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Executive Summary

The medical facilities at Middlesex Hospital have been progressively transferred to a new hospital building on Euston Road in the London Borough of Camden during 2005, and the current hospital buildings will be vacated by Spring 2006. This brief covers the main hospital block bounded by Mortimer Street, Nassau Street, Riding House Street and Cleveland Street, and a smaller related site to the north, MacDonald Buchanan House, is included as an appendix.

The brief aims to ensure an integrated approach to redevelopment of the site in order to maximise townscape, amenity and community benefits.

The brief sets out several restrictions that will apply to any redevelopment of the site. The main hospital site is within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) where it will be appropriate to accommodate some commercial uses, such as offices and shops. But the site offers an important opportunity to provide a substantial number of housing units and make a significant contribution to meeting the City Council’s housing target. Accordingly, the brief requires at least half of the site to be developed for housing.

It would also be desirable to meet the demonstrable needs of the local community by providing facilities for public use.

The site lies within the East Marylebone Conservation Area and contains two listed buildings, including the Grade II* listed chapel, which will need to be retained. Redevelopment of the non-listed main hospital block would bring opportunities to improve the area’s townscape, but there are some non-listed frontages within the site that positively contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area and are worthy of retention.
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1. Introduction

1.1 The University College London Hospitals NHS Trust ("the Trust") is in the process of bringing all its NHS services together on one site at Euston Road in the London Borough of Camden. The new hospital building on Euston Road has replaced the hospital facilities at Middlesex Hospital and surrounding smaller sites. These buildings will no longer be required for NHS purposes and are to be disposed of.

1.2 Phase 1 of the Euston Road hospital was commissioned in Spring 2005. The transfer of most functions from Middlesex Hospital took place in Autumn 2005. The medical school facilities on the Middlesex Hospital site will move out in early 2006 so that the hospital buildings will finally be vacant in Spring 2006.

1.3 The purpose of this planning brief is to provide a planning framework for the future development of the Middlesex Hospital site bounded by Mortimer Street, Cleveland Street, Riding House Street and Nassau Street. The brief provides guidance to potential developers on the alternative uses and form of development that may be considered acceptable. Proposals will be judged on their merits against the criteria set out in this planning brief and UDP policies.

1.4 There are a number of buildings to the north of the main hospital site, north of Riding House Street, which provide nurses and hostel accommodation and ancillary office accommodation for the Trust. McDonald Buchanan House on Ogle Street is included as an appendix to this brief as it is likely to be disposed of at the same time as the main hospital building. The other buildings will continue to be used for health worker residential accommodation, ancillary office accommodation, and the provision of a new community centre for Fitzrovia (as part of a s.106 agreement in connection with the Phase 1 hospital development on Euston Road in Camden) and are not therefore included in this brief.

Planning policy framework

1.5 The statutory development plan for Westminster is the Unitary Development Plan adopted in 1997. However, the Replacement UDP is at a very advanced stage and is being used for development control purposes by the Council. The planning brief has therefore been prepared within the context of the policies in the Westminster draft Replacement UDP (UDP) approved by Full Council in December 2004.

1.6 The UDP is the subject of a Direction under section 17(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, issued by the First Secretary of State on 9 December 2004. The Direction relates only to policies for affordable housing, but it prevents the adoption of the whole plan.
1.7 The Direction and the subsequent revisions to the affordable housing policy considered by Cabinet on 12 December 2005 do not affect housing schemes within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) comprising over 25 homes. As the main hospital site is within the CAZ and likely to provide well in excess of 25 homes, the site is unaffected by the Direction. (MacDonald Buchanan House is outside CAZ and the revised affordable housing policy will be applied to this site).

1.8 The brief also takes account the Mayor’s London Plan (2004) which sets out the strategic planning policies for London.

1.9 The brief will be regarded as a material consideration in the assessment of any planning application.
2. Summary of Development Opportunities

2.1 The City Council believes that the Middlesex Hospital site is an important opportunity to create a lively mixed use development in the Fitzrovia area. The hospital occupies an important part of the East Marylebone Conservation Area and includes two Listed Buildings. Any
redevelopment proposals will need to be of the highest architectural and urban design qualities.

2.2 The City Council will expect any scheme to:

- Incorporate a mix of activities including residential, commercial, retail, leisure, social and community facilities and public open space which will enhance the varied character of this part of Fitzrovia
- Include at least 50% residential floorspace with at least 30% of the residential units being affordable, and 5% to be for key workers
- Provide a high quality design that will positively enhance the character and appearance of this part of the East Marylebone Conservation Area and provide an appropriate setting for the Listed Buildings.

3. The Site and Surrounding Area

The site

3.1 The Middlesex Hospital site lies within the East Marylebone Conservation Area and adjacent to the western boundary of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area (in the London Borough of Camden). The site is bounded by Mortimer Street, Nassau Street, Riding House Street and Cleveland Street and has an area of 1.2ha and was until recently entirely in hospital use. The site is occupied by a large number of different buildings dating from the 18th Century to the 1980’s. Whilst the existing buildings are internally linked, in townscape terms the site comprises a number of discrete elements, as set out in the following paragraphs.

3.2 The “H” building: This building fronts onto Mortimer Street, with a side elevation to Cleveland Street. It provides the main entry to the Hospital, which is reached via a surface car park. Constructed in 1929, it comprises seven levels, plus roof level, and a basement and sub-basement. It has been much altered internally and provides most wards and theatres.

3.3 10 Mortimer Street: This Grade II Listed Building lies on the corner of Mortimer Street and Nassau Street and is four storeys, designed in the Arts and Crafts Tudor style. 10 Mortimer Street is linked to the “H” building to the east by a building of six storeys.

3.4 Buildings fronting the length of Nassau Street: a series of unlisted buildings built at the beginning of the 20th Century. They are four to five storeys with stone and brick facades and are linked internally to the main H block and 10 Mortimer Street.
3.5 **The Grade II* listed chapel** - between the “H” building and the buildings fronting Nassau Street. The chapel is the only remaining portion of the earlier hospital building and was constructed in 1891. It is of Italian Gothic style, with ornate mosaic and marble interior decoration.

3.6 The north eastern part of the site is occupied by a number of buildings of 3-4 storeys which, together with the “H” building form the enclosure for a pleasant inner courtyard/garden, which contains a number of mature trees. The building on the corner of Riding House Street and Cleveland Street is linked to the building on the north of Riding House Street by a bridge at second storey.

3.7 To the west of this group, two modern buildings infill the area east of the buildings fronting Nassau Street, including a four storey building on Riding House Street containing servicing facilities and the seven storey building behind occupied by the Medical School.

**The surrounding area**

3.8 The site lies in an area of mixed use (see Plan 2). The Central Activities Zone (CAZ) boundary, which runs along Riding House Street, reflects the general change from predominantly residential usage to the north, to a more mixed use character to the south.

3.9 Immediately to the north of the site lies the All Souls’ School (listed Grade II) and several buildings occupied by the Hospital. North of Foley Street lies the John Astor House nurses accommodation, which is surrounded on three sides by predominantly residential buildings, generally of a smaller scale. On the western side of Nassau Street the main uses are residential and commercial. On the southern side of Mortimer Street the larger scale of buildings reflects the mixture of retail, office and showroom uses interspersed with residential accommodation. The block on the eastern side of Cleveland Street is again of a smaller residential scale and is somewhat dwarfed by the bulk of the existing Hospital building on the opposite side of the street. The terrace is principally in residential use but there are also some commercial uses and an annex of the hospital. All these buildings are to be retained.
Plan 2 – Land uses
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4. Potential Uses

4.1 The following section indicates the range and type of uses likely to be acceptable to the City Council on this site. The uses included are not exhaustive and all schemes submitted will be judged on the overall balance of uses proposed and the effect on the townscape and amenity of the nearby residential communities. All redevelopment proposals should accord with the relevant criteria as set out in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

Plan 3 – UDP policy areas (see also plan 4)
Mixed uses in the Central Activities Zone (CAZ)

4.2 Particular regard should be had to policies CENT 3, COM 2 and H 3 as the site lies within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) as defined in the UDP (see Plan 3). Policy CENT 3 requires the provision of residential accommodation where there is an increase in commercial floorspace within the CAZ. The residential accommodation should comprise an amount of floorspace equivalent to the increase in commercial floorspace. Policy COM 2 sets the same requirement but only applies to increases in office floorspace in the CAZ. The aim of the policies is to promote mixed use development incorporating housing wherever appropriate and practical in the central area.

