

Dike, Darlene

From: Peter [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2017 17:27
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: DICKENS WORKHOUSE SITE W1

Dear Ms Henry

Having previously lived and worked near this work house I would like to register my objection to the two planning proposals that have been submitted.

This is a rare and unusual building with both literary and medical connections. It would be entirely inappropriate to redevelop it at the present time without, at the very least, undertaking a full archaeological study of the building and its surrounding graveyard. (Personally I think it would be inappropriate to disturb these graves although I appreciate this has been allowed in other parts of London.)

There are few if any buildings elsewhere in the country which combine both the poor law workhouse tradition with Florence Nightingale wards. In combining these two features this building represents the best of British values in caring for the poor and sick. This was a time when we lead the world in addressing these issues. This building should be retained as a monument to our forwardthinking in those times and to remind future generations all the need for humility and humanity in our everyday dealings with the poor and sick.

Yours sincerely

Peter Hayward

Dr Peter Hayward

Sent from my iPhone

Dike, Darlene

From: Janet Sacks [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2017 08:36
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Cleveland Street workhouse

I am writing to you about the demolition of the Cleveland street workhouse and the building of luxury apartments. I object to both of these because this is a site of historical interest and so many of these are being ignored in short term interests of developers who are not concerned with history or the neighbourhood. No doubt the flats will not benefit anyone from Camden but rather wealthy overseas investors. It is a unique site and should be valued as important to Camden.

Yours sincerely
Janet Sacks

Dike, Darlene

From: Rosemary VanArsdel [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2017 19:10
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Refuse both applications

To: Kate Henry, Planning Officer
Cleveland Street Workhouse Site

Thanks to hearing from my friend and the distinguished scholar, Dr. Ruth Richardson, about plans to demolish the site of the Cleveland Street Workhouse. While it is quite impossible for me, now, to travel to England, I would like to offer my intellectual approval for the preservation and honorable support for, the Strand Union Workhouse/Middlesex Hospital Annexe in London's Cleveland Street, built in the 1770's. The preservation of London's, and England's, history is so enormously important to the history of the world, particularly in this time when everything is "hoopla" on the internet. The world is full of garages and high-costing apartments, which makes the preservation of history more important than ever. The thought of civilization which occupied this territory almost three hundred years ago should never be lost.

Any scholar, who reads of the history of the world, and particularly the history of England, can understand the enormous importance of preserving and evaluating the way a civilization and a country grew and developed. And no one needs to have history abused and obliterated by modern garages, gas stations, and money-making, high rise apartment buildings.

Three cheers for ancient history,

Dr. Rosemary T. Van Arsdel
Distinguished Professor of English, Retired

Dike, Darlene

From: Henry, Kate
Sent: 24 February 2017 14:56
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Workhouse in Cleveland Street

Please log as objection to 2017/0414/P

Kate Henry
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2521



From: SUE WEIR [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2017 10:43
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Workhouse in Cleveland Street

2017/0415/L

I write to register my objection to the planning request to destroy this old historic workhouse, the last of its nature in central London, to be replaced by expensive apartments. This plan will not only give no direct benefit to the local residents & those on a low income of the area but will only increase the number of inappropriate dwellings. It is not a brown filed site but is one of historic and unique interest and importance. Retaining the existing building is vitally important as it can be used for alternative purposes.

2017/0414/P

I also write to object to the use of a burial ground as a car park. This is consecrated ground and quite inappropriate to be used for cars which go directly against the Mayor of London's aims to reduce the number of cars in central London. Camden must be responsible for helping to achieve these aims and not ignoring those whose bones lie in this grave-yard.

Sue Weir DHMSA

Dike, Darlene

From: Henry, Kate
Sent: 24 February 2017 17:00
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Cleveland Street Workhouse site

Please log as objection to 2017/0414/P

Kate Henry
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2521

-----Original Message-----

From: Dawn Kemp [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2017 16:26
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Cleveland Street Workhouse site

Dear Kate

I have tried to log on to the planning portal to note my objections but was unable to get through and as deadline is today I hope you don't mind that I write to you directly.

I strongly object to the development of the Cleveland Street Workhouse site which has come to light in the last two years as having exceptional social and cultural importance in the history of the poor in London. The connection to Dickens making it even more extraordinary and of international significance.

As one of London's last inner city graveyards it is also important as a sacred place of burial. Disruption of burial grounds of wealthy people from this period would, rightly, not be considered and nor should this.

This site could be developed to enhance the representation and understanding of the history of London's poor.

