

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954P	Alice Brown	29/10/2022 10:55:33	COMMNT	I strongly object to this application on the grounds that it will cause 28,000 tonnes CO2e to be emitted into the atmosphere within the next couple of years which is not compatible with the need to radically reduce carbon emissions to reduce the catastrophic effects of climate change.
2021/2954P	Alice Brown	29/10/2022 10:55:37	COMMNT	I strongly object to this application on the grounds that it will cause 28,000 tonnes CO2e to be emitted into the atmosphere within the next couple of years which is not compatible with the need to radically reduce carbon emissions to reduce the catastrophic effects of climate change.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Pearl Oseki	28/10/2022 10:18:21	OBJ	<p>1. Conservation: The proposed tower will uncompromisingly dominate the important conservation areas of Bloomsbury and adjacent Covent Garden, Seven Dials and Soho on account of its sheer size. It will intrude upon and in many instances, completely monopolize, the views from many key points in our area - the British Museum, St George's, Bedford Square, Museum St, Drury Lane and well beyond. The longer views from the British Museum and Bedford Square will be particularly affected but it will also destroy discreet views within our specific area such as along more narrow streets such as Coptic St where the tower will appear to terminate the street like an enormous book end. The overdevelopment and height of the tower block is totally unacceptable and destructive and shows callous disregard of the quality of the adjacent conservation areas and large number of listed buildings. If Camden grants permission for the development, it will be ignoring its own conservation policies and those in the London Plan.</p> <p>2. Environment: Camden has validated the current application without including their latest environment or energy reports. However, previously commission independent appraisal of the original report by the renowned specialist and advisor on carbon reduction, Simon Sturgis, who was able to challenge the carbon credentials of the scheme. He concluded,</p> <p>"The potential carbon cost of the new build proposal over a retrofit of the existing building is both significant, avoidable and unnecessary."</p> <p>Since the developers are still proposing to demolish and rebuild rather than refit the existing building, our concerns remain the same, that overall, demolishing the existing tower and replacing it with another, higher structure will contribute unnecessarily to more carbon emissions. This planning submission for the demolition and replacement of 1 Museum Street is against UK National Policy, GLA Policy and intentions, and Camden's declared climate and ecological emergency.</p> <p>As we are increasingly seeing the effects of climate change in our daily lives it is surely important that we seize the opportunity within our own areas of influence to insist on sound decisions being taken to prevent the situation from becoming worse. In addition to carbon emissions, local people are once again expected to put up with the pollution that will enter our homes during the 4 years it will take to complete the works, including 1 year to demolish and 3 to rebuild, with all the additional transport required to carry it out. This is on top of all the huge developments which have taken place over recent years on our doorstep such as the Post building and the former MOD offices.</p> <p>3. Overshadowing: The proposal will result in an unacceptable degree of [REDACTED] of existing surrounding buildings, depriving residents, businesses and visitors of the open sky, views and sunlight that they presently enjoy. Museum St and Coptic St will experience a reduction in light, particularly at certain times of the day.</p> <p>The height and bulk of the proposed office tower and the siting of the public housing units facing West Central St will result in them being exceptionally badly impacted in terms of overshadowing, aspect and light, particularly in relation to the minimal open space play area [REDACTED].</p> <p>4. Uses and amenities: Now that many more people are working from home, we don't need more speculative office space. Surely more imaginative and relevant uses need to be considered, such as a hotel - the former Travelodge was popular with visitors to London requiring cheaper accommodation.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment: Response:

6. Street planning. Residents have been arguing against the plan for a new cut-through street (called 'Vine Lane') from West Central St to High Holborn as we cannot see how it will serve any useful link to the existing street layout or provide any additional benefit to residents, those working in central London or visitors, as it will likely be a dark narrow passage that 'comes from nowhere and goes to nowhere' increasing risks to residents, particularly females.

7. Public realm: DSDHA architects and Simten are making exaggerated claims about the extent of their greening up plans since they will be taking over more of the available space, including some which is currently public space, leaving less room for pedestrians along Museum St south.

