

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Stuart Tappin	18/10/2022 16:23:19	OBJ	<p>A key item that seems to be missing from the debate about the future of Selkirk House is the environmental damage that its demolition and replacement would cause. It is clear that we must build less if we are to meet the legally-binding commitments to meet to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>The existing building contains a substantial amount of embodied carbon which would be lost by demolition. Worse still, the new building will require an enormous amount of finite resources to build. A new structure will need a large amount of reinforced concrete. The production of cement for the construction industry accounts for around 8% of all greenhouse gas emissions and we must, therefore, reduce our use of concrete. Tinkering with cement replacements or off-setting the carbon by planting some trees somewhere is not the answer.</p> <p>At a meeting last week at the Institution of Structural Engineers the challenges facing us were clearly spelt out if we are not to face a climate catastrophe. The solution for Selkirk House must be to retain and re-use. The suggestion that it would not be possible to make it fit for modern office accommodation indicates a problem with the client's brief, not the building. The whole scheme needs to be re-thought to make use of what already exists.</p>
