

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Mr. Les Green	11 Marie Lloyd house Murray Grove London N1 7PU	15/08/2017 17:03:46	OBJ	<p>This Temple has been serving the community since it opened its doors in 1927, with the kind financial assistance of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. At the front of the Temple a foundation stone with his name carved in it supports the building. Up until the day its doors were closed it has been a strong part of this local community, and for London as a whole, providing healing, sanctuary, friendship, philosophy, and so much more.,</p> <p>As far as I am lead to believe the architect who designed this temple never designed another and it is something therefore of a one-off. It was forced into a state of poor condition by the Spiritualist National Union who allowed a nephew of one of their Temple overseers to build a house practically hanging off the side of it, which added to problems of damp and leakage.</p> <p>Trees were illegally cut down in the garden without permission, even though this is a conservation area.</p> <p>The garden was a garden of remembrance. The ashes of many were dug into the land with rosebushes and trees planted to commemorate them. Whoever was responsible for the massacre of this garden should clearly be made to renovate the Temple at the very least.</p> <p>The proposed flats are an eyesore. they do not fit in at all with the wonderful and rare character of the area. Flats are going up everywhere in Camden, Town, each one more ghastly looking and unlivable in as the next. Why should such a development be tolerated in this historically significant part of London. The people living by the temple must be distraught at the thought of the charming building on their doorstep being flattened and a basement dug out right on their doorsteps. God alone knows what that could do to their foundations and their views. Their houses may be protected, but this work has an unknown future effect on old foundations.\</p> <p>Nobody I have met nor myself feel that an art gallery could even begin to touch making up for the loss of service to the community provided by this Temple. Any ordinary human being would rather sit in a beautiful garden on a bench under an exquisite Lime Tree which the developers have destroyed, than go underneath the ground to ogle a painting of it.</p> <p>Basically, these plans are frightful,</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Les Green ,</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Tracey Hood	116 Gervase Rd Edgware Middlesex ha8 0ep	14/08/2017 15:43:05	COMMNT	I am informing you that I am making an objection to this planning application on the grounds that as a member of this Church, I am in dispute with the owners, The Spiritualist National Union. The SNU have deliberately let the Church fall into disrepair so it could be sold. The Church was founded in 1926 by Pioneers of Spiritualism (our movement) and the Church itself contains many antiques and memorabilia as well as irreplaceable plaques on the front wall and stained glass windows. It is of historical significance to the movement. It has been a beacon of light and support of those in need. It should continue to be that.
2016/7088/P	Gloria Hewgill	508 Carole House 80 Regents Park Road NW1 8UE	15/08/2017 10:48:57	COMMNT	I object to anything which destroys the temple in Rochester Road. This has now been senselessly shut for several years by these rapacious developers. Gloria Hewgill gloriakhewgill@gmail.com