Residential

4.3 Policies CENT 3 and COM 2 also aim to contribute to meeting the strategic need to provide more housing in London. The hospital site is an important opportunity to provide new housing and contribute to meeting the strategic housing target for Westminster set out in policy STRA 14 of the UDP. Policy H3 seeks to maximise the amount of land in housing use, where appropriate, within the CAZ and in association with commercial and other developments. The hospital site is sufficiently large to accommodate mixed use development with a substantial amount of housing on site and the Council will expect at least 50% of the floorspace on this site to be for residential use in order to contribute to meeting the strategic housing need.

4.4 The priority of the UDP is to increase housing provision, wherever possible, and to protect the residential environment in order to sustain thriving local communities. To this end, the Plan includes policies to encourage the provision of more housing, secure affordable housing for residents, and to protect the amenity of existing residents. In Westminster, there are very few sites capable of providing a substantial net increase of housing on previously non-residential land and, as such a site, the Middlesex Hospital site is an ideal opportunity to achieve a substantial number of new residential units of high quality architecture and urban design.

4.5 For this reason any scheme for the site must include a substantial residential element, i.e. a minimum of 50%. Whilst normally this proportion may be reduced by other planning considerations (such as any physical constraints on the site, the character and function of the locality and any particular opportunities presented by the site or proposed development) these constraints are unlikely to apply to the Middlesex Hospital site. Only the provision of community facilities on the site, in compliance with UDP policy SOC 1, will be exempt from this requirement. The provision of more than 50% residential will be encouraged subject to compliance with other policies and requirements.
applying to the site, including the achievement of a vibrant mix of uses on the site.

**Affordable Housing**

4.6 In line with policies STRA 14 and H 4, the City Council will require 30% of the housing to be for affordable housing and for this to be provided on the site. 25% should be for residents in housing need and 5% for key workers. The affordable housing should provide suitable accommodation for its likely occupants. This is likely to comprise two and three bedroom units. One bedroom and two bedroom dwellings may be suitable for some key workers but accommodation smaller than two bedroom is unlikely to be suitable for residents in housing need. The Council may require a proportion of the affordable housing to be suitable for households with particular needs e.g. households containing a disabled person.

4.7 The City Council will require developers to meet the equivalent of the land cost element of the affordable housing rather than the total cost of the completed affordable housing units where the City Council can contribute funding in the form of social housing grant. This will have the added benefit of requiring the affordable housing to meet the rules and regulations of the Housing Corporation and will require a much simpler legal agreement between the developer and the City Council to ensure the provision, management and retention in perpetuity of the affordable housing.

4.8 Affordable housing could be provided via a housing association, rented or shared ownership or discounted home ownership schemes and, where possible, should be designed and located to avoid polarisation. Applicants are advised to contact the Director of Housing for advice on this matter.

4.9 The provision of student accommodation by local institutions such as the University of Westminster will be encouraged in line with policy SOC 3(B). The University has a requirement for an additional 800 student beds in the central London area part of which could be met on the hospital site and would be convenient for other University facilities. Student accommodation would not be considered part of the affordable housing requirement under policy H 4 of the UDP. As the site is owned by an NHS Trust, its future use could also be an effective opportunity to help meet the housing needs of health care workers in central London.

**Housing Mix and Family Housing**

4.10 The City Council wishes to encourage families to live in Westminster and so policy H 5 requires a range of housing sizes. This will be applied to all housing on the development site, i.e. both affordable and private sector housing. The Council will require 33% of the housing units to be family-sized (3 or more bedrooms) and 5% of this family housing to have five or more habitable rooms. The range of housing
sizes is necessary in Westminster to ensure larger households, especially families, will not lose the chance to live in the City, where smaller accommodation is normally provided.

4.11 High quality amenity and private space should be included for the family sized units in particular. Where possible, this should be in the form of private ground floor amenity space or courtyards but could also include balconies and roof level gardens provided they are well designed and form an integral part of the architectural approach. General open space requirements are set out in paragraph 4.23.

**Mobility Housing**

4.12 In accordance with policy H8, the City Council will require that all new housing units meet the Lifetime Homes Standard and that 10% of the dwellings should be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. This percentage applies to both the market and affordable housing elements of the scheme. Dedicated off-street parking spaces must be provided in association with these units. New dwellings are required to have access and facilities for disabled people under Part M of the Building Regulations. The Council expects dwellings to be designed to the Lifetime Homes Standard to provide housing that is more flexible and adaptable than that required under Part M and so is more suitable for older or disabled people. Further advice can be found in the Joseph Rowntree publication ‘Meeting Part M and designing Lifetime Homes’ (1999).

**Density**

4.13 The site falls into the density range 400-850 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh) as set out in policy H11 of the UDP. However, any development of this site will be assessed primarily having regard to the proposed mix, bulk, layout and compliance with other relevant standards and policies set out in the UDP, including in particular the provision of public and private amenity space, and sunlight/daylight controls.

**Hostels**

4.14 UCLH provides hostel accommodation for doctors, nurses and students on smaller sites immediately north of the hospital, north of Riding House Street. The Trust has advised that the hostel accommodation is to be retained to meet the needs of the relocated hospital at Euston Road. This is consistent with the Council’s view that every effort should be made by the establishment concerned to ensure that adequate accommodation is provided. The Council wishes to retain hostels and would require the Trust to demonstrate that the hostel is not required as a hostel before disposal in order to prove that
it is surplus to requirements under policy H 6 of the UDP. The Council would also carry out its own assessment of demand.

Social, Community and Health Uses

4.15 The City Council’s policies for the provision of social and community, health, educational, leisure and recreational facilities, including open space, are contained in Chapter 6 of the UDP.

Health Uses

4.16 The loss of the hospital facilities would be contrary to UDP Policies SOC 1 and SOC 4 if no replacement facilities were provided on site or in the City. The Westminster Primary Care Trust is interested in developing primary health care facilities at this site. Assessment of the need for facilities should be included in a Health Impact Assessment (see paragraph 7.3).

Social and Community Facilities

4.17 In order to sustain viable, flourishing local communities it is essential to make adequate provision for social and community facilities. Without facilities and premises, services cannot operate satisfactorily. The present use of this site as a NHS Hospital is providing a service which is beneficial to local people, residents and workers. The vacation of the present Hospital buildings creates the opportunity to provide a range of facilities intended to serve both the resident population and those working in the area. Policy SOC 1(A) and (E) of the UDP seeks the provision of community facilities on appropriate sites such as this.

4.18 There is already considerable pressure on the demand for primary school places in Westminster, with a persistent shortfall of places in the north of the City, with continued population growth in child numbers forecast. This shortfall will be significantly exacerbated by the impact of any major residential development, and by those which include predominantly family units, particularly affordable housing, in line with UDP policy. Redevelopment of the hospital could provide an opportunity to expand All Souls CE Primary School from one to two forms of entry, plus an enlarged nursery, contributing to the future need for additional primary school and childcare places in the area. It also provides the opportunity to provide additional play space in a constrained urban setting at a school that falls far short of existing DfES guidelines. A contribution from developers, either through S106 or any other valid mechanism, could be earmarked to meet the costs of enhanced education provision. Guidance on the level of contribution will be set out in the Council’s SPG on planning obligations.

