

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Adele Rutledge	209 Parchmore Road CR7 8HD CR7 8HD	21/02/2017 09:49:22	OBJ	I do not support this planning application because it will desecrate a consecrated burial site. The precedent has been set for cases like this where care is taken when exhuming consecrated sites. There is so much to be learnt about our history and also about the people buried there which should not be cast aside to build flats and provide parking for a few. In any case, as happens far too frequently, these flats will probably remain empty and just sit in the portfolio of some one who probably does not live in the United Kingdom
2017/0414/P	Pedro Bichinho	16 Wenlock Road London N17TA	22/02/2017 15:36:20	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Council, as an architect and person living in London I was very interested in the plans for this site. I have seen many of the comments here as published online and some of the critics are extremely valid.</p> <p>I have some issues to highlight to this too.</p> <p>1- This is a burial ground which needs archaeological investigation. Even in the case of something being built, any remains need to be removed and placed on this same site with some kind of public memorial and educating the public.</p> <p>2- The fact that the listed building seen from the street seems to look good externally, does not help to minimize the issue of and historical building being gutted and partially demolished to make flats. The value of this listed building is more historical than aesthetic. There should be a public part of the building to be used as a "museum". Managed properly it would add value to the site, inform the public and keep the memory of this historical site alive.</p> <p>3- There seems to be a partial demolition of the front wall just after the south house building. This is unnecessary as there is a gate just on the next segment of wall.</p> <p>This application is a step forward but clearly the historical value of the site is approached only aesthetically, which is a shame to waste such an opportunity of creating something good to the city of London.</p>
2017/0414/P	Mary Purcell	49 Erskine Hill London NW11 EY	22/02/2017 14:48:27	WREP	<p>Before any further steps are taken to alter this important historical site, LBCamden should undertake a thorough site survey and then reconsider the proposed re-development of the Workhouse site and burial ground.</p> <p>The former Middlesex Hospital site excepting, most of Bloomsbury/Fitzrovia has been protected from blatant commercial re-development. The scale of the proposed new build 8 storey block will be quite counter to the neighbouring streets eg Tottenham Mews. The proposed development will be out of scale with the existing Workhouse building.</p> <p>Further relevant comments are contained in my representations under your reference 2017/0415/L</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Dr A H Sarafian	Red Lodge 115 Horse Street Chipping Sodbury Bristol BS37 6DF	21/02/2017 19:58:17	OBJ	What is the point in listing a building if it can be destroyed because of powerful business interests? Will this benefit the local inhabitants? I think not. This building is part of our history and it is a disgrace that somebody should think of ruining it. I strongly object to the proposal.
2017/0414/P	Dr A H Sarafian	Red Lodge 115 Horse Street Chipping Sodbury Bristol BS37 6DF	21/02/2017 19:58:02	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Jordan	NW6 7EA	21/02/2017 12:35:44	COMMNT	<p>I am writing to oppose planning applications numbers 2017/0414/P and 2017/0415/L. Neither of these developments should be allowed to go ahead for these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 38 affordable units is well below the policy-stipulated required number the owners were asked to provide. As this is a priority for Camden, we cannot accept to lose even one unit from what they are required to provide. - There is a deep graveyard in the back of the building, yet the planning application glosses over it entirely. The proposed development will obliterate the resting place of thousands of poor souls who have had their permanent resting place for centuries in the Workhouse ground! This should never be allowed. It would be another profoundly disrespectful act towards paupers, already so maltreated. - The proposed development seems to put cars above the importance of the graveyard: its deep basement and car park will effectively displace the dead. Camden does not need more private parking, and this area of Fitzrovia is already horribly congested as it is. No car park should be provided on the premises. This parking will dislodge thousands of burials: this is disrespectful, uncivil and should not be allowed; it does