxide emissions and PM particulate matter.</p> <p>HOUSING:</p> <p>Do we really need so much square footage of office space post covid? There are still empty spaces in the Post Building and 10 Bloomsbury Way developments, and with the evolving changes in people's working patterns how can this be justified.</p> <p>This area needs more social rented and genuinely affordable housing as opposed to the derisory 6 socially rented properties offered in this development.</p> <p>HERITAGE ASSETS:</p> <p>What other European City would permit a development of this proportion so close to Conservation areas and numerous historic buildings/ Squares?</p> <p>I respectfully ask the planning committee to reject this application, and would like to be kept informed of any hearing.</p> <p>Noel Gordon</p> <p>Noe</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Howard Jameson	04/08/2021 17:06:55	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <p>1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement.</p> <p>2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets".</p> <p>3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level.</p> <p>4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.</p>
2021/2954/P	Bryan	04/08/2021 09:22:53	OBJ	This development does not respect its setting and risks degrading the character of Bloomsbury, Holborn and Covent Garden.
2021/2954/P	Bryan	04/08/2021 09:23:00	OBJ	This development does not respect its setting and risks degrading the character of Bloomsbury, Holborn and Covent Garden.
2021/2954/P	Bloomsbury Association	04/08/2021 21:39:41	OBJ	<p>As an Association, we are wholeheartedly opposed to the proposed application.</p> <p>The building that has been proposed is of a scale that is out of keeping with neighbouring conservation areas, its bulky, slab-like structure will be visible from historic locations across London and it will result in serious loss of sunlight and overshadowing to residential and commercial properties in the vicinity. These properties include Tavistock Chambers, and those on West Central, Grape, Museum and Coptic Streets.</p> <p>The quantum and quality of housing offered is derisory. The calculations used to determine the housing seem to seriously understate the true requirements as existing floorspace within Selkirk House designated as housing has not been included within the calculations. Furthermore, the social element of the housing, due to the proximity of neighbouring buildings, will be almost permanently in shadow.</p> <p>The proposal to open up a further north-south route seems certain, given the narrowness and darkness of the scheme, to act as a magnet for criminal activity in an area that has only recently succeeded in chasing out a longstanding problem of drug dealing and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>We also believe that the Camden Local Plan which encourages retrofitting rather than demolition of buildings, should act as a block on any plans to knock down a serviceable and relatively recently constructed building.</p> <p>Despite the Council and local groups rejecting previous plans as being too tall, the developers have returned with a similar scheme with similar flaws. It should be soundly rejected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Ellinor Koch	04/08/2021 23:17:30	OBJ	The proposed building is neither fitting of the area nor needed. Office space stands vacant around us. Surely the fact that people are now more likely to be working from home should influence what buildings are being built? And why so high? Why let it over shadow Museum Street and it's surroundings? Bloomsbury is an area of beauty and enormous history, one of the reasons tourists visit London in fact. We cannot let what happened in Liverpool Docks happen in Bloomsbury. It's value and integrity should not only be upheld but more importantly, protected.
2021/2954/P	Mr. W. Williams	04/08/2021 10:35:16	OBJ	<p>I vehemently object to the proposed development on this site which would create years of disruption for a highly undesirable result. The development would bring nothing to the local community and would be an eyesore, incongruous with the area. This kind of lazy, thoughtless planning is a symptom of the same issues that have led to Liverpool losing its World Heritage status.</p> <p>This is a beautiful neighbourhood which requires sympathetic planning. The recent works increasing pedestrian public spaces are a great step in the right direction. Conversely, there is nothing about this development which is attractive, forward-looking or beneficial to the quality of life of the humans who live and work here. Mostly, it is offering to increase office space to a city which is facing a huge drop in demand, which causing years of environmentally damaging demolition, excavation and congestion.</p> <p>Please deny this application in its entirety. Let's work together to build a better, more attractive neighbourhood for all.</p>
2021/2954/P	Adrian O'Brien	04/08/2021 11:40:24	OBJ	I wish to object entirely to the Selkirk House redevelopment project. The entire scheme is not in keeping with this historic area and would destroy the community and the identity of the district. There is far too much development in the area already and the beleaguered and long suffering residents have had enough of unimaginative high rise demonstrative buildings blighting their light and air space. The area needs to breath and should have more green space to help the pollution problem. The sheer lack of sympathy with the surroundings building is staggering and something Camden Council should be trying to preserve not destroy. The area needs more housing, more green public space and sympathetic buildings that reflect the history and benefit the community. We do not need another four years of building works, congestion and environmental pollution.
2021/2954/P	Victoria Odonnell	04/08/2021 09:47:40	COMMNT	Not happy with plans I object
2021/2954/P	Lorraine Goodhew	04/08/2021 13:38:37	COMMNT	There is no need to demolish perfectly decent buildings to build a tower block which has no relationship to the existing buildings. In addition there is a minimum of social housing provided on this large site. The developers will profit and the community will lose.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Joanne Scott	04/08/2021 11:53:36	OBJ	<p>Objection from Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) North London branch</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) North London branch as Pub Protection Officer, and we object to this planning application. This development is too tall and bulky and will loom heavy over several pubs in the area, including the Old Crown, the White Hart, Craft Beer Co., the Bloomsbury Tavern and others around Museum Street. Any replacement buildings on the site should be no higher than the existing buildings. The development will harm the Old Crown public house, 33 New Oxford Street and the Grade II listed buildings adjoining the site boundary at 43-45 New Oxford Street and 16 West Central Street. The Old Crown public house adjoins the site and was identified as a positive contributor in the Conservation Area Appraisal, along with 35-41 New Oxford Street. The pub has outdoor seating and function rooms on the upper floors and their business is likely to be impacted during construction of the scheme.</p>