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Derek O'Neil	flat 9 Pierrepoint Road London W3 9JJ	15/08/2017 15:22:15	OBJ	<p>The plans are unattractive and unwelcome on several points.</p> <p>Basement excavation is an awful thing to inflict on this conservation area, especially since there are lovely old houses nearby that may be at risk of weakened foundations in years to come.</p> <p>Too many modern flats are being built in the area. These plans will destroy the charm of the location. The Temple was a great amenity for the area. It was allowed to be run down on purpose for financial gain. This is quite shocking, and unacceptable. Camden council should not back this sort of manipulative, greedy and destructive behavior..</p> <p>Trees that were protected were cut down by prospective developers. There was no planning permission. Mature trees are (unlike a building)..nothing that can be constructed speedily. Is Camden Council losing its sense of authority? How dare such a travesty take place? The garden of Rochester Square Temple has the ashes of many souls interred there. Trees and bushes were planted to commemorate them..</p> <p>The community will suffer greatly if this Temple is disposed of. Up until its doors were closed it served those in greatest need. All races, religions, creeds were welcome .It opened its arms to the sick, the bereaved ,the curious and the joyous, without judgement or disclosure .Nothing like this in Camden remains The community will certainly suffer.</p> <p>Surely the perpetrators of the tree massacre should be forced to renovate this lovely old building.</p> <p>How can an underground art gallery replace what the community will lose? It is laughable.</p> <p>I have faith enough in Camden Council that they will NOT allow these awful trespassing plans to go ahead.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Derek O'Neil,</p> <p>Vice President of Rochester Square Temple.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Iiris Ryan	44a camden Square NW1 9XA	15/08/2017 00:47:47	OBJ	<p>The plans are ugly. They do not fit in with local streets.</p> <p>Flats of this kind are being built all over Camden, many remaining empty.</p> <p>Basement excavation is a wound to this conservation land.</p> <p>Surrounding houses will possibly suffer foundation damage in the future.</p> <p>Trees which the area needs have been cut down. I have received information that no permission was given.How can this take place in a conservation area? If this is allowed, what next?</p> <p>Art galleries have been proven to fail in this area People visit here for the nature,which has already suffered. not to go inside and look at pictures of nature.</p> <p>Nothing about these plans appeal, either to me or anybody I know</p> <p>sincerely</p> <p>Iris Ryan.</p>
2016/7088/P	Ben Emlyn-Jones	151 Divinity Road St Clements OX4 1LP OX4 1LP	16/08/2017 18:24:46	OBJ	<p>Please do not demolish this classic Spiritualist church. It is a piece of historical legacy of Spiritualism, this country and the local area. Its cornerstone was laid by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. It would be a tragedy to lose such a place of rich tradition.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	k.Lacey	47 Weavers Way London NW1 0XF	11/08/2017 19:34:59	OBJNOT	<p>I am objecting to this application as it is premature to say that this community resources e cannot be saved as the developers maintain in the heritage brief. I contacted several of those responsible for this building and they did not reply to me. I would have appreciated time to raise the money to buy the Temple and save it as a community resource. I believe the former congregation can still do so.</p> <p>Secondly the building is the earliest purpose built spiritualist church in North London and deserves on historical and architectural grounds to be saved. No other comparable buildings exist and the architects work is Only Represented By This Building. It Is All Too Easy to Dismiss this as a worthless building. It has interesting features such a an original platform, roof, glass and neon cross on the roof. SPIRITUALIST CHURCHES OF THIS PERIOD are rare. A Slmilar Art DEco Spiritualist CHurch In Littlehampton Was also Destroyed for flats.</p> <p>The Need for A Community Building Is Greater Than Flats. Losing this place Of Worship is Unacceptable. The Congregation could Keep It Open. The SNU Wants The Money More Yet We The Former congregation Can Use The funds From the sale For another Building.</p> <p>The developers have erred in saying that it cannot be saved as a church. As an historian and professional fundraiser I am certain I Can help save it.</p> <p>The History Of The Building And Its Local Architect Is A Heritage Asset To Camden.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Graham Coxon	36 Rochester Square Camden NW1 9RZ	16/08/2017 22:49:43	COMNOT	Re Planning Application 2016/7088/P

Please read carefully: our objections to the proposed demolition of the Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple and redevelopment of the site  
(Please also see the further numbered objections that form the latter part of this document)

#### ON THE SUBJECT OF DEMOLITION AS OPPOSED TO RESTORATION

To begin with I would like to discuss the proposed demolition of Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple. I wholly oppose the destruction of this significant Religious and Historic building. The National contribution the Spiritualist Movement has made since its inception, particularly after the First World War when the whole country was grieving, it's connections to the science of empirical discoveries and the lives that have been touched and made better communally by these Temples in their working states must be subjects carefully considered before assessing the fate of these vulnerable religious buildings under threat and out of respect for the many people who work and utilise these essential spiritual spaces today.

It is against every moral code to destroy religious buildings. Spiritualism is a recognised religion in this country and environmentally, restoration and conversion should always outweigh destruction and re-development.

It is also extremely important to protect our historic buildings. Not just for the country but for Camden's historical prosperity. The RSST is almost one hundred years old, less than nine years shy of being eligible for a Historical Listing. It's interior is exquisite, with intact carvings, glasswork and original murals - and it's exterior could very easily be restored and returned to its former glory. Having entered the building (on many occasions over the years) and conversed with the individuals who tried so hard to restore it (against adversity from 'above') and contributed to its past use on occasion, I can tell you that the building was very much appreciated and loved and attended not just by its official membership but by many members of the local community including ourselves. Since it has been closed (we thought for restoration) it has been in the press due to an issue with a set of squatters who have now vacated the building.

From the Evening Standard:

Graham Hewitt, assistant general secretary of the Spiritualist National Union which owns the church, said: "Our congregation has been there since 1926 when Sir Arthur Conan Doyle laid down the church's foundations. I don't know what this group is doing here, all I know is I want them out."

The question is, who is then therefore responsible for putting the site up for sale to developers ...?

and just how was it previously agreed that another developer was allowed to build right up

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

against the RSST's wall ?  
When will the strict guidelines of this Conservation Area start being effectively enforced ?  
These guidelines must be upheld.

PLEASE HELP US SAVE, RESTORE AND PRESERVE THE ROCHESTER SQUARE  
SPIRITUALIST TEMPLE ONCE AND FOR ALL

Contrary to the insistence of the developers the building is not derelict nor is it ripe for demolition. Whether the powers that be at the Spiritualist National Union now conveniently consider the Temple of absolutely no worth to the point that they are willing to dismantle and steal its exterior and brickwork and sell the site to these developers, is another subject that should be under discussion here. It certainly does not take into account the emotional impact: the wishes and feelings of all of the local residents who pass the temple each day and or whom can view aspects of the RSST and its lovely garden from their houses and consider it of historical and architectural importance to Camden: internationally - because one of our country's most famous authors and the creator of the Sherlock Holmes detective novels, the writer Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, was the founder of this very place as well as an influential advocate of the Spiritualist Movement (his foundation stone is the first thing a pedestrian would notice) or the fact that it is a beloved historical sight directly within vicinity of our homes, as residents of Rochester Square, a Camden Conservation Area and a building of significance that we all feel emotionally connected to as part of our home here in this Square

It is absolutely shameful that this religious centre of hope has been closed and deliberately left empty in order to force a redevelopment of the site, when any redevelopment should be primarily concerned in preserving what is already there. This is a building of significance which desperately needs your protection and support, in your authority as the Planning Department of Camden Council.