not represent the sensibility of our citizens or of our times. - the proposed 8 floor development behind the Workhouse is totally disproportionate to the size of the listed building, which is less than half its size?? Such a jarring contrast should not be allowed as, by law, a listed building should be preserved in its environment. An 8 storey block more than twice the height of the Workhouse will loom over it, dwarf it, and overwhelm it. - The proposed development deletes the fact that the workhouse building has always had two wings attached at the rear, even in the 18th century. To flatten it at the rear as the proposal suggests is effectively a historical falsehood which should not be allowed. Similarly, images survive of the original front porch which should be reinstated. We have lost enough heritage in this country! It's time for it to stop! <p>FINALLY, it is disgraceful that the listed Workhouse could be transformed into luxury flats: it is a true abomination that what was once the only home for the poorest of the poor, will become more empty homes for the super rich. Camden should protect this building, especially in light of what it means for the history of the poor, for whom Camden Council is famous for proving help and support. Allowing the proposed development would mean a negation of values for which Camden has always stood.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Dr Nicholas Cambridge	61 Bennetts Way Shirley Croydon Surrey CR0 8AF	22/02/2017 23:42:01	OBJEMPER	<p>I have the following concerns which are listed below:</p> <p>1) The history of the site is confused because of changes in the relevant regulatory bodies. The site was originally regulated by Westminster – the boundary between Holborn and Westminster was originally Charlotte Street (?or even Tottenham Court Road). When the boroughs of Holborn and St Pancras were united, and then further united with Camden, the boundary shifted to Cleveland St. This has made it difficult to track the changes requested by planners in the latter part of the 20th century, when the changes happened.</p> <p>2) There is a possible radioactive waste contaminating area south of the Windeyer Building, adjacent to the graveyard. When the Windeyer building on the south side of Howland Street was being planned by Easton & Robertson, the decision was made that the building should not include a basement for most of its length. The exception was at the western end of the site, where a large lecture theatre (the Edward Lewis Theatre) was planned. Further along the south side of Howland Street, about halfway to Charlotte Street, there had been a radiation laboratory dealing with the experimental uses of radiochemicals for medical diagnosis and treatment. In the era when this was being used, there was little concern about the hazards of radiation, and waste radioisotopes were often emptied down a sink. When it came to planning the Windeyer building, there were justifiable concerns that radioactive substances had been trapped in the drainage system. The decision to have a basement level for the lecture theatre was to enable the stage to be connected to the hospital tunnel system to allow patients to be wheeled to the stage as required for clinical teaching purposes. The lower level of the Edward Lewis Theatre was raked, and beneath the rear portion and behind it, there was a large infill of aggregate between concrete walls to prevent any seepage of radioactivity.</p> <p>3) There are possible Security issues over pedestrian walkways. When the annexe was functioning as the Middlesex OPD, and when resident doctors and administrators occupied South House, the through way from Cleveland St via Bedford Passage to Charlotte St was locked between 6 p.m. and 8 a.m. every night. This was because not the entire corridor was visible from the street, and this provided opportunities for attempted break-ins at street level to the annexe or to South House, as well as attacks on residents, and also refuges for rough sleepers. This was a significant issue because of the entrance to the passageway being directly across the street from a much-frequented pub. It isn't clear what thought has been given to the issue of security.</p> <p>4) Vehicular access to the new build residences is limited and there are concerns regarding deliveries. What are the arrangements for deliveries of online shopping, etc., and for the collection and delivery of residents and guests. People who live in central London rarely use their cars except to leave central London for the suburbs, countryside, etc.</p> <p>5) Disabled access - ?Potential problems</p> <p>6) There are possibly one thousand bodies buried in the graveyard and there has been no archaeological</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