2021/2954/P	Giles Ellwood	04/08/2021 12:05:55	COMMNT	<p>This application seems to belong to a former age. A declining demand for office space (in London) alone should obviate it, but there are also two Grade 1 listed buildings (St George's and the BM) in close proximity. This new development is clearly inspired by those around Centrepoint, an historic anomaly in a low-built conservation area; Holborn & Covent Garden are moving in a different direction.</p>
2021/2954/P	Giles Ellwood	04/08/2021 12:06:46	COMMNT	<p>This application seems to belong to a former age. A declining demand for office space (in London) alone should obviate it, but there are also two Grade 1 listed buildings (St George's and the BM) in close proximity. This new development is clearly inspired by those around Centrepoint, an historic anomaly in a low-built conservation area; Holborn & Covent Garden are moving in a different direction.</p>
2021/2954/P	Alison Oswald	04/08/2021 12:06:47	COMMNT	<p>I Believe this build will be a eyesore and is not in line with the historic ambience of the area in an historic part of London.</p> <p>Creating disruption and distress to the wider community and will cause increased traffic issues in an already congested area</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	John Cole	04/08/2021 23:04:45	OBJ	<p>LabTech's proposals are damaging and inappropriate to the sensitive setting of Bloomsbury. This is an area defined by a distinctive mix of theatres, museums and galleries, its residential and hotel buildings, specialist shops, fine public houses, it's literary, academic and university meeting places and others, all dependant on a vibrant and active life at street level and of respect for the fine legacy of human scale buildings and open spaces.</p> <p>One of the challenges set for the architect and developer on this particular site was: how to link the scale and vibrancy of the north part of Museum Street with the bustle, intimacy and activity of Drury Lane, just 100m to the south. LabTech's scheme completely fails to address this opportunity and instead reinforces the already dark and unpleasant 20m wide canyon corridor between Selkirk House and The Post Building with a massive overdevelopment which includes a huge overpowering tower. As proposed, this will be a space only to be sped through as quickly as possible as there is nothing to entice a longer stay. Nor do the proposals make any attempt to arrange building form in a way that would increase permeability to sun and daylight to the street or provide any meaningful addition to public open space.</p> <p>At every level the scheme is mean and greedy: mean in its provision of housing, open space and sunlight - greedy in its taking over of the skies over Bloomsbury, its over provision of unnecessary offices, its blatant waste of resources and its infliction on the community of up to 5 years of dirt, dust, noise and disruption of lives.....all for what? It's a scheme of the past, not one for the future.</p> <p>The developer's working hypothesis also seems to be that Museum Street is an appropriate location for a high rise office towers. There is no formal planning guidance to support this, and even the Council's draft, but now out-of-date and unadopted, 'Holborn Vision and Urban Strategy' makes no reference to high rise office towers in its so-called Museum Quarter. The height of any building on this site should be limited to the height of Selkirk House and no higher.</p> <p>Office towers generally indicate areas that are in a state of redevelopment and where the monoculture of offices might be seen as the best recipe for the future. Bloomsbury, however, does not need redeveloping, on the contrary, it needs its existing fabric repaired and enhancing, especially with the provision of more homes and facilities for those who wish to permanently live and work in this vibrant city community.</p> <p>The extensive document of objection prepared by Save Museum Street should be studied in detail by the planning department and by the planning sub-committee, as it contains clear evidence of the many areas where this application fails to meet the wishes, or find the support of, the local and wider community. I endorse the Save Museum Street objections and ask that these proposals be rejected outright.</p>
2021/2954/P	Lorraine Goodhew	04/08/2021 13:39:22	OBJ	<p>There is no need to demolish perfectly decent buildings to build a tower block which has no relationship to the existing buildings. In addition there is a minimum of social housing provided on this large site. The developers will profit and the community will lose.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Angel Daden	04/08/2021 14:43:32	COMMNT	Covent Garden in a beautiful area, that has had to fight many times over the decades to stop unscrupulous money hungry developments such as the one proposed. It will mar this area and contribute zero. The area has enough building and I note that the massive office buildings all around still remain empty and vacant since the world has undergone change since 2020. Homeworking now a feature of life. Therefore the arguments for a "need" for such massive high rises to service an area seems rather redundant in this time. Of course Camden will be hungry to capitalise on the business rates and such like, but surely it is better that the existing buildings are used. The main massive office block on Shaftesbury Avenue is empty. I overlook it and see it with my own eyes. So where is the argument from the development. It will greatly destroy the beauty of this area.
2021/2954/P	Peter	04/08/2021 17:58:46	OBJ	This scheme is an abomination which has no regard to the scale and historic relevance of the surrounding area. I fully concur with the comments submitted by the CGCA and hope that the Council treat this application with the contempt it deserves and unanimously refuse planning consent
2021/2954/P	Mr Kadir Alam	04/08/2021 12:07:02	OBJ	I object for the following reasons: - Sustainability - the proposal to demolish several perfectly usable structures and build several new buildings will create 60 years worth of carbon emissions, damaging the environment and further endangering the future of the young people in Camden and across the world. - Height - they are trying to build a massive new tower in the middle of our neighbourhood, blocking light, heritage views and setting a dangerous precedent for the kind of developments that can get approval in our home. - Housing - despite a 3,700% increase in office space, the intended development would only provide 12 'affordable' houses, only 6 of which would be available for social rent. That is a joke considering the enormous size of the site.
2021/2954/P	Monika Morawietz	04/08/2021 13:00:38	OBJ	Absolutely no need for massive development in the area, destroying historic buildings and not profiting the local community.
2021/2954/P	Monika Morawietz	04/08/2021 13:00:43	OBJ	Absolutely no need for massive development in the area, destroying historic buildings and not profiting the local community.
2021/2954/P	Monika Morawietz	04/08/2021 13:00:45	OBJ	Absolutely no need for massive development in the area, destroying historic buildings and not profiting the local community.
2021/2954/P	Henry Hogarth	04/08/2021 13:11:53	COMMNT	Dear Planning Officer(s), I think the proposed development will, overall, represent a significant improvement to the immediate area. The only core disagreement I have to the proposal is the building height. I think the height should be kept close to that of the existing Travelodge and/or Post Building. Best regards, Henry