8. Precedent. There is no doubt that if planning permission is granted for the tower, it will set a firm precedent for more and even taller structures which will ringfence and permanently destroy the architectural and environmental quality of this unique area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954P	Alexander Jan	28/10/2022 18:25:37	SUPPRT	<p>The Central District Alliance (CDA) is the business improvement district for Holborn and Clerkenwell. We represent 400 businesses with the aim of making Central District Alliance the destination of choice for business.</p> <p>One Museum Street (also known as Selkirk House) is a vacant site formerly occupied by Travelodge, which faces Museum Street, New Oxford Street and High Holborn. In its current condition, the CDA considers that this site does not support economic activity or the area's social fabric. The streets and shared spaces around this site are currently under-used, are in poor state and contribute to anti-social behaviour. They are negatively impacting safety and perceptions of safety.</p> <p>We consider the development has the potential to positively impact both the local environment and the economy.</p> <p>We understand the development proposes high quality new workspace that is estimated to directly support over 1,600 jobs in the area and deliver nearly £16m per annum in Business Rates and Council Tax. Notwithstanding the complexities of business rate retention mechanisms, as the site has been vacant since 2020, the CDA considers this represents a considerable uplift and positive impact on the local economy. Furthermore, this workspace is located in an area of high public transport connectivity and includes the provision of over 400 new basement cycle parking spaces. The development's transport impact is therefore in line with supporting Camden's commitment to achieving a Net Zero Carbon Borough by 2030.</p> <p>CDA considers that this development has the potential to help address Camden's housing needs through its provision of 48 new homes. We understand ten of these will be available to buy via shared ownership at below market rate and nine will be available to rent at 80% of the market rate via a Housing Association.</p> <p>This proposal has the potential to positively impact the built environment particularly at street level.</p> <p>It will deliver a new high quality pedestrian area (Vine Lane) connecting West Central Street south to High Holborn. It will lead to an upgrade in the streets along High Holborn, with investment in public realm and pavements along Museum Street and upgraded surface materials along the whole of West Central Street.</p> <p>Safety and the perception of safety are currently key issues at ground level for many users of the streets around this site. Vine Lane, a new north-south connection, opens up sight lines along what is currently a dead-end route. New ground floor food and retail along Museum Street, West Central Street, Vine Lane and High Holborn will help these streets become livelier and more welcoming, complementing and strengthening the new ground floor commercial units in the neighbouring Post Building.</p> <p>On this basis the CDA is happy to support the proposed development and the positive impact on the economy, and the environment that it has the capacity to bring.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954P	Judith Torzewska	29/10/2022 19:40:34	OBJ	<p>Objection to Selkirk House Proposal</p> <p>Now that Simten have taken over from Labtech, why are over 250 of us, individuals and collectives, who have already vehemently objected to Labtech's proposals for Selkirk House, having to write again after all this time since the last consultation to make our points. After such a large number of objections Labtech did nothing to concede over the size and bulk of the main building at Selkirk House, simply changed its shape slightly, lowering it by two floors but bulking it out to retain the original size. There are two points about this in my opinion, taking off just two floors is an insult to the intelligence of all who are involved in the campaign against this bulky monster of a building, making it fatter to compensate for this slightly reduced height loss is the second insult. As I just said, there were over 250 objections lodged at the last consultation, including individuals and prominent organisations such as Historic England and various other preservation and environmental groups</p> <p>Labtech did nothing to find a viable solution to the awful situation that we, the people of the area find ourselves in; Simten have inherited the original plans and most of the team, including the architect, and all involved have continued to ignore the pleas and objections of the people of Bloomsbury. So, it appears we are all back to square one with this situation, having to waste our time and energy being batted back and forth between soulless venture capital investment, the local and greater authorities and government policy, all due to vested interests and financial gain where the Selkirk House plan is concerned.</p> <p>The discovery that a substantial amount of funding in the form of CILS, The Community Infrastructure Levy, that was introduced by Central Government adds to a feeling of cynicism that Camden Council and the Greater London Authority are working hand in glove with Simten. Both Camden and the GLA will gain financially from the scheme (the GLA receiving the most funding). This works well for the governments building plans too for investment in larger projects, the perfect collaboration for them all. While architects continue to blight the landscape with their visions of a 'Brave New World', can anyone be proud of such an idea as the plans for the redevelopment of Selkirk House itself? In my opinion Selkirk House is an ugly building as it stands, but to replace it with an oversized towering monster seems even more negative. Among those who should be concerned about how a concept will be received when it finally becomes a 'real thing', architects surely shoulder that responsibility first and foremost, they ought to stop being so full of themselves and concerned about the prestige value of their future portfolios and start to be more empathetic with those they will affect, buildings have a huge impact on the environment they inhabit, it's not fast fashion! And it doesn't even take having an aesthetic eye as some do, to see that the proposal for Selkirk House will not fit in with the surrounding historical landscape which the people of the area are very much attuned to. Anyway, why is it that this lack of respect for a community's viewpoint is continually being ignored by vested interests, instead they try to plough on with their own agenda which resembles vandals smashing up a conservation area in this case, beauty being discarded, disregarding the voices of those who are unhappy and turning a deaf ear to their suggestions. I think that has been answered already, the money is fighting with the local community as usual, civilised behaviour trying to mask the real agenda with a thin veneer. So while I do not personally dislike some of the changes proposed for the other buildings in the project, as before, I oppose the new building at Selkirk House, in my opinion, a monument to negativity like so many that have come before it, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✦ It is too tall, it will dwarf and overwhelm the surrounding area in a completely negative way, abandoning the character of this conservation area to its detriment for miles around ✦ The building of such a monster building in place of Selkirk House does not reflect the character of the area, and will also create a negative vibration due to the dark shadows it will cast and the blocking of the skyline.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

✦ These negative factors are not only attributed to [REDACTED] but will basically ruin the neighbourhood and area beyond the locality irreversibly. It doesn't take much imagination to see how people's enjoyment of where they live will be impacted by this awful plan to build upwards and outwards.