survey carried out.

7) The central grade II listed building and the North and South houses should be preserved.

8) The Nightingale wards are unique and part of our heritage and should be preserved.

9) There appears to be a small proportion of affordable units compared to the total number being proposed.

10) The public consultation process was viewed by just a few people. A large number of people passionate about the legacy of the Middlesex Hospital and the area were not informed or even knew about it.

Final Comments.

Having qualified at The Middlesex Hospital as a doctor and a medical historian I am saddened that The Middlesex name has effectively been airbrushed out of history. For example the chapel is now called the Fitzrovia Chapel rather than the Middlesex Hospital Chapel and the Workhouse site is the last remnant of our once historic hospital.

I and many others would like to see this site converted into the following:

1) Middlesex Hospital Archive and Museum.

2) Dickens and the Workhouse Museum.

3) Fitzrovia Museum.

4) Modern day Workhouse for poor people

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	G Thomas	9 FRAMLINGHAM CLOSE	21/02/2017 11:36:15	COMMNT	<p>I am writing to oppose planning applications numbers 2017/0414/P and 2017/0415/L. Neither of these developments should be allowed to go ahead for these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 38 affordable units is well below the policy-stipulated required number the owners were asked to provide. As this is a priority for Camden, we cannot accept to lose even one unit from what they are required to provide. - There is a deep graveyard in the back of the building, yet the planning application glosses over it entirely. The proposed development will obliterate the resting place of thousands of poor souls who have had their permanent resting place for centuries in the Workhouse ground! This should never be allowed. It would be another profoundly disrespectful act towards paupers, already so maltreated. - The proposed development seems to put cars above the importance of the graveyard: its deep basement and car park will effectively displace the dead. Camden does not need more private parking, and this area of Fitzrovia is already horribly congested as it is. No car park should be provided on the premises. This parking will dislodge thousands of burials: this is disrespectful, uncivil and should not be allowed; it does not represent the sensibility of our citizens or of our times. - the proposed 8 floor development behind the Workhouse is totally disproportionate to the size of the listed building, which is less than half its size?? Such a jarring contrast should not be allowed as, by law, a listed building should be preserved in its environment. An 8 storey block more than twice the height of the Workhouse will loom over it, dwarf it, and overwhelm it. - The proposed development deletes the fact that the workhouse building has always had two wings attached at the rear, even in the 18th century. To flatten it at the rear as the proposal suggests is effectively a historical falsehood which should not be allowed. Similarly, images survive of the original front porch which should be reinstated. We have lost enough heritage in this country! It's time for it to stop! <p>FINALLY, it is disgraceful that the listed Workhouse could be transformed into luxury flats: it is a true abomination that what was once the only home for the poorest of the poor, will become more empty homes for the super rich. Camden should protect this building, especially in light of what it means for the history of the poor, for whom Camden Council is famous for proving help and support. Allowing the proposed development would mean a negation of values for which Camden has always stood.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Dr Geoff Scott	Flat 64 County Hall North 5 Chicheley St SE1 7PN	21/02/2017 10:26:52	COMMEMP ER	Having worked in this historic building for about 15years before it was closed, I have an attachment to the concept of maintaining the visibility of the property as it was. The development of flats is a good idea because the outside structure is to be maintained, and should not be allowed to deteriorate further. However, the construction of a new build detracts from the area. Furthermore, deep excavation will likely reveal a burial ground and possibly a plague pit from 1665 or before. I believe these should remain undisturbed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Kitty Edwards-Jones	25b Fitzroy Square London W1T 6ER	22/02/2017 21:35:27	OBJLETTE R	Camden Planning comments Planning Application: 2017/0415/L 2017/0414/P

Subject: 'Strand Union Workhouse' Middlesex Hospital Annex, 44 Cleveland Street, W1

I wish to oppose the planning proposals to redevelop this site on the following grounds:

1. This is a unique historical site, and a rare asset for Camden. Whilst the Georgian section of the former Workhouse has a Listed status the rest of the site lies within the Curtilage of the building and has an equally important role to play in its rich social history and the surrounding conservation area. It is one of the last and possibly only remaining Workhouse in the country of this merit and its association with Charles Dickens and his inspiration for Oliver Twist.

As a rare example of a Georgian parish Workhouse, it operated as a facility for London's sick and poor for 230 years with notable pioneers, such as Louisa Twining, Florence Nightingale and Dr Joseph Rogers who worked tirelessly with a passion and campaigned to reform the London Poor Law. The Poor Law was founded with influential support from Charles Dickens who lived close by. This adds substantially to its historical significance.

2. As a Listed building, it is on the 'Buildings at Risk Register and therefore any positive method of protecting its safety will be welcomed by English Heritage. I may say that in supporting the proposals in principle, (are they aware that the wall is still partially to be demolished?) they have compromised the integrity of the site as a whole. Once demolition takes place within the context of the setting; this rare gem, our heritage asset with its extraordinary history, will be lost forever. It is shocking that it has come to this. I believe many of the Heritage bodies would agree.

3. The early 20th century boundary wall and railings enclosing the frontage forms a significant heritage feature in views up and down Cleveland Street and along Fowley Street. It frames the site and it should be kept in its entirety not partially demolished (South side) as proposed. The central portico should be retained to 'celebrate' the entrance.

NOTE: The early 20th century additions to the Workhouse site were publicly funded not only by the Middlesex Hospital staff, but paid for by more than £1 million of donations from members of the public. There are photos in the archives to substantiate this. That in itself is a worthy cause for retaining the site in tact and not handing over to private developers to create luxury apartments. We have already seen the blot on the landscape with the Middlesex hospital site opposite where the new development is bulky and brutal. (Paths and open spaces are restricted to the public - you can walk through but get told to move on if you sit on a bench).

