

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Rt Rev Dr Barry Harding-Rathbone	Church House CSJ International 2 Baker R Bournemouth BH119JD	07/08/2017 19:08:39	OBJEMAIL	<p>Dear Sir or Madam</p> <p>With regard to the application to demolish the existing Spiritualist Temple, are the board and officers aware of the immense historical context of this property with regard to the history of the recognised UK religion of Modern Spiritualism?</p> <p>When the property was originally conceived at the turn of the 19/20th century, the Temple's Founders, a Mr and Mrs Ellis, were backed by such theosophical and philosophical luminaries as Hannen Swagger and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the latter of whom mentioned in glowing terms the simple joy and profoundly deep commitment of the Ellis's "et a" for their "fundamental and base human spirituality & consciousness for this New Age of enlightened thought.</p> <p>After the Divine Service we adults were entertained by the younger attendees from their burgeoning Lucien, with dance and songs of such patriotic fervour that one could easily have been within the finest of symphony halls" within his personal diaries.</p> <p>I would urge, as the highest ranking Spiritualist Minister in the UK, that this board seriously reject this application and suggest a review into actually having the property listed as a site of national spiritual and community heritage. We simply cannot support the continued wanten demolition of our national faith heritage sites for yet another soulless and impersonal steel and glass bland structure.</p>

I recommend this to the members of planning, the officers and executive of the council.

2016/7088/P	Sarah Andrew	172 Camden Road London NW1 9HJ NW1 9HJ	06/08/2017 23:50:34	COMMEM PER	<p>The building proposed to be demolished is of significant historical and architectural interest, being a Spiritualist temple built at the height of that religious movement's popularity in London and in Camden. It is cited in numerous accounts of spiritualist meetings of the time and the foundation stone was laid by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle in 1926. I am concerned that this building seems to be unlisted, on no account should it be demolished Its destruction will strip this location of an important piece of its local history, character and architectural value.</p>
-------------	--------------	---	---------------------	---------------	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Lisa Jacobs Mackintosh	31 Rochester Square London	07/08/2017 14:16:02	OBJ	<p>Adding to my previous comment, I oppose the development on the following specific grounds. The density of the proposal would be an overdevelopment in the conservation area. It shows a disregard for CPG6, in regard to proximity to other dwellings nearby. Especially 29-36 Rochester square and many flats in Julian Court. These properties would lose their open aspect and would be seriously overlooked by the proposed development. Many of the drawings in the plans are misleading, insubstantial and incorrect. Planning statement 7.7 is vague, incorrect and misleading regarding VSC and daylight distribution. The current pitched roof gives a sense of expanse and allows for light in a way that is incomparable with the proposed solid bulky structure. A structure that would stand at over 10 metres high, when seen from the lower ground patios of the houses in Rochester Square, one metre beneath ground level and barely 10 metres from the rear rooms of those houses. This is clearly not in line with the attitude, spirit and ethos of the conservation area. Planning statement 7.81 is incorrect. The minimum distance of 18 metres (laid out in Camden's CPG6 distance guidelines) between windows of nearby habitable rooms and properties, is not adhered to in the plans. The distance from the rear windows of 29-36 Rochester Square to the existing boundary of the site, is actually 8/9 metres and not 15 metres as claimed. The proposed partial buffer, still only allows for 12 metres between the windows of the proposed building and the windows of 29-36 Rochester Square. Planning statement 7.82 is flawed, incorrect and contains worrying elements. The proposed 2 metre buffer on plan GA033, is actually 1.5 metres in front of 30/31 and 34/35 Rochester Square, numbers 32 and 33 have NO buffer at all between them and the site. The public access routes in GA032 on the ground floor, are extremely concerning. The plans show entrances to the proposed building, would be adjacent to the boundaries of /30/31/33/34/35/, with access from the square at either end of the site. There is a well documented history of drug dealing/using and drug related anti social behaviour and prostitution in the immediate area, particularly at the junction of Camden mews and Rochester square. These access routes, do not take into consideration, the security of the adjacent properties. Again, this is strong grounds for objection, as this is a matter of social and environmental importance. The plans in GA041, show no accurate description, construction, or materials used in the building of the 2 metre supposed boundary wall. Bricks shown in plans GA063 and GA064, are inappropriate and out of character with the original Victorian London brick, used on the boundary walls of existing houses 29-36. I do not wish to see my original garden wall demolished for this development. I have very serious doubts and concerns about