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Kester Robinson	04/08/2021 18:24:15	OBJ	<p>I write in objection to the application scheme principally on the grounds of negative impact on the sensitive nature and historic significance of the surrounding context due to excessive bulk and overbearing size of the proposals. While the height of the existing hotel provides cover in the attempt to justify the scale of the proposals this was never in keeping when originally built so offers no meaningful justification now. The scheme will clearly be detrimental to the conservation area altering the prospect from far and wide.</p> <p>I object also on the grounds of the negative impact on the residents and the neighbourhood more widely resulting from years of demolition, construction works and congestion.</p>
2021/2954/P	Ellinor Koch	04/08/2021 23:17:52	OBJ	<p>The proposed building is neither fitting of the area nor needed. Office space stands vacant around us. Surely the fact that people are now more likely to be working from home should influence what buildings are being built? And why so high? Why let it over shadow Museum Street and it's surroundings? Bloomsbury is an area of beauty and enormous history, one of the reasons tourists visit London in fact. We cannot let what happened in Liverpool Docks happen in Bloomsbury. It's value and integrity should not only be upheld but more importantly, protected.</p>
2021/2954/P	Ellinor Koch	04/08/2021 23:18:21	OBJ	<p>The proposed building is neither fitting of the area nor needed. Office space stands vacant around us. Surely the fact that people are now more likely to be working from home should influence what buildings are being built? And why so high? Why let it over shadow Museum Street and it's surroundings? Bloomsbury is an area of beauty and enormous history, one of the reasons tourists visit London in fact. We cannot let what happened in Liverpool Docks happen in Bloomsbury. It's value and integrity should not only be upheld but more importantly, protected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Kathy Doyle	04/08/2021 18:55:49	OBJNOT	<p>Objection to Application No. 2021/2954/P – 1 Museum Street</p> <p>This building is too tall, too bulky and too brash. It is not appropriate for this location, where it is in close proximity to four Conservation Areas made up of historic medium or low-rise buildings. The current building on the site, Selkirk House, is already too large and overbearing, it should not be used as a pretext for building something even worse.</p> <p>The proposed tower will ruin the views from and of many historic assets such as the Grade I listed St George's Church by Hawksmoor and the British Museum; it will spoil the views, across the neighbouring Conservation Areas and affect much of the West End.</p> <p>It is unneighbourly, casting a massive shadow over adjoining neighbourhoods, casting nearby buildings into gloom and causing unwarranted intrusion into the adjoining buildings. The height and bulk of the building will cause a canyon-like effect in the nearby streets making life unpleasant for residents and neighbours and adversely affecting local businesses, many of which rely on a street café-culture trade.</p> <p>The idea of tearing down a sound 60-year old building, which could be refurbished and re-used, is shocking. It offends against all London and Camden's policies of sustainability. It shows a callous disregard, of the climate emergency we are all facing, and our responsibilities to society. Re-use of existing buildings should in all cases be the first priority. It would be hard to accept that re-use of this building is not possible, when it started life as a prestigious office headquarters and has been successfully converted to a hotel, especially as there are many examples of successful refurbishment of similar buildings within Camden already, such as the Standard Hotel, making use of Camden's own former 60s office building and the new building for the Bartlett School of Architecture at UCL. Whatever the applicant states about the green credentials of the proposed tower it is incontrovertible that a high rise building is essentially not energy efficient, a refurbished building can have as efficient thermal properties as a new-build and the greenest building is one which already exists.</p> <p>In addition there are a number of attractive 19thC buildings on the site, which the applicant proposes to demolish or retain only the façade. Although not individually listed they are attractive buildings which add to the texture of the area and the richness and diversity of the neighbourhood's architectural heritage and should be retained.</p> <p>In the current situation, where offices have been abandoned during the pandemic in favour of working from home and there is already a great deal of empty office space in London, it would seem to be the height of folly to add even more space to this surfeit. Housing is certainly badly needed in central London, but not offices.</p> <p>If Camden is to show that it pays more than just lip-service to its policies on housing, sustainability and conservation it will reject this application.</p>
2021/2954/P	Stephen Jones	04/08/2021 12:41:03	OBJ	<p>This area will benefit from redevelopment. However, the height of the proposed development is completely out of proportion to the surrounding buildings and local character. There is no need for the proposed buildings to be so high apart from maximizing profits for the developers. This is obvious. There is a glut of empty office space in the area anyway. Please demonstrate that Camden Council is sensitive to the unique character of the area around Museum Street by rejecting this planning application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Maximilian Frederick Herbert	04/08/2021 12:42:17	OBJ	This is not something that I have followed for very long, and I cannot say I am an expert in any of the matters concerned, however I recall the character of Camden years ago when I was still at school and how it has changed since then, and while one might argue that the area is in some respects safer following its development, it also seems somehow soulless as corporate interests have moved in and given it a commercial look and polished appearance that is entirely at odds with the spirit of the area and what originally made it a destination for people who celebrate counter-cultures. Now with many pressing concerns affecting the populous, including environmental issues, global warming, housing shortages, welfare deficits, and new work-from-home expectations being implemented by many employers, the idea of building a huge office space that would intrude on the skyline much as the BT tower still does to members of the public trying to enjoy some seclusion in nature when visiting Regents Park, is an idea that seems poorly thought through. Not only would it further undermine the character of the area, but it would do so whilst failing to properly address any of the aforementioned problems and in fact having a negative impact on them. For this reason it seems like a bad idea that should be opposed and not permitted to go ahead.
2021/2954/P	Sarah Staton	04/08/2021 22:30:37	OBJ	Please accept my comments in opposition to this pre covid kind of development. My objection is based on the potential carbon emissions generated by the proposal to demolish perfectly usable structures, replacing them with new builds which impact heavily in terms of carbon emissions. If Camden is unsure about the reality of climate change, and is therefore still considering passing planning on developments like 1 Museum Street, perhaps this summers devastating floods and fires across Europe provide some evidence that adding to Carbon emissions is not a good idea. This proposal is too high for the area, and will block light, and views and set a dangerous precedent for the kind of developments that can get approval in our neighbourhood. If this proposal were 100% affordable housing it might at least be useful in the future. presently there is an excess of empty office space in London and this proposal would only provide 12 'affordable' houses, (affordable housing for buyers with income levels of 80K+, is not really affordable when average incomes are so much less than that) only 6 of which would be available for social rent.
2021/2954/P	Dean Baker	04/08/2021 09:16:38	OBJ	This seems to me to be a ridiculous idea. Main concerns continue to be: - Sustainability - the proposal to demolish several perfectly usable structures and build several new buildings will create 60 years worth of noise and disruption, dust and increased HGV traffic further endangering the future of the young people in Camden. - Height - A massive new tower in the middle of our neighbourhood will block light, views and set a dangerous precedent for the kind of developments that can get approval in our area. - Housing - despite a 3,700% increase in office space, the intended development would only provide 12 'affordable' houses, only 6 of which would be available for social rent. That is a joke considering the enormous size of the site. This seems to me to be a land and profit grab. Plain and simple.
2021/2954/P	Jason Borrows	04/08/2021 09:38:01	OBJ	The proposed building is a monstrosity. Grossly out of proportion to the local area. As well as being oversized, ugly, of very poor unimaginative design, the area does not require a substantial increase in office space but more affordable housing! Even after the pandemic there is not the demand for large scale offices, in the centre of London. what is needed is more housing of which a fair percentage should be affordable.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	John Cole	04/08/2021 23:04:47	OBJ	<p>LabTech's proposals are damaging and inappropriate to the sensitive setting of Bloomsbury. This is an area defined by a distinctive mix of theatres, museums and galleries, its residential and hotel buildings, specialist shops, fine public houses, it's literary, academic and university meeting places and others, all dependant on a vibrant and active life at street level and of respect for the fine legacy of human scale buildings and open spaces.</p> <p>One of the challenges set for the architect and developer on this particular site was: how to link the scale and vibrancy of the north part of Museum Street with the bustle, intimacy and activity of Drury Lane, just 100m to the south. LabTech's scheme completely fails to address this opportunity and instead reinforces the already dark and unpleasant 20m wide canyon corridor between Selkirk House and The Post Building with a massive overdevelopment which includes a huge overpowering tower. As proposed, this will be a space only to be sped through as quickly as possible as there is nothing to entice a longer stay. Nor do the proposals make any attempt to arrange building form in a way that would increase permeability to sun and daylight to the street or provide any meaningful addition to public open space.</p> <p>At every level the scheme is mean and greedy: mean in its provision of housing, open space and sunlight - greedy in its taking over of the skies over Bloomsbury, its over provision of unnecessary offices, its blatant waste of resources and its infliction on the community of up to 5 years of dirt, dust, noise and disruption of lives.....all for what? It's a scheme of the past, not one for the future.