



Middlesex Hospital Annexe Site  
44 Cleveland Street, W1T 4JU

For and on behalf of University  
College London Hospitals Charity  
(UCLHC)

**S73 planning application to vary  
planning permission 2017/0414/P  
& 2017/0415/LBC**

## Design & Access Statement

---



### Design team

Llewelyn Davies  
Temple  
Aecom  
Arup  
Crosby Transport Planning  
Urban counsel  
Delva Pateman Redlar

Issued - 18-03-29





# Contents / Introduction

## Introduction

## Pre Application Meeting with LB of Camden

### 1.0 Scheme Variations - Overview

Schedule of Areas Planning Consent  
Schedule of Area Amended Scheme

### 1.1 Approved Planning Scheme Issue to Address

- 1.1.1 Basement Floor Plan
- 1.1.2 Ground Floor Plan
- 1.1.3 1st Floor Plan
- 1.1.4 2nd Floor Plan
- 1.1.5 3rd Floor Plan
- 1.1.6 4th Floor Plan
- 1.1.7 5th Floor Plan
- 1.1.8 6th Floor Plan
- 1.1.9 7th Floor Plan

### 2.0 Existing Buildings - Market Housing Approved & Variation

#### Heritage Statement

### 2.1 The Workhouse

- 2.1.1 Basement Floor Plan
- 2.1.2 Ground Floor Plan
- 2.1.3 1st Floor Plan
- 2.1.4 2nd Floor Plan
- 2.1.5 3rd Floor Plan
- 2.1.6 4th Floor Plan
- 2.1.7 Roof
- 2.1.8 Proposed Cross Sections
  - East - West Section
  - North - South Section
- 2.1.10 Proposed Workhouse Elevations
  - North Elevation
  - South Elevation
  - East & West Elevation

### 2.2 North House - Approved & Variation

- 2.2.1 Basement Floor Plan
- 2.2.2 Ground Floor Plan
- 2.2.3 Upper Floor Plans
- 2.2.4 Existing Elevations
- 2.2.5 Proposed Elevations
  - Proposed Cross Section

### 2.3 South House - Affordable Intermediate Approved & Variation

- 2.3.1 Basement & Ground Floor Plan
- 2.3.2 Upper Floor Plan
- 2.3.3 Existing Elevations
- 2.3.4 Proposed Elevations
- 2.3.5 Existing Cross Section
- 2.3.6 Proposed Cross Section

### 3.0 Residential & Office - New Build Approved & Variation

### 3.1 New Build Issue to Address

### 3.2 Office / D1 - New Build

- 3.2.1 Basement Floor Plan
- 3.2.2 Ground Floor Plan
- 3.2.3 1st Floor Plan
- 3.2.4 2nd Floor Plan

### 3.2 Residential Affordable - New Build Approved & Variation

- 3.2.1 Basement Floor
- 3.2.2 Ground Floor Plan
- 3.2.3 1st Floor Plan
- 3.2.4 2nd Floor Plan
- 3.2.5 3rd Floor Plan
- 3.2.6 4th Floor Plan
- 3.2.7 5th Floor Plan
- 3.2.8 6th Floor Plan
- 3.2.9 7th Floor Plan
- 3.2.10 Roof Plan

### 3.3 Elevation & Sections Approved & Variation

- 3.3.1 Elevation 01 Bedford Passage
- 3.3.2 Elevation 02
- 3.3.3 Elevation 03
- 3.3.4 Elevation 04
- 3.3.5 Section AA
- 3.3.6 Section BB
- 3.3.7 Section CC
- 3.3.8 Section DD
- 3.3.9 Section EE
- 3.3.10 Section FF
- 3.3.11 Section GG
- 3.3.12 Section HH
- 3.3.13 Section JJ
- 3.3.14 Section LL

### 4.0 Roof Plant Visual Impact

- 4.1.1 View from Cleveland Street
- 4.1.2 View from Foley Street

### 5.0 Transport

- 5.1 Market Housing Cycle Parking
- 5.2 Affordable Housing Cycle Parking
- 5.3 Commercial & Health Cycle Parking

### 6.0 Schedule

- 6.1.1 Approved Planning Schedule
- 6.1.2 Revised Planning Schedule
- 6.2.1 Approved Planning Unit Mix
- 6.2.2 Revised Planning Unit Mix

# Introduction

---



# Introduction

## Overview

This report highlights the revised scheme for the Middlesex Annex development. The high level changes to the scheme are as follows:

### Existing Buildings - Market Housing Ground - 3rd Floor + Roof

**North House** All Floors  
Increase in town houses size to provide large family units.  
Units have been extended to incorporate basement floor space & courtyard garden.