assertions made in report 8.18 regarding the basement excavation. In the BIA report, the problems and challenges of damp are highlighted. BIA appendix C (1) states that basement excavations MAY undermine adjacent property and COULD lead to settlement in gardens and damage to buildings and below ground services. This clearly shows enough doubt for this aspect of the proposal to be totally withdrawn. The recent water damage and damp to Julian Court from an adjacent building development, highlights serious concerns with basement excavations in this clay based area. The evidence is not conclusive that nearby buildings WILL NOT be affected and therefore this is strong grounds for objection. There is currently no basement in the temple, again clearly showing that the proposal is disproportionate to the current site. Unless these requests and concerns are seriously addressed, we feel the planning committee should reject this proposal</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Stefania Tigani	118 camden road	06/08/2017 17:45:43	COMMNT	<p>due to</p> <p>A: adverse effect on privacy, loss of views, light, outlook, noise in relation to the residents of 36-29 Rochester Square and Julian Court.</p> <p>B: Proposed building is overbearing, out of scale (in terms of mass/volume and proximity to adjacent buildings) and out of character with the existing plot.</p> <p>C:The design is unsympathetic and unbalances the relationship between the old and new in what is a designated conservation area. These plans have a disregard for Camden guidelines for residential buliding and would set a disturbing precedent for future plans.</p> <hr/> <p>I have been living in Camden for 10 years and I am against the redevelopment of the site. All religions should be represented and demolition of the church would mine the freedom of expression and faith in Camden</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Seyed Kamal Ghorashian(Mr)	Flat9 Julian Court 150 Camden Court London NW19HU	05/08/2017 22:43:36	OBJ	<p>Further to my earlier objection note sent via your web site ability the application reference number 2016/7088/P please add the followings as an addendum.</p> <p>I as a resident of Julian Court have had to endure a previous case of lengthy and anxiety-driven development besides the site of the Spiritual Temple and next to our block lasting several years. This objection in fact reflects a communally felt sense of distress at another proposal to build in immediate proximity to us in this closely packed residential area. I must add that the residents of the terrace houses on the otters side of the temple share my view.</p> <p>I along with a number of residents in the vicinity attended a public meeting with the developers only to come away with heightened dismay and more expressions of upset with the proposal.</p> <p>My objection is based on the following reasons</p> <p>The existing incomplete building recently constructed on a plot next to the Temple (originally part of the Temple) was limited to two floors and a basement in the line of building with that of 146 Camden Road. I can not comprehend how the Camden Council Planning can now even consider a three-floor high build with a large basement covering the whole plot of the land belonging to the Spiritual Temple even under the claimed aims of an arts-oriented and probably a non-profit development scheme.</p> <p>The proposed plan completely ignores the impact on Julian Court residents and particularly the nine of so flats overlooking what is now a low wall and a garden being replaced with a brick wall three floors high. The various aspects of my point here are given below. Having been involved directly in facing up to the shambolic development at 144/146 Camden Road and particularly their extended deep excavations/shoring up last year, I am shockingly aware of the subsequent ground water welling up around their recently built basement. I am also aware that Thames Water was brought in to inspect the underground water flow around this basement. The worrying point not just for myself but also other Julian Court residents as well as the owners of the row of the town houses on the other site of the temple is that yet another large impervious basement will be constructed abutting the existing one and further, it will be extending all along our boundary wall with the temple. Our block will then be surrounded by an L-shaped underground impervious against the natural ground water flow. I and local residents are urging Camden Council Planning to reconsider the proposal with a wider scope inclusive of the clay geology of our neighbourhood and its behaviour vis-a-vis the construction of additional underground obstacles.</p> <p>Further on point 2, the business/office footfall of the proposed development will be concentrated immediately around the entrance gate to Julian Court adding to our continual communal struggle to keep the vicinity clean and clear of nuisance and vandalism.</p> <p>Still on point 2, no considerations have been given (neither the documentations presented as part of the proposal nor at the meeting above) to tone down the monstrous wall facing our block entombing the inner court and blocking our view and light. This is a sore point for the</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

residents of Julian Court since all the architectural detail and design work have been concentrated only on the facade facing the row of terrace houses opposite.
