

Our ref: T3452

Your ref: 2017/0414/P & 2017/0415/L

11th April 2017

Kate Henry
LB Camden Council
5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG



TEMPLE

LEADERS IN ENVIRONMENT,
PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY.

Dear Kate,

Planning Application (2017/0414/P) and Application for Listed Building Consent (2017/0415/L) by University College London Hospitals Charity (UCLH Charity) on the former Middlesex Hospital Annex, 44 Cleveland Street W1T 4JT: Response to Public Representations, Consultee and Officer comments.

Further to our meetings with yourself, Sarah Freeman, and Frances Madders on the 28th February and the 9th March 2017 and following the consultation on both applications during January and February 2017, we write to you on behalf of the applicant to respond to the comments and issues raised. This letter reaffirms some of the key benefits of the scheme and secondly responds to comments/issues raised by the public representations, statutory/non-statutory consultees and Council Officers. We have enclosed:

- Llewelyn Davies' revised drawings schedule and full set of revised proposed drawings (*all proposed drawings now revision A, drawings showing existing arrangements are unchanged*);
- HLM's revised Landscaping proposals;
- Llewelyn Davies' design revisions report;
- Historic Environment Assessment (February 2017) by Museum of London Archaeology;
- Heritage Statement (revised to include missing Appendices) by Steven Bee Urban Counsel; and
- Revised Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment April 2017.

Please note AECOM will be submitting the necessary details in accordance with Campbell Reith's requirements regarding the Basement Impact Assessment directly.

1. Summary of the Scheme's key benefits

The applicant's development proposal aims principally to:

- Deliver a scheme which accords with the Council's adopted masterplanning principles and related policies within the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan (FAAP) (2014);
- Secure the long term future of the Grade II listed former Strand Union Workhouse (currently on the Heritage at Risk Register) in addition to the unlisted adjacent North and South House by sensitive refurbishment of the buildings for residential use;
- Redevelop the remainder of the site to deliver a residential led scheme, comprising 40 much needed affordable housing units and 10 private sale units (within the retained Workhouse) which exceeds the Council's affordable housing policy requirement;

- Deliver B1 Business uses in accordance with the Development Plan and meeting an acute demand for such uses in this location i.e. the Central London Area; and
- Provide new high quality public open space including the re-opening of the historic pedestrian route through the application site, known as 'Bedford Passage', linking Cleveland Street with Tottenham Mews and Charlotte Street.

2. Public Representations

We note from the Council's website that the applications have received a significant number of representations from members of the public with many being from outside of the Borough. Though most of the representations raised objections, virtually all accepted that redevelopment of the site must happen. The Design Team has carefully considered all comments and note that the majority raise concern in relation to the demolition of existing buildings, the potential for buried heritage assets, affordable housing and the historic S106 planning obligations associated with the site. In the interest of clarity we set out some short responses to the key concerns below.

Heritage

Central to the applicant's vision for the site and in line with the aspirations of the FAAP (2014), is securing the long term future of the Grade II listed former Strand Union Workhouse. This is to be achieved through the retention of the building and its sensitive refurbishment and adaption for residential use, which will ensure that the building is removed from the 'Heritage at Risk Register'. Further to this, the scheme proposes to retain the two 19th Century buildings (both of which are unlisted) which flank the Workhouse and front onto Cleveland Street (known as North and South House respectively), as well as the majority of the existing 20th Century boundary wall to enclose new private amenity space. The demolition of the un-listed 19th Century pavilion wings to the rear of the listed Workhouse will facilitate the optimum development of the site as a whole, enabling the applicant to deliver the key policy objectives for the site and focusing the new build elements away from Cleveland Street.