4.19 There is a long-established need in the area for a new, purpose-designed and built community centre. The development of the new hospital on Euston Road includes the provision of a new 400sqm
community centre in John Astor House as planning gain. As the agreed space to be provided is insufficient to meet the identified needs of the community, the City Council will encourage the provision and/or funding of additional facilities as planning benefit/obligation. In addition to the development of the community centre, the Fitzrovia Trust intends to refurbish the swimming pool in John Astor House and manage it for the use of the community. The City Council will encourage a developer contribution to funding the refurbishment project.

4.20 This part of Westminster is particularly under resourced in terms of nursing home facilities for elderly people and special needs housing/hostel for mentally ill people and people with learning difficulties. There is also a lack of day time services for people with a mental health problems in Central London. Such services include day care and support employment and training opportunities and leisure and educational activities. In this part of Central London some of those people with mental health problems will have been homeless and need to re-acquire day-to-day living skills. The City Council would welcome the provision of a facility, or facilities, which enable these services to be provided. The Directors of Social Services and Housing should be contacted for further advice.

**Childrens Playspace and Childcare Provision**

4.21 Policy SOC 6 (A) of the UDP requires children’s play space and facilities to be provided as part of new developments which include 25 or more family housing units. The City Council has identified a need for additional open play space for use by nearby All Soul's School (see paragraph 4.18 above). The School (and the area to the north of Riding House Street) is in a Priority Area for additional play space, as identified in policy SOC 6 (B) the UDP, and the school itself is very short of play space. At present all games take place off site. Therefore, the City Council would expect the provision of additional on-site or local multi-use play space. This could form part of the public open space - see below. There are various options for managing the additional playspace, including grant aid to the voluntary sector, funding from a Learning and Skills Council (LSC) or sponsorship. The Director of Education should be contacted for further advice.

4.22 The City Council recognises that the provision of childcare is vital in enabling people, especially women, to take up paid work. For this reason, in line with policy SOC 2, the City Council will encourage the provision of nursery facilities, adjacent to All Souls' School, to meet current identified and future demand.

**Public Open Space**

4.23 The East Marylebone area has been identified as being deficient in small areas of local public open space for use by residents and the Council will encourage the provision of new open space in line with
policy ENV 15 (Plan 4). The inner courtyard of the main hospital block could be retained and opened up for public use in an imaginative way in order to help to meet the open space needs of the area. If the inner courtyard of the main Hospital block is not retained then alternative public open space should be provided elsewhere on the site. Accessible public seating should also be provided in any new open space.

**Plan 4 – UDP policy areas (see also plan 3)**

---

4.24 The new public open space should be easily accessible and be designed to meet nature conservation objectives and to deter crime. In particular, the space should be capable of good all-round natural surveillance and the planting should be designed to maintain visibility
and to minimise opportunities for concealment. The planting scheme should as far as possible use native species (or those with a proven value for wildlife) and different planting structures. Further guidance is provided in the City Council's Nature Conservation Strategy Action Plan (1997) and the City of Westminster local Biodiversity Action Plan (2000).

Shopping and Services

4.25 The City Council's policies for the provision of shops and services are contained in Chapter 7 of the UDP. The City Council will expect the provision of retail uses at street level, particularly on the Mortimer Street frontage, to comply with policy SS 4 which seeks the provision of new retail uses in the CAZ, and some appropriate local facilities may be permitted on Cleveland Street. The majority of floorspace should be for A1 use to provide local shopping facilities. Some A3 uses may be acceptable provided they can be located and serviced in a manner that would not be harmful to residential amenity and comply with policies TACE 8-10 of the UDP. The emphasis should be on small scale restaurants and cafes as the site lies close to the northern limit of the CAZ where it would not be appropriate to encourage late night activity.

Cultural and Entertainment Uses

4.26 Policies on cultural and entertainment uses are set out in Chapter 8 of the UDP. The City Council considers it important to make provision for the enjoyment and practice of the arts as well as general social activities for local communities. In view of the Middlesex Hospital's location in the CAZ uses such as an arts centre, exhibition centre, theatre, cinema, etc. may be considered acceptable subject to the impact on the amenity of the existing and future residential occupiers in the area and the highway, parking and servicing aspects. Late night uses or other noisy entertainment uses are unlikely to be acceptable in this area and these uses would be contrary to policies TACE 8-10 of the UDP. These policies apply to A3, A4, A5, nightclubs and D2 uses, including casinos.

Office Use

4.27 General office space would also be acceptable subject to the attainment of an acceptable overall balance of uses on the site in compliance with policies CENT 3, COM 2 and H3 of the UDP and the other requirements of this brief. The City Council seeks to maintain and enhance the mixed use character of the CAZ and expects office development on sites within the CAZ to provide accommodation for activities which contribute to the character and function of that particular locality. This area is characterised by small businesses requiring flexible small office space. The provision of small offices would be particularly appropriate on this site and any office development would be expected to comply with the requirements of
policy COM 4(C) of the UDP. Access and service cores should be located and designed to facilitate the sub-division of buildings and enable the provision of a range of small office accommodation.

**Creative Industries Special Policy Area**

4.28 This part of Fitzrovia falls within the designated Creative Industries Special Policy Area (Plan 3). The inclusion, perhaps at first floor level, of smaller scale studio space suitable for craft, light industrial/media type activities in accordance with policy COM 9 would be welcomed. Some of the space might be linked with retail uses on the ground floor. The City Council would wish to reserve some of this space for light industrial (Class B1 (c)) use by legal agreement.

**Hotel Use**

4.29 Policy 3D.6 of the London Plan (2004) aims to focus new hotel provision within the central London sub-region on Opportunity Areas (London’s major regeneration areas) and accommodate smaller scale provision in the sub-region’s town centres and CAZ fringe locations. Policy TACE 2 of the UDP permits new hotels in the CAZ in streets which are not predominantly residential in character, provided no adverse environmental and traffic effects would be generated. Adequate facilities would need to be provided within the the site.

4.30 The UDP recognises that hotels contribute to the function and character of the CAZ, for example through linkages with theatres, restaurants, major tourist attractions, shopping and services such as exhibition and convention centres and main line railway termini. In residential areas, however, the impact of hotel development can result in many environmental problems, especially from coaches and taxis. Generally, hotels are not compatible with residential neighbourhoods because of the intensity of activity they generate and the Council would prefer commercial uses other than a hotel to be provided at this location.

4.31 Given the size of the Middlesex Hospital site, the fact that the site is within the CAZ and that the area to the south of the site is predominantly commercial in character, the location of a hotel on the southern frontage of the site may be acceptable. However, the opportunity is likely to be limited by the requirement under policy TACE 2(A) to provide adequate off-street servicing and access for taxis and coaches. Also, there should be no significant impact on the amenity of existing and future residential and commercial occupiers to the north and east. Proposals which would have a significant detrimental impact on residential accommodation or the environment would be unacceptable. Conditions may be attached to ensure that functional areas, such as restaurants, bars, conference and banqueting facilities, are restricted to use by resident hotel guests only and that such areas
are only used in conjunction with the main use of the building as a hotel.

**Public Toilets**

4.32 In line with policy SOC 8 of the UDP the site is an opportunity to provide new public conveniences, including baby changing facilities. The requirement for public conveniences will depend on the eventual mix of uses. New public conveniences should be fully accessible.
5. Design and Conservation

5.1 The site lies within the East Marylebone Conservation Area (Plan 5), a brief description of which is included as Background Paper (A). The City Council’s policies relating to Urban Design and Conservation are set out in Chapter 10 of the UDP, and more detailed design guidance is set out in ‘Design Matters in Westminster’ (2001). The site is also adjacent to the Charlotte Street West Conservation Area and the Charlotte Street Conservation Area in Camden, and there are listed buildings facing the site on Cleveland Street, Riding House Street and Nassau Street.
5.2 As the site is within a conservation area and contains historic buildings, the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance: “Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings” and “Demolition and Development in Conservation Areas” are relevant. Reference should also be made to the draft East Marylebone Conservation Area Audit (October 2005). The Council’s expectations for new buildings are set out in the SPG “Design Matters in Westminster”. The advice of central government as set out in Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) and Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) is also relevant (and in particular sections 3 and 4 of PPG15). The application of the above policy and guidance to the Hospital site is set out below.