</p> <p>The developer's working hypothesis also seems to be that Museum Street is an appropriate location for a high rise office towers. There is no formal planning guidance to support this, and even the Council's draft, but now out-of-date and unadopted,'Holborn Vision and Urban Strategy' makes no reference to high rise office towers in its so-called Museum Quarter. The height of any building on this site should be limited to the height of Selkirk House and no higher.</p> <p>Office towers generally indicate areas that are in a state of redevelopment and where the monoculture of offices might be seen as the best recipe for the future. Bloomsbury, however, does not need redeveloping, on the contrary, it needs its existing fabric repaired and enhancing, especially with the provision of more homes and facilities for those who wish to permanently live and work in this vibrant city community.</p> <p>The extensive document of objection prepared by Save Museum Street should be studied in detail by the planning department and by the planning sub-committee, as it contains clear evidence of the many areas where this application fails to meet the wishes, or find the support of, the local and wider community. I endorse the Save Museum Street objections and ask that these proposals be rejected outright.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	John Cole	04/08/2021 23:05:31	OBJ	<p>LabTech's proposals are damaging and inappropriate to the sensitive setting of Bloomsbury. This is an area defined by a distinctive mix of theatres, museums and galleries, its residential and hotel buildings, specialist shops, fine public houses, it's literary, academic and university meeting places and others, all dependant on a vibrant and active life at street level and of respect for the fine legacy of human scale buildings and open spaces.</p> <p>One of the challenges set for the architect and developer on this particular site was: how to link the scale and vibrancy of the north part of Museum Street with the bustle, intimacy and activity of Drury Lane, just 100m to the south. LabTech's scheme completely fails to address this opportunity and instead reinforces the already dark and unpleasant 20m wide canyon corridor between Selkirk House and The Post Building with a massive overdevelopment which includes a huge overpowering tower. As proposed, this will be a space only to be sped through as quickly as possible as there is nothing to entice a longer stay. Nor do the proposals make any attempt to arrange building form in a way that would increase permeability to sun and daylight to the street or provide any meaningful addition to public open space.</p> <p>At every level the scheme is mean and greedy: mean in its provision of housing, open space and sunlight - greedy in its taking over of the skies over Bloomsbury, its over provision of unnecessary offices, its blatant waste of resources and its infliction on the community of up to 5 years of dirt, dust, noise and disruption of lives.....all for what? It's a scheme of the past, not one for the future.</p> <p>The developer's working hypothesis also seems to be that Museum Street is an appropriate location for a high rise office towers. There is no formal planning guidance to support this, and even the Council's draft, but now out-of-date and unadopted, 'Holborn Vision and Urban Strategy' makes no reference to high rise office towers in its so-called Museum Quarter. The height of any building on this site should be limited to the height of Selkirk House and no higher.</p> <p>Office towers generally indicate areas that are in a state of redevelopment and where the monoculture of offices might be seen as the best recipe for the future. Bloomsbury, however, does not need redeveloping, on the contrary, it needs its existing fabric repaired and enhancing, especially with the provision of more homes and facilities for those who wish to permanently live and work in this vibrant city community.</p> <p>The extensive document of objection prepared by Save Museum Street should be studied in detail by the planning department and by the planning sub-committee, as it contains clear evidence of the many areas where this application fails to meet the wishes, or find the support of, the local and wider community. I endorse the Save Museum Street objections and ask that these proposals be rejected outright.</p>
2021/2954/P	Isabelle Hartley	04/08/2021 09:56:51	OBJ	<p>As residents on Macklin Street, we are very concerned about this development towering over the many characterful streets in Covent Garden and its surround and irrevocably changing the historic nature of the area. The natural light in and around our homes will be adversely affected and it will stand like an incongruous monolith blighting the area. Please do not allow this development to go ahead.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	John Cole	04/08/2021 23:05:49	OBJ	<p>LabTech's proposals are damaging and inappropriate to the sensitive setting of Bloomsbury. This is an area defined by a distinctive mix of theatres, museums and galleries, its residential and hotel buildings, specialist shops, fine public houses, it's literary, academic and university meeting places and others, all dependant on a vibrant and active life at street level and of respect for the fine legacy of human scale buildings and open spaces.</p> <p>One of the challenges set for the architect and developer on this particular site was: how to link the scale and vibrancy of the north part of Museum Street with the bustle, intimacy and activity of Drury Lane, just 100m to the south. LabTech's scheme completely fails to address this opportunity and instead reinforces the already dark and unpleasant 20m wide canyon corridor between Selkirk House and The Post Building with a massive overdevelopment which includes a huge overpowering tower. As proposed, this will be a space only to be sped through as quickly as possible as there is nothing to entice a longer stay. Nor do the proposals make any attempt to arrange building form in a way that would increase permeability to sun and daylight to the street or provide any meaningful addition to public open space.</p> <p>At every level the scheme is mean and greedy: mean in its provision of housing, open space and sunlight - greedy in its taking over of the skies over Bloomsbury, its over provision of unnecessary offices, its blatant waste of resources and its infliction on the community of up to 5 years of dirt, dust, noise and disruption of lives.....all for what? It's a scheme of the past, not one for the future.</p> <p>The developer's working hypothesis also seems to be that Museum Street is an appropriate location for a high rise office towers. There is no formal planning guidance to support this, and even the Council's draft, but now out-of-date and unadopted,'Holborn Vision and Urban Strategy' makes no reference to high rise office towers in its so-called Museum Quarter. The height of any building on this site should be limited to the height of Selkirk House and no higher.</p> <p>Office towers generally indicate areas that are in a state of redevelopment and where the monoculture of offices might be seen as the best recipe for the future. Bloomsbury, however, does not need redeveloping, on the contrary, it needs its existing fabric repaired and enhancing, especially with the provision of more homes and facilities for those who wish to permanently live and work in this vibrant city community.</p> <p>The extensive document of objection prepared by Save Museum Street should be studied in detail by the planning department and by the planning sub-committee, as it contains clear evidence of the many areas where this application fails to meet the wishes, or find the support of, the local and wider community. I endorse the Save Museum Street objections and ask that these proposals be rejected outright.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Covent Garden Community Association (Elizabeth Bax, Chair of Planning Subcommittee)	04/08/2021 23:47:47	OBJNOT	<p>Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA) must object strongly to this application. It reminds us of a simple poster that was put up across Covent Garden in the 1970's, but is even more eerily relevant today:</p> <p>(Image of poster saying "London Needs Another office Block Like It Needs Another Plague")</p> <p>Our objection is not to the idea of redeveloping this block of buildings per se. Indeed, we have supported many elements of previous schemes put forward by previous owners here. The block bounded by New Oxford Street, West Central Street and Museum Street has been allowed to deteriorate and clearly needs refurbishment. To the South, Selkirk House itself, which was built as the headquarters for Trusthouse Forte in 1968, was always an incongruous size and design in the context of what would become two of the UK's prime conservation areas - but with a new finish, re-worked interior and cleared public realm it could contribute successfully to the area as a residential building, office or hotel (or a mix of such uses).</p> <p>No, it is this specific scheme which we believe to be wholly unsuitable for the site and its context, as well as being contrary to planning policy in many aspects. We urge the council to reject it and to ask the developers to re-think a more sympathetic solution for this important location.</p> <p>Many of our grounds for objection are included in the extensive comments made by the 'Save Museum Street' grouping of respected societies, associations and landowners.</p> <p>We summarise our grounds for objection below.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Could we imagine such a scheme being built in Paris, a block away from the Louvre? Of course not. And no more should it be built here in London, a stone's throw from the British Museum, one of the UK's major tourist attractions and a monument to the history of culture and place. What will it say to visitors from all over the World about our respect for our own historical neighbourhoods?</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Appearance detrimental to the area and wider context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The main tower is too tall, at 80 metres it would be 70% the height of Centrepoint and 50% higher than Selkirk House is currently. It would be visible from all over London, from historic squares to the river. The applicant's Zone of Visual Influence study shows this clearly – and only at a level 1.6 metres above ground. The building will dominate views from higher floors of even more buildings throughout the West End that this study does not show. <p>The 53 metre height of Selkirk House is already out of keeping with its surroundings when viewed from Covent Garden (eg: from Shaftesbury Avenue, Seven Dials, Drury Lane) and Bloomsbury. But at least it cannot be seen from so far afield. New development on this site should not be permitted any higher than Selkirk House currently stands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The massing of the main new building is too bulky, dominating local views and overshadowing its