In terms of significance, we fully acknowledge the association that Charles Dickens is thought to have had with the Workhouse and this was a factor in its statutory listing.. It is indeed an important part of London's heritage but it is the listing that will preserve that association. The ability of the scheme to remove the building from the Heritage at Risk register is a distinct benefit. The significance of the remaining buildings has been tested by the listing process and more importantly, by the certificate of immunity against listing of them that was re-issued this year. The extent of works on the site has been tested at length with officers and Historic England has also confirmed that it has no objections to the scheme subject to conditions.

These matters are dealt with in detail in the Heritage Statement accompanying the application.

Potential for buried heritage assets

Please refer to the following section (3) entitled 'Heritage & Archaeology' for details regarding potential for buried heritage assets.

Housing

We note that several representations included concern over a perceived lack of housing and affordable housing provided as part of the proposed scheme. To clarify, the Charity's aspirations for the site have consistently focused on delivering a policy compliant residential-led scheme, by ensuring 50% of the additional uplift in floorspace within the development is for housing (under Policy DP1) and policy compliant provision of affordable housing is incorporated into the design (under Policy DP3). As such, *of the 50 residential units proposed 40 are affordable dwellings, including 36 social rented units and 4 intermediate units* with 10 (within the retained Workhouse) being private sale units.

Consequently, the scheme would deliver a development that provides approximately 74% of it's housing as affordable accommodation, exceeding local policy requirements. We note that no social rented housing was completed in the borough last year and it has all but diminished within the Borough and more widely, in London. It is important to reaffirm that the Charity is also committed to securing the affordable housing in perpetuity and has been working with a Registered Provider to ensure the scheme is capable of being delivered.

The applicant has sought to maximise the number of dwellings on the site (including affordable housing) in discussion with Planning Officers. That includes the extent of provision under the 2004 S106 Agreement. It is agreed that the relevant policy tests for the amount of housing and especially affordable housing, have been met (and exceeded).

3. Heritage & Archaeology

Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA) were instructed to undertake a Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (DBA) of the application site. The report is enclosed with this submission.

The purpose of the study was to assess the impact on buried heritage assets (archaeological remains), especially in light of the representations made to the application. The DBA has found that in the case of the application site, buried heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals comprise:

- *Post-medieval burials* (moderate potential for intact burials, high potential for disarticulated remains) dating from the late 18th century to mid-19th century of medium or high heritage significance;
- *Late 18th to mid-19th century structural remains* associated with former workhouse buildings in the site (high potential), of low to medium heritage significance.

The DBA concludes by recommending a targeted field evaluation on site following consent and approval of the applications but that there should be no requirement for pre-permission works. The evaluation would seek to clarify the extent and condition of any potential burials and the likely impact of development. The results of the targeted field evaluation would subsequently enable an informed decision to be made on an appropriate mitigation strategy for any archaeological assets.

It is also important to note that the development on the site in the past, when no such heritage controls were in place, is likely to have meant that many potential remains have long since been removed though we acknowledge the need to address the matter appropriately.

4. Public Open Space & Landscaping Design

During post submission application meetings and subsequent workshops with Officers, detailed discussions were held regarding potential changes to the design and landscaping of the proposed public open space (POS). As such, the applicant has sought to revise the design and landscaping of the public open space, in accordance with Officer's comments.

Please refer to revised landscaping proposals and design revisions report enclosed within this submission for further details.

With regards to overshadowing of the scheme's proposed public open space please refer to the enclosed revised (specifically pp. 5 'Overshadowing') Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment April 2017 for further details.

5. Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)

Campbell Reith undertook an independent audit of the submitted BIA report and provided written feedback, including requests for further information. The applicant's ground conditions consultant (Aecom) has agreed the extent of work required to resolve the issues with Campbell Reith and the revised assessment will be submitted imminently.

6. Design Revisions

During post submission discussion with Officers several minor design changes were suggested. The applicant has sought to incorporate these changes including revisions to elevational details, layout revisions and the provision of additional balconies of the new mixed use building and the connecting lift block.

The changes are set out in full within the enclosed design revisions report and the full set of revised proposed drawings (revision A) also enclosed with this submission.