5.3 The site occupies an important part of the East Marylebone Conservation Area and its redevelopment represents a valuable opportunity to enhance the character and appearance of the area. The City Council expects any redevelopment scheme to be of the highest architectural and urban design qualities.

Retention and Demolition of Existing Buildings.

5.4 There are two listed buildings within the main hospital site which must be retained within any redevelopment scheme. These are as follows (with their full listing descriptions set out in Background Paper C of this brief):

a) Middlesex Hospital Chapel
This very important Grade II* listed building was built between 1891-1929 in an Italian Gothic style by John and Frank Loughborough Pearson. The Middlesex Hospital was rebuilt around the Chapel, following demolition of the original hospital building, in 1927. It is vital, therefore, that its special architectural and historic interest is safeguarded. The building should remain in situ and alterations are unlikely to be considered favourably. The most appropriate use of the building is for religious purposes. If the building ceases to be used for religious purposes, then any new use should respect the special interest of the building. The City Council will require the provision of public access to the interior of the Chapel.

Advice on managing the future of the listed building can be obtained from the following organisations: the Association of Building Preservation Trusts, the Historic Churches Preservation Trust, the Victorian Society and the Diocese of London.

b) 10 Mortimer Street
This corner block was designed by W.T.M.Walker and was built in 1898 in a restrained Arts and Crafts Tudor Style. It is listed Grade II. The interior has been much altered and does not appear to retain any features of particular interest.
5.5 The following non-listed buildings on the site are considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area (see Plan 6). Therefore, in accordance with the City Council’s policies and central government advice, there is a presumption in favour of their retention:

a) All buildings fronting onto the east side of Nassau Street
This frontage is made up of the listed 10 Mortimer Street, a middle four-storey hospital building of brick with stone bays (built in 1910), and the northern hospital building of red brick with terracotta features
The street facades of these buildings are of merit and some historic interest. As such they contribute positively to the character and appearance of the East Marylebone Conservation Area and should be retained. Significant alterations and extensions to these buildings are unlikely to be acceptable.

b) The buildings at the north east corner of the site, fronting onto Cleveland Street, with their rear facades fronting onto the internal courtyard.

The rear (west) facades fronting onto the courtyard are of some interest but alterations may be acceptable.

5.6 There is a presumption to retain the above buildings. The Council will only consider applications for redevelopment of the non-listed buildings if the replacement buildings are of outstanding quality. The developer would have to demonstrate that the replacement buildings would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Any scheme should comply with the guidance for new development set out in the Council’s SPG “Design Matters” and “Demolition and Development in Conservation Areas”.

5.7 The remaining buildings (i.e. those not identified in paragraphs 5.4-5.5 above) could be demolished provided that their replacements preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Sensitive refurbishment of some of the existing buildings could be considered, but the Council will prefer that the main Hospital building (the “H” building) is redeveloped. Redevelopment of the remainder of the site should accord with the guidelines set out below.

5.8 The murals in the hospital entrance hall are of interest and should be salvaged for incorporation in the replacement buildings on the site or an appropriate alternative location to be agreed with the City Council.

5.9 The Courtauld Institute of Biochemistry on Cleveland Street is in separate ownership to the hospital and is not likely to be redeveloped with the hospital buildings. It is linked to the main hospital building by a bridge at second floor level across Riding House Street. Development of the main hospital site will either need to retain the link bridge or provide satisfactory treatment of the exposed wall if the bridge is removed.

**Height, bulk and scale**

5.10 The height, massing and scale of any new buildings should respect the prevailing character of the surrounding conservation areas and the settings of adjacent listed buildings.

5.11 In terms of height:
a) On redevelopment the opportunity should be taken to reduce the height of buildings to create a better architectural relationship to the surrounding townscape and to avoid conflict with the strategic view (see paragraph 5.15).

b) New buildings should generally be no higher than four storeys on the street frontages; a recessive fifth storey may be acceptable. This would be of particular benefit to properties on the east side of Cleveland Street which, because of the height of the buildings on the west side of Cleveland Street, receive little or no direct daylight or sunlight.

c) Towards the centre of the site six storeys may be acceptable.

d) Buildings of more than six storeys are unlikely to be acceptable.

5.12 These are general principles but an imaginative and outstanding design of greater height and bulk may be acceptable if it can be demonstrated that it enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area and local views.

5.13 The acceptable number of storeys referred to above is based on office floor-to-floor heights of no more than 3.5m. If lower storey heights are used (e.g. for residential buildings) it may be possible to increase the number of storeys – provided that this can be achieved within the heights set out above. The maximum number of storeys referred to should include all plant areas.

5.14 The City Council is particularly concerned that any redevelopment will not result in a material loss of amenity to existing occupiers of nearby residential buildings. All Souls’ School and properties on Cleveland Street are already overshadowed by the hospital buildings and the redevelopment of the site will be an opportunity to reduce this impact. Particular attention is drawn, therefore, to the standards concerning the residential environment, daylight and sunlight. For the detailed design of residential units applicants are referred to policy ENV 13 of the UDP which aims to protect and improve amenities, daylight and sunlight, and environmental quality. Recommended standards for daylight and sunlight for residential accommodation are set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) publication ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight’ (1991).

Strategic views

5.15 The eastern two thirds of the site lie within the wider setting consultation area of the strategic view from Parliament Hill to the Houses of Parliament (Plan 7). Development of the site will need to remain below the protected development plane in order to safeguard the wider setting of the viewing corridor in compliance with policy DES 14 of the UDP. Full photo montage studies of the likely impact of the proposed development on the viewing corridor will be required. Further guidance is set out in the Council’s supplementary planning guidance ‘Strategic Views in Westminster’ (1994).
5.16 The height of the strategic view development plane is approximately 49.5m above the Ordnance Survey datum at this point. This means that any new development would need to be less than 22m in order to avoid exceeding the development plane. If existing buildings do so, then their redevelopment presents the opportunity to improve the situation. However, it should not be assumed that new development, replacing existing buildings which breach the threshold, will be acceptable right up to the threshold level. This is because in townscape terms development exceeding four or five storeys in height is unlikely to be acceptable in the context of this location – see 5.10 - 5.14 above.
5.17 The Mayor of London has produced a draft view management framework for London. Once adopted, the Mayor's view management framework will replace existing strategic guidance and paragraphs 5.15-5.16 of this brief will be revised accordingly.

**Tall buildings**

5.18 The Council's policies on high buildings are set out in policy STRA 30 and DES 3 of the UDP. The aim of policy STRA 30 is to protect or enhance important or acknowledged views across or within Westminster and to resist inappropriately designed or intrusively located high buildings.

5.19 A tall building on the hospital site would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the East Marylebone conservation area (and the Charlotte Street Conservation Area in Camden) (DES 9), on listed buildings and their settings (DES 10) and upon the views of the BT Tower (DES 15). The existing hospital building already overshadows properties on Cleveland Street and redevelopment should improve daylighting and sunlighting to this street. Building higher than the existing buildings would also seriously conflict with the prevailing four storey pattern of development in the area.

5.20 Tall building development would therefore be contrary to the criteria set out in policy DES 3 of the UDP and would be unacceptable in principle on this site.

**Design and materials**

5.21 New buildings should be of the highest design standards and should be sympathetic to the character of this part of the East Marylebone Conservation Area, and the Charlotte Street Conservation Area in Camden. New designs should refer to the architectural characteristics, profile and silhouette of adjacent buildings. Facades should exhibit an appropriate level of richness, variety and complexity to echo that of other buildings in the area.

