

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Tris timson	5a Willoughby road london NW3 1RP	08/08/2017 15:18:18	COMNOT	<p>I have been a member of Rochester square temple for many many years. In the late 80's I attended a funeral there with my colleague Richard Talbit, of our good friend John Shepherd. His ashes, after the service, were dug into the garden to commemorate him. Since the late 1920's the land has been used as a final resting place for countless souls. This is just one of many reasons why I and so many people (many of whom are either unable or unaware of how to object), are totally against any development of the land. The SNU closed the doors to the Temple under the pretext of renovation works which they never undertook. They made no advice of closing the Temple and people were coming from as far away as Iceland and America for services. That is how well known and respected this particular Temple is. People were devastated. Richard took it upon himself to stand at the gates of the Temple to explain. The SNU were informed and made no response. Various questions have been posed as to how the SNU gained control over the land. At the final AGM the members were assured that the Temple would never be demolished by one Graham Hewitt, their property manager, it seems that the SNU have not followed protocol in any way. This Temple is also the one and only example of a temple designed by architect Thomas Yorke Esquire. This makes it unique and far more historically valuable than is being currently acknowledged. The foundation stone is laid by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle who had a special connection to the Elliss's who rendered themselves homeless to create this healing space for the community in the 1920's. In the 50's the SNU were associated with the deeds in order to protect the Temple. No money was ever exchanged and many questions need to be asked about how they consider profiting from ripping the heart out of this and a much broader community to be validated. The SNU only became remotely interested in the Temple when the charity commission changed their laws as to the legal rights of selling property and land. Prior to this the congregation were barely aware of their existence. I understand that the destruction of trees in the garden took place illegally and sincerely hope that the council will make sure the financial penalties for this act are enforced and trees planted back. The proposed plans include excavation for a basement. This may effect the foundations of the houses close by over time. Neighbors are very worried. How anybody could even imagine that the conciliatory proposal of an art gallery to pacify the locals and make them think that this is being done altruistically for the benefit of the neighborhood is ridiculous and a transparent legal play. The actual work that this Temple has done within its walls right up until its doors were forcibly shut is quite beyond measure. The temple serves people of all religions cultures and creeds, healing and uplifting people who have literally had nowhere else to turn to. This has always been done as a humane gift from people who have desired neither financial gain or merit. Well over 100 local signatures have already been collected to oppose these plans.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	P Pirecki	30 Rochester square	09/08/2017 23:39:32	OBJ	<p>Re OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION: 2016/7088/P</p> <p>I oppose the development on the following specific grounds:</p> <p>The density of the proposal would be an over-development 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.</p> <p>These properties would lose their access to daylight, their open aspect and would be seriously overlooked by the proposed development.</p> <p>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 of the existing Temple building 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 above and below</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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 bulidings 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> <p>To recap, reasons for rejection:</p> <p>A: adverse effect on privacy, loss of views, significant loss of daylight to lower ground floor that already lack sufficient light penetration and would be plunged into even more darkness, significant loss of daylight to the raised ground and first floors of 36-29 Rochester Square and Julian Court, loss of outlook, noise pollution from the density of residents in the proposed new buildings including but not limited to their access to multiple roof terraces in close proximity to and overlooking the adjacent properties, especially in relation to 36-29 Rochester Square and Julian Court.</p> <p>B: the 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.</p> <p>D: we do not need another 'community art space' in Rochester Square. Sufficient and well equipped provision already exists within walking distance of Rochester Square.</p> <p>E: the Spiritualist Temple is an iconic building in an area that prides itself on architectural diversity. It would be an outrage if this building were to be demolished to be replaced with a generic, overbearing and bulky development.</p> <p>F: these plans have a disregard for Camden guidelines for residential building and would set a disturbing precedent for future plans.</p>