I add my own objections to those already submitted covering added pedestrian and car parking loads in our congested area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Martha Mackintosh	31 Rochester Square London	07/08/2017 14:23:07	OBJ	<p>Adding to my previous comment, I oppose the development on the following specific grounds. The density of the proposal would be an overdevelopment in the conservation area. It shows a disregard for CPG6, in regard to proximity to other dwellings nearby. Especially 29-36 Rochester square and many flats in Julian Court. These properties would lose their open aspect and would be seriously overlooked by the proposed development. Many of the drawings in the plans are misleading, insubstantial and incorrect. Planning statement 7.7 is vague, incorrect and misleading regarding VSC and daylight distribution. The current pitched roof gives a sense of expanse and allows for light in a way that is incomparable with the proposed solid bulky structure. A structure that would stand at over 10 metres high, when seen from the lower ground patios of the houses in Rochester Square, one metre beneath ground level and barely 10 metres from the rear rooms of those houses. This is clearly not in line with the attitude, spirit and ethos of the conservation area. Planning statement 7.81 is incorrect. The minimum distance of 18 metres (laid out in Camden's CPG6 distance guidelines) between windows of nearby habitable rooms and properties, is not adhered to in the plans. The distance from the rear windows of 29-36 Rochester Square to the existing boundary of the site, is actually 8/9 metres and not 15 metres as claimed. The proposed partial buffer, still only allows for 12 metres between the windows of the proposed building and the windows of 29-36 Rochester Square. Planning statement 7.82 is flawed, incorrect and contains worrying elements. The proposed 2 metre buffer on plan GA033, is actually 1.5 metres in front of 30/31 and 34/35 Rochester Square, numbers 32 and 33 have NO buffer at all between them and the site. The public access routes in GA032 on the ground floor, are extremely concerning. The plans show entrances to the proposed building, would be adjacent to the boundaries of /30/31/33/34/35/, with access from the square at either end of the site. There is a well documented history of drug dealing/using and drug related anti social behaviour and prostitution in the immediate area, particularly at the junction of Camden mews and Rochester square. These access routes, do not take into consideration, the security of the adjacent properties. Again, this is strong grounds for objection, as this is a matter of social and environmental importance. The plans in GA041, show no accurate description, construction, or materials used in the building of the 2 metre supposed boundary wall. Bricks shown in plans GA063 and GA064, are inappropriate and out of character with the original Victorian London brick, used on the boundary walls of existing houses 29-36. I do not wish to see my original garden wall demolished for this development. I have very serious doubts and concerns about assertions made in report 8.18 regarding the basement excavation. In the BIA report, the problems and challenges of damp are highlighted. BIA appendix C (1) states that basement excavations MAY undermine adjacent property and COULD lead to settlement in gardens and damage to buildings and below ground services. This clearly shows enough doubt for this aspect of the proposal to be totally withdrawn. The recent water damage and damp to Julian Court from an adjacent building development, highlights serious concerns with basement excavations in this clay based area. The evidence is not conclusive that nearby buildings WILL NOT be affected and therefore this is strong grounds for objection. There is currently no basement in the temple, again clearly showing that the proposal is disproportionate to the current site. Unless these requests and concerns are seriously addressed, we feel the planning committee should reject this proposal</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Leo Bonomo	6 Ford Lane Roxton MK44 3EJ MK44 3EJ	04/08/2017 00:39:42	OBJLETTE R	<p>due to</p> <p>A: adverse effect on privacy, loss of views, light, outlook, noise in relation to the residents of 36-29 Rochester Square and Julian Court.</p> <p>B: Proposed building is overbearing, out of scale (in terms of mass/volume and proximity to adjacent buildings) and out of character with the existing plot.</p> <p>C:The design is unsympathetic and unbalances the relationship between the old and new in what is a designated conservation area. These plans have a disregard for Camden guidelines for residential buliding and would set a disturbing precedent for future plans.</p> <hr/> <p>Rochester Square is such an important building historically and is also important to the community.</p> <p>I myself have been privileged to have served that church many times. This church has been a cornerstone of the spiritualist movement from its wonderful inception and it is absolutely disgusting that those responsible have allowed and encouraged its decimation.</p> <p>It was and should be the hub of the community it serves, those such as Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and many others have lent historical importance to this building not only from the point of view of a spiritual connection.