5.22 Good modern design may be acceptable, if carried out successfully within the following disciplines:

   a) New buildings should be of the highest design standards.
   b) They should be of human scale.
   c) They should respond to and respect the architectural character of the surrounding streets within the conservation areas, e.g. Nassau Street, Cleveland Street.
   d) Facades should be balanced compositions in terms of their vertical and horizontal emphases. Their solid:void ratios should reflect that of traditional buildings in the area (such as those in Nassau Street).
e) Facing materials should be predominantly red or yellow London Stock brick, perhaps with stone dressings. Roofs should be generally clad in natural slate or lead.

5.23 Any departure from these guidelines would need to be fully justified in terms of its relationship to, and impact upon, the existing character and appearance of the East Marylebone Conservation Area and the Charlotte Street Conservation Area.

5.24 Further guidance is set out in the Council’s supplementary planning guidance ‘Design Matters in Westminster’ (2001). Reference should also be made to the Council’s supplementary planning guidance on ‘Sustainable Buildings’ (2003) (see also section 7).

5.25 There may be an opportunity to create balconies and/or roof level gardens which contribute to the greening of the site, provided these are well designed and form an integral part of the architectural approach. It may be more appropriate for these to be located towards the centre of the site, and not face onto the existing street frontages.

Site layout

5.26 Existing (historic) building lines should be respected. With the demolition of the main block, the building line to Mortimer Street could be recreated.

5.27 Existing street trees should be retained, and new trees should be provided. Pavements should be created of sufficient width for effective tree planting. Other soft landscaping should be incorporated into private land rather than relying on planting in public highways.

5.28 A new route north-south through the site could be provided to create smaller street blocks. This could continue the line of Berners Street (but not as wide) to provide a new view of the listed All Soul’s School to the north. There may also be scope to provide new pedestrian links east-west, particularly to connect with Tottenham Street. Any new routes should relate to the surrounding street pattern and should be defined and endorsed by the front facades of new buildings. They will allow the introduction of new frontages, uses and improve access within the site and within this part of the conservation area.

5.29 The existing inner courtyard at the north-east corner of the site could be retained (and imaginatively adapted) to form a new public open space. Alternatively, new space could be created around the Chapel (see below). The creation of other green public spaces within the site is desirable.

Settings of Listed Buildings

5.30 The settings of the following listed buildings should be respected: the chapel (Grade II*), 59-61, Riding House Street (Grade II*), 10,
Mortimer Street (Grade II), Nos. 20, 23 & 26 Nassau St (Grade II), All Souls School, Foley Street (Grade II), and 16-22, Cleveland Street (Grade II). If the buildings surrounding the Chapel are to be demolished then there is an opportunity to create a new and appropriate setting to this important building. This could involve the creation of a new public open space around the Chapel, accessible from the surrounding streets by the creation of new routes (see para. 5.28 above).

**Archaeology**

5.31 In accordance with policy DES 11 of the UDP, any application for redevelopment of this site should be supported by a desk-based assessment of the impact of development on archaeological remains and of the existing buildings on the site. The results will then be used to make an informed planning decision and to guide further assessment in the form of field evaluation and an appropriate mitigation strategy as necessary. Advice from the Greater London Archaeology Advisory Section of English Heritage in 1996 is provided as a background paper to this brief. The City Council will consult English Heritage on any planning application for the site.

**Access for disabled people**

5.32 The City Council expects all new development to make proper provision for people with disabilities, including residential development (policy DES 1 of the UDP). Central Government standard BS8300 and Part M of the Building Regulations set out the minimum standards for access and facilities for people with mobility and sensory disabilities. An access statement should be submitted with any planning application setting out particular key performance indicators for accessibility of the proposed development. Further information can be found in the Council’s supplementary guidance note ‘A guide to improving access for all’ (1995) and the Department for Transport document ‘Inclusive Mobility’ (2002).

**Crime and security**

5.33 The City Council seeks to ensure high standards of security and crime prevention measures are incorporated into all large developments (policy DES 1). Many crime prevention objectives are easier and less expensive to accommodate at the design stage. Such careful design can reap wide benefits by helping to reduce the vulnerability of people and property to crime in the built environment, as well as reducing fear of crime. Together with good maintenance, this can also discourage graffiti and litter and make the resulting development more attractive and usable. In the development of this site, the City Council will expect the design to incorporate the following:
Separate entrances for different uses and careful design of the fire escape routes.
Limited numbers of dwellings accessed by a single communal entrance door, unless with concierge service.
The design of public open space, pedestrian routes and other public facilities to deter crime.

5.34 The City Council will have regard to the advice of the Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor when considering any proposals for the site and seek to incorporate the Advisor’s recommendations into schemes where appropriate.

Public art

5.35 Public art can play a valuable role in improving the fabric of the physical environment and in promoting the cultural image of Westminster. Policy DES 7(A) of the UDP encourages the provision of suitable public art in development schemes and the City Council’s booklet, “Public Art in Westminster” (1994) should be referred to for guidance.

5.36 Works of public art should be fully integrated with the design of new buildings. Free standing public sculptures may be acceptable within public open space created within the site. All works should be of the highest quality. It is desirable to include some physical reminder of the use of the site for hospital purposes. This could take the form of a plaque or a more elaborate work of public art. The City Council’s Public Art Advisory Panel should be consulted on the commissioning and use of public art.

Environmental Improvements

5.37 The development should make provision for environmental improvements, such as improved pedestrian facilities, street furniture, and improved lighting. The brief area is an important opportunity to provide for tree planting in an area of the City with little greenery. Re-paving around the brief area should form an integral part of the redevelopment proposals and where appropriate pavements should be widened to a sufficient width to allow effective tree planting. Any new hard or soft landscaping works should be carefully designed, using traditional materials, of high quality. Soft landscaping should be incorporated into private land rather than relying on planting in public highways.

5.38 Developers should refer to the Council’s emerging guidance on street furniture - “the Westminster Way” (draft 2004). This sets out detailed standards for environmental improvements and street furniture appropriate to the City. The document is already being applied as a design guide but will be re-issued to form part of a wider public realm strategy.
5.39 Trees within the curtilage of the brief site may be worthy of retention. Assessment of these trees needs to be undertaken by an arboricultural specialist in order to ascertain whether any trees are of sufficient merit to warrant their retention and if so any new development needs to be suitably designed so that these trees are successfully retained.
6. Highway Network, Parking and Servicing

6.1 The City Council seeks to co-ordinate land-use and transport policies so as to reduce the need to travel and to ensure that the most appropriate means of transport is used for each journey. In pursuit of this objective, the Council’s transport policies, as set out in Chapter 4 of the UDP, seek to increase accessibility; enhance and improve the environment and maintain and improve the efficient operation of London’s road and rail networks so as to ensure the continued attractiveness and economic viability of Westminster.

6.2 The Council will seek to achieve this by applying the car parking standards set out in policies TRANS 21 – 24 and the cycle parking standards set out in TRANS 10 (see appendix 4.2 of the UDP). Any application for development of the hospital site should be accompanied by a detailed Transport Impact Statement (policy TRANS 14 of the UDP). Appendix 4.1 of the UDP sets out what should be included in the Transport Assessment. The developer will be expected to provide the relevant infrastructure to cater for extra trips generated by the redevelopment scheme, or to contribute an appropriate proportion of the cost of the required improvements.

The Highway Network

6.3 The site is situated on the eastern boundary of the City, bordering with the London Borough of Camden. Three of the streets surrounding the main block operate one way, with the fourth, Mortimer Street, operating two-way. Mortimer Street forms an important west-east link through the City, providing an alternative route to Oxford Street for local traffic. As the site is adjacent to Camden’s section of the Clear Zone, it is appropriate that traffic generation is kept to a minimum in line with the City Council’s policies.