With kind regards

Dawn Kemp
40 Methuen Park
London N10 2JS

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

Dike, Darlene

From: Eileen Dunwoodie [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2017 14:09
To: Planning
Subject: THE 'STRAND UNION WORKHOUSE' Planning proposal for demolition Comments

EILEEN DUNWOODIE

65A ST PETERS ST
LONDON
N1 8JR

Camden Planning comments

FAO : Kate Henry, Camden Planning 020 7974 2521 (could extend deadline a few more days)

Planning Application Nos:

2017/0415/L

2017/0414/P

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

Dear Camden Planning

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. Longevity of a Listed building on the site is appropriate (sensitive) within the setting as a heritage asset.
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 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'.

1. 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 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 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.

Regards

Eileen Dunwoodie

Dike, Darlene

From: Miriam Margolyes [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2017 20:11
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: RE: application 2017/0415/L

The proposal is insensitive:

Re: application 2017/0415/L It is important to retain the configuration of the surrounding Victorian buildings as part of the context for the Georgian workhouse building itself. Note Dickens Society resolution to this effect (Beziers, France, 2014).

Re: application 2017/0414/P I oppose the large-scale commercial development proposed for the historic pauper graveyard site surrounding the Workhouse. Consecrated in 1790, in use until 1853, this is a historical site as well as a consecrated one, not just an empty lot. Camden would be destroying graves, a desecration.

Both sites, being close to Charles Dickens's childhood home, have additional importance in forming his urban consciousness, later to be used in his great accounts of the city of London. It would be a great waste to let this irreplaceable area slip away into anonymity. Charles Dickens brings tourists to London; he is a vital part of our literary pre-eminence. Appalling to think of removing a part of his imaginative development.

Think again, please.

Miriam Margolyes OBE

Dike, Darlene

From: Judith Martin [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2017 20:20
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: 2017/0414/P & 2017/0415/L Former Middlesex Hospital Annexe

Dear Ms Henry,

I should like to lodge my objections to these applications, on several grounds, mostly concerning heritage but also concerning pressure on infrastructure and the area generally.

First, the planning application document says, re. Immunity from Listing, "Refer to accompanying Heritage and Planning Statement for details". But when Steven Bee's Heritage Statement comes to mention the certificate, it says it is based on work that can be found in Appendices 1 & 3 - which are not included online. The Planning Statement says the site 'benefits' from a Certificate of Immunity, which is infelicitous estate-agent-speak. Again, it says the Certificate is to be found in Appendix 2, which is blank.

The application recognises the importance of the 18th century listed building, but the Heritage Statement is dismissive of the idea that Florence Nightingale was involved in the design of the pavilion wards that will be lost in this scheme (para. 3.19). In fact there is considerable circumstantial evidence that she was, although without the time to delve into the numerous holdings of her own papers it's still hard to prove. However, her specific connections with the Middlesex Hospital and the immediate vicinity are many. Even before that, her father, a magistrate, was on a steering group in 1834 to oversee improvements to Romsey workhouse, in Hampshire, so it could be argued that she had grown up with a knowledge of the shortcomings of the existing designs and systems. (The remains of Romsey Workhouse are now a housing development called Nightingale Court, by no means the only redeveloped site to be named after Florence or her father.)

The Middlesex connection with Charles Dickens is recognised in the listing, and Florence Nightingale, Charles Dickens, John Stewart Mill and Louisa Twining, who had been a visitor to the workhouse since 1853, were all founder members of the Association for Improving Workhouse Infirmaries, established in the early 1860s, and which led to the passing of the 1867 Metropolitan Poor Law Act.

In 1854, while Nightingale was serving as the unpaid superintendent at the Institute for Sick Governesses in Distressed Circumstances, there was an epidemic of cholera in Soho (where Dr John Snow famously traced the cause); the number of patients brought to the Middlesex Hospital was overwhelming, to the extent that current patients were ejected. Nightingale went to the Middlesex to work with the crisis.

Subsequently she was elected by the committee of the hospital to an honorary life governorship in late 1856.

In 1859 Nightingale published Notes on Hospitals, which has not been out of print since. She wrote that the answer to hospital mortality "was neither prayer nor self-sacrifice, but better ventilation windows and corridors placed to carry away foul air ... a larger cubic allowance of air per patient". As a result she was widely consulted on hospital design across the country and its empire, and her pavilion plan - the built result of these requirements - appears in many places, most notably St Thomas. She even designed the hospital in Lisbon.

nhshistory.net, in its section on workhouse infirmaries, says that in the improvement campaign that followed the 1867 Act the pavilion plan, although not cheap, was almost invariably chosen.