</p> <p>We must not allow the history of spiritualism to be wiped away from this place when so many need it and embrace this religion. There is no real need for this church to be demolished except that of greed, money and the subjugation of real spiritual needs.</p> <p>This is the decimation of an historical building and needs to be recognised as a special place, and should because of historical reference be recognised as such. This should be a protected place.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Glynis P Vercoe	10 Julian Court Camden Road London NW1 9HU	05/08/2017 14:45:14	OBJ	<p>1.The church has historic significance for the area.It may not be architecturally outstanding but is an important building and far better on the eye to what is proposed.</p> <p>2.This is a conservation area and therefore the question is whether the proposed building adds anything to the area? I think not at all and by removing the church the area's interest is much diminished.</p> <p>3.The proposed building fills the whole area of the original site which is at present occupied approximately one-third by a two-storey building with a sloping roof, one-third by a single storey building and one-third by an area of garden.The proposal is overdeveloped.</p> <p>4.The proposed facade facing Julian Court is a three-storey high brick wall with no decorative details and only narrow slitted windows, presumably a compromise to prevent Julian Court being overlooked.. This facade replaces the existing far gentler variation in height as described in 3 above. The facade facing the rear of the houses in Rochester Square is similar and appears even more brutal in its impact.</p> <p>5.There is proposed a basement which will be the third in recent years to border Julian Court and must have repercussions for the water table levels and subsidence issues. There is a new basement built to the extensions to No.144 and 146 Camden Rd and a huge basement to the new house built in the rear gardens to these properties. The latter is four times the original planning agreement.</p> <p>6.The proposed building because it occupies the whole site is long, narrow and disproportionately high, Inevitably affecting light penetration to the lower floors of Julian Court especially.</p> <p>7.The proposal of mixed use for the building will increase the foot and vehicular traffic in the area. This will inevitably increase the demand for parking in Rochester Square.</p> <p>8.The conversion of the church rather than its complete removal seems a far more sensible plan and similar approaches i am sure have been undertaken in the area many times before.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	William Skeaping	11 Camden Mews London NW1 9DB	07/08/2017 12:34:54	OBJEMAIL	<p>I live on Camden Mews a few doors from the proposed development.</p> <p>In my opinion the proposed building is far too tall. It is significantly taller than the current building on this site and as such, will definitely block light onto the mews and this end of Rochester Square. Besides changing the landscape unnecessarily, It will also offer additional cover for criminality at this end of the street which is rife.</p> <p>There aren't enough parking spaces in this area and additional luxury flats in this very overcrowded street will make this an even more significant issue.</p> <p>We do not need another 'community art space' - there is one opening next door in Rochester Square.</p> <p>The current Spiritualist Temple is an iconic building in a conservation area that prides itself on architectural diversity. It would be terribly sad for this to be demolished to be replaced with an absolutely generic and unnecessary development.</p> <p>Though there have been recent building developments relatively close by on the other side of Camden Road, this proposal is in a very different residential area, away from the main road. Building work will be extremely disruptive to the surrounding streets.</p>
2016/7088/P	Carmel	41 Westbourne road London	08/08/2017 08:47:20	OBJ	<p>I am objecting to the proposed planning to build 8 flats on this site. It was given the snu to be kept as a place for spirituality and they are now putting profit first. The history in this church is massive and should be preserved always, and reopened as a church again for the spiritualists.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	steven mackintosh	31 ROCHESTER SQUARE 31 ROCHESTER SQUARE	07/08/2017 14:12:21	OBJ	<p>Adding to my previous comment, I oppose the development on the following specific grounds. The density of the proposal would be an overdevelopment in the conservation area. It shows a disregard for CPG6, in regard to proximity to other dwellings nearby. Especially 29-36 Rochester square and many flats in Julian Court. These properties would lose their open aspect and would be seriously overlooked by the proposed development. Many of the drawings in the plans are misleading, insubstantial and incorrect. Planning statement 7.7 is vague, incorrect and misleading regarding VSC and daylight distribution. The current pitched roof gives a sense of expanse and allows for light in a way that is incomparable with the proposed solid bulky structure. A structure that would stand at over 10 metres high, when seen from the lower ground patios of the houses in Rochester Square, one metre beneath ground level and barely 10 metres from the rear rooms of those houses. This is clearly not in line with the attitude, spirit and ethos of the conservation area. Planning statement 7.81 is incorrect. The minimum distance of 18 metres (laid out in Camden's CPG6 