

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2016/2808/P

Case Officer:

Laura Hazelton

Application Address:

1 Rochester Square
London
NW1 9SD

Proposal(s)

Temporary installation (for a period of 12 months) of two accommodation units for property guardians to secure the site and prevent future unauthorised occupation.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	52	No. of responses	11	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	9

Summary of representations

(Officer response(s) in italics)

3 letters of support have been received:

Hugh Griffiths – 34 Rochester Square – no objection

- Strongly in favour.

Lewis Lenssen – 27 Rochester Square – In support

- Positive step in the right direction to keep away squatters.

Judi Blackmur – 18 Rochester Square - no objection

- Support the application and prefer the units to be positioned in the primary location.

2 letters of support with conditions have been received:

Adam Straw – 32b Rochester Square – support, subject to conditions

- The redevelopment of the site and the removal of squatters is important as it currently causes noise disturbance and is unsightly.
- Support the application provided the secondary location is only used for temporary periods of up to 10 days at a time.

Officer response

The applicant has agreed to only use the secondary locations for a maximum of 10 days at a time, for a total of 30 days throughout the whole year

Clive Bennett & Mike Lackersteen – 35 Rochester Square – support with conditions

- The plans are not drawn to scale.
- Outlook will be compromised.
- Support the compromise that the units will not be any closer than 10m in front of the residential buildings.
- Concerned that the footprints of the secondary location are too imprecise – may impact light and privacy.

Officer response

The original plans were revised to show the correct size and position of the proposed units. In the primary position, the units would be approximately 16m away from the nearest residential properties, which, combined with the existing vegetation blocking views between the two, is not considered to cause harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of a loss of outlook, daylight or privacy.

Due to the very temporary nature of the units in the secondary positions (a

maximum of 10 days at a time, for a total of 30 days throughout the whole year), they are considered to have a limited, transient impact on neighbouring amenity which is considered acceptable.

4 letters of objection/support with conditions were received and subsequently withdrawn following confirmation of details.

Lisa Jacobs – 31 Rochester Square - comment 11/06/2016

- Satisfied with the principle of the proposal but oppose the placing of the units in front of my house (row of houses 29-36). This terrace is in closer proximity than any other houses in the square and already suffers from noise disturbance. The other side of the square would be a more suitable location.
- 23/06/2016 – remove objection – support the application and believe a permanent presence will be required to prevent the site continuing to attract squatters. Prefer the units to be located in the primary location. Units should be located in the secondary location for short spells at a time.

Tom Gentleman – 32b Rochester Square – support with conditions 11/06/2016

- The primary location is a better option, as they would be located on a narrow strip currently used for parking, etc. next to a busier road – would not have a serious impact on the appearance of the square. If they are located in the secondary position, they would disrupt the only substantial open space in the square.
- Confusion over the length of time proposed – 12 months seems acceptable, whereas the application form states 3 years.
- 20/06/2016 – Spoken to the applicant who has addressed concerns – removes objection.

Steven Mackintosh – 31 Rochester Square – objection – 11/06/2016

- Satisfied with the principle but object to the location in front of my house – the row of houses 29-36. This terrace is in closer proximity than any other houses in the square and already suffers from noise disturbance. The other side of the square would be a more suitable location.
- 18/06 – remove objection – support the application and believe a permanent presence will be required to prevent the site continuing to attract squatters. Prefer the units to be located in the primary location. Units should be

located in the secondary location for short spells at a time.

Blythe Mackintosh – 31 Rochester Square – objection – 11/06/2016

- Satisfied with the principle but object to the location in front of my house – the row of houses 29-36. This terrace is in closer proximity than any other houses in the square and already suffers from noise disturbance. The other side of the square would be a more suitable location.
- 21/06/2016 – remove objection. Support the application and believe a permanent presence will be required to prevent the site continuing to attract squatters. Prefer the units to be located in the primary location. Units should be located in the secondary location for short spells at a time.

2 letter of objection were received:

Martha Mackintosh – 31 Rochester Square – objection – 11/06/2016

- Satisfied with the principle but object to the location in front of my house – the row of houses 29-36. This terrace is in closer proximity than any other houses in the square and already suffers from noise disturbance. The other side of the square would be a more suitable location.

Officer response

The units would be located approximately 16m away from the nearest residential property in this terrace (no.36). They would be partly blocked by existing trees and vegetation between the two and are not considered to cause harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of a loss of outlook, privacy or daylight.

Coral Temple – 34b Camden Square.

- Object to the temporary units - they would be an eyesore and guardians could inhabit the church. Also I deeply object to the fact these "temporary" units are the only planning alerts visible to the public when in fact there has already been an application for FULL planning permission for a housing complex. This would destroy the character of this conservation area, ruin neighboring views, put the famous Rochester Sq Spiritualist Temple at risk of closure and at worst demolition. A new build in this historical environment would be a social disaster, an eyesore, a cultural loss, overpopulation, decimation of valuable trees and nature and devaluation of all surrounding property.

Officer Response

Planning permission is sought for the installation of two temporary units/caravans within Rochester Square itself for a period of 12 months only. This application does not relate to the spiritualist temple, or its land, and does not involve the erection of new residential dwellings

Recommendation:-

Grant planning permission