So when the Heritage Statement says in 2.12 "There is some suggestion that Florence Nightingale was involved in the design of these wards, but this was more likely to have been related to the general

development of this form of accommodation rather than being specific to the Cleveland Street site", it ignores the twin facts, that Florence Nightingale was deeply connected with the Middlesex Hospital over many years, and that the pavilion design was synonymous with her improvements.

I recognise that the Certificate of Immunity was renewed until 2021 - with as far as I can tell no public consultation - but immunity from listing is not the same as consent to demolish. I have obtained the COI from Historic England; some of the reasons for granting immunity seem strange. In 2011 the then English Heritage said the buildings are plain and utilitarian; this is the case with almost any 20th century, modern movement, listing; surely it's a case of a design that is appropriate to its function. One of Florence Nightingale's main concerns was for plain, easily cleaned surfaces. Besides, one can imagine the outcry of the ratepayers if the Union had wanted to spend public finances on frivolities. Some 19th century workhouses were extremely decorative but presumably their funding models were different. The Strand Union was the only one that resisted the suggestions by the Poor Law Board in 1867 for improvements, opting instead to spend more on outdoor relief (nhshistory.net). The 2016 reissue by HE says it is unremarkable in its design and planned on earlier models; again, I would suggest the guardians would not have wanted 'remarkable', but I do not believe this is an example of an established design. Rather this is an early example of the pavilion, shown on the 1870 OS map - which would of course have been surveyed some time before publication.

The Heritage Statement is more open-minded regarding communal value (3.32), where it acknowledges the role played by the 19th century wings as well as the original, listed, building. In para. 5.10 it says the pavilion wings are not suitable for reuse; I believe there are many examples, from mews to workshops, of listed buildings of a similar modest nature that are happily reused, for studio space, live/work units, or even simply housing. The workshops on the Boundary Street estate come to mind.

I make no defence of the 20th century accretions, but the pavilions, in a conservation area, surely qualify to be an undesignated heritage asset and thus protected under the NPPF.

In conclusion the Heritage Statement says (6.5) that the pavilion wings have to go because otherwise the site could not be redeveloped and would have to remain on the Heritage at Risk Register. This is a cynical justification and not a serious heritage position. A good architect and a good client could transform the 18th and 19th century buildings for any number of uses, as well as preserving the important archaeology of the burial ground which gets barely a mention. In fact the Statement says (para4.11) "Section 3 of this Statement has identified the elements that contribute the historic significance of the application site". It fails to do so regarding the burial ground.

Beyond heritage, there is the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan, adopted in 2014. So this was based on the much larger number of houses in the earlier application which was dismissed. It talks about concerns raised by Thames Water regarding sewerage capacity, which is presumably no longer a major concern. It also mentions a decentralised energy network; there is a proposal for photovoltaics in the new plan, but if the Grade I listed church of St James Piccadilly can incorporate these, then surely so can the existing historic buildings on this site, when retained and reused.

But how an eight-storey block can be said not to have an adverse impact on the setting of listed building in such close proximity is not clear. In fact the site would be grossly over-developed, with no consideration for archaeological remains, but with the odd tree in the passageway thrown in to tick a 'green' box..

In sum, I hope very much you will resist the 36 affordable units (that are undoubtedly needed, but this is not the way to provide them - and at 80% go market rents they will not be affordable to UCH employees below the level of consultant) and the 14 others that may well be left as safe-deposit boxes. Instead, I believe the listing should be amended to include the 19th century pavilions, and the total would make a wonderful heritage-led development in the right hands, that would be of genuine community benefit. At the very least, before allowing this application UCH should be required to demonstrate that it has tried to dispose of the site in a responsible way, in the same way that a demolition of a listed building has to be proved to be unavoidable.

Yours sincerely,

Judith Martin
MSc Historic Conservation
Vice Chair, SE Heritage Trust Network

Nightingale sources: Oxford Dictionary of Biography, entry by Monica E. Baly & H.C. G. Matthew
I. B. O'Malley, Florence Nightingale 1820 - 1856, pub. 1931
Cecil Woodham Smith, Florence Nightingale 1820 - 1910, pub. 1950
Elspeth Huxley, Florence Nightingale, pub. 1975
Hugh Small, Florence Nightingale Avenging Angel, pub. 1998
Mark Bostridge, Florence Nightingale, pub. 2008
& the British Newspaper Archive

Dike, Darlene

From: Rosalind Pearson [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2017 21:01
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Cleveland Street workhouse

I am writing to urge you to think more carefully about the historical importance of the entire site at Cleveland Street, including the consecrated burial ground and the dead buried there.