4. The PUBLIC Pre- Application Consultation (Public consultation 7th Sept 2016) - held one afternoon (6 hours) is just not acceptable. Residents in the area were not informed about the consultations and I came across the 'pop up' exhibition by pure chance. The extensive series of

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

meetings & consultation were obviously held by others, not the public.

5. Scale & Massing - Re-Use of building around the listed building should be sensitively designed, complimenting the setting, scale, height, form and architectural detailing. The proposals are unacceptable, impacting on the listed building and conservation area. It is cramming too much onto a small footprint and goes higher at 8 storeys to over compensate, thus compromising the setting and integrity of the heritage site. Sensitive approach not seen. Site needs formal simplicity/Georgian in character.

6. Importance of retaining the grid block which contributes to the character of the conservation area. The grid block has influenced the subdivision and development of the street scene within which the site lies and its visibility should be retained as a heritage asset.

7. Archeological site - There is no mention of this and the fact that the land is a deep burial ground circa 1780. All the land except the original workhouse footprint was consecrated at this time. It was a pauper burial ground, so the graves were deep, mass burials, left open until full. Often people were buried without a coffin, crammed together, especially if the bodies were the dissected remains from the medical school opposite (old Middlesex Hospital). They were likely to be packed in during the early 19th century. The ground may require thorough investigation/excavation as these are mass graves.

8. Your Statement: "Housing should be the predominant use" - Then why is 39% of the proposed new build offices and only 61% housing (of which a % of that is affordable)?
 "Development - respect listed element - appropriate building height, separation between listed building and new blocks" - There is little evidence of this on the proposed plan
 "Preserving elements that make a positive contribution and enhance character of the area". The design and scale of this proposal is utterly out of keeping within the context of the listed building and its curtilage.
 "New building to contribute positively to setting" - The height of 8 storeys overwhelms the 4 story listed building. Double the height of the Georgian Workhouse and higher still than the 3 storey North and South houses.
 View of wider setting - 8 storeys high new build will contribute to harm view of the skyline and should be resisted. It will diminish the Georgian workhouse within its setting being overwhelmed - too close, too high.
 "Retain buildings that were developed from 18th/19th century" - as part of the Workhouse footprint they form part of the Curtilage of the building - Heritage recommend to restore not replace. If missing fenestration, it should be replaced 'like for like'.
 The proposed Bedford

9. Passage is likely to attract loitering, crime and security issues.

10. Certificate of Immunity (to prevent a further statutory Listing on the Victorian sections of the Workhouse) - The Georgian section of the Workhouse was Listed in March 2011. A certificate of Immunity was then immediately placed on the site for 5 years until April 2016. A new certificate of

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

Immunity was sought again in June 2016. Since then further historical evidence has come to light... Clearly the developers are trying to prevent any further listing applications in order for them to develop the site.

11. Design concerns

- * The new development fails to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- * It merges into the Workhouse then towers above it blurring definition between old and new. An awful architectural vision and design scheme.
- * too high - impact roof height will have on listed building
- * not coherent
- * material inappropriate
- * visual impact of taller building on Listed Workhouse
- * cladding
- * fenestration - why replace existing sash windows, restore.
- * overhang on new build (to allow more more floor space at upper levels) = crowding, pushing bulk and mass higher up the building thus more out of context with listed building 'recovering floorspace'.
- *Courtyard space & planting

IN CONCLUSION

The plans to turn this former workhouse and hospital into flats and commercial offices is outrageous. The value in preserving buildings of our past cannot be underestimated, it reminds us of why and how we live in the present. We need to keep the Workhouse in a preserved state for future generations. Not only preserved in full as a vital part of our history, but with respect to the legacy of the medical pioneers and of Charles Dickens, with his connection to the Workhouse and inspiration for 'Oliver Twist'.

This building should be open to the public, as a museum, a public space, turned into creative workshops, small affordable workplaces for smaller businesses (Fitzrovia was the heart of the artistic and literary world; artisans, actors, writers, prostitutes). The character of the area with its elegant town houses and gritty old buildings is gradually being eroded, driven out by commercial development, the corporates who are sanitising the area, faceless buildings, losing its character. Architectural and social history is about the gritty old buildings as well as the finer ones. The Workhouse stands for the hardship of everyday lives which the majority of people lived in the 18th and 19th century.