**Listed Workhouse** All Floors  
Larger units reduced to create a further 3 units per floor on floors 1st, 2nd & 3rd.

### Affordable Intermediate Ground - 2nd Floor + Roof

**South House** Basement and Ground Floor  
  
Reconfigured to provide UKPN substation at basement floor level and community room at ground floor level. Minimal change to apartment at upper floor levels.

### New Build - Commercial Floors Basement - 2nd Floor

**D1**  
  
Basement Floor Level  
6 MRI scanners have been located within the basement to support the new Proton Beam development and the Macmillian Cancer Centre building.

To provide space for the 6 MRI scanners the basement footprint has been extended southwards. This will allow for a link at basement level to the Mental Health Site on Tottenham Mews.

**D1 & B1**  
  
Ground Floor Plan  
Ground Floor reconfigured to provide separate D1 & B1 entrance on the Bedford Passage. Office space is proposed for the majority ground floor.

D1 space and requirements are currently being discussed with UCLH Trust

**D1 & B1**  
  
1st & 2nd Floor Levels  
No change.

### New Build - Affordable Social Rented & Intermediate Basement - 7th Floor

Below is a list of overall changes to the affordable housing design:

- Overall apartment sizes have increased slightly. All units meet the London Housing Design Guide Standards.
- Bathrooms standardised and configured to 4 different types.
- Bathrooms and kitchens designed to stack for SVP's.
- Flats are now designed so that the kitchen/ living and/ or main bedrooms have access to the balconies. No single bedrooms (children room) have access to balconies for health and safety purposes.
- Flats redesigned to reduce circulation space and create further space within the rooms.
- Kitchens do not clash with windows – no bespoke kitchen units required.
- Store added in each flat to accommodate HIU units
- Winter garden removed to create a duplex flat and changed from a 2 bed unit to 3 bed duplex with terrace space.
- Washing machines integrated within the kitchen designs.

### New Build - Affordable & Commercial Roofspace 7th Floor

- The roof plan has been reconfigured to incorporate plant equipment, pv panels and green roof.

### Scheme Variation Document

The following reports have been submitted with this revised application:

Scheme Variation Document includes the following:

- Design & Access Statement
- Planning Statement by Temple
- Basement Impact Assessment by Aecom
- Transport Statement - contained within DAS, see section 5.0
- Heritage Statement - contained within DAS, see section 2.0
- Public Consultation - contained within DAS see section 7.0
- Plans, Sections & Elevations @ 1:200
- Plans, Sections & Elevations @ 1:100 for the Listed Workhouse, North House & South House

# Pre Application Meeting with LB of Camden



**Planning Solutions Team**  
**Planning and Regeneration**  
Culture & Environment  
Directorate  
London Borough of Camden  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
5 Pancras Square  
London  
N1C 4AG

[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

**Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> Feb 2018**  
**Our ref: 2018/1010/Pre**  
**Contact: Gavin Sexton**  
**Direct line: 020 7974 3231**  
**Email: [Gavin.Sexton@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Gavin.Sexton@camden.gov.uk)**

Mark Furlonger  
Temple Group Ltd  
The Woolyard,  
52 Bermondsey Street,  
London  
SE1 3UD

Dear Mark,

**Re: amendments to approved development at Middlesex Hospital Annex site 44 Cleveland Street (planning reference 2017/0414/P).**

Following our meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> January to discuss the above and review the document pack on the above [received on 30<sup>th</sup> January, accompanied by 'Scheme Variation' cover document ('Working Draft 29<sup>th</sup> Jan 2018')] in which we discussed the principle issues relating to the proposed amendments, I have set out detailed feedback below.