The Workhouse was built in the 1770s on an open meadow, and surrounded by a graveyard for the poor consecrated by the Bishop of London in 1790. Thousands of Londoners are buried there, including many foundlings, orphans, and the Italian Boy, the victim of the London Burkers in 1831. The burial ground was closed to further burials in 1853 because it was overfull.

In 2010-11 you may remember that a major discovery was made, which helped save the 18th century front part of the building: the great novelist Charles Dickens had twice lived only a few doors away from this particular Workhouse, for several years in childhood and young adulthood. Confirmation that this place is likely to have been inspirational for his famous novel *Oliver Twist* was obtained when it was subsequently proved that while Dickens had been writing the novel, a tallow chandler's shop opposite the Workhouse was run by a man called Bill Sykes! The regime inside the workhouse was very like that portrayed in the book - there was a reiterated ban on extra helpings of food, and even Oliver's uniform was the same regulation brown. More recently still, evidence has emerged which records that in the years before the Dickens family had moved there, the street had been a red-light district: so Nancy may have lived nearby, too.

I believe that this site embodies London's health care history since the 1770s, and that the whole site, including the Workhouse and the subsidiary buildings on the site, deserves a full forensic 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. It also embodies 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 investigation.

Please think carefully and save this site.

Yours sincerely,

Rosalind Pearson

Sent from my iPad

Dike, Darlene

From: Carolyn Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2017 16:50
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Dickens site W1

Dear Kate Henry

I would like to add my name to the objections against the 2 building plans involving the Dickens site[old Middlesex Hospital Annexe and workshop/graveyard.]

I think it is completely inappropriate to plan to build apartments here ,and very disrespectful of the poor people who lived and died on this spot in the past.

Thankyou for reading my latter.

Yours sincerely

Dr Carolyn Williams

Previous student at the Middlesex Hospital Medical School,

Dike, Darlene

From: David Blackwell [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2017 19:35
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Cleveland Street workhouse site 2017/0414/P and 2017/0415/L

To whom it concerns.

Both applications should not be permitted on the grounds that what is left of our heritage should be retained and not lost.

Has been a workhouse since 1770's and any items of the past must be searched and displayed.

David Blackwell.
Secretary of the Hanwell Heritage & Local History Society.

(We have a museum at the former London District Poor School at Hanwell (London Borough of Ealing)
now a community centre. Built in 1857.

Dike, Darlene

From: Robert Stephenson [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 February 2017 12:54
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: CLEVELAND STREET WORKHOUSE SITE

Dear Ms Henry

I am very concerned about the proposals for the Cleveland Street Workhouse and think that both should be rejected.

The site and buildings should be left intact as far as possible without being gutted. This whole site is a unique survival from a former age and deserves to be preserved for future generations to appreciate.

Regards,
Robert Stephenson

Dike, Darlene

From: Hurwitz, Brian [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 February 2017 22:07
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Strand Union Workhouse/Middlesex Hospital Annexe

Dear Kate Henry,

I write as a concerned doctor about the two Planning Applications to develop the site of the Strand Union Workhouse/Middlesex Hospital Annexe in London's Cleveland Street. This site is one of only two Georgian Workhouses in London and the only one in the London Region with Nightingale wards within it. It is the only one situated on a graveyard for the poor, consecrated by the Bishop of London in 1790. Thousands of Londoners are buried there, including foundlings, orphans, and the poor murdered Italian Boy. There is no indication as to what will happen to these bodies when the site is developed. Without this the application should be allowed to go no further

The proposed building is far too high – it is double the height of the current Workhouse and will loom over the building and diminish it.

There was a children's pin factory and school in the Workhouse in the C19th and could well be interesting finds of industrial archeological significance, but there is no evidence that a real archeological survey has been undertaken. This is essential for a building of this sort that is being proposed for development. The plans should be thrown out as substandard.

The Nightingale wards in the building are very unusual, built by architects John Giles and Gough and they should not be dismantled but a use found for them within the development which means they can be preserved.

For all these reasons, even though the current plans are an improvement on the previous ones submitted, I hope the Council will do the right thing in rejecting these plans.

Yours sincerely

Dr Brian Hurwitz