6.4 Cleveland Street, which is a boundary road with the London Borough of Camden, is a narrow one-way street which provides a continuation of northbound for traffic wishing to move out of Soho. The links in and out of Soho are limited and tenuous and need to be preserved and enhanced. This street also provides the sole means of servicing the properties on its east side. The opportunity should be taken upon redevelopment to improve both footways and carriageways to at least minimum standards (5.5m carriageway with 1.8m footways). The possible need to improve footway or carriageway widths for servicing and access should not be taken to mean that the Council will accept significant increased traffic on Cleveland Street. If any significant pedestrian activity is introduced onto this frontage (e.g. a significant retail frontage), the associated footway may require additional width commensurate with its proposed use.
6.5 Riding House Street provides a link east to west running parallel with Mortimer Street, linking Cleveland Street to Portland Place. The length of the north of this site between Cleveland Street and Nassau Street generally serves properties related to the Middlesex Hospital, and provides the current service access to the site.

6.6 The overall width of Nassau Street is adequate for its current use. It could be possible to widen the footway on the western side of the street (at the expense of existing carriageway) to improve pedestrian safety but the impact on the provision of residential parking in the area would need to be considered.

6.7 Any footpaths to internal public space should be of sufficient width to make them attractive to the public at large (3.0m+) with a high standard of public lighting. Alignment of the paths should ideally follow the pedestrian desire lines through the site and maximise opportunities for natural surveillance. This could be achieved by the provision of entrances and windows on these routes. Any pedestrian crossing should include tactile paving to improve the environment for visually impaired people. Access to and within the site must be compliant with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act.

Site Access

6.8 The site is of sufficient size to cater for all servicing and public demands without impinging on the highway network and in accordance with the requirements set out in policy TRANS 20 of the UDP. Any major public access to the site (pedestrian or vehicular) should be from either Mortimer Street or if improved, Cleveland Street. Servicing access to the site currently takes place from Riding House Street. This should continue, and could be supplemented from Nassau Street. If the site is divided into discrete blocks, it may be necessary to provide access from most frontages. All off-street parking and servicing facilities should be designed so that vehicles do not need to reverse on or off the highway.

Parking and servicing for specific uses

Residential

6.9 Policy TRANS 23 applies to parking for residential developments. It states that for residential development generally, the City Council will normally require parking space to be provided on the basis of a maximum of one off-street parking space per residential unit of two bedrooms or less. For residential units of three bedrooms or more, the Council will apply a maximum parking standard of 1.5 off-street parking spaces per residential unit. The Council is concerned that in mixed use developments, the parking provision for residential development should be kept physically separate in order to ensure that the parking is permanently available solely for residents’ use (policy TRANS 24).
6.10 A parking standard of 1 space per 10 residential units will normally be applied for special needs housing (e.g. sheltered housing and housing for people with disabilities) but this may be varied to suit particular cases. All such parking spaces should be designed in such a way as to be accessible to wheelchair users.

6.11 The design of any parking areas should take into account the need for safety, security and lighting, and should consider landscape issues. The use of a CCTV system could be considered.

Offices, shops and industry

6.12 The permitted parking provision for staff, visitors and servicing will be a maximum of one space for each 1,500sqm of gross floorspace. One adequately proportioned and positioned space for staff and visitors with disabilities shall be provided for each 6,000sqm. Parking for shop customers will not be permitted. All servicing should be catered for within the curtilage of the site. This applies equally to small retail units. Due to the highway constraints of the site and potential traffic generation, it is considered that a large retail unit such as a major supermarket would not be acceptable.

Hotel

6.13 Car parking facilities will not be required for hotel development in this location. Hotel development will however be required to assess and meet expected demand for parking and servicing from coaches, minibuses and people with disabilities (see appendix 4.2 of the UDP). All picking up and setting down should occur within the curtilage of the site, including taxis and coaches, as required by policy TACE 2 (A) of the UDP. Vehicular access should be from Mortimer Street.
7. Other Standards and Controls

7.1 Compliance with all other relevant standards and controls is required and should be discussed with Council officers when an acceptable scheme has been agreed.

7.2 Policy ENV 2 of the UDP lists a number of developments for which Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA’s) are usually required. Major urban development projects in sensitive areas are included on this list so, given the potential impact of the scheme on the environment, an EIA could be required for the proposed development subject to the precise nature of the proposal.

7.3 The impact of a proposal on human health is a material planning consideration and the developer should consider the health impacts of any proposed scheme on the locality and residents in an Health Impact Assessment (HIA), either as part of the EIA/EPS process or in a separate document. HIA identifies potential environmental and health impacts of a proposal in terms of health improvement and reducing health inequalities, and any mitigation and enhancement measures that could be implemented. Information on using HIA for assessing the potential impacts on health can be found in the ODPM guidance “Creating Healthier Communities: a resource pack for local partnerships” (March 2005). This can also be viewed at www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=784>

Green Buildings, Recycling and Sustainability

7.4 The City Council will encourage the developer to take into consideration environmental impacts in the design of the development. There is considerable potential for reducing environmental damage by improving the design of buildings, for example, by reducing carbon dioxide and particulate emissions by the application of cost-effective current technology (see The Environmental Charter for Westminster).

7.5 The developer will be expected to use sustainable development checklists and will be advised to refer to best practice guides published by the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) and the London Research Centre in preparing the planning application. The BREEAM provides a ‘green building certificate’ and can demonstrate the efficiency of energy use and in materials and methods of construction. The City Council supports the development of environmentally friendly buildings in accordance with Policy ENV1 of the UDP.

7.6 In addition to this, the City Council has produced Supplementary Planning Guidance on ‘Sustainable Buildings’ (2003) in Westminster. The advice contained within this guidance will be a material
consideration in the consideration of any subsequent planning application.

7.7 The City Council encourages the minimisation of waste and re-use and recycling of waste materials, and will expect appropriate provision to be made for the storage of materials for recycling as well as for refuse collection (off street and within buildings). The main site may be appropriate for the provision of a public recycling facility in line with policy ENV 11(E) as Fitzrovia is an area where on-street provision of micro-recycling sites is difficult to achieve and there is under-provision of recycling facilities for residents.

Contaminated Land Issues

7.8 The City Council has a duty to bring to the attention of developers the possibility that land in Westminster is contaminated. The City Council will follow the procedures set out in the Government's Planning Policy Guidance Note on Planning and Pollution Control (PPG23) and policy ENV 8 of the UDP. The Contaminated Land Regulations 2000, which implemented Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1995 (section 57) may be applicable to the site. Accordingly, where there is a strong possibility of contamination, the City Council may require an investigation to be carried out before an application for planning permission is submitted. In granting planning permission the City Council may impose a condition requiring any necessary remedial works to be carried out. The Environment Agency may require a site investigation to assess contamination and may request that conditions be attached to any permission.
8. Planning Benefits

8.1 The redevelopment or the refurbishment of the existing Middlesex Hospital buildings is likely to place increased demands on existing services in the locality, e.g. on transport facilities, leisure, social, community and health provision and childcare facilities. The City Council will seek to ensure that any proposal for the site includes measures to offset these increased demands.