✦ As mundane and inconvenient as it sounds, this lack of care and consideration for the people who live and work in the area, not to mention its conservation status, is a slippery slope which should not be encouraged in any sense, morally or aesthetically. This huge bulky building, if it is allowed, will create an environment that is completely the opposite of one that is suitable for harmonious human existence, it will represent anti-life on our doorstep - I doubt very much that the developers would want to live next to it themselves...

If any among you have some kind of conscience and concern for the people of Bloomsbury, Covent Garden and the surrounding area, then I ask that you really do look for another way of doing things.

✦ Don't allow Simten Investments to knock down the existing Travel Lodge building. From an environmental standpoint, to help limit climate change, and based on Camden Council's green agenda, knocking down and rebuilding are completely contradictory to those claims. Instead, the existing building could be reused as a foundation, just like the Post Building opposite, saving valuable resources and keeping the construction work to a minimum in the process. Four years of unbearable noise and disruption for local people would be greatly reduced following this course of action and would be a much more sustainable approach.

✦ Don't allow Simten Investments to build higher than the buildings surrounding the old Travel Lodge. As previously stated, this would be extremely detrimental in many ways, not only due to the overshadowing of other buildings and surrounding streets and interrupting the view for miles around, but high-rise buildings create perpetual air currents around them, causing a constant wind in the surrounding streets, another depressing point to consider.

✦ Don't allow Simten Investments to ruin Bloomsbury, Simten, like Labtech its predecessor is showing that it has no empathy, concern or respect for the lives and feelings of the people here. They should not be allowed to ride roughshod over us with such a monstrous plan, just so planners, lawyers, consultants and architects can walk away with their pockets full.

✦ Furthermore, in these uncertain times due to the pandemic and financial climate, how would Simten Investments be able to let or lease out such a massive amount of space when offices lie empty across the city? These two factors have changed the landscape of office work in city centres. We don't want another oversized monument to glass and concrete lying empty on our doorstep.

The plan for the tower is in essence a violation of the people of Bloomsbury and Covent Garden, its a monstrous idea which any local authority who cares at all about its constituents should have rejected from the start, its a shameful waste of people's time and energy trying to counter it, not to mention the mental anguish that the idea for such a scheme on our doorsteps is causing to many people. This plan, if it goes ahead will be a monument to how humanity can impose ugliness and negativity on others in the pursuit of wealth, not what the world needs at all.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2954/P	Ian Sugar	30/10/2022 15:52:49	OBJ	<p>Objection to Selkirk House Proposal</p> <p>More in sorrow than in anger, I feel I must express my supreme distaste at the current attempt to foist onto Bloomsbury the latest incarnation of architectural violence, in the name of progress.</p> <p>There have been myriad objections by local tenants' associations as well as organisations such as Historic England, all blasting the height and overwhelming presence of the planned development - (a loud raspberry) to the intended scheme.</p> <p>All the meetings, get togethers, public consultations and briefings seem to have arrived at roughly the same conclusion, that is, the building goes ahead. Why is this? After all attempts at compromise on bulk, height and effect on a very important area of Central London. Reasoned argument on the availability of office space or lack of housing for local residents, light blockage, noise pollution - the sheer lack of grace and empathy for the surroundings. Nothing, it seems has had an effect on the plans.</p> <p>No-one has been listened to who could possibly affect the vision of Simten - a real estate development company, who inherited the scheme from Labtech. Why this inheritance? It seems that the previous driver of the scheme had to run for his life as he had upset the wrong people. So now we are confronted by BC Partners, to quote their blurb - 'committed to the highest standards of transparency' - 'commitment to incorporating environmental, social and governance issues into its investment process' etc, etc, ad nauseum, blah blah blah!</p> <p>No, this development is, first and foremost, about money. About who controls it, the use of it, where it settles, how safe it will be and the supposed return on it.</p> <p>Such vast amounts of money do not listen or care about the views of locals or groups intent on preserving quality of life or the look or atmosphere of an old established part of this black-hearted city - London.</p> <p>This is mammon, moloch, on the march, unstoppable, unreasoned, heavy, dead; and ultimately this is what it will produce - dead air.</p> <p>So, there you have it, all talk of responsibility, communication, consultation is just so much pantomime posturing, there is only fiscal imperative. It's a shame. What I would like to see is some form of compromise where this obviously overbearing structure is reduced in size - that would be nice; or even some re-tread of the previous abomination that exists on the site - Selkirk House - that would be even better. But I'm afraid that the system that has been concocted by the real powers that be, with its kickbacks to the Local and Central Government, precludes any real constructive conversation about the future of this part of London - which I love dearly.</p> <p>As I say, I finish as I started, more in sorrow than in anger.</p>