The amendments set out the following key alterations and each is addressed in order below:

1. Incorporation of MRI scanner facility in extended basement.
2. Extension to market housing floorspace through incorporation of lower ground floors to retained north houses
3. Changes to affordable housing layouts to improve and standardise units.
4. Works to listed building to sub-divide flats at levels 1-3.
5. Changes to ground floor of the south house to incorporate community facility
6. Minor design changes
7. Other issues

## 1. MRI facility

- The principle of the additional underground floorspace to support/provide an outpatient-style medical facility is acceptable.
- Any submission will need to be accompanied by an updated Basement Impact Assessment (BIA). See section 7 below. The BIA will need to be audited by the Council's independently engineers and the costs of the audit will need to be borne by the applicant, independent of any pre-application or application fee.
- A key potential impact of the basement is on the landscaping and the potential of the site to support trees of any scale or significance. It is understood that the extended basement would not be accompanied by additional lightwells or skylights and therefore the visual impact of the basement on the hard landscaping in Bedford Passage would be minimal. This is welcomed. Any application will need to include drawings detailing the depth/volume and size of proposed tree pits to ensure that the scheme maintains the potential for high quality planting.
- The expansion of the rooftop plant area may make it more visible than in the approved scheme. Any application should provide details of the proposed plant screening. Where the additional plant screen would be more visible in specific local views it would be helpful to have updated views submitted with the application in order to demonstrate the impact.

- A second commercial entrance would be added to the ground floor frontage. The proposals show that the main office entrance would be re-orientated to face Cleveland Street within the projecting ground floor. This would direct the focal point away from the Passage and the approach from the south via Tottenham Mews. Officers consider that the two commercial entrances should be given equal prominence directly onto the Passage, which would make them visible from all directions. This could be achieved by setting in the building line at ground floor so that the entrances align and could be achieved with minimal loss of floorspace.
- Transport impacts will need to be addressed within the submission (see item 7 below) but it seems likely that the additional numbers of visitors to the facility will not be significant in the context of the public use of Bedford Passage and therefore the impact of the development on local amenity and the public highway is unlikely to be significant.
- The increase in D1/commercial floorspace will trigger a corresponding increase in cycle parking requirements. As publically accessible facility it may be appropriate to increase the number of short-term cycle parking in the public realm for visitors.

## 2. Changes to market housing

- From the submitted figures it appears that the overall scheme would maintain a policy compliant uplift in housing when the new basement floorspace and market housing is incorporated. Similarly it appears that the increase in market housing floorspace remains matched by a policy compliant proportion of affordable housing (in the non-legacy element) within the scheme as a whole. These factors are an important policy consideration and should be confirmed within a supporting statement to any application.
- The principle of enlarging the market housing floorspace in the north houses is supported on the basis that it is based on evidence of existing lightwells in the same location and retained fabric at the lower level. Officers would expect to see the lightwells limited in size to no larger than is reasonably necessary to provide daylight and a degree of outlook. The lightwell should be detailed in a manner which is sensitive to the setting and sympathetic to the host building and adjacent listed building, through use of metal balustrading etc.
- The revisions to the dwelling mix is supported on the grounds that the mix of unit sizes in the market housing retains a focus on the 2- and 3- bed high priority dwelling sizes, in accordance with policy H7.
- The change in location of the basement cycle parking has made the link between the lift circulation lobby and the new store more convoluted than in the approved scheme. This should be revisited to provide direct access without dog-legs/tight corners to negotiate.

## 3. Changes to affordable housing layouts

- The scale of these changes appear to be generally modest. The replacement of the communal indoor and outdoor space at level 4 seems like a pragmatic and sensible use of the space. Officers would support the conversion of the remainder of the roof to a living roof.
- The reconfiguration of flats AL01, AL03, AL05 is acceptable, although moving the main living space to the corner of the building would provide lower quality outlook which is regrettable. You are encouraged to re-visit the positioning of windows on the west elevation to evaluate if more opportunity can be afforded for a view to the west from the affected living rooms.

## 4. Works to listed building

- A full set of amended elevation drawings has not been submitted so the full extent of proposed external changes cannot be assessed.
- The internal alterations do not appear to impact adversely on the legibility of the original floorplan and/or are being carried out in areas which have already received consent for alteration under the previous proposals.
- The proposed elevation numbers on the amended drawings don't match up fully with the proposed elevation numbers on the approved drawings.

