

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0415/L	Dr John Hook	5 Kemishford Woking GU22 0RL	21/02/2017 15:22:18	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.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0415/L	GHOMAS	9 FRAMLINGHAM CLOSE	21/02/2017 11:37:38	OBJ	<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:
2017/0415/L	Kitty Edwrds-Jones	25b Fitzroy Square London W1T 6ER	22/02/2017 21:15:55	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 developers to create luxury apartments for the private realm. 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'.

9. The proposed Bedford 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 Immunity was sought again in June 2016. Since then further historical evidence has come to

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>light...Clearly the developers are trying to prevent any further listing applications in order for them to develop the site.</p> <p>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 insensitive & unimaginative architectural vision and design scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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 <p>IN CONCLUSION</p> <p>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 Charles Dickens, with his connection to the Workhouse and inspiration for 'Oliver Twist'.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0415/L	Jordan Antonowicz-Behna n	NW6 7EA	21/02/2017 12:36:23	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:
2017/0415/L	Enrica Pedotti	17 Cleveland Street London W1	23/02/2017 01:11:52	OBJLETTE R	<p>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>I ahve already objected to the other application pertaining to this building.</p> <p>This one in particular seems pretty outrageous as in all effectiveness, the house of the poor gets converted for the use of the richest of the rich! What kind of justice is that?</p> <p>I hope the Camden has better judgement: this building deserves full protection, not alteration and extension.</p>
2017/0415/L	C David S Goldberg	7 St John's Road Kingston Kt1 4AN	21/02/2017 10:48:47	COMMEM AIL	<p>Please may the archaeological report on the site be available, prior to further discussion?</p> <p>The site not only is of archeological interest but part of the site is likely to contain human remains.</p> <p>Dr. David Goldberg, ex-Middlesex Hospital</p>
2017/0415/L	Mr C J Begent-Cove	11 Somerset Point Somerset Street Brighton E Sussex BN2 1JS	22/02/2017 08:50:51	OBJ	<p>This development will destroy a very important part of London's history. It should be vigorously opposed.</p>
2017/0415/L	Mary Purcell	49 Erskine Hill London NW11 6EY	22/02/2017 14:37:11	WREP	<p>The proposed modifications to the former Workhouse building will radically change its presentation and character. This is probably the only remaining Workhouse in or near central London and as such it has inherent historical and social importance. There is no evidence that detailed archeological or other research has been conducted on the site to date. Thus an opportunity to discover more about the life of residents of the Workhouse will be lost forever.</p> <p>The historical importance of the building includes the fact that it was the likely inspiration for Oliver Twist, one of Charles Dickens's most celebrated novels.</p> <p>The scope of the alterations will reduce one of the most important buildings in the locality to an anonymous block of private flats.</p> <p>The Workhouse was intended for relief of the destitute. There is no indication in the planning application that this site should be dedicated in future for continuing public good. There is already in the vicinity a massive private apartment development and there remains in Camden substantial housing need. At least if the building were adapted for social housing, provision might be made for some form of public access to the ground floor, or part of, where a small museum might be established or a Charles Dickens heritage display. As a former employee at The Middlesex Hospital Medical School, I am disappointed that the outline of the building is not to be maintained and the internal space put to public benefit in some way that reflects its history and connection to the former hospital.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0415/L	Pedro Bichinho	16 Wenlock Road London N17TA	22/02/2017 15:39:50	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>