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

neighbours. It is out of scale in the context of pre-Georgian Seven Dials to the South and Georgian Bloomsbury to the North. It is also out of scale with the historic buildings that are part of this application on New Oxford Street.

The nearby Post Building has proven to be dominant in terms of bulk; it is described on its own website as “a post-industrial building of epic scale and volume”. But the planning system had little choice in allowing it, because it replaced an already massive Post Office sorting office. The Selkirk House proposals are a whole order of magnitude greater than this “epic scale” but in this case there is no issue of having to replace an already massive building. New development on this site should not be permitted any larger in bulk than Selkirk House currently occupies.

- The roof extensions to the historic buildings with frontages on New Oxford Street, West Central Street and Museum Street are unattractive and unsympathetic to their host buildings, whose designed proportions they destroy.

- The replacement shopfronts to the historic buildings with frontages on New Oxford Street, West Central Street and Museum Street are a lost opportunity to improve the streetscape in historic style epitomised by the World-famous James Smith umbrella shop at neighbouring 53 New Oxford Street.

- The other new buildings in the scheme are anodyne and much bulkier than their older neighbours. This site is in the centre of London’s historic district, yet these buildings could be seen anywhere. They represent a missed opportunity for what could be amazing design in an amazing place.

- The site lies within the ‘Tottenham Court Road’ area under Camden’s Local Plan, Growth & Spatial Strategy. This states that development should be “of the highest quality, as befits this historic area in the heart of London, which preserves local amenity and seeks to enhance and conserve the significance of heritage assets such as the character and appearance of conservation areas”. These proposals do the opposite.

In terms of design, the scheme should be refused as contrary to Camden’s Local Plan policies D1(a, b, f & m), D2 and D3.

Inadequate housing

- The site has always contained a significant number of dwellings, all of whose occupiers have now been ‘decanted’. Residents in the 11 flats at 35-37 35 New Oxford Street told us that this move was against their will, but the council indicated that the loss of their homes could not be prevented.

- 11 more of the existing dwellings are within Selkirk House, with their front door at the side of the tower (at 11 West Central Street). These have been, and remain on, the regularly updated council tax lists which we use direct from Camden.

The 2-floor maisonettes are well known to their neighbours in West Central Street and, in the past few years, were managed by a company called Bridgestreet Worldwide as medium-to-long term company lets. Bridgestreet provided corporate housing to more than 5,000 companies, such as Tesla, Disney, and Liberty

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Mutual before going bankrupt during the pandemic in December 2020.

- The applicant's provision of housing fails to take full account of the existing housing being lost. We estimate that about 80% more housing should be provided within the scheme, and ask you to recalculate the requirement in order to comply with policy.

We also ask that any new housing at this or any other site is prevented by condition from being used for anything but primary homes.

- The quality of the affordable and social housing units in the proposed scheme seems mean. These properties are for long-term primary homes, yet they have far less privacy, light and outside view than the properties designated for the open market.

We understand that it is reasonable for space to be larger and finish to be of higher quality in luxury apartments, but we ask that any new affordable and social housing at this or any other site is mixed in with other housing in a way that does not discriminate in terms of build quality or light.

In terms of housing provision, the scheme should be refused as contrary to Camden's Local Plan policy D1(n), H1/3/4 and Camden's Housing Design Supplement, as well as GLA standards.

Lack of public and recreational space, and damage to neighbouring public open space

- The immediate impression of the plans is that public open space has been reduced to a minimum. Even the open area in front of Selkirk House on Museum Street has been taken away.

We ask that any scheme on this site retains at least the current amount of public open space at ground level.

- In terms of quality, despite imagery in the D&A statement there is nowhere substantive for families to play nor for social / inter-generational interaction. There is a small courtyard set above ground level which will generally be in shadow and is flanked by equipment. There is no garden for residents nor a community room.

- In terms of quantity, the proposed open space does not comply with the standard of 9 sqm per residential occupant cited in Camden's Local Plan policy A2.

- The bulky building at 1 Museum Street would overshadow the public garden space provided as part of the S106 agreement for the Post Building, removing half its view and much of its light. This would cause great harm to it as a much-needed community amenity. Camden's Local Plan, Growth & Spatial Strategy states that, in this area, development should be "remedying the lack of open space in the area through on-site provision or contributions to assist in the provision of new spaces". These proposals do the opposite.

In terms of open space provision, the scheme should be refused as contrary to Camden's Local Plan policies A2, C1 and D1(k & l).