# Pre Application Meeting with LB of Camden

- Approved drawing ref E\_LB\_03-04 (listed building proposed elevations 03 and 04) show one small rooflight on elevation 04 and the amended drawing ref E\_00\_01-02 (proposed elevations 01 and 02) shows two rooflights. This apparent addition is not shown on the approved or amended proposed roofplans so there may be a discrepancy with the originally submitted drawings.
- In any event officers have no objection in principle to 2 slightly larger, conservation style rooflights in the position shown on the amended drawing, subject to detailed design.
- Drawing ref E\_00\_01-02 appears to show something added to the roof (it looks like a solar PV panel) but this is not shown on the amended roofplan. Clarification on this is needed.
- Two small windows are also now shown at basement level on amended drawing ref E\_00\_01-02 and on the proposed floorplan. We have no objection to these in principle, again subject to detailed design; they are in keeping with other lower ground floor apertures found elsewhere on the building.

## 5. Community facility

- The relocation of the sub station in the south house and its replacement with a community facility is welcomed in terms of bringing the potential for new active uses to the street level.
- Policy C1 (community facilities) highlights that the long-term sustainability of community facilities is a particular concern as funding continues to decline and so we encourage providers to engage early in the development process with ward members and local communities, including Neighbourhood Forums where they exist. This ensures that local people can meaningfully input into a scheme's development and the nature of how they will be used.
- The policy is clear that we expect developers proposing new community facilities to reach agreement with the Council on its continuing maintenance and other future funding requirements. The Council would not accept responsibility for any future maintenance or funding arrangements.
- You are encouraged to provide details of who would manage the new facility, its targeted use, a strategy for its ongoing funding and details of how it would be provided at affordable (or nil) rates to local community users. If there are links between the use and the RP for the scheme we would welcome comments from the RP about the proposal.

## 6. Minor design changes

- It is noted that amendments have been made to the windows on the west and south elevations. These appear to follow internal reconfiguration, are relatively minor and they maintain the overall quality of the appearance. They should be highlighted as part of any application.

## 7. Other issues

- A planning application for the proposed amendments should be accompanied by the following documentation :
  1. A summary of design changes
  2. An update to the BIA and its supporting documents. The approved BIA did not include Middlesex House within the zone of influence of the basement works and this will need to be addressed within section 5 of an amended BIA.
  3. The changes to the Listed building and the proposed new lightwells should be addressed as part of an updated heritage statement.
  4. Due to the limited scale of the changes a covering planning statement will suffice to address the amendments so long as it includes the following details:
    - a. Overview of the MRI facility use – hours of operation, likely visitor numbers, transport implications of the MRI facility (servicing, increase trip generation, etc)

- b. Overview of the Community facility – users, management, ongoing funding, affordability and letting rates.
- c. Revised accommodation schedule – providing GEA and GIA figures for each use.
- d. Plant equipment – the approved Acoustic Report includes no details of mitigation – it is just a noise survey – it would be useful to have a statement on how the plant for the MRI would be accommodated and any necessary mitigation.
- e. Energy Use and Sustainability- implications of proposals on approval – including consideration of reduced PV panels on roof due to expansion of plant space, for example

- The proposed changes would require a Deed of Variation to the s106, with associated legal costs to be borne by the applicant. These would include :
  - a new Head of Term to cover the Community Facility
  - amended plans to reflect the revised affordable housing layout
  - possible financial supplement to Employment and Training contribution
  - any necessary amendments to the sustainability/energy Heads of Terms

## General conclusion

The principle of the proposals are supported by officers. They appear to maintain a policy compliant mix and proportion of uses, preserve the appearance of the proposed buildings and the conservation area, and would likely have limited impact on local amenity and the highway network. The expansion of the basement and its associated access, while acceptable in principle, has the potential to impact on the stability of neighbouring buildings, the landscaping in Bedford Passage and the legibility/appearance of the commercial frontage onto the Passage. Any planning application needs to demonstrate, with evidence, how these impacts would be mitigated.

If the opportunity arises we encourage you to share and discuss your proposals with your neighbours before submitting a planning application. We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would put up a notice on or near the site and advertise in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

It is likely that that a proposal of this size would be determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click [here](#).

**This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.**

If you have any queries about the above letter please do not hesitate to contact me on 020 7974 3231.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Gavin Sexton  
Principal Planner.  
Planning Solutions Team