OUR EMOTIONAL & MATERIAL ATTACHMENTS TO THE ROCHESTER SQUARE  
SPIRITUALIST TEMPLE SITE AND IT'S CURRENT CONDITION - FOLLOWED BY THE  
REMAINDER OF OUR DETAILED OBJECTIONS

Speaking up for all the residents, the Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple is part of our home and our neighbourhood as well as a religious centre.

In our time living at Rochester Square we have all experienced some use of the Temple, enjoyed its Summer Open Days and had conversations with many passers-by and members regarding its significance and importance to the community. The tourists who pass by or seek it out specifically are touched and intrigued by the presence of the foundation stones and by the building itself. Residents along this terrace and beyond had hoped for an imminent restoration of the Temple and its garden, which also provides a much needed 'green space'

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

in the area.

The RSST is a small and simple yet beautiful building, a fine example of a Spiritualist Temple from the early part of last century. The original building is sound, all the heating pipes are new and the only major issues are with the glass areas of the roof. There is also very very skilfully painted gold mural of the seven principles inside that needs to be seen to be believed.

We would urge you make it your priority to visit and assess the Temple for yourselves, our only fears being that criminal damage could be made in anticipation of such a visit. It is very clear that there are unscrupulous forces at work here, those who would wish for the Temple to appear a unsalvageable wreck fit only for demolition. We as residents are watching carefully for signs of any criminal damage to its facade and contents and will be reporting any breaches to the Police.

#### OBJECTIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF REDEVELOPMENT

The apparent reasons the application provides for redeveloping the site are not valid:

The design of the relevant application is actually a divisive proposition for our Conservation neighbourhood - as is the destruction of the Temple in favour of a much larger commercial build - any redevelopment would be the cause of an unconscionable amount of distress and anguish for us as residents, as well as causing major disruptions, dust and noise pollution and traffic at the entrance to our Square which provides the only thoroughfare from the Camden Road directly into Rochester Square and neighbouring areas. It would mean that large construction vehicles would have to access the site from this aspect only. Also nine apartments behind our small gardens and a so called communal space would mean a lot more noise, pedestrian and vehicle traffic and naturally if there are many more residents, as well as families of residents and visitors to the building, they will want to use their outside spaces both on the ground and on higher levels, as they wish, causing a lot of invasive noise pollution.

With UrbanLab's proposed community facilities (which we can't trust will even feature in the final build or if so, how long it would remain) the added extra human and vehicle traffic and blockages would prevent us from being able to use our Square as we have been accustomed to and as established residents, we have full rights to. This could cause no end of misery, not to mention the general adverse affects it would have on all of the nearby residents during a lengthy noisy and messy build - on our homes and our businesses. Many of us work from home and some of us rent our properties to other families - who would naturally wish to end their tenancies and all of the above would prevent us from procuring any new tenants. Therefore the financial impact would be immediate and deadly. For us personally we currently have tenants in our house, without them we would not be able to pay our mortgage and would be in danger of losing our current main home, also in North London. Looking ahead, we would



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

also not be able to return to Rochester Square as was the plan. We would be prevented from returning to a home where where our views, access to light, privacy and fears of long term structural issues due to the below objections would be prevalent. Our children would be extremely sad about this.

The destruction, redevelopment and final structure would therefore greatly impact on our abilities to enjoy our homes both immediately and long term, impair our ability to work from home in a peaceful environment and pay our bills and mortgages, causing us unacceptable and prolonged mental, emotional and financial stress and disruption and subject us to an ugly view and loss of privacy in our homes and gardens.

Of particularly grave concern is the fact that our rear garden wall, which runs along the end of the terrace, lies on the boundary of the proposed development. This wall is original. It would be unacceptable for this wall to be dismantled and for the old brickwork to suddenly be rejoined onto new brickwork where it meets the railings of the RSST.

The Temple itself also forms the majority of our rear boundary, therefore we would be without a boundary at the bottom of our garden which, considering that we wholly object to the demolition and redevelopment, surely has some legal standing and is something we would be prepared to exercise if necessary. It is unacceptable to imagine a new wall there - simply put, the period aesthetics at the end of our garden and our direct neighbours as well as along the terrace, would be severely and unacceptably altered. We would also feel much less secure.