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

No improvement to Safety & Security

- The scheme involves cutting through the site from North to South, to join the elbow of West Central Street to High Holborn by creating a walkway called Vine Lane. Sadly, this area is subject to very high levels of street crime, as the hotspot map for 2019 shows:

(Image showing 2019 crime figures and hotspots including near this site)

The narrow, high walled design of the alley, which will get very little natural light, is unlikely to improve matters and may make them worse.

- Much of the new built is characterised by recesses at ground floor level. There is no evidence that designing-out crime and antisocial behaviour has been considered.

- Camden's Local Plan, Growth & Spatial Strategy states that, in this area, development should be "improving community safety, including opportunities for crime and anti social behaviour". These proposals do the opposite.

In terms of safety & security, the scheme should be refused as contrary to Camden's Local Plan policy C5 and D1(i).

Environmental abuse

- The proposals involve demolition of a viable 15 storey building that has been in continuous use for more than 50 years, as well as demolition of other elements of the site. The removed fabric will largely be disposed of in landfill. Viable schemes could be proposed that involve very little demolition.

We ask that any scheme on this site follows principles of refurbishment instead.

- The proposals involve the erection of a much bulkier, 22 storey building faced in glass and other materials that require massive energy consumption and carbon emissions in manufacture.

We ask that any scheme on this site involves as little new build as can viably be accommodated.

In terms of climate change mitigation, the scheme should be refused as contrary to Camden's Local Plan policy CC1.

Unacceptable loss of amenity during the Demolition, Excavation & Build phase

- The proposals involve demolition, excavation and building work across a large site. Works are projected to last at least 4 years. This would be going on throughout the entirety of some local children's GCSE and A-Level years.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The effects of such works include damage to air quality from site traffic and congestion, serious nuisance from noise and vibration, dust in people's homes, and loss of sleep due to work at antisocial hours. This is detrimental people's mental health in streets near large developments. It is totally unacceptable to local people for such a prolonged time, especially on the back of nearby Crossrail works and development at St. Giles Circus; these are finally about to come to an end and, everyone had hoped, allow local people back some peace. All CMPs claim to mitigate these effects, but in reality they cannot be prevented and the council readily admits that it does not have the resources to enforce breaches.

We ask that any scheme on this site involves smaller interventions that can be accommodated by construction periods of months rather than years.

Servicing needs that will be difficult for the area to support

- We have serious concerns over the capacity of the local area to absorb the delivery, servicing and waste collection needs of such a substantial mixed-use development in this tight area of London's West End. In a separate document we have detailed our concerns with the applicant's estimates. We ask you to require the applicant to revise their approach, but in any case we believe that the site's needs are likely to cause disruption.
- Deliveries & servicing are now the leading cause of complaints from residents in our area. DSPs are painstakingly negotiated, then their terms are broken. For example, residents are woken by cages being rolled outside at 6am, and then again by refuse trucks compacting during the night. The council readily admits that it does not have the resources to enforce breaches. The situation is unsustainable as it is, let alone with the addition of this demanding scheme.
- In an attempt to lessen the impact we suggested to the developer at the outset that a micro-distribution facility be provided. We reiterated this request, but the developer would not engage with it.

We ask that any scheme on this site involves consolidation of its own delivery requirements and a micro-distribution facility to help with those in the wider area.

Risk of further unacceptable development

- If London did not need yet another office block in the 1970's, it even less needs one now in the era of home-working. We believe that the current scheme will prove unviable and require yet more development to be permitted in order for work to be completed: maybe more storeys, maybe more bulk. This would put the LPA in an impossible position if the current proposals had already been consented and work started.

We have seen many buildings in the area lie fallow when work starts and then demand drops away or money runs out. They can remain empty, part-demolished carcasses for years. The alternative is to allow something still more unacceptable in order to alleviate an unsightly chronic embarrassment in the centre of our capital city.

- Centrepoint stands as a monument to mid-1960's high rise aspirations. It stands alone, as it should. If

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Ryan Heng	04/08/2021 11:15:45	COMMNT	<p>the campaign to save London's West End, including 65% of Covent Garden, had failed in the 1970s' the surrounding area would have risen up alongside it in concrete.</p> <p>If another high tower were allowed now in its vicinity then it becomes more challenging for the LPA to resist the next, and the next.</p> <p>The hubris of the era is summed up in another poster from that campaign:</p> <p>(Image of poster showing tower blocks and saying ""My name is Ozymandias, king of kings: Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!"")</p> <p>Surely we have learned from those mistakes?</p> <p>-----</p> <p>We ask you to reject this application, and to urge the applicant to re-think their approach to this site based on principles of sustainability and in sympathy with the World class historic neighbourhood nearby.</p> <p>Here at CGCA we, together with the many knowledgeable representatives of well-regarded societies and associations whose comments you have seen, stand ready to contribute to making this site beautiful and satisfying on a human scale.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>PLEASE SEE emailed LETTER FOR OUR FULL OBJECTION and separate TRANSPORT COMMENT DOCUMENT.</p>
				<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement. 2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets". 3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level. 4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Dr Robin Biellik	04/08/2021 10:05:08	OBJ	<p>I have read the objection to the above-mentioned planning application sent to Camden Council by Mr. Fowler on 3 August 2021, representing a team of architects, and concur completely with their objection on environmental grounds. Camden Council should demonstrate its commitment to climate change mitigation by enforcing the planning conditions that it has previously approved and legislated. This proposed development meets few of those planning conditions.</p> <p>Thank you for your kind attention.</p>
2021/2954/P	Ryan Heng	04/08/2021 11:16:14	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement. 2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets". 3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level. 4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.
2021/2954/P	Lebinh Tu	04/08/2021 13:56:26	OBJ	<p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>I am a resident living very close by to Selkirk House.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The height of the proposed building is much higher than its surrounding buildings, and will be an eyesore on the current skyline. The development therefore contravenes Camden Local Plan Policy A1 as it compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements. 2) The development does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets" and contravenes Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The building's size and scale does not fit in with its surroundings. It will overshadow listed buildings and interfere with protected views. <p>With most businesses having moved to remote working successfully, you must reconsider whether more office space is necessary in central London.</p> <p>Kind regards, Lebinh</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Wyndham Albery	04/08/2021 10:21:58	OBJ	<p>As a local resident, I must object to the building of a block that grossly towers over everything else. The culture and landscape of a beautiful part of London will be changed for the worse. The shadows and cutting out of natural sunlight to multiple residents will be significant.</p> <p>We are the last generation that can stop the destruction of the community, of London and the environment - these massive buildings though potentially energy-saving mean that transport in and out will massively increase pollution - we have seen the result of climate change in the last year - if we continue this avenue the forecasts are all too horrifying. If anything we need to create a sensitive green area as a statement of what Camden believes in healing and the future.</p> <p>Our roads are already too full, how many more people and vehicles will this pull in to an overcrowded area. The damage to the fabric of society is immeasurable, In a time of climate crisis do we really need another tower to fill with people in the centre of London.</p> <p>Lastly, the building works over the coming years will be unbearable for local residents and businesses alike. I back on to the tower street work which has taken nearly two years and it has been misery, and it is not on the scale of this.</p> <p>Please reflect on the long term future damage to Camden - and how history will judge our decisions.</p> <p>Wyndham Albery</p>

