

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0757/P	John Cole	09/04/2022 20:08:39	OBJ	<p>These OBJECTIONS are made on behalf of the South Bloomsbury Tenants and Residents Association (SBTRA)</p> <p>1. We OBJECT to the loss of A1/A3 the retail/restaurant uses proposed by the applicant. These uses were an integral part of the 2015 Post Building planning approval (2014/5946/P) and which, the local community was assured during the planning consultation process, would contribute to the generation of a rich and vibrant street scene to enhance this environmentally damaged section of Museum Street. In its built form The Post Building has failed to deliver this promise and as a result this part of Museum Street continues to be a sunless and windy corridor. These 'sui genesis' proposals for a 'virtual reality experience' will further diminish the opportunity to improve the street environment and will instead provide a rather dull and disappointing visual termination to the 'prow' of the Post Building, at this important corner of Museum Street and High Holborn.</p> <p>2. We OBJECT to the removal of D1 (Doctors Surgery) uses under the Section 106 agreement and to the planning process's failure to enable the provision of this much needed facility.</p> <p>3. We OBJECT to the argument being put forward by the applicant that a lack of demand is a reason for removing the A1/A3 use classes. It is more likely to be the case that excessively high levels of rent that are to blame or that prospective tenants may be reacting to the prospect of their suffering 5 years of noise, disruption and traffic chaos from the construction of the proposed massive new office tower development, just across the street.</p> <p>4. We OBJECT that If the report by Cushman & Wakefield is correct, and that the demand for A1/A3 retail / restaurant no longer exists in this area, how then should we then view LabTech's Museum Street ambitions, where their whole project is underpinned by the promise of safe, busy and vibrant retail activity at street level, all founded on the successful roll-out of A1 / A3 retail, restaurant, shops and cafes?</p> <p>5. We OBJECT to the trading hours being proposed. Due to the unproven conduct of this new operator, on no day of the week should trading operate beyond 11.30pm, for a minimum probationary period of 2years.</p> <p>6. Internal and external lighting and the impact of the 'fit-out' treatment on the building's glass facade, should all be the subject of 'conditions' attached to any planning approval, if granted.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0757/P	John Cole	09/04/2022 20:08:34	OBJ	<p>These OBJECTIONS are made on behalf of the South Bloomsbury Tenants and Residents Association (SBTRA)</p> <p>1. We OBJECT to the loss of A1/A3 the retail/restaurant uses proposed by the applicant. These uses were an integral part of the 2015 Post Building planning approval (2014/5946/P) and which, the local community was assured during the planning consultation process, would contribute to the generation of a rich and vibrant street scene to enhance this environmentally damaged section of Museum Street. In its built form The Post Building has failed to deliver this promise and as a result this part of Museum Street continues to be a sunless and windy corridor. These 'sui genesis' proposals for a 'virtual reality experience' will further diminish the opportunity to improve the street environment and will instead provide a rather dull and disappointing visual termination to the 'prow' of the Post Building, at this important corner of Museum Street and High Holborn.</p> <p>2. We OBJECT to the removal of D1 (Doctors Surgery) uses under the Section 106 agreement and to the planning process's failure to enable the provision of this much needed facility.</p> <p>3. We OBJECT to the argument being put forward by the applicant that a lack of demand is a reason for removing the A1/A3 use classes. It is more likely to be the case that excessively high levels of rent that are to blame or that prospective tenants may be reacting to the prospect of their suffering 5 years of noise, disruption and traffic chaos from the construction of the proposed massive new office tower development, just across the street.</p> <p>4. We OBJECT that If the report by Cushman & Wakefield is correct, and that the demand for A1/A3 retail / restaurant no longer exists in this area, how then should we then view LabTech's Museum Street ambitions, where their whole project is underpinned by the promise of safe, busy and vibrant retail activity at street level, all founded on the successful roll-out of A1 / A3 retail, restaurant, shops and cafes?</p> <p>5. We OBJECT to the trading hours being proposed. Due to the unproven conduct of this new operator, on no day of the week should trading operate beyond 11.30pm, for a minimum probationary period of 2years.</p> <p>6. Internal and external lighting and the impact of the 'fit-out' treatment on the building's glass facade, should all be the subject of 'conditions' attached to any planning approval, if granted.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0757/P	John Cole	09/04/2022 20:08:35	OBJ	<p>These OBJECTIONS are made on behalf of the South Bloomsbury Tenants and Residents Association (SBTRA)</p> <p>1. We OBJECT to the loss of A1/A3 the retail/restaurant uses proposed by the applicant. These uses were an integral part of the 2015 Post Building planning approval (2014/5946/P) and which, the local community was assured during the planning consultation process, would contribute to the generation of a rich and vibrant street scene to enhance this environmentally damaged section of Museum Street. In its built form The Post Building has failed to deliver this promise and as a result this part of Museum Street continues to be a sunless and windy corridor. These 'sui genesis' proposals for a 'virtual reality experience' will further diminish the opportunity to improve the street environment and will instead provide a rather dull and disappointing visual termination to the 'prow' of the Post Building, at this important corner of Museum Street and High Holborn.</p> <p>2. We OBJECT to the removal of D1 (Doctors Surgery) uses under the Section 106 agreement and to the planning process's failure to enable the provision of this much needed facility.</p> <p>3. We OBJECT to the argument being put forward by the applicant that a lack of demand is a reason for removing the A1/A3 use classes. It is more likely to be the case that excessively high levels of rent that are to blame or that prospective tenants may be reacting to the prospect of their suffering 5 years of noise, disruption and traffic chaos from the construction of the proposed massive new office tower development, just across the street.</p> <p>4. We OBJECT that If the report by Cushman & Wakefield is correct, and that the demand for A1/A3 retail / restaurant no longer exists in this area, how then should we then view LabTech's Museum Street ambitions, where their whole project is underpinned by the promise of safe, busy and vibrant retail activity at street level, all founded on the successful roll-out of A1 / A3 retail, restaurant, shops and cafes?</p> <p>5. We OBJECT to the trading hours being proposed. Due to the unproven conduct of this new operator, on no day of the week should trading operate beyond 11.30pm, for a minimum probationary period of 2years.</p> <p>6. Internal and external lighting and the impact of the 'fit-out' treatment on the building's glass facade, should all be the subject of 'conditions' attached to any planning approval, if granted.</p>