Another subject (dealt with below) is the sheer inappropriate and unsympathetic design of the proposed building in comparison to what is already currently there. This cannot be fully assessed from their plan, it's a drawing, the reality would be much worse. Our views of other surrounding period homes would also be greatly affected. All this hampers our rights within the Conservation Area we live in.

We have been told by the developers that the new residents would not be entitled to Camden parking passes. This seems preposterous as surely as residents they would be entitled to passes?? Parking around the Square is already challenging at the best of times. However if this is accurate then surely they would park illegally anyway, causing blind spots where our children would be unable to cross the roads safely. Or perhaps the basement excavation might provide them with a car park. Of course, this also is an utterly preposterous proposition due to the ground limitations as well as the risks of subsidence.

Further to this, we do not require an additional community arts hub, having an spacious artists' ceramic studio in the centre of Rochester Square and a huge and more than adequate childrens' play centre just meters away in neighbouring Camden Square. We also do not need a noisy environment right against the back of our garden or our peaceful enjoyment of our houses and sleep to be interrupted by said hub's proposed nightly events.

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

Other objections as you will know by now feature information on what the Temple was built in that particular location and the limitations presented by the water table concerning ground water. There were also important fossils found on the site which means the garden area is of archeological interest. This presents yet another reason why this application and further applications need to be refused.

To conclude, if the RSST site was to be sold to developers, any applications for redevelopment of site it would have to be extremely considered, taking into account:

-The wishes and feelings and real impact on directly affected residents in the surrounding Conservation Area neighbourhood concerning the impact on their homes and lives and their wishes and concerns for the preservation of this Historic Building

-Propose a sympathetic restoration of the site where any additional and adjoining structure added to the Temple would not overbear, encroach on the views or access to natural light overshadowing our gardens and caused prolonged major disruption, noise or traffic

Not feature a basement excavation: as in this application - inappropriate and worrying in this Conservation Area and in such close proximity to our terrace of Early Victorian houses and all other dense housing in the vicinity

A willingness to ensure there would be no after-effects to the build or build extension - e.g. as with the nearby Julian Court development where surrounding residents are still suffering the effects of the build in an area where the water table is very high, losing trees and experiencing water damage and damp in their homes

and specifically not to add to the presence of the unsympathetic neighbouring development adjacent to the Temple which included an unscrupulous third party wall agreement as part of its successful application

#### DETAILED FURTHER OBJECTIONS

Comments on the proposed development of the Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple. We formally object to this proposal on the following grounds:

- 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
- b) The proposal sets out an unacceptably high density and over-development of the site in

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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 major deleterious effect on the quality of the light and the outlook of the adjacent houses.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 meters 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</p> <p>Planning Statement 7.82 is factually wrong and misleading in claiming the 'buffer' provided by the site is 2 metres wide.</p> <p>Architect's plan GA_033 shows the 'buffer' as reducing from 3 metres in front of numbers 36</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>and 29 to 1.5 metres in front of numbers 35/34 and 31/30 There is no buffer at the site boundary with Numbers 32 and 33. Numbers 32 and 33 actually have a terrace running up the boundary of the site on the first floor. Number 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. 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 meters 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 on the boundary side walls of the existing houses. 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. This illumination will cause yet more light pollution to the neighbouring houses and will add to</p>

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

the already extensive adverse effects of the proposal.

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.

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. 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 (our italics). 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.

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, 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.

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.

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 and not insignificantly because it would require the demolition of an important historical building.

#### CONCLUSION

The Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple forms a deeper and more meaningful part of this community than it is being given credit for and in the spirit of the original congregation of 1926 who all had to buy their own chairs, we urge your to listen to the power of the people and exercise your authority by refusing this application. A lot of residents and concerned parties in Camden are away at the moment as it is August. Otherwise the number of objections you are getting through would be quadrupling. The extension of the deadline until the 17th of this

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

month is nothing more than a token gesture. If UrbanLab were serious and genuine they would have withdrawn this application completely and consulted with our Conservation neighbourhood in order to find out what we feel would be an appropriate solution to regenerating this plot of land sandwiched in between our gardens. The sheer fact that not even one consultation was organised prior to entering their application is damning. If we had been consulted the resounding opinion would of course be to save the RSST and to work from the standing point of the original building, to preserve and improve upon what is already there.

What is evident here is that a lot of people are very upset and will be upset by this going forwards. This site is simply not suitable for a large and unattractive, unsympathetic and inappropriate multiple occupation dwelling. This is a Conservation Area. The new builds in this area are very few but there is dense occupation and green spaces are in short supply. Lessons need to be learnt about destroying the few green spaces we have left. The water table is high in this area and large building excavations destroy plants and trees and anything of archeological interest will be lost forever under the concrete.

The Temple, even in its empty state, was serving the community by supplying much needed views of greenery and a very attractive structural shape which greatly added to the urban historical landscape with no structural or visible threat to our houses. Its pitched roof adds a much needed aesthetic to the skyline in that area where Conservation and historic buildings should and must take precedence.

