From: Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Catherine Bond
Principal Planner, Conservation and Heritage
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

cc. Andrew Hinchley, Green Space Development Officer

1.9.17

Dear Ms. Bond,

2017/4426/P Tavistock Square

BCAAC objects to this application for a memorial to be sited in the gardens at Tavistock Square.

The atrocity to be commemorated took place in the street, on the opposite side, outside the British Medical Association building, and it is entirely coincidental that it happened to be opposite Tavistock Square Gardens. It has no connection with the gardens.

The existing plaque recognises this and is correctly sited on the railings outside the BMA. Any new memorial should be placed there. Placing the memorial in the gardens would be misleading to anyone visiting the site, who would not know where the atrocity took place. The suggestion that visitors would obstruct the pavement is entirely misleading - there is no such problem at present. If it had happened elsewhere the memorial would have been in the street anyway.

Several years ago at a site meeting we first pointed this out and requested a liaison meeting with the BMA and our understanding was that this was to be arranged. We have subsequently repeatedly contacted the director of the BMA directly to request a meeting to discuss these issues. These requests were ignored. We therefore visited and were told that someone had been deputed to respond to our request. On pursuing this it was admitted that this

information was wrong. We have therefore been denied the chance to discuss with the BMA the appropriate site for any memorial, and this should be investigated.

In any case the London Squares Preservation Act 1931 does not permit any structures being erected in the gardens of protected squares except as 'necessary or convenient'. It provides that: 'no building or other structure or erection shall be erected or placed on or over any protected square except such as may be necessary or convenient for or in connection with the use and maintenance of such square for one or more of the authorised purposes'.

The proposed memorial clearly fails this test.

Camden's own policies also discourage changes to squares in ways that have no connection with them.

We have pointed this out to the applicants and to planning officers.

Entirely without prejudice to the above objection, we have also expressed our disapproval of the present design which would destroy the rhythm of the square by breaking the historic planted margin in an arbitrary position for no justifiable reason.

Yours,

Anthony Jennings for BCAAC