

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Tom Benson	30 Rochester Square NW1 9RZ	10/08/2017 11:51:02	OBJ	<p>Re OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION: 2016/7088/P --UPDATE--</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 building 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</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Azzi Glasser	24 Rochester Square London NW1 9SA	10/08/2017 17:39:00	OBJ	<p>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>
					<p>I strongly oppose to the demolition of this building that is full of heritage and culture and part of the history of Britain.</p> <p>I also have not even been contacted by email or by post, and have been a resident on the square for many years, in fact I live only a few doors away from it. I believe this is also a conservation area and i would have thought there would be strict guidelines on protecting the surrounding area too and the disruption it will cause around.I am appalled of the plans that have been submitted in destroying this old beautiful church and strongly advise you not to give any permission to the developers. We have invested already a lot of our money into the square and do not wish it to be destroyed in this vulgar manner.</p> <p>We need to preserve and enhance the beauty of London and not destroy it.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Helena Stainforth	71 a Queens Crescent London NW5 4ES	10/08/2017 16:58:24	COMNOT	The temple should be restored. It's disappearance will erode the charm and beauty of this conservation area. This Temple is a one off and therefore should not be disposed of. As far as I am aware it is the only example of the work of the architect who designed it in the 1920's. I am extremely concerned that Camden Council rules are no longer being adhered to. It seems that protected trees were cut down in the Temple garden without asking permission. Unless these plans are now scuppered, and the perpetrators fined and forced to plant trees back immediately this sort of thing will just keep happening and Camden Council will lose all authority. Also, having looked at the plans I do not agree with the excavation of a basement area. The surrounding listed buildings could well be at risk of foundation damage. The people living in these houses bought them because of the rural beauty and charm of the area. Why should they have their properties devalued? when you live in a conservation area, that is what you actually expect it to be. If anything is to be demolished it should be the hideous modern house that recently got built practically hanging off the side of the Temple. I was never aware of any planning permission for this monstrosity and if the neighborhood had been aware it would never have been allowed to be constructed. I would personally very much like to be informed of how on earth that was allowed to happen. Also, the area is not in need of an art gallery. Many people I have spoken to about this have suggested that it may well be a ploy on behalf of the developers to make a token gesture to the community that it is for public welfare. Well we have had art galleries come and go in neighboring Murray st. They failed. The Temple however was not a failure. It helped people from all walks of life up until the day the doors were closed. People traveled from Europe and the USA to attend services there. This, more than any other planning application I have ever looked at, (and there are many), is one instance where Camden Council really must put its foot down. The developers who illegally desecrated the garden should actually be forced to refurbish the Temple for their presumptuous and illegal act. Otherwise Camden council is well on the way to losing all control within the borough.
2016/7088/P	Sharon Campbell	50 a Camden Street London NW1 ODX	10/08/2017 15:46:01	COMNOT	I object entirely to these planning proposals. I am aware of funerals that have taken place in the Temple. Some of my friends did actually attend funerals where ashes of the deceased were dug into the garden. This is hallowed ground and must not be disturbed. This practise has been happening since the mid 1920's, so many souls must have this ground as their last resting place. Also to dig a basement out with beautiful protected houses around it which are old may over time play havoc with their foundations. No more flats are needed in this area. They are destroying the character of the area and it is far more important to plant back the trees that were illegally destroyed in the Temple garden. The Temple is a beautiful old building, there are no others exactly like this as the architect only ever built this particular one. Any funds should be put into restoring it to its former glory, as the deed holders had promised at their final AGM