distance guidelines) between windows of nearby habitable rooms and properties, is not adhered to in the plans. The distance from the rear windows of 29-36 Rochester Square to the existing boundary of the site, is actually 8/9 metres and not 15 metres as claimed. The proposed partial buffer, still only allows for 12 metres between the windows of the proposed building and the windows of 29-36 Rochester Square. Planning statement 7.82 is flawed, incorrect and contains worrying elements. The proposed 2 metre buffer on plan GA033, is actually 1.5 metres in front of 30/31 and 34/35 Rochester Square, numbers 32 and 33 have NO buffer at all between them and the site. The public access routes in GA032 on the ground floor, are extremely concerning. The plans show entrances to the proposed building, would be adjacent to the boundaries of /30/31/33/34/35/, with access from the square at either end of the site. There is a well documented history of drug dealing/using and drug related anti social behaviour and prostitution in the immediate area, particularly at the junction of Camden mews and Rochester square. These access routes, do not take into consideration, the security of the adjacent properties. Again, this is strong grounds for objection, as this is a matter of social and environmental importance. The plans in GA041, show no accurate description, construction, or materials used in the building of the 2 metre supposed boundary wall. Bricks shown in plans GA063 and GA064, are inappropriate and out of character with the original Victorian London brick, used on the boundary walls of existing houses 29-36. I do not wish to see my original garden wall demolished for this development. I have very serious doubts and concerns about assertions made in report 8.18 regarding the basement excavation. In the BIA report, the problems and challenges of damp are highlighted. BIA appendix C (1) states that basement excavations MAY undermine adjacent property and COULD lead to settlement in gardens and damage to buildings and below ground services. This clearly shows enough doubt for this aspect of the proposal to be totally withdrawn. The recent water damage and damp to Julian Court from an adjacent building development, highlights serious concerns with basement excavations in this clay based area. The evidence is not conclusive that nearby buildings WILL NOT be affected and therefore this is strong grounds for objection. There is currently no basement in the temple, again clearly showing that the proposal is disproportionate to the current site. Unless these requests and concerns are seriously addressed, we feel the planning committee should reject this proposal</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Rosemary Parnell	11 Otter Street Derby DE1 3FD	04/08/2017 09:14:55	COMMEM PER	<p>due to</p> <p>A: adverse effect on privacy, loss of views, light, outlook, noise in relation to the residents of 36-29 Rochester Square and Julian Court.</p> <p>B: Proposed building is overbearing, out of scale (in terms of mass/volume and proximity to adjacent buildings) and out of character with the existing plot.</p> <p>C:The design is unsympathetic and unbalances the relationship between the old and new in what is a designated conservation area. These plans have a disregard for Camden guidelines for residential buliding and would set a disturbing precedent for future plans.</p> <hr/> <p>This church is of historical note and should not be demolished. The building and land upon which it is built should have a preservation order placed on them . Too many historically important buildings have been demolished in the name of 'progress' . We should preserve and cherish our historical buildings especially this one with its link to such a famous person as Sir Arthur Conan Doyle - It should be included in tourism guide books and a plaque put on the outer wall.</p> <p>Spiritualism is one of the fastest growing religions of our time and as such this building should be preserved and promoted .</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Clive Bennett and Mike Lackersteen	35 Rochester Square London NW1 9RZ	06/08/2017 14:18:52	COMMNT	<p>We have received a letter from the developers saying that they have requested Camden to extend the time for the application in order to revise their plans and further consult with local residents. The extent of these revisions is unknown but the developers say they will take into account the objections to the plan that were raised at the meeting to which residents were invited on August 2nd.</p> <p>For the record therefore we wish to state our objections to the existing scheme in order that, should these not be addressed in the revision, the objections will still stand.</p> <p>Comments on the proposed development of the Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple.</p> <p>We formally object to this proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>a) There will be an adverse effect on the residential amenities of the houses 29 - 36 Rochester Square and many of the flats in Julian Court by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and disturbance due to the proximity of the dwelling units and community spaces. The entire proposal shows an egregious disregard of CPG6 regarding proximity to other dwelling units</p> <p>b) The proposal sets out an unacceptably high density and over-development of the site in this Conservation Area. It involves loss of the open aspect of most of the houses overlooking the east façade of the site.