2021/2954/P	Jo Weir MBE	04/08/2021 16:02:30	OBJ	<p>Having lived in this area for 40 years, I can say with great experience that everything about this development is wrong for the area. The proposed buildings are too high and will be an eyesore and a blot on the landscape, ruining the views from various locations and dominating the shy line, blocking out light to all the surrounding streets and residential flats.</p> <p>With Dury Lane and other historic streets being massively impacted by both the works and the long term loss of light and dramatic change of character.</p> <p>This stands to make a mockery of what is a recognised conservation area.</p> <p>This proposal is also an environmental disaster which totally fails to comply with Camden's own sustainability policies. It's wrongly conceived and fundamentally flawed and will be severely damaging visually and environmentally not only to its immediate surroundings and the afore mentioned sensitive conservation areas but to the whole of London.</p> <p>The scheme as it stands is rotten and completely beyond any workable variation or justification. It will be horrific for the entire area.</p> <p>I implore Camden to wholeheartedly reject of this appealing scheme for the hugely damaging impact it will have on the area.</p>
-------------	-------------	---------------------	-----	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	David Kaner	04/08/2021 22:51:48	OBJ	<p>I am a resident in the Seven Dials area, approximately 350m from the site. I have lived in the area since 1993 and have seen a lot of changes in that time.</p> <p>I understand that the particular part of the area which is the subject of this application is in need of improvement. The area is tired and rundown. The existing Travelodge Hotel, which was originally built as an office building, is in need of improvement, as is the block to the North.</p> <p>I agree with a support the Save Museum Street group's view that what is needed is not some alterations to the scheme to make it acceptable but a complete rethink in order to meet the future needs of the area as a place to work, live and visit as well as take account of the impact of climate change, and the need to reduce our contribution to it. This type of environmentally damaging development might have been acceptable in 2010 but is not acceptable now.</p> <p>The NPPF states that there are 3 three overarching objectives of the planning system , which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. They are economic, social and environmental. I believe that the focus of this proposal is economic, for the developer to make sufficient profit from the development, after taking into account the cost of purchasing the various sites which make it up the footprint of the scheme. The social objective is provided through a very limited amount of housing and the environmental objective is focussed on reducing energy consumption and ignoring the huge cost in terms of emissions of demolishing the existing structure and building a new one.</p> <p>There is also a huge social impact from the 4 year build process. As a resident in the West End I have had to live with noisy and disruptive developments for the last 30 years. This one is much larger than most and so will have an even larger impact. The CMP may seek to reduce this impact but this does not make the impact acceptable, even if the developer was able to stick to the CMP requirements which few are.</p> <p>I am most concerned with the proposal to demolish Selkirk House and build a much higher structure in its place. This is all about financial benefit and takes no account of the social or environmental objectives. If the developer had paid a lower price for the site then he would not have to build so high to get an adequate return. I do not see why the area should have to endure all of the negative impacts of a much larger building because the developer paid too much for the site. What will happen if during development the financial return from office space falls? Will the developer ask to increase the height further in order to pay for the CIL and S106 contributions which it provides, or will it try, as some have done, to reduce those contributions?</p> <p>Based on the detailed comments provided by the Save Museum Street group, which I support, I believe that the scheme as it stands should be rejected and a new scheme developed. This could, perhaps, convert the existing Selkirk House into a mixed-use development without requiring so much demolition of the existing structure. This would allow it to comply with Policies CC1 and CC2. It could also use the fact that the site is easily accessible from major roads to provide a micro-distribution centre to allow deliveries to be made in the surrounding area using cargo bikes or on foot.</p> <p>There is a way in which the development of this site can achieve economic, social and environmental objectives in a mutually supportive way. This proposal does not do this. I ask that the Council refuses permission.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	K L Westerholt	04/08/2021 22:52:49	OBJ	<p>This is not needed, it is greedy and environmentally unfriendly It blocks out light from my building and the height is unnecessarily tall. It's going to take years and the sound and dust will make my and my neighbour's lives a misery, for years. The sound of construction during recent building (The Post Building) completely destroyed my quality of life and mental health. There is no double glazing here. Tjis, being a bigger project will take longer.</p> <p>I just see this as rampant greed that benefits only the developer and not the residents of the neighborhood.</p>
2021/2954/P	Howard Jameson	04/08/2021 17:06:59	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement. 2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets". 3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level. 4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.
2021/2954/P	Jo Weir MBE	04/08/2021 16:02:38	OBJ	<p>Having lived in this area for 40 years, I can say with great experience that everything about this development is wrong for the area. The proposed buildings are too high and will be an eyesore and a blot on the landscape, ruining the views from various locations and dominating the shy line, blocking out light to all the surrounding streets and residential flats.</p> <p>With Dury Lane and other historic streets being massively impacted by both the works and the long term loss of light and dramatic change of character. This stands to make a mockery of what is a recognised conservation area. This proposal is also an environmental disaster which totally fails to comply with Camden's own sustainability policies. It's wrongly conceived and fundamentally flawed and will be severely damaging visually and environmentally not only to its immediate surroundings and the afore mentioned sensitive conservation areas but to the whole of London. The scheme as it stands is rotten and completely beyond any workable variation or justification. It will be horrific for the entire area. I implore Camden to wholeheartedly reject of this appealing scheme for the hugely damaging impact it will have on the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Howard Jameson	04/08/2021 17:07:01	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Camden and live near the proposed Selkirk House redevelopment.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the development for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) the development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy A1. The increase in height of the new development far exceeds the existing height of the building and exceeds the height of neighbouring buildings. Hence the height of the development compromises the "visual privacy, outlook and overshadowing" requirements of this Camden Policy Statement.2) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The development is far overshadows the neighbouring building and does not fit in with the culture. Hence it does NOT respect the "local context and character" or "preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets".3) Furthermore it also CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), in that it does NOT "preserve strategic and local views", because it obscures views and creates an overshadowing and overwhelming presence on the street level.4) The development CONTRAVENES Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design). The proposed development does not "relate well to its surroundings" and the "how the top of a tall building affects the skyline" because it is significantly higher than other buildings in the area and stands out much higher than surrounding buildings.