The graves of the dead lie deep within the ground since 1780 on the Workhouse site. This appears to have been glossed over by the developers.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Mary Coffey	14 Moat Road East Grinstead RH19 3JY	21/02/2017 14:54:16	OBJ	I object on the grounds that the building is listed, and for a very good reason. It is a site of historical significance, and it is also the site of a paupers grave which should be sacrosanct. I feel it is just another nail in the coffin of London's heritage. It will be dwarfed by the proposed development of the surrounding area which is unlikely to reflect the historical significance of the site. Is this yet further destruction of the Middlesex Hospital's not insignificant history?
2017/0414/P	Enrica Pedotti	17 Cleveland Street London W1	23/02/2017 01:07:18	OBJLETTE R	I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT No sorry, this just won't do. There are hundreds of people buried there! Poor people, who really do not deserve, after all their pain in life, to suffer in death too. Please do not allow any construction that is not conservative to go on. This site must b respected and preserved as it is.
2017/0414/P	Adele Rutledge	209 Parchmore Road CR7 8HD CR7 8HD	21/02/2017 09:49:33	OBJ	I do not support this planning application because it will desecrate a consecrated burial site. The precedent has been set for cases like this where care is taken when exhuming consecrated sites. There is so much to be learnt about our history and also about the people buried there which should not be cast aside to build flats and provide parking for a few. In any case, as happens far too frequently, these flats will probably remain empty and just sit in the portfolio of some one who probably does not live in the United Kingdom
2017/0414/P	Dr John Hook	5 Kemishford Woking GU22 0RL	21/02/2017 15:23:52	OBJ	I oppose this application. This site embodies London's health care history since the 1770s, and that the whole site, including the Workhouse and its subsidiary buildings, deserves a full forensic architectural & archaeological investigation before any new plans are made for it. The assemblage of buildings and the graveyard are like a time-capsule, sealed in 2006 when the hospital closed. The place may also embody elements of London's industrial heritage, because we know (for example) that there was a pin-making manufactory employing children there in the early 19th century. There will certainly be all sorts of other evidence and artefacts discovered if the whole site is recognised as a heritage asset worthy of proper protection and investigation. It stands inside a Conservation Area.
2017/0414/P	Simon Scott	2 Monks Cottages Hunts End Buckden PE195ST	22/02/2017 13:01:19	OBJ	I am against this development on the grounds that it will destroy this historic building and am concerned that no consideration has been given to the people that are buried there. It seems that because they were poor they were of no consequence, that the search for money is more importance than our cultural heritage.
2017/0414/P	Mr C J Begent-Cove	11 Somerset Point Somerset Street Brighton E Sussex BN2 1JS	22/02/2017 08:54:31	OBJ	I object to this development as it will destroy an important part of London's history.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Adele Rutledge	209 Parchmore Road CR7 8HD CR7 8HD	21/02/2017 09:49:33	OBJ	I do not support this planning application because it will desecrate a consecrated burial site. The precedent has been set for cases like this where care is taken when exhuming consecrated sites. There is so much to be learnt about our history and also about the people buried there which should not be cast aside to build flats and provide parking for a few. In any case, as happens far too frequently, these flats will probably remain empty and just sit in the portfolio of some one who probably does not live in the United Kingdom
2017/0414/P	Ann Goodburn	Flat 1 45-46 Newman Street W1T 1QF	21/02/2017 23:01:25	COMMNT	I object to the height of the building. Building should be kept the four floors as customary in the area. Most developers have now pushed this to six. Eight is totally unacceptable. People should be discouraged from owning cars in central London and should NOT be encouraged by providing parking. There should be some social housing not some token so called 'affordable' housing. It would be nice to have a small 'workhouse museum' within the development to house photos, equipment and records. I am trying to locate the archived records that used to be housed in cabinets in the basement.
2017/0414/P	Judith Carney	4th Floor 23 Golden Square London W1F 9JP	22/02/2017 02:08:10	OBJ	This site is of historical and cultural interest to this part of London and the suggested alterations are out of character with the area and inappropriate to the listed building setting. The suggested height of 8 storeys will dwarf the existing Georgian building and will also dwarf many other buildings in the area, depriving them of light and views. I lived for some time in this area so am familiar with many of the dwellings - the domestic buildings are on a human scale which is one of the main attractions of the area. The value of a workhouse with connections to one of England's greatest novelists to the cultural and tourist industry has not been considered in the development plans and any demolition of Victorian parts of the building will only damage the look of the area.