</p> <p>c) The visual impact of the development is detrimental to the houses on the eastern side and to the flats on the western side. It is over-bearing and out-of-scale in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the Camden Square Conservation Area. The Google Earth map of the Area shows that the proposed close proximity to the existing habitations is not replicated anywhere else.</p> <p>d) The proposal to make a community space by demolishing, rather than creatively re-using, the historically important Temple, will have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. We urge a rethink particularly in the Applicant's interpretation of sections of the Camden Core Strategy, The London Plan (2016) and various parts of NPPF, in particular sections 56, 57, 58 and 61.</p> <p>e) Many details on the Architect's drawings, and the interpretation put upon them in the Planning Statement, are a) wrong b) inadequate c) questionable and are grounds for objection in themselves.</p> <p>Detailed Submission .</p> <p>Planning Statement 8.17 is a statement of opinion with which we fundamentally disagree.</p> <p>1: The claim in submitted Planning Statement 7.82 that the increase in bulk of the new building will be broken down by being heavily articulated does not bear "in situ" scrutiny. The argument concerning the VSC and Daylight Distribution evaluations in Planning Statement 7.7 is entirely specious.</p> <p>Rather, the narrow obscured glazed windows and the vertical steel louvres create a modernist version of a medieval fortress with arrow slits and defensive portcullises. It will be a heavy bulk over 10m high (when seen from the lower ground patios of the houses in Rochester Square, approx. 1 metre beneath ground level) and barely 10 metres from the rear rooms of those houses. We contend it is out of keeping with the ethos of a Conservation Area.</p> <p>The existing pitched roof of the Temple gives a sense of space and airiness to the rear of the Rochester Square houses. Its removal and replacement with a solid structure will have a</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>major deleterious effect on the quality of the light and the outlook of the adjacent houses. See also 3 below</p> <p>2.1 Planning Statement 7.81 is factually wrong. The entire proposal contravenes Camden's guidelines in CPG6 of a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms of different units that directly face each other. The distance from the rear facing windows of 29 – 36 Rochester Square to the existing eastern boundary of the site is between 8 and 9 (eight and nine) metres not 15 (fifteen) as submitted. The proposal provides a partial buffer (see below) but there will still only be 12 metres between the new building's windows and those of the houses 29 – 35 Rochester Square. This runs counter to Camden's guideline of 18 metres between overlooking windows in CPG6 and is unacceptable, especially in a Conservation Area.</p> <p>2.2 Planning Statement 7.82 is factually wrong and misleading in claiming the 'buffer' provided by the site is 2 metres wide. Architect's plan GA_033 shows the 'buffer' as reducing from 3 metres in front of numbers 36 and 29 to 1.5 metres in front of numbers 35/34 and 28/27. There is no buffer at the site boundary with Numbers 32 and 33. No. 33 actually has a terrace running up the boundary of the site on the first floor. No 35 has a terrace proposed to end only 1.5 metres from the boundary wall. This will directly overlook a shower room/toilet and a living room on the ground floor of No 35 at a distance of less than 10 metres. The 1st floor west-facing rooms of the existing houses on the eastern flank do not 'only serve staircases and bathrooms' (see submitted document DS Report 4.3.1). They are also living rooms and bedrooms. These will be adversely affected and overlooked by the proposed development. The proposed terraces, even though not actual rooms, are still areas of occupation and will impact heavily on the privacy of the houses.</p> <p>3 The views expressed in Planning Statement 7.83 are factually wrong, misleading and contentious. Architect Drawings GA_033 and GA_034 show that the proximity of the mass of the building and the terraces on both the first and second floors, even with the proposed vertical COR-TEN steel Louvres, however angled, will not mitigate the intrusion on the neighbours' privacy. The terraces are intended for use, not as decoration. They will need lighting, as will the bedrooms. Even with obscure glazed windows, there will be light and noise pollution affecting Nos 36/35, 33, 34, 30 and 29. There will be further light pollution from the ground floor plan. Submitted Documents GA_032 and GA_063 show full-length, unobscured windows directly overlooking the rear of the houses 36 – 34; in the case of numbers 35 and 34 they will be less than 10 metres away. There is no indication of the height of these windows or of how the interior space will be illuminated. There is no indication of how this luminance will be mitigated. One might surmise from GA_041 that there will be a wall 2 metres high forming the site boundary but there is no accurate plan or any statement of its construction/depth/lighting. The bricks shown in the mock ups (GA_063 and GA_064) are inappropriate and out of character with the old London bricks used</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>on the boundary side walls of the existing houses.