7. Affordable Workspace

Officers have identified a desire for inclusion of some 'affordable' workspace aimed at SMEs. We note that the adopted Core Strategy Policy CS8 '*Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy*' sets out the Council's overall strategy for the economy across the Borough. This includes encouraging '*a mix of employment facilities and types suitable for small and medium sized enterprises, such as managed affordable workspace*'. Adopted Policy DP13 – '*Employment premises and sites*' aims to support the delivery of that strategy. Policy DP13 sets out the detailed planning policy for ensuring sufficient sites are retained for a variety of commercial and industrial businesses to stay in or move to the Borough. Policy DP13 relates to existing employment premises and for sites or land which is suitable for continued business use, the policy requires the re-provision of employment floorspace to be able to accommodate a range of business types and sizes including SMEs. The application site is not, however, an existing employment site for the purposes of the policy. The Fitzrovia Area Action Plan (FAAP (2014) identifies the established use of the site as being for Medical/Healthcare use. As such, whilst we recognise that the Council seeks to *encourage* the provision of affordable workspace broadly across the whole of the Borough, the *requirement* in policy DP13 does not apply.

It is important to also note that the proposed B1 Business space (which the Council terms

‘commercial’) has been designed with Principle 4 of the FAAP in mind. Principle 4 states that the Council will support SMEs by seeking to ensure that where appropriate, new floorspace is designed flexibly to allow for occupation by SMEs. The proposed floor spaces are designed to allow for flexible subdivisions of the floor plates in accordance with that Principle.

We have reviewed the Employment Land Study produced by URS in 2014, which is part of the evidence base informing the Borough’s emerging Local Plan. Section 8.2 addresses the balance of demand and supply within the borough, and the policy options for both Grade A office space in Central London and space for start-ups and small businesses in the Borough. The Study found that in respect of Central London, although there is significant capacity in the identified opportunity areas and growth areas, demand for Grade A office space across Central London over the proposed Plan period (2016-2031) is strong, and so provision needs to be planned for.

With regard to space for Start-ups and Small Businesses, the study concludes that certain formats of space are in demand and should be encouraged. These include incubator, accelerators and co-working spaces (IACs) as there are particularly high concentrations of these across the Central Activity Zone (CAZ). However, the Study also advises caution, as the provision of IAC type spaces for SMEs and Start-ups has grown rapidly, with the commercial property market responding well to demand without public sector intervention. Subsequently, the Study notes that because the growth in the SME sector has been so rapid, the sustainability of growth in the Sector is questionable. As such, the study concludes by advising the Council supports the concept of SME workspace, but does not intervene unless there is clear evidence of local market failure. *The study proposes that policy support could be directed to the retention of existing premises that would allow SMEs to cohabit the space/building in Outer Borough locations, Kentish Town and Camden Town.* This is reflected in Policy DP13.

Furthermore the conclusions are backed up by the findings of the Property Market Assessment included within Chapter 6 of the Study. Section 6.9 specifically assesses workspace for Start-ups and Small businesses including SME workspaces and notes that London has seen a significant increase in the number of workspaces available to start ups and SMEs in recent years an increase also noted within the London Plan (Chapter 4). The Study states that circumstantial evidence also suggests that certain sectors prefer to cluster in areas where there is combination of flexible building stock, accessibility and amenities such as Tech City (the western area of which around Clerkenwell and Angel borders LB Camden’s boundary). The Study suggests that *anecdotally*, the shortage of affordable and readily usable workspace is hindering the growth of SMEs and there is a belief that these spaces will become even more common over the next few years as the market responds to demand.

In terms of the affordability of SME workspace, the Study considers whether it could be appropriate to introduce a form of ‘cap’ on rents for this type of workspace. It advises that there is *no evidence* for such a step to be introduced. Whilst the Study notes that there is some evidence of Local Authorities providing subsidised space in regeneration areas, these have tended to be because demand is low, as opposed to segments of demand (i.e. SMEs) being priced out of markets. As such, the Study suggests that due to the strength and vibrancy of the SME sector the market is finding a means of providing affordable space to occupiers not able to enter the more traditional market already without intervention.