This Temple was and could still be a centre of community spirit - we all wish to see this happen and there are many of us. For almost one hundred years, it's provisions and services have been instrumental in assisting its many member and visitors in dealing with all areas of human grief, a subject that needs to be on the map in this country. Further to that we all feel an incredibly deep attachment to the building and garden. I know that we speak for much of Camden when I talk about the spotlight on preserving our historic buildings.

This significant building should be allowed to have a more appropriate use than filling the pockets of developers. The RSST site, building and garden, should never be redeveloped but should be preserved to form part of an historic trail on literature and Spiritualism through the borough of Camden, spanning the distance from Baker Street to Marylebone and onwards to Camden Town. Equally this archeological interest could be further explored before the garden could re-seeded with additional meadow and native ornamental plants. If any influential members of the SNU are reading this, this appeal goes out to you, please do the right thing or ensure that you sell this wonderful temple to someone who will.

To conclude, planning application 2016/7088/P for proposed redevelopment of the RSST site by UrbanLab features a token area of communal use in a building which would feature at least nine apartments and very possibly a future basement excavation. It is simply unacceptable that this could be allowed to happen. The contents of this application are in many ways abhorrent, inaccurate and unwelcome. To destroy the historic Rochester Square Spiritualist

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Maggie Moore	50 St Kenelms Road Romsley Halesowen Worcestershire	16/08/2017 20:27:17	OBJ	<p>Temple in a transparent bid for profit and subject us to this ominous, unsympathetic and unwanted modern building in such unacceptable close proximity to our properties would be incredibly tragic. In consideration of all of the above objections contained in this document and out of great concern for the Temple which currently resides on the site, we strongly object to this application and oppose any revised or further applications to demolish the Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple and redevelop the site.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the demolition of this historic building. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, a stalwart of Spiritualism and world reknown Author has historic connections that should not be destroyed. To demolish this temple is to deny present and future generations the beautiful and historic culture of English Spiritualism and heritage. So many pioneers of Spiritualism are connected to this building that to demolish it would be beyond belief.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Paula Gregory	25B Elaine Grove Oak Village London NW5 4QH	16/08/2017 13:22:41	COMMEM AIL	<p>Dear Camden Council Planning Office, ref: Spiritualist Temple: Rochester Square.</p> <p>The Spiritualist National Union: SNU who I believe owned and / or had the deeds to the above property have failed in their "duty" to ensure that the Spiritualist church as all persons attended have always called it. To ensure clarity of purpose and plans to change the premises from a temple into flats.</p> <p>Therefore, the community as a whole and those who would attend the temple consistently. Where not given an ample opportunity to have a say about the above new planning proposals. Neither, to be able to promote a challenge against such a new planning move.</p> <p>As a Community Centre/ Spiritualist Temple/ Church for thousands of people over the long years since it was opened. It has helped many within the Community as meeting place with no prejudice against what ever religion somebody came under. As all religions were welcome. All nationalities and age groups. It helped many with solace, aging, homelessness, mental health issues, drug dependency, alcoholism, and those who were suicidal, people new to the country, those suffering with domestic violence or any form of brutality etc., For Spiritualism covers and helps all forms differing life situations and aids belief in strengthening a persons worth and specialness/ uniqueness.</p> <p>It aided a gave a great deal to the community.</p> <p>I would ask that the Community/ ies are given an opportunity, one of which, the SNU have not allowed or been honest about, that the community is allowed time to challenge the closing down of the Spiritualist Temple?</p> <p>The building itself should have had a classification given to it for its Historical Past and that of those who first brought it into being. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle carries much weight as an historical benefactor. Surely, the above could be given some consideration by Camden Council Planning Department and that an extension of time could be given to the local community and others to at least set a challenge opposing the destruction of a much needed Spiritualist Trmple/ church Meeting centre. Camden is a huge Borough with many citizens in need of help. Many people who came to the church came from all over London and beyond. I would be grateful for any thought you could give to my Appeal.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
2016/7088/P	Mr Ronald MacThomas	8 Turner Court IV51 9TN	16/08/2017 02:03:10	OBJ	<p>I think the loss of this church would be to the detriment of society. It has a fundamental role in the British Spiritualist Movement. If anything it should be refurbished and publicised.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Coral Temple	34b Camden Square London Nw1 9XA	13/08/2017 23:42:58	OBJ	<p>I have attended Rochester Square Temple for over 20years. I am aware that every tree and rosebush planted in the garden was done so in commemoration of the people whose ashes were buried beneath them. It was regarded as a "living" garden. it is hallowed ground and must not be disturbed.The desecration that has already occurred without any planning permission must be redressed to honor the deceased.The idea of actually creating a basement is architecturally unacceptable considering the age and historical value of the neighboring houses whose foundations may well suffer from this in years to come. Not only is it architecturally unacceptable it is also unprecedentedly ghoulish. This Temple is a one off, both historically and architecturally, as the architect who designed it only ever built one temple and it can never be replaced. The sale and or destruction of this Temple is illegal.There are restrictions on the deeds. The SNU (Spiritualist national Union) were only ever handed the deeds as a protection to ensure that the Temple would always be kept as a Spiritualist Temple and never destroyed. They were simply entrusted to them for safe-keeping. This particular Temple has a unique history,, financed by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle in the 20's .There is a foundation stone engraved with his name that he laid. The SNU have broken their contract with both the members and congregation of the temple and with the spiritualist movement as a whole. Any sales of this property and or land which have taken place or may take place are illegal and null and void. There is strong evidence of nepotism.The house which absurdly was allowed to be built practically hanging off the temple, adding to problems of leakage for the building, is owned by a nephew of one Andreus Visiliou. This gentleman was sent into the Temple to run it by the SNU but had to be removed after reports of bullying and a tribunal which took 18 months to set up. There is much more going on here than meets the eye. These plans must NOT be allowed.