


**Parnjit Singh**

---

**From:** David Fowler  
**Sent:** 07 April 2022 11:39  
**To:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Labtech/ Selkirk House 2021/2954/P



David Fowler  
Deputy Team Leader


Telephone: 0207 974 2123



The majority of Council staff are continuing to work at home through remote, secure access to our systems. Where possible please communicate with us by telephone or email.

---

**From:** Andy Wuensche [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 March 2022 13:38



**Subject:** Re: FW: Labtech/ Selkirk House



Dear Mr Fowler,  
We would like to strongly endorse the views expressed by Peter Bloxham in his email to you below. If this development were realized our East facing windows would be directly and closely overlooked with a consequent loss of privacy and light, and our view blocked.

This bloated over-development would ruin the neighborhood, and if approved would not reflect well Camden Council.

kind regards  
Andrew and Stephanie Wuensche

[REDACTED]  
Flat 6, 3 Grape Street, London WC2H8DX

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 March 2022 13:40  
**To:** Fowler, David <[david.fowler@camden.gov.uk](mailto:david.fowler@camden.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Labtech/ Selkirk House

Dear Mr Fowler

I refer to previous exchanges.

As I expect you know, Labtech, via London Communications, have circulated a flyer about their apparently revised proposals for Selkirk House and those adjoining properties they own. This is presumably in response to the clear indication given by your colleagues in the planning team at Camden that the original proposals, including the height of the proposed tower, are unacceptable to Camden.

Labtech or London Communications are also holding meetings over the coming weeks.

It is very hard to make sense of the detail of the revised proposals and, in particular, their impact on the surrounding streets and the overall neighborhood, including the Bloomsbury Conservation area, in part of which the Labtech sites are situated. I note in passing that this fact appears to have been overlooked in the recent draft Holborn Land Allocation Plan consultation. I do not think Camden has yet issued its response to this exercise.

May I take this opportunity to repeat a sensible request made in relation to the original proposal and invite Camden to endorse it. This is that Labtech, or one of its panoply of advisers, should produce a physical scale model of the proposed development (in its revised form), showing the impact on surrounding streets and buildings as well as its height relative to its surroundings. It is particularly difficult to understand the impact the new buildings proposed on the west side of West Central Street would have on residential homes in Grape Street and on the flats in The Old Fire Station building in West Central Street. *Prima facie* there are likely to be significant overlooking and reduction of light issues.

I have made the request to London Communications, but have not yet had a reply.

I appreciate that this model might not be available in time for the already planned meetings, but there is no reason why it should not be placed in the reception/ dining area on the ground floor of Selkirk House and available at stated times during the period leading up to the formal public hearing at which the Labtech application is considered. I note that Labtech have security staff on the site, who could provide access, just as, I understand, the Post Building security staff provide access to the public space on the roof of that building.

I am sure you will agree that this is a perfectly reasonable request in the context of such an important proposal, potentially having a very significant impact on the local and wider environment. You will recall that London Communications used the pretext of Covid to rebuff my request previously.

Incidentally, I am puzzled as to why the public meetings are to be held in the car park and not in Selkirk House. Can you shed any light on this?

This request is separate from the request for more cgi images of the views of the proposed tower from sensitive locations such as St George's, the British Museum, Bedford Square and Lincoln's Inn Fields. It is telling that the flyer avoids including any image of the most prominent and controversial element of the Labtech proposals. Labtech and its professional team must at some level be ashamed of their proposals.

I take this opportunity to raise a number of other points:

- ∞ I am troubled by the fact that the plan circulated by London Communications on behalf of Labtech gives the impression that Labtech own West Central Street, or have power to decide over its use. This street is in fact part of the public highway and now the only vehicular access to Grape Street. Should that not be corrected?
- ∞ I have referred above to the Draft Holborn Land Allocation Plan Consultation. How will the Council's response to the feedback on that consultation be taken into account in considering the revised Labtech proposals?
- ∞ There is also a separate consultation on which, according to your website, progress is paused, for Holborn Vision. The next step in that process will be a public consultation exercise. How will you ensure that the consideration of the Labtech proposals does not preclude the Council acting on submissions made when this consultation takes place? When will this consultation process recommence?
- ∞ One of the proposals emanating from Camden mentioned both in the Holborn Land allocation plan and, I understand, forming part of the original draft Holborn Vision consultation is for the creation of a pedestrian passage from West Central Street leading to the busy and now two way High Holborn roadway. It is not quite clear what this would achieve; in any event, this idea is problematic for numerous reasons, as has been expressed in responses to Labtech's original proposals and in responses to the recent Land Allocation Plan consultation. Nevertheless, such a passage seems to be part of Labtech's proposals and I understand that they claim that they themselves are somewhat agnostic about the idea but have been encouraged by Camden to include it in their overall proposals. Is this correct? If so, quite apart from questions of the propriety of this, surely Camden should not make such a suggestion without first taking account of comments already made and also completing the process of consulting on the draft Holborn Vision?

I look forward to hearing from you.

I will separately be compiling a list of unanswered questions.

Regards

**Peter Bloxham**