</p> <p>The proposal for additional community space is welcome. But we contend that the architectural proposal pays insufficient attention to its effect on the neighbours. The plan for the Ground floor (GA_032) shows two public access routes for the Community areas. One has direct access from Rochester Square south. The other, also serving the entrance to living accommodation units 1, 2 and 3, is directly adjacent to the boundaries of numbers 32, 33, 34, 35 and 36 Rochester Square. The visual representation (GA_064) shows this. However there is no indication of the lighting plan or of any security precautions. Given that an Exclusion Order was recently enforced on the Rochester Court estate; that until recently drug dealing was commonplace on the junction of Camden Mews and Rochester Square; that when the squatters in Rochester Square Gardens were evicted evidence of drug use was found there, it is surely an issue of great environmental and social importance to ensure appropriate illumination and security.</p> <p>This illumination will cause yet more light pollution to the neighbouring houses and will add to the already extensive adverse effects of the proposal.</p> <p>Planning Statement 7.44 says there will be, "inter alia" public performances of literary, theatrical and film events. There will inevitably be noise from the building, from users and from audiences as they arrive and depart; the public access route referred to above is the only external space available for smokers. We note there is no information concerning sound insulation, lighting or facilities such as a refreshment bar in the plans. All of this is cause for objection on the grounds that it will adversely affect the right of peaceful enjoyment of the residents of 32 to 36 Rochester Square. Additionally it will have a negative effect on the residential amenities of the other residents.</p> <p>4 We are not confident of the assertions in the Structural Report 8.18 concerning the basement. The report suggests that the plans for the basement are technically questionable. The BIA Structural report indicates a lack of confidence. Please observe the number of qualifiers in the next sentences. It notes groundwater is 'considered to form a thin but laterally continuous aquifer unit that is possibly confined and that it is considered prudent to adopt a conservative approach' to the basement construction. It highlights the problems of damp and the challenges this presents, (see BIA Appendix C(1)) both during and after construction. BIA Appendix C(1) also says that the excavation of the basement may undermine the adjacent property and could lead to settlement in gardens and damage to buildings and below ground services. None of that is an unequivocal endorsement of the proposal. Given the history of damp in the houses on the eastern flank and in Julian Court this is especially worrying and is cause for objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>We respectfully request that unless the revised plans to be submitted materially address these concerns the Council's Planning Committee should review and reject this proposal,</p> <p>a) on the grounds of it having a major adverse effect on the privacy, outlook, the right of peaceful enjoyment, and the loss of existing views of the residents of 29 – 36 Rochester Square and occupants of Julian Court.</p> <p>b) on the grounds that the proposed increase in volume and mass and the proximity of the building to adjacent residential properties is overbearing, out of scale for the area and out of character of the existing plot.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					c) on the grounds that its appearance represents an unsympathetic alteration to the balance between old and new in a designated Conservation Area, especially in relation to the Victorian buildings it abuts, and creates an undesirable precedent by its disregard of Camden guidelines for residential building.
2016/7088/P	Steven Mackintosh	31 ROCHESTER SQUARE	07/08/2017 16:40:22	COMMNT	Regarding my last comment . My preferred method of contact is actually email and not post as previously stated Details below
2016/7088/P	Rachel Wrangham	20 Rochester Square	07/08/2017 13:02:41	OBJ	<p>I strongly oppose this outrageous application.</p> <p>The Spiritualist Temple is an unusual and historically important building. It's a modest but attractive building, with an interesting association with Conan Doyle. Until recently, it was in regular use. Since being illegally squatted, it has looked less loved, but is still a very attractive building on the stretch of Rochester Square that was inexplicably marred by a modern back-garden development.</p> <p>This proposed development is even more out of character than that. Its scale is gross, and its style inappropriate. It would overlook, crowd, and take light from houses in the 'lane' section of Rochester Square, and from flats in Julian Court. Enormous windows would afford existing residents little privacy.</p> <p>There can be no grounds for building over the Temple garden. This forms an important end vista to Camden Mews, the longest mews in London. The 'glimpse' this space gives, of sky, and of the rear elevation of the Temple, must be preserved.</p> <p>The Temple itself should be subject to a protection order of some sort, and should not be threatened with demolition. Conversion to residential or community use could be appropriate, but demolition should not be considered.</p> <p>Camden's local plan has outlawed the building of basements, and a basement should not be contemplated on this site.</p> <p>The 'community space' smells of a cunning attempt to win support for an unpleasant proposal. What would it be used for? Would it be offices, or an events space of some kind? The area is at present substantially residential, and this is a significant change of use. Finally, it should be remembered that this has been, for nearly 90 years, a place of worship. What would</p> <p>This is a grossly insensitive and inappropriate proposal, which should be rejected.</p>