8.2 In accordance with policy STRA 7, and in addition to the other policy requirements set out in this brief, the City Council may seek to use conditions on any grant of planning permission or may use its powers under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) to require the following matters to be covered by planning obligations:

- Highway and footway improvements to Mortimer Street, Nassau Street and Cleveland Street, including pavement widening
- Timing and securing of any affordable housing provided as part of residential elements of the development
- Long term management of the listed chapel and arrangements for public access.
- Public open space and public access through the site
- Resources for All Souls School
- Community facilities, e.g. a neighbourhood centre, voluntary resource centre and improvements to the local library network
- Primary and community health care facilities
- Tree planting in streets
- Environmental improvements, including street furniture, repaving and lighting
- Public Art

8.3 Reference should be made to the Council’s draft supplementary planning guidance note on planning obligations (2003). The City Council is currently revising this SPG in accordance with ODPM Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations (July 2005).
9. Implementation

9.1 Having regard to the size and importance of this site in the East Marylebone Conservation Area and the fact that it includes listed buildings, it is considered essential that once the site is vacated, by the Hospital, the agreed development scheme is implemented quickly and in its entirety. The City Council is particularly concerned that the Middlesex Hospital building is not left vacant for a long period after services have been transferred to the new hospital in Camden. A vacant building on a site of this size would be an eyesore as well as having the potential to be squatted and the listed buildings vandalised. Therefore, the City Council will impose planning conditions or enter into a legal agreement with developers and will liaise with the Trust and the London Borough of Camden to secure a proper phased implementation.

Code of Construction Practice

9.2 The City Council's Code of Construction Practice is intended to define environmental standards and outline procedures pertaining to major construction works. It covers the environmental and public health and safety aspects affecting the interests of local residents, businesses, the general public and the surroundings in the vicinity of proposed construction sites. Activities and impacts covered by the Code include: site set-up and servicing arrangements, management of construction traffic and highway works, site management, public safety, noise and vibration, hours of working, dust and air pollution, waste disposal and protection of water quality and urban ecology.

9.3 The Code is intended to clarify for the developers and their contractors their responsibilities and requirements, as well as providing assurances to residents and others about the standards that they can expect during construction.

9.4 If proposals for the hospital site constitute significant demolition and new construction, the City Council will expect the developer of the site to conform to the Code of Construction Practice. The Code is a two-part document with Part A being generic and applicable to all developments. Part B is site-specific and is drafted by the City Council usually at tender stage and refined once a main contractor/construction managers have been appointed.
10. Contacts

- For further information about the City Council's policies and to discuss this brief, please contact David Parker (020 7641 7922).
- For information of a development control nature or to discuss specific development proposals, please contact Steve Brandon (0207 641 8541).
- For advice on conservation and design and listed buildings matters, please contact Robert Ayton (0207 641 2978).

Other useful contacts are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fergus Coleman</td>
<td>Housing issues, including affordable housing</td>
<td>020 7641 2129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Case</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>020 7641 3398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivienne Lukey</td>
<td>Social, community &amp; health facilities</td>
<td>020 7641 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ruse</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>020 7641 2496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Benton</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>020 7641 3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Reid</td>
<td>Public toilets</td>
<td>020 7641 2839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kerrigan</td>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>020 7641 2696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Akers</td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>020 7641 6096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Turton</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>020 7641 1224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Grimm</td>
<td>Waste and Recycling</td>
<td>020 7641 7962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Haskell</td>
<td>Contaminated land</td>
<td>020 7641 1317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Further Information

The following documents are available on the Council's website – www.westminster.gov.uk – or at One-Stop Services at City Hall, 64 Victoria Street, SW1E 6QP between 8.30am and 7.00pm Monday to Friday and 9.00am to 1.00pm on Saturday.

- Design Matters in Westminster, 2001
- Sustainable Buildings, 2003
- Standards for Residential New Building, Conversion and Rehabilitation Schemes, 1991 (being revised).
- Draft East Marylebone Conservation Area Audit, October 2005
- Demolition and Development in Conservation Areas, April 1996.
- Trees and Other Planting on Development Sites, 1996.
- Westminster Way (draft), 2003
- Central Government standard BS 5810 - Disabled Access.
- Designing Out Crime in Westminster
- Draft SPG on Planning Obligations, 2003 (being revised)
APPENDICES
## APPENDIX A

### MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL PLANNING BRIEF

| Site Address:       | McDonald Buchanan Building  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ogle Street, W1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area:</td>
<td>East Marylebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Activities Zone:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Designation:</td>
<td>Creative Industries Special Policy Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description:

This unlisted 1960s building is entered only from John Astor House (refer Appendix D). It comprises basement, ground and six storeys and was purpose-built as a school of nursing.

It is within the setting of the St. Charles R.C. church and presbytery which are located on the western side of Ogle Street.

### Potential uses/development:

The existing seven storey building is out of scale with its surroundings, which are generally 1-2 storeys lower. Because of its design and bulk, the building makes no positive contribution to the East Marylebone Conservation Area or the setting of the listed church and presbytery.

Replacement with a new building designed to be sympathetic to its surroundings and respecting and improving the setting of the listed buildings would be welcomed. The building should be of a human scale. Its facade should have a solid void ratio similar to the adjacent traditional buildings and a balance of vertical and horizontal emphasis. It should be of no greater height than the existing building, with recessed upper floors and built in traditional materials (brick with stone dressings). The opportunity should be taken to improve the amenity of nearby residents. It should be accessible for people with disabilities.

The primary use of any new building should be residential. Alternatively, social and community uses would also be acceptable at ground floor level. Other uses may be considered only if the equivalent residential floorspace is provided on the main hospital site, ie. as part of a comprehensive scheme.

New residential development should comply with the City Council's policies regarding affordable housing, housing mix (in terms of dwelling size and provision of mobility and wheelchair
housing) and car parking. The occupiers of the new residential accommodation should have use of the courtyard to the rear of the building (part of John Astor House).

**Other Relevant Information:** Freehold owned by University College London Hospitals Charities and leased to the UCLH NHS Foundation Trust.

**WCC Contacts:** Planning policies: David Parker (0207 641 7922)  
Development proposals: Steve Brandon (0207 641 8541)  
Conservation and Design advice: Robert Ayton (0207 641 2978)
BACKGROUND PAPER (A):

Extract from 'East Marylebone Conservation Area leaflet' March 1996

Designation: First designated 1982, extended 1990 to include the Middlesex Hospital fronting on to Mortimer Street.

Historical Background: Until the second half of the 18th century East Marylebone remained almost completely undeveloped apart from a few houses fronting on to Oxford Street. In the 1750s Oxford Market was established on the site of the Market Place and residential development slowly filled the parkland of the Audley Estate to the north with a regular grid of street centred on Great Titchfield and Great Portland Streets. By 1812 the street pattern as we find it today had been established and development was virtually complete. The original buildings were mostly redeveloped when their 99 year leases fell in from about 1860 to 1914. Terraced houses were replaced with mansion blocks, commercial and semi industrial buildings and the present character of the area as a light industrial centre with a strong local community became firmly established in bricks and mortar. Originally the rebuilt Great Portland Street was a centre of the motor trade; today it is the centre of the garment industry. While redevelopment was extensive, however, it was also piecemeal. Reflecting the original slow development of the area, individual buildings appear to have been redeveloped as the leases fell in and the late nineteenth and early twentieth century rebuildings rarely occupy more than two or three original building plots. The exceptions to this general rule are the great commercial palaces on Oxford Street and the rebuilt Middlesex Hospital which replaced the original mid-18th century hospital building in 1928.

Key Features: The street plan is typically 18th century with main parallel north-south streets and secondary east-west streets. Some 18th century houses survive (e.g. 91-101 Great Titchfield Street) as do some late infill developments (e.g. the mid-19th century Middleton Buildings). These provide an historic context for the area, but its appearance is dominated by late-19th and early 20th century small scale and piecemeal redevelopment.

The architectural style of the area is predominantly classical, albeit the flamboyant, mannered classicism of the late Victorian and Edwardian Queen Anne and Flemish revival, which stands out beside the modest original buildings. The rebuildings are at their most flamboyant on corner sites with domes, gables and tall, broad chimneys. They are articulated with elaborate classical details, moulded brickwork and terracotta or faience, heavy multi-paned sash windows and structural polychromy, dominated by red, yellow and black brick with bands of stone painted stucco. This polychromy is a particular feature of the area, historically dating back to William Butterfield's innovative All Saints, Margaret Street (1849-59) and taken to extremes at the old Langham Clinic and Boultings in Riding House Street. This polychromy was to some extent abandoned by the inter-war redevelopments which are by and large found at the southern ends of Great Titchfield Street and in Great Portland Street and their hinterlands. In general however, the classical theme is maintained in restrained Thirties' manner.