2016/7088/P	Malcolm Mackintosh	14 Chapelfield Way Sawston Cambridge CB22 3SY	09/08/2017 12:05:00	COMMENT	This Spiritualist Church is of historic and religious importance and this will grow over time. Its preservation is a vital part of the legacy for future generations and it must not be destroyed.This apart, the proposal is totally inappropriate. It is too close to existing buildings which would be in serious danger of damage during the construction process and the density of occupation would place unacceptable strain on a densely occupied area already short of parking spaces.The proposed would cause a serious deterioration in the lives of everyone living in the locality and should be refused while ensuring the preservation of this important church.
2016/7088/P	P Duprez	5 Wellesley rd Wood Green London n22 6ep	08/08/2017 10:11:25	COMMEM PER	I object to the plans as the church was opened for people in need. The S.N.U have no heart all they think of is money. They cannot call theirselves spiritualist as they want to destroy a church opened for true spritual people. please stop these plans going ahead.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	melody boon	basement flat 214 A camden Rd Camden Town nw19hg nw19hg	09/08/2017 12:01:43	OBJ	Historic Building-Place of Worship-1st stone laid by Sir Conan Doyle-Place of Historic interest therefore as Famous Author-Meeting Place for people in the community-Place of Sanctuary-Place of Calm Refuge within heart of Camden-Against many many camden residents wishes-Protected trees in community garden-Decline in many vulnerable peoples mental health needs as their communal place of sanctuary was closed/ and proposed Demolished

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Tom Gentleman	32 Rochester Square London NW1 9RZ	09/08/2017 13:54:52	OBJ	I object to the proposed development for the reasons set out in the attached submission. I wish to be notified of the date of the committee meeting.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Tom Benson	30 Rochester Square NW1 9RZ	09/08/2017 22:21:08	COMMNT	<p>Re OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION: 2016/7088/P</p> <p>I live at 30 Rochester Square. I oppose the development on the following specific grounds. The density of the proposal would be an over-development 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 buliding of the 2 metre supposed boundary wall. Bricks shown in plans GA063 and GA064 are innapropraite 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 above 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 bulidings WILL NOT be affected and therefore this is strong grounds for objection. There is currently no basement in the temple, again clearly</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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> <p>To recap, reasons for rejection:</p> <p>A: adverse effect on privacy, loss of views, significant loss of light to lower ground floor that lack sufficient light penetration as things are, and would be plunged into even more darkness, outlook, noise in relation to the residents of 36-29 Rochester Square and Julian Court.</p> <p>B: the 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.</p> <p>D: we do not need another 'community art space' in Rochester Square. Sufficient and well equipt provision already exists within walking distance of Rochester Square.</p> <p>E: the Spiritualist Temple is an iconic building in an area that prides itself on architectural diversity. It would be an outrage if this building were to be demolished to be replaced with an generic, overbearing and brutal development.</p> <p>F: these plans have a disregard for Camden guidelines for residential buliding and would set a disturbing precedent for future plans.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	juliet ramsden	30 rochester square	09/08/2017 22:55:56	OBJ	<p>live at 30 Rochester Square. I oppose the development on the following specific grounds. The density of the proposal would be an over-development 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 buliding of the 2 metre supposed boundary wall. Bricks shown in plans GA063 and GA064 are innapropriate 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 above 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 bulidings 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</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>concerns are seriously addressed, we feel the planning committee should reject this proposal.</p> <p>To recap, reasons for rejection:</p> <p>A: adverse effect on privacy, loss of views, significant loss of light to lower ground floor that lack sufficient light penetration as things are, and would be plunged into even more darkness, outlook, noise in relation to the residents of 36-29 Rochester Square and Julian Court.</p> <p>B: the 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.</p> <p>D: we do not need another 'community art space' in Rochester Square. Sufficient and well equipt provision already exists within walking distance of Rochester Square.</p> <p>E: the Spiritualist Temple is an iconic building in an area that prides itself on architectural diversity. It would be an outrage if this building were to be demolished to be replaced with an generic, overbearing and brutal development.</p> <p>F: these plans have a disregard for Camden guidelines for residential buliding and would set a disturbing precedent for future plans.</p>

2016/7088/P	Dorothy Parris	84 Cambridge Road Waterbeach Cambridge CB25 9NJ	08/08/2017 10:44:11	COMMNT	3 Storey building will be too high, it will be invasive to the properties immediately behind in Rochester Square. The Church is standing on an area which has been treated as conservation, we would hope to see some planting of trees etc to keep up the green space for the surrounding houses.
-------------	----------------	---	---------------------	--------	--