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Crispin Weir	04/08/2021 16:55:06	OBJ	<p>As a long term local resident and business owner I fully reject this proposal in the strongest possible terms. It is not only completely inappropriate for the area, it is yet another generic and badly proposed scheme by developers who only wish to make money with no regard whatsoever for this historic area and its huge significance within the context of London.</p> <p>With all of the hundreds of towers approved by the former Mayor; now Prime Minister, you only have to look at the river to see the wholesale destruction of what was once a beautiful skyline.</p> <p>This area is one of the few parts of central London that has not been completely blighted by impact of high rise towers. Centre Point is long established but is not without its issues, it paralysed St Giles High Street with its construction and blocks out a lot of light from the area as is. Not to mention the wind tunnel it has created of the surrounding streets.</p> <p>The prospect of a building nearly three quarters this height in this proposal is absolutely ridiculous. The vast impact it would have on the surrounding streets and the area as a whole is so damaging that it will complete ruin the area and turn small local streets into dark and dangerous places.</p> <p>With the long term nature of the many small local business and homes in the area, streets like Grape Street, Dury Lane, Little Russell Street, Bury Place and Sicilian Avenue will be hugely affected by it long term, not only by the environmental impact and massive loss of light but they stand to lose their historic charm and character. These streets have Listed Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian houses and shops, all of which are part of the unique charm that runs through this part of Bloomsbury, St Giles and Covent Garden.</p> <p>I have spoken to fellow residents and business owners all of whom are shocked by the proposal and object very strongly to it.</p> <p>Area's are defined by how they are develop over decades and this is a particularly charming area. This proposed development is a completely out of place with its surroundings and threatens to ruin the most historic corner of the borough of Camden.</p> <p>If you think tourists visiting the British Museum will be enjoy seeing an ugly, generic tower dominating the vista of one of London's most timeless area's you are very much mistaken. It will ruin the experience of visiting the area almost as much as it will ruin the lives of the many residents and business owners in the vicinity.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead there will be talk of bribery due to the totally inappropriate nature of the scheme for the area. Given the recent scandals that have gone on in neighbouring boroughs, this is not something Camden wants to be associated with and with the mass commercialisation of the nearby TCR Crossrail development, the wholesale destruction of some of Camden's most historic streets will be viewed very badly with accusations of selling out.</p> <p>Given the completely inappropriate nature of this development for the area, it will be very difficult to disagree with such accusations if the development is approved and the outcry and response will be absolutely massive. This is a hugely unpopular proposal and hundreds of people will be prepared to fight against it. Therefore I object in the strongest possible terms.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	margaret Crowe	04/08/2021 11:42:36	OBJ	<p>Once again we have another application for a redevelopment to a building within the Camden area. I was shocked to read about the developers in the Guardian newspaper and the Camden Council in an unfavourable light but this just adds to my anger over this scheme. The building is going to tower above everything in the area and it will be a total eyesore.</p> <p>This building will be 82 metres high and will overshadow listed buildings in the area and we need to protect these architectural beauties. My God are we going to be like Hong Kong with skyscrapers all around us? The amount of office space is absolutely ridiculous, London cant even fill the existing ones as it is, you only have to look around the empty office buildings. People are working from home now and this will be the future. Who wants to travel into Central London now, people dont. Its amazing though that they only want to provide 12 affordable homes(that statement in itself is laughable) when all around you can see homeless people on the streets. The planning application lists Lab Selkirk House Limited. Who might that be? The company address is a PO box in Guernsey. Two directors are listed. The CEO is an Israeli national who lives in Spain, the chief financial officer is a Lithuanian national who lives in the UK ı and has another 100 directorships, mostly in what sound like London property companies. These people are allowed to invest in property in out country when they themselves do not care about us and the local community. I totally object, its another ludicrous scheme.</p> <p>The big wide world has come crashing in.</p>
2021/2954/P	Colette Thomson	04/08/2021 21:58:33	COMMNT	<p>The proposed development is totally out of keeping with the area and within sight of the iconic British Museum would be shocking and destroy the historic feel to the area. I appreciate that more modern redevelopments of business ha have been allowed but on the other side of the street.</p>
2021/2954/P	ME MCCORMICK	04/08/2021 10:11:11	OBJ	<p>The proposed building is environmentally unsustainable, insufficient housing is outdated. There is a surfeit of office space, less will be needed in future due to changing work patterns. It is far too large and out of keeping with the historic museum area. There is no green space provided, needed in this area. A narrow alley link is proposed to High Holborn, this will become a crime area inviting drug use and a lurking place for street crime making it dangerous for women in particular. It will also become a place for urination etc. This is yet another ugly, lazy outdated environmentally hostile development that takes no account of real needs of the community and area in which it is being imposed. London has enough of these ugly unaesthetic, characterless buildings which are ruining the city.</p>
2021/2954/P	ME MCCORMICK	04/08/2021 10:11:14	OBJ	<p>The proposed building is environmentally unsustainable, insufficient housing is outdated. There is a surfeit of office space, less will be needed in future due to changing work patterns. It is far too large and out of keeping with the historic museum area. There is no green space provided, needed in this area. A narrow alley link is proposed to High Holborn, this will become a crime area inviting drug use and a lurking place for street crime making it dangerous for women in particular. It will also become a place for urination etc. This is yet another ugly, lazy outdated environmentally hostile development that takes no account of real needs of the community and area in which it is being imposed. London has enough of these ugly unaesthetic, characterless buildings which are ruining the city.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Caroline Johns	04/08/2021 09:19:56	OBJ	A dangerous precedent is being set which is changing London from the city of historic beauty, into one of towering concrete behemoths, little or no natural light and no respect to public needs. This project will overshadow numerous listed buildings in the area, damaging the visual quality of the neighbouring four Conservation Areas. The new tower would also affect many protected views. The developers have not extended their visual impact assessment to address this matter. Instead of refurbishing and improving the existing building Labtech are planning to demolish the entire existing structure. This is a catastrophic proposal in terms of sustainability, the physical environment and a big demolition will be incredibly disruptive.
2021/2954/P	ME MCCORMICK	04/08/2021 10:11:16	OBJ	The proposed building is environmentally unsustainable, insufficient housing is outdated. There is a surfeit of office space, less will be needed in future due to changing work patterns. It is far too large and out of keeping with the historic museum area. There is no green space provided, needed in this area. A narrow alley link is proposed to High Holborn, this will become a crime area inviting drug use and a lurking place for street crime making it dangerous for women in particular. It will also become a place for urination etc. This is yet another ugly, lazy outdated environmentally hostile development that takes no account of real needs of the community and area in which it is being imposed. London has enough of these ugly unaesthetic, characterless buildings which are ruining the city.