

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Liisu Pall	73 Great Eastern Street	05/07/2017 14:18:46	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:
2017/0414/P	Dominic C	45 Cleveland Street	05/07/2017 17:14:02	OBJ	I am writing to oppose planning applications numbers 2017/0414/P and 2017/0415/L. Neither of these developments should be approved. Development should NOT go ahead at this time, especially as Florence Nightingale involvement in its design is still being investigated.

The site should be seen as a whole, and as such worth preserving: by now, this is most talked about workhouse worldwide, due to its association with Charles Dickes and, more recently, Florence Nightingale. We should preserve it as a rare example of 'history of the poors' rather than demolish most it to make space for an 8 floor monstrosity which will loom over a listed part of the building, totally dwarfing it. Nobody seems to care that this is a conservation area either: it is and such reckless distruction should not be allowed on it.

It seems that the main objective of the development is to create housing, but actually a large portion is destined to commercial development. This should not be allowed, as the building as it is can provide possibly more housing than the meager 38 affordable units proposed (which are not enough in any case).

The entire site is consecrated ground, buried very deep with London poor. It is disgraceful to dig up remains, especially of those poor who thought they had found at last their final resting place.

It is equally disgraceful to think that luxury flats will in part occupy what was once the home of London poorest. This proposal makes a mockery of that difficult period and this plan should be rejecte to respect those less fortunate who lived centuries and AND the less fortunate of today.

The council has received hundreds of objections: the only democratic and just thing to do is to listen to people's voices and categorically deny permission. Anything else is an abuse.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Charlotte Brown	30 Portman square	05/07/2017 15:17:11	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:
2017/0414/P	Natalie	29 faith court coopers road SE15HD	06/07/2017 16:15:59	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"> - Florence Nightingale"s involvement with the pavillion wards has been recently discovered. In particular, the architect of the new Pavilion wings, John Giles, knew Florence Nightingale's Notes on Hospitals and conferred directly with her concerning the design of Pavilion Wards. Also, these Nightingale Pavilions are unique in England: Historic England know of no other instance. These wards need re-evaluation and preservation. - 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 8 floor development behind the Workhouse is totally disproportionate to the size of the listed building, which is less than half its size. The law stipulates that 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. This should not be allowed. - 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. Similarly, images survive of the original front porch which should be reinstated. We have lost enough heritage in this country! The Euston Arch and St Pancras Station are precedents in this case – two Camden buildings, the one controversially destroyed and the other preserved for new use. Which one was a victory for the city?? These buildings deserve to be preserved as witness to this history and re-used to provide much-needed good quality housing for Londoners. 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	Zeljka Dragas	Innere Loewenstr. 6 96047 Bamberg	05/07/2017 20:31:30	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 significantly below the stipulation set out by the policy. The owners are required to provide more such units - losing just one would be detrimental. - This property has a graveyard in the back of the building, yet the planning application glosses over it entirely. So that the resting place of thousands of people whose resting place was right here in the Workhouse ground! This is not right. - Furthermore, proposed development seems to put cars above the importance of this 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 out of proportion in regards to the size of the listed building, which is on the order of half its size. This contrast is not allowed and not in line with the law, which states that a listed building should be preserved in its environment. An 8 story block more than twice the height of the Workhouse overshadow it. - The proposed development does not include 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. Losing heritage in has to stop! - Transforming the listed Workhouse into luxury flats is an abomination; building which 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. To allow the proposed development would mean a negation of values for which Camden has always stood.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	Sarah Black	41 Bedford square	06/07/2017 01:24:46	COMMNT	<p>I am writing to oppose planning applications numbers 2017/0414/P and 2017/0415/L. Neither of these developments should be approved. Development should NOT go ahead at this time, especially as Florence Nightingale involvement in its design is still being investigated.</p> <p>The site should be seen as a whole, and as such worth preserving: by now, this is most talked about workhouse worldwide, due to its association with Charles Dickes and, more recently, Florence Nightingale. We should preserve it as a rare example of 'history of the poors' rather than demolish most it to make space for an 8 floor monstrosity which will loom over a listed part of the building, totally dwarfing it. Nobody seems to care that this is a conservation area either: it is and such reckless distruction should not be allowed on it!</p> <p>It seems that the main objective of the development is to create housing, but actually a large portion is destined to commercial development. This should not be allowed, as the building as it is can provide possibly more housing than the meager 38 affordable units proposed (which are not enough in any case).</p> <p>The entire site is consecrated ground, buried very deep with London poor. It is disgraceful to dig up remains, especially of those poor who thought they had found at last their final resting place.</p> <p>It is equally disgraceful to think that luxury flats will in part occupy what was once the home of London poorest. This proposal makes a mockery of that difficult period and this plan should be rejecte to respect those less fortunate who lived centuries and AND the less fortunate of today.</p> <p>The council has received hundreds of objections: the only democratic and just thing to do is to listen to people's voices and categorically deny permission. Anything else is an abuse.</p>
2017/0414/P	Emerson Soriano	562 Hanworth Road	10/07/2017 09:31:39	OBJ	<p>I write to oppose planning application number 2017/0414/P. This development should not be allowed to go ahead as this is a piece of still uncharted London history, we need more time to discover everything about it before a final decision can be made about its future! Development should NOT go ahead at this time, especially as the history of Florence Nightingales' involvement in its design is still being investigated.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a deep graveyard in the back of the building. Desecrating the resting place of thousands of people who have had their permanent resting place for centuries in the Workhouse ground, is unacceptable.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0414/P	James Newey	118 grange park road London E10 5EU	06/07/2017 11:05:07	COMMNT	<p>- it was recently revealed/discovered that Florence Nightingale was involved with the pavillion wards. Ruth Richardson revealed that the architect of the new Pavilion wings, John Giles, knew Florence Nightingale's Notes on Hospitals and discussed directly with her about the Pavilion Wards. These wards need re-evaluation and preservation.</p> <p>- 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.</p>