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Valerian Freyberg	21 Patshull Road	11/08/2017 09:54:42	OBJEMPER	<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>I wish to object to this development for three reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, there are many church groups in Camden that are unable to find suitable spaces for worship so destroying this one seems inappropriate when there is still a current need.</p> <p>The Ethiopian Church, based in Tottenham Court Road, for example, has been searching for a suitable home over last two years as their Church is being redeveloped.</p> <p>Secondly, it would destroy an architectural and social amenity that is part of the historic fabric of the area.</p> <p>The new design has little architectural merit and is unsympathetic to the building surrounding it.</p> <p>Thirdly, the planned space is overdeveloped. It would be more appropriate to use the exiting shell and carve up the space within but I doubt there is 'enough' profit for the developer in doing this, hence this inappropriate scheme.</p>
2016/7088/P	Nicola Kohn	28 Stratford Villas London NW1 9SG	14/08/2017 12:22:36	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to this application. This is a building with an important local and national history which should be preserved. Furthermore, the erection of a 3 storey building and basement will cause damage to surrounding buildings which are erected with shallow foundations and susceptible to subsidence. The application also seeks to build over green space in what is already a highly polluted urban area.</p>
2016/7088/P	Danny Lee	16 Sussex Square Brighton East Sussex BN2 5AA	15/08/2017 18:04:40	OBJ	<p>Are the developers and Camden Council aware of the fact that services only ceased at the church due to the building's condition and its congregation was told by the Spiritualists' National Union (SNU) to whom it is affiliated, that they would be able to move back in when and resume services when it was refurbished. Instead, no remedial work has been carried out and nor have the church committee and membership been advised that the church is being sold to developers. That decision is being challenged by the church's president and committee who point out that the SNU does not own the property or the land on which it sits, they only hold the trust deeds on behalf of the church which is taking legal advice about the situation. The developers need to be aware of this.</p>
2016/7088/P	Yannie	228 Daubeney Road E50ED	11/08/2017 16:19:27	INT	<p>I feel that this Church has been a Pillar of the Community for years and has helped a lot of people. The Church is entrusted to the SNU who have broken they're own Constitution by seeking to demolish the Church as opposed to doing what's right and refurbish the Church. They would rather take the money and run, as opposed to supporting the Committee and the Community to reopen the Church.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Alison Stead	14 Mill Street Oakham Rutland LE15 6EA	16/08/2017 08:17:42	SUPPEMPE R	<p>I strongly oppose the demolition of the Spiritualist Temple, Rochester Square, London NW1 9RY.</p> <p>I base my objections on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is a site of historic significance.</li> <li>2) It is a site of social and considerable cultural significance.</li> </ol> <p>The proposed demolition, if carried out, will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) Significantly and detrimentally affect the fabric of the local community.</li> <li>4) Detrimentally alter the character of surrounding area.</li> </ol> <p>Additionally the proposed erection will detrimentally impact on surrounding buildings and dwellings by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5) Overlooking existing buildings and dwellings.</li> <li>6) Impinging on privacy of such buildings/dwellings.</li> <li>7) Increased congestion in the area.</li> </ol> <p>Finally:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8) No consideration has been taken in regards of parking provision for the proposed new development.</li> </ol>
2016/7088/P	Remie Carter - Slavin	66 Richmond Avenue	15/08/2017 15:10:47	COMMNT	I would like to see the Temple remain as a Church, I am against it becoming another expensive block of flats.
2016/7088/P	Maggie Moore	50 St Kenelms Road Romsley Halesowen Worcestershire	16/08/2017 20:27:01	OBJ	I strongly oppose the demolition of this historic building. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, a stalwart of Spiritualism and world reknown Author has historic connections that should not be destroyed. To demolish this temple is to deny present and future generations the beautiful and historic culture of English Spiritualism and heritage. So many pioneers of Spiritualism are connected to this building that to demolish it would be beyond belief.
2016/7088/P	Robert Jones	67 Tufnell Park Road Holloway Islington N7 0PS	13/08/2017 23:20:01	OBJ	This is a genuinely historic building. 1..Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's connection. 2..The link to the Spiritualist Movement which was huge at the time and for a long time earlier. The existing building can be accommodated if the developers want the site badly enough. Once it is gone then it is gone forever - New ersatz buildings are ten a penny and can be had anytime. Please make a principle stand. Thank you.
2016/7088/P	Lucy Heller	58 Camden Square	13/08/2017 13:51:39	COMNOT	I support the building of more houses but they need to be affordable houses not more luxury flats. In this case, it would be crowding more expensive residential properties into a quite tight space at the expense of a lovely and historic building. Please reject this proposal!
2016/7088/P	Lucy Heller	58 Camden Square	13/08/2017 13:51:38	COMNOT	I support the building of more houses but they need to be affordable houses not more luxury flats. In this case, it would be crowding more expensive residential properties into a quite tight space at the expense of a lovely and historic building. Please reject this proposal!