2016/7088/P	Jill Trafford	5 cross street Hollingworth Hyde Cheshire sk148nz	05/08/2017 14:56:48	OBJ	<p>I object to the demolition of the spiritualist temple Rochester square London.</p> <p>This is part of our English heritage, we have lost enough already, this is a church, a disgraceful act to take it and demolish it. This has to stop.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Blythe Mackintosh	31 Rochester Square NW1 9RZ	07/08/2017 14:20:28	COMMNT	<p>Adding to my previous comment, I oppose the development on the following specific grounds. The density of the proposal would be an overdevelopment in the conservation area. It shows a disregard for CPG6, in regard to proximity to other dwellings nearby. Especially 29-36 Rochester square and many flats in Julian Court. These properties would lose their open aspect and would be seriously overlooked by the proposed development. Many of the drawings in the plans are misleading, insubstantial and incorrect. Planning statement 7.7 is vague, incorrect and misleading regarding VSC and daylight distribution. The current pitched roof gives a sense of expanse and allows for light in a way that is incomparable with the proposed solid bulky structure. A structure that would stand at over 10 metres high, when seen from the lower ground patios of the houses in Rochester Square, one metre beneath ground level and barely 10 metres from the rear rooms of those houses. This is clearly not in line with the attitude, spirit and ethos of the conservation area. Planning statement 7.81 is incorrect. The minimum distance of 18 metres (laid out in Camden's CPG6 distance guidelines) between windows of nearby habitable rooms and properties, is not adhered to in the plans. The distance from the rear windows of 29-36 Rochester Square to the existing boundary of the site, is actually 8/9 metres and not 15 metres as claimed. The proposed partial buffer, still only allows for 12 metres between the windows of the proposed building and the windows of 29-36 Rochester Square. Planning statement 7.82 is flawed, incorrect and contains worrying elements. The proposed 2 metre buffer on plan GA033, is actually 1.5 metres in front of 30/31 and 34/35 Rochester Square, numbers 32 and 33 have NO buffer at all between them and the site. The public access routes in GA032 on the ground floor, are extremely concerning. The plans show entrances to the proposed building, would be adjacent to the boundaries of /30/31/33/34/35/, with access from the square at either end of the site. There is a well documented history of drug dealing/using and drug related anti social behaviour and prostitution in the immediate area, particularly at the junction of Camden mews and Rochester square. These access routes, do not take into consideration, the security of the adjacent properties. Again, this is strong grounds for objection, as this is a matter of social and environmental importance. The plans in GA041, show no accurate description, construction, or materials used in the building of the 2 metre supposed boundary wall. Bricks shown in plans GA063 and GA064, are inappropriate and out of character with the original Victorian London brick, used on the boundary walls of existing houses 29-36. I do not wish to see my original garden wall demolished for this development. I have very serious doubts and concerns about assertions made in report 8.18 regarding the basement excavation. In the BIA report, the problems and challenges of damp are highlighted. BIA appendix C (1) states that basement excavations MAY undermine adjacent property and COULD lead to settlement in gardens and damage to buildings and below ground services. This clearly shows enough doubt for this aspect of the proposal to be totally withdrawn. The recent water damage and damp to Julian Court from an adjacent building development, highlights serious concerns with basement excavations in this clay based area. The evidence is not conclusive that nearby buildings WILL NOT be affected and therefore this is strong grounds for objection. There is currently no basement in the temple, again clearly showing that the proposal is disproportionate to the current site. Unless these requests and concerns are seriously addressed, we feel the planning committee should reject this proposal</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p data-bbox="1099 134 1167 153">due to</p> <p data-bbox="1099 165 2069 217">A: adverse effect on privacy, loss of views, light, outlook, noise in relation to the residents of 36-29 Rochester Square and Julian Court.</p> <p data-bbox="1099 229 2069 280">B: Proposed building is overbearing, out of scale (in terms of mass/volume and proximity to adjacent buildings) and out of character with the existing plot.</p> <p data-bbox="1099 293 2089 376">C:The design is unsympathetic and unbalances the relationship between the old and new in what is a designated conservation area. These plans have a disregard for Camden guidelines for residential buliding and would set a disturbing precedent for future plans.</p>