The rich and vibrant appearance of the area is matched by its character which is dominated by the lively garments industry to the south and solid residential community to the north. Main street frontages in the southern part of the area are dominated by garment industry showrooms and to the north there are restaurants.
and local shops, all of which combine to create a well rounded 'village' atmosphere. Retail uses dominate Oxford Street.
Dear Sir,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
DoE PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE NOTE 16

Archaeology at: Middlesex Hospital - Draft Planning Brief

Recommendation for Archaeological Assessment

Thank you for consulting English Heritage on the proposal for the redevelopment of the above site.

Although the archaeology of this area has not been thoroughly investigated, topographical evidence and the discovery of isolated artefacts indicate that this area was occupied during the prehistoric period. The site lies on a gravel terrace in between the Tyburn and Fleet rivers, which would have provided ideal conditions for cultivation. A number of prehistoric implements, including both Neolithic and Bronze Age axes, have been discovered within 500 metres of the site.

Evidence of prehistoric landscapes are extremely rare within Inner London, as successive development, from the Medieval period onwards, has destroyed much of the earlier archaeological deposits. However, traces of prehistoric occupation can be anticipated where significant ground reduction has not occurred (for example, within open areas and underneath unbasemented buildings). I would therefore recommend that any application for the redevelopment of the above site should be supported by a desk based assessment of the impact of both previous and proposed development upon the anticipated archaeological remains.

The applicant may wish to discuss arrangements for such assessment with an
ENGLISH HERITAGE

archaeological agency, as for example the Museum of London Archaeology Service, to undertake any necessary research or fieldwork.

Once the archaeological impact of the proposal has been defined a decision can be made. If archaeological safeguards do prove necessary, these would normally consist either of design measures to preserve remains in situ or archaeological investigations prior to development, or a combination of the two.

I hope these comments are useful, but if you need any further information and/or advice at this stage please contact me.

Please note that this response relates solely to archaeological considerations.

Yours faithfully

Ian Morrison
Archaeology Advisor
Background Paper C – Extract from List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest – Middlesex Hospital Chapel

SCHEDULE

In the entry for:

TQ 2981 :M
46/19

CITY OF WESTMINSTER

MORTIMER STREET, W1 (north side)

MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL CHAPEL

The grade shall be amended to read; II* (star)

The description shall be amended to read;

Hospital. 1891 by John Loughborough Pearson, completed 1929 by his son Frank Loughborough Pearson. Italian Gothic style. Red brick in English bond; headers only to apse; Portland stone dressings and plain tile roofs. Narthex and organ gallery, apsed western transepts, nave and apsed chancel. Semi-circular chancel apse has lancet windows; 2-light windows to western bays of chancel and to nave have plate tracery and quatrefoils to heads. Similar windows to canted sides of NW transept and to S side of riarthex. SV; transept has shallow inner bay with hipped roof and lower semicircular apse with stone-coped parapet and lancet windows. Windows all have splayed stone sills, heads and tracery. W door has continuous keeled moulding to intrados, shafts and chamfered arch to extrados, hood mould and label stops. Chapel has blue brick plinth and stone-coped parapet.

Interior: chapel has complete scheme of polychrome marble and mosaic decoration, and vaulting. Vaults are enriched with mosaic work of stars against a gold background and bands of mosaic ornament instead of cross ribs with patterned circles at intersections. Vaults spring from tall marble shafts with stiff-leaf foliage to attached stone capitals and moulded alabaster bases which rest on a high continuous ledge running at level of bottom of window splays. Window splays are lined with alabaster with bands of mosaic at level of shaft capitals and 2 thinner bands to lower part of splays; patterned marble mosaic work to splays above bands at level of springing of vault. Walls below ledge are lined with green onyx with broad band of marble mosaic in zigzag pattern running below mosaic decoration of ledge.

Chancel has pillar piscina with Cosmatiesque ornament to spiral moulding of pillar and to bowl. Ogee-arched aumbry presented in memory of Prince Francis of Teck, outlined by mosaic ornament with white marble roundel above carved with Pelican in her Piety. Round-headed chancel arch with plain piers lined with red marble, stiff-leaf capitals, marble abaci and mosaic work to arch with roundels depicting busts of Twelve Apostles to underside of arch; marble mosaic work between arch and vault. Similar arch between nave and western crossing with rectangular panel depicting the greater Prophets to mosaic work of underside of arches.

Similar arch frames W gallery and organ loft with mosaic capitals and inscription to mosaic work of arch reading GLORIA IN EXCELSIS DEO ET IN TERRA PAX HOMINIBUS BONAE VOLUNTATIS. W gallery is supported on 3 arches, that to
centre wider and flanked by paired red marble shafts with stone stiff-leaf capitals, single shafts to outer arches. Arches are lined with alabaster. Gallery front is panelled with Irish bog marble divided by vertical mosaic strips. 3 sunk panels of mosaic work below mosaic work, projecting ledge of gallery rail. Inner arch framing organ loft is lined with alabaster bearing mosaic crosses. NW apse has large marble roundel on N wall below vault depicting Saint Barnabas. SW apse forms baptistery and has narrow vaulted bay in front of semicircular apse. Lower walls of apse are lined with alternating panels of red, pale green and green marbles and mosaic work to apse depicting angels bearing scrolls either side of cross against blue background.

Font is carved from solid block of deep green marble with symbols of Four Evangelists at each corner and inscribed with Greek palindrome copied from the font of Nagin Sophia. White marble altar with mosaic panels and marble gradine. White marble cancelli between nave and chancel incorporating lectern with winged eagle supporting reading desk. Chancel and sanctuary with pavements of opus alexandrinum; simpler tessellated floors to body of chapel. Late C19-midC20 stained glass. All directions are liturgical; the chapel is in fact aligned on a roughly N-S axis. The Middlesex Hospital was rebuilt around the chapel following the demolition of the original building in 1927. (John Loughborough Pearson, Anthony Quiney. The Middlesex Hospital, C D Shaw and W R Winterton).

46/19 5.2.70
NW
CITY OF WESTMINSTER
MORTIMER STREET W1 (north side) Middlesex Hospital Chapel

Hospital Chapel. 1890 by J.L. Pearson. Small red brick chapel with Portland stone dressings in mixed C13 Gothic and Italian Romanesque. Nave, apsed chancel and differing, apsed western transepts. Interior vaulted, arcaded lobby with organ loft over, the walls lined with marble, alabaster and mosaic and with mosaic floor, stained glass.

John Loughborough Pearson, Anthony Quiney
Background Paper C – Extract from List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest – 10 Mortimer Street W1

2 SCHEDULE

In the entry for:-

TQ 2981 NW

MORTIMER STREET W1
(North Side)

No 10

46/27

II

3

4 The description shall be amended to read:-

Corner block of offices and chambers. 1898 by W.T.M. Walker for Bratt Colbran & Co of Finsbury. Good quality red brick with portland stone dressings, slate roof, in restrained Arts and Crafts Tudor Style. 4 storeys and basement. 3 irregular bays wide on each front. Entrance in second bay from corner with plain stone surround and segmental pediment. Very shallow rectangular 3 storey bay windows to each front, stone dressed with 6-light mullioned transomed casement windows to each floor, the mullions and transoms squared and set flush with face; otherwise coupled glazing bar sashes in one reveal with flat gauged arches and 2 groups of 4 sashed lights to attic storey facing Mortimer Street. Shallow projecting stone cornice at 3rd floor level, broken over bay windows and attic crowned by plain stone frieze and cavetto coping. Cast iron area railing with very restrained Arts and Crafts detailing.

Dated: 7th June 1991