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Lucy Heller	58 Camden Square	13/08/2017 13:51:21	COMNOT	I support the building of more houses but they need to be affordable houses not more luxury flats. In this case, it would be crowding more expensive residential properties into a quite tight space at the expense of a lovely and historic building. Please reject this proposal!
2016/7088/P	Lucy Heller	58 Camden Square	13/08/2017 13:51:05	COMNOT	I support the building of more houses but they need to be affordable houses not more luxury flats. In this case, it would be crowding more expensive residential properties into a quite tight space at the expense of a lovely and historic building. Please reject this proposal!
2016/7088/P	R D and CD Buchanan	54 Camden Square NW1 9XE NW1 9XE	15/08/2017 18:19:31	OBJEMAIL	We strongly object to the proposed development. The grounds are that the proposed construction is too large. The construction does not blend with the Victorian character of the area. This is a Conservation Area, and as such all developments should relate to existing buildings. The existing building has a strong history, with a foundation stone laid by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Any development should retain the existing building.
2016/7088/P	R D and CD Buchanan	54 Camden Square NW1 9XE NW1 9XE	15/08/2017 18:19:30	OBJEMAIL	We strongly object to the proposed development. The grounds are that the proposed construction is too large. The construction does not blend with the Victorian character of the area. This is a Conservation Area, and as such all developments should relate to existing buildings. The existing building has a strong history, with a foundation stone laid by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Any development should retain the existing building.
2016/7088/P	R D and CD Buchanan	54 Camden Square NW1 9XE NW1 9XE	15/08/2017 18:19:28	OBJEMAIL	We strongly object to the proposed development. The grounds are that the proposed construction is too large. The construction does not blend with the Victorian character of the area. This is a Conservation Area, and as such all developments should relate to existing buildings. The existing building has a strong history, with a foundation stone laid by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Any development should retain the existing building.
2016/7088/P	Caroline Canihan	1 Cartwright Gardens London WC1H 9EN	17/08/2017 07:52:03	COMMNT	I strongly object to this planning proposal. The Spiritualist Temple is a significant site, both religiously as an important landmark for the Spiritualist community and historically as Arthur Conan Doyle laid the foundation stone. Additionally, its demolition would mean the loss of green space, an attractive façade, and a lovely interior. Others have correctly noted in their objections that the proposed development would break with the aesthetics of neighbouring buildings while likely causing traffic, noise, and safety issues both during and after construction (citing, among others, the London Plan, NPPF, and the BIA Structural Report. As is evident in neighbours' objections, the Temple remains a beloved part of the Rochester Square community- its exterior and garden are aesthetically pleasing, and many have fond memories of attending events or visiting the Temple. At nearly 100 years old, it would be a shame to lose this building, obscuring its history and aversely affecting the Spiritualist faith. It is crucial that any development carefully considers its effects on the neighbourhood, and in this case it is clear that a restoration of the existing Temple and its garden would be immensely superior to the proposed development in serving the needs of the local community, Spiritualists, and curious passersby alike.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	R D and CD Buchanan	54 Camden Square NW1 9XE NW1 9XE	15/08/2017 18:19:11	OBJEMAIL	We strongly object to the proposed development. The grounds are that the proposed construction is too large. The construction does not blend with the Victorian character of the area. This is a Conservation Area, and as such all developments should relate to existing buildings. The existing building has a strong history, with a foundation stone laid by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Any development should retain the existing building.
2016/7088/P	yasmin Allen	30a malden Road NW5 3HH NW5 3HH	15/08/2017 11:19:10	COMMBO BXI	This is a very historical building where many people have sought comfort from the services which have been held their in . It attracts a wonderful community of people who administer the services and special events. As such every possible avenue should be explored to protest this building from being turned into flats , shops , etc. this is an established community space and every effort must be to preserve it for the intention which was meant and intended at the time conan doyle laid the foundation brick. The fact it is a low rise building and old and quite extraordinary in its use, ought to provide it a special use criteria whereby camden council protects its forethinking status as a borough of old history and innovator of the new. I was in awe of it and the wonderful people who ran it. Their hospitality and caring was not as evident in any other church in Camden that I'd been to..and I've been to many ! that is its testament, to help protect it from redevelopment, which impugns the local community ,destroys its uniqueness. For what ? Privileged flat owners and the ilk of tesco express ? A basement dig ..more basement digs ? and art gallery? Is that what's required in the community ? Preserve and save , not wipe out history and community please.