

5th July 2017

Dear Ms Henry

Re: 2017/0415/L, demolition of the inside of the Workhouse at 44 Cleveland St and redevelopment into flats

2017/0414/P, destruction of the site and erection of an eight-storey tower block

I object to the proposed demolition of the Middlesex Hospital Annexe other than the Grade II Listed part of it on two principal grounds:

1. This development will destroy an historic ensemble including solid Nightingale Pavilions. The buildings are historic because they are the only such pavilion wards attached to a London workhouse that still survive. New research has shown that the Cleveland Street wards are unique examples of Pavilion wings, directly associated with Florence Nightingale herself. She was not only crucial to their design but sufficiently impressed by their quality and scale to plan the establishment of a second nursing school in Cleveland St. This lineage confers historical significance on the wards which should be recognized, not ignored as here, by developers eager to bulldoze them - and their historical significance - away.
2. The second ground for objecting to this proposal is its complete disregard for the significance of the land surrounding the buildings, which was a pauper burial site for half a century. The argument put forward by the developers - that previous disruption of the site from later building works nullifies its archeological importance - presumes that such building works

must have destroyed all human remains, an entirely evidence-free assumption, one which blatantly self-serves the developers' interests. The assumption is totally unacceptable and not a sufficient basis on which to dig up the site. It is sacred and consecrated ground. If, for any *legitimate* reason, the burial ground is to be disturbed, it deserves full respect.


No development should be permitted without a full scale archeological exploration of the site and its buildings. In its absence the dead deserve their peace to be respected.

I hope the Planning Committee will think long and hard before permitting destruction of this historically important and redolent health care site.

Yours faithfully,

Brian Hurwitz

Professor of Medicine and the Arts, King's College London.



Gentet, Matthias

From: HOWARD WINGFIELD [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 July 2017 11:45
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Objection to Planning Application re 44 Cleveland Street.

Dear Ms Henry,

I am writing to submit my strong objections to planning applications nos. 2017/0415/L and 2017/0414/P in advance of your Planning Committee meeting tomorrow (6th July 2017).

I assume that you have been made aware and have read the recent publication of an article by the distinguished historian Dr Ruth Richardson on the website 'Spitalfields Life'. If not, you can download it here: [Florence Nightingale in Cleveland St | Spitalfields Life](#)



**Florence Nightingale in
Cleveland St | Spitalfields Life**

Among other things, this clearly sets out the importance of the link of the so-called Nightingale Pavilions directly to Florence Nightingale and raises their architectural importance to something much greater than mere Victorian additions to the original, and listed, Strand Union Workhouse building. Their destruction would remove a unique complex of buildings which are an essential feature of the social and medical historical narrative that we have received as a legacy to be preserved and passed to future generations.

I urge you to seek to reject these applications.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Howard Wingfield MA, FIBMS, DMS.

49 Vine Road
Stoke Poges
Bucks. SL" 4DW

Gentet, Matthias

From: HOWARD WINGFIELD [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 July 2017 17:00
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Re. Planning Application 44 Cleveland Street.

Dear Ms Henry,

Further to my email today regarding Planning Nos. 2017/0415/L and 2017/0414/P I wish to submit these further objections to the granting of these applications.

I do not agree that the relevant NPPF guidance has been adequately met, in particular those detailed in Paras 128 and 129:

National Policy Planning Framework
March 2012

Dept. Of Communities & Local Government.

128. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

129. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected

by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

In addition, I do not agree that the development of the curtilage has been shown to demonstrate Optimal Viable Use, as described for example by Historic England:

Historic England

"If there are a range of alternative ways in which an asset could viably be used, the optimum use is the one that causes the least harm to the significance of the asset, not just through necessary initial changes but also as a result of subsequent wear and tear likely future changes"

Howard Wingfield MA, FIBMS, DMS

49 Vine Road
Stoke Poges
Bucks. SL2 4DW

Gentet, Matthias

From: Joanna Moncrieff [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 July 2017 00:47
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: 2017/0415/L and 2017/0414/P - Former workhouse,, Cleveland Street

Dear Ms Henry

I strongly object to the plans for the former workhouse in Cleveland Street. This building is very much part of London's history and deserves recognition and to be preserved in its whole.

Although I don't live in the area I am a tour guide who regularly brings visitors to the area and I believe there is a real reason for the buildings to be kept and used as they are to keep London's chequered history alive and in people's minds.

Kind regards

Joanna Moncrieff

15a Buxton Road
Chingford
London E4 7DP

Gentet, Matthias

From: Emma.Barker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 05 July 2017 23:19
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: planning applications 2017/0414/P and 2017/0415/L

Dear Ms Henry,

I am writing as a Camden resident to protest at the proposed redevelopment of the workhouse on 44 Cleveland street. I am appalled at the threat to rip down yet more of the historic fabric of the borough (or at the very least redevelop so that almost none of its historic character survives).

There has already been far too much building of luxury accommodation in Camden – there is a severe need for proper affordable housing and, given its history, this would surely be an ideal site for this purpose.

Many thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Barker
106 Thanet House
Thanet Street
London WC1H 9QG

Gentet, Matthias

From: Hurwitz, Brian [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 July 2017 11:45
To: Henry, Kate
Subject: Re: 2017/0415/L: demolition of the inside of the Workhouse at 44 Cleveland St and redevelopment into flats 2017/0414/P: destruction of the site and erection of an eight-storey tower block
Attachments: Cleveland Street July 2017.docx

Dear Ms Henry,

Please find attached a letter objecting to the current proposals to redevelop 44 Cleveland Street which I would like the Planning Committee to see and take account of in coming to their decision.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Brian Hurwitz