The Council’s Economic Development Officer highlighted three recent example where affordable workspace had been provided as part of mixed use schemes in the Borough, these being 106 Camley Street (2011/5695/P), Panther House (2015/6955/P) and 5-6 Spring Place (2016/5181/P).

Whilst we welcome the Officer providing examples the development context and objectives for the proposed redevelopment at Middlesex Annex are very different to the examples suggested. Having reviewed the example schemes we note that all three sites involve the redevelopment and re-use of existing employment land, whereas the application site does not. Two (Camley Street and Spring Place) are identified as having existing B2 General Industry uses and Panther House comprised a mix of uses including A3 (restaurants and cafes), B1 office and C3 dwelling. By contrast, Middlesex Hospital Annex has lain largely vacant since 2006, its established previous use is D1 medical and the proposed scheme will be residential led (approx. 64% of total floorspace).

Unlike the proposed development at the application site, we note that two of the example schemes are employment led and whilst the scheme at Camley Street is residential, it is a student accommodation led scheme. Thus, all three schemes by the nature of the existing and proposed uses are inherently more employment focused and thus suited to providing affordable SME space than the development proposals at the application site. All three of the schemes also fail to provide a percentage of affordable housing close to that proposed at the application site (+70% provision).

The ability of the example sites to provide SME space is set against their shortfall in affordable housing i.e., they will not have been able to do both. The very clear emphasis on the application site is in providing housing as well as very significant levels of affordable housing.

In light of the number of factors affecting the delivery of the scheme, its emphasis on housing, current demand and the Council's own evidence, a requirement *on this site* for a planning obligation that secures rental incomes of the type sought is considered inappropriate.

8. Flexible B1 / D1 (Health Care) Use

As discussed with Officers, the applicant would like to explore the opportunity for introducing some flexibility in terms of the use of the non-residential element of the new build. As such the applicant has requested that the proposed description is amended to include a flexible '*B1/D1 (healthcare)*' use.

9. Sustainability & Air Quality

The Council's Sustainability Officer requested further details and clarifications regarding the proposed cooling hierarchy and landscaping strategy in terms of Green walls and Green/Blue roofs. Concern was raised by Officers regarding the use of Solar PV panels on the roof of the Workhouse. The applicant's sustainability consultant (Arup) has subsequently responded to the officers' request separately.

Similarly, Officers' requested clarifications regarding the submitted Air Quality Assessment and the modelling assumptions used. Subsequently the applicant's Air Quality consultant (Temple Group) and Sustainability consultant (Arup) have responded with the requested information separately.

10. Flood Risk & Drainage

Officer's requested further details regarding the micro drainage calculations and the likelihood of flooding occurring within the development in a 1 in 100 + 40% climate change event. The applicant's drainage consultant (Aecom) has responded separately.

11. Transport

Transport for London (TfL) support the scheme and principally, that it will be car free, Bedford Passage will be accessible 24/7 and that the scheme includes an appropriate quantum of cycle parking. Following TfL's request, the applicant has sought to accommodate larger bicycles by providing a number of larger cycle parking bays.

Feedback on the scheme from Camden's Highways Officer has highlighted several transport points requiring a response from the applicant. This included requests for further details regarding cycle access and types of storage, details on short and long stay cycle parking and details regarding servicing access, loading bays and management of vehicular access to Bedford Passage. Please refer to the design revisions report enclosed with this submission for further details and the applicant's transport consultant's response to the issues raised.

12. Timing of the Application

We trust that all the relevant information and clarifications has been provided to ensure the application will be considered by members at the next Planning Committee on the 11th May 2017.

Yours sincerely,

Temple Group
Encl.