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Rob King	29 Rochester Square NW1 9RZ NW1 9RZ	16/08/2017 17:41:04	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to the demolition and redevelopment of the Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple. The proposed development scheme is wholly inappropriate and ill-considered given the sensitivity of the existing building and its location within a carefully protected Camden Council conservation area. As a resident of Rochester Square I am objecting both on a personal level with regards to my house – Number 29 Rochester Square – and also my objection for the greater consideration of the local area.</p> <p>Numbers 29-36 Rochester Square 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. Rochester Square falls within a Camden Council conservation area. The square and neighbouring streets have a unique character and architectural heritage. This development is in direct contravention of CPG6 which is designed to protect and safeguard such areas. Camden council's planning framework has effectively maintained such areas for a great many years. It exists for a reason to stop destructive and erroneous development schemes being given the go ahead. This application falls into direct contravention of that longstanding, and successful, framework.</p> <p>The rear of my house (number 29) backs directly on to the Spiritualist Church. At the moment there is adequate light that comes through the rear of the property as the church was designed and built with respect and consideration to the entire row of houses (29-36 Rochester Square). The existing church was built sympathetically to allow for light and space at the rear of our properties. The proposed application takes little regard for this and would massively compromise the sense of openness and space. Natural light into the rows of houses 29-36 Rochester Square would be affected due to its overbearing scale.</p> <p>The Spiritualist Church is a site of important historical significance. Too many buildings in the borough of Camden, and also London, have been sacrificed in such developments because they are perceived to be not significant enough architecturally or historically. Where does it stop, will there be no historic churches left in Camden within 20-30 years?</p> <p>I note the proposed developer 'UrbanLab' is claiming the building is in a dilapidated condition and that its re use is not considered viable. Why is this? Could it simply be more convenient to demolish a historical building – so that access can be gained to excavate a lucrative, more profitable vast sub-basement level – rather than sympathetically develop the existing structure?</p> <p>The proposed sub-basement excavations are major. I have taken professional advice from construction and planning experts and I am of the view that the proposals represent a significant threat to numbers 29-36 Rochester Square. The structural implications are unclear as to how these proposed works could affect houses, gardens and the water drainage of the numbers 29-36.</p> <p>I urge the Camden planning committee to recognise the wholly inappropriate and ill-considered nature of this application. We must maintain the character of Camden's local areas. We must not destroy them on the pretence of providing unrequired community spaces (there are numerous community and artistic spaces nearby) and high density, oversaturated housing schemes, all of which appear to be led by profit and not community success.</p> <p>Rob King</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7088/P	Mirella Carreras	34d Camden Square London NW1 9XA	14/08/2017 23:25:04	OBJ	<p>There is too much building work already going on in this conservation area.</p> <p>Camden Council is not doing its job efficiently.</p> <p>Trees have been illegally cut down at the back of Rochester Square Temple. That in itself should have been enough for the council to have stopped these locally extremely unpopular plans.</p> <p>More modern unsightly flats are not needed in this area which is already in danger of losing its historic atmosphere. An art gallery is the very last thing needed, they have opened and closed in neighboring Murray st. without making a stir.</p> <p>Basement excavation is just about the worse idea you could dream up at that location. It is a ghastly procedure in itself, but to consider it in the middle of ancient protected houses is quite ludicrous.</p>
2016/7088/P	Philippe Bonhôte	36 Rochester Square NW1 9RZ	12/08/2017 14:37:19	COMMNT	<p>I have just moved to Rochester Square 36 with my family and I am surprised by the proposed scheme that I can only strongly oppose. Being an architect, but not aware of the local rules in the area, I can just notice that it is impossible to built decent housing units in this plot, without opening windows facing existing houses and flats at a very short distance. To avoid this problem, it is noticeable that the proposed flats will be of very poor quality. They will also jeopardize the quality of the houses and flats being along the plot. For these first reasons, the proposed scheme should be refused. I think it is impossible to build decent housing in this plot. Furthermore, I totally agree with the comments made on the quality of the existing church and ont the already strong density of housing in the area. Looking at the section, I notice that the basement is supposed to go to the property limits. This will imply strong measures to avoid to damage the walls and gardens of the properties along the plot.</p>