

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7020/P	Soraya Syed and Graham Coxon	36 Rochester Square London N10 2LD	19/01/2018 15:53:45	COMMNT	<p>i/The first thing that we want to highlight is that the timing of this second application, entered just days before Christmas. The first one in July/August. Entering these applications at the two significant periods of the year when people are very likely to be away or distracted is very unfair-we cannot be expected to ably digest this incredible amount of information in such a short space of time. If Urbanlab (now Spacelab) are keen to work alongside with local communities, why are they not giving us a chance to both have time to properly assess and digest these revised matters and adequately communicate with them?</p> <p>ii/There are still inaccuracies in the developers report which need correcting, listed below.</p> <p>1. Contrary to: 1606_GA_003_Rochester Sq_Site Images 02</p> <p>There is NO access to green space in Rochester Square for anyone on this terrace except for our already small gardens. The square itself has been privately owned for many years. The Square as far back as we can remember (we have owned our house since 1996) has always been dilapidated, neglected and the gates chained in one form or another. Camden Square residents are very lucky to have green space in their Square, we only what is available at the rear of our houses-on the terrace that numbers 29-36 that means our scant but precious garden space. The only communal green space that we had access to was the beautiful and tranquil garden of the RSST, which we were readily welcomed into by our neighbours the Spiritualists and so of course ideally, we would prefer it to remain that way, in their hands and for the site to continue in its previous use. This green space will no longer be available to us if this proposed plan goes ahead.</p> <p>2. Trees have now been included on Spacelab's design proposals. However the trees that feature in the back gardens of the terrace on Spacelab's designs far outnumber the reality, giving a deceptive impression to the planners and making our tiny garden spaces look a lot greener</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7020/P	Graham Coxon and Soraya Syed	36 Rochester Square London N10 2LD	19/01/2018 16:03:15	COMMNT	<p>i/The first thing that we want to highlight is that the timing of this second application, entered just days before Christmas. The first one in July/August. Entering these applications at the two significant periods of the year when people are very likely to be away or distracted is very unfair-we cannot be expected to ably digest this incredible amount of information in such a short space of time. If Urbanlab (now Spacelab) are keen to work alongside with local communities, why are they not giving us a chance to both have time to properly assess and digest these revised matters and adequately communicate with them?</p> <p>ii/There are still inaccuracies in the developers report which need correcting, listed below.</p> <p>1. Contrary to: 1606_GA_003_Rochester Sq_Site Images 02</p> <p>There is NO access to green space in Rochester Square for anyone on this terrace except for our already small gardens. The square itself has been privately owned for many years. The Square as far back as we can remember (we have owned our house since 1996) has always been dilapidated, neglected and the gates chained in one form or another. Camden Square residents are very lucky to have green space in their Square, we only what is available at the rear of our houses-on the terrace that numbers 29-36 that means our scant but precious garden space. The only communal green space that we had access to was the beautiful and tranquil garden of the RSST, which we were readily welcomed into by our neighbours the Spiritualists and so of course ideally, we would prefer it to remain that way, in their hands and for the site to continue in its previous use. This green space will no longer be available to us if this proposed plan goes ahead.</p> <p>2. Trees have now been included on Spacelab's design proposals. However the trees that feature in the back gardens of the terrace on Spacelab's designs far outnumber the reality, giving a deceptive impression to the planners and making our tiny garden spaces look a lot greener</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7020/P	Soraya Syed and Graham Coxon	36 Rochester Square	19/01/2018 15:52:33	COMMNT	<p>i/The first thing that we want to highlight is that the timing of this second application, entered just days before Christmas. The first one in July/August. Entering these applications at the two significant periods of the year when people are very likely to be away or distracted is very unfair-we cannot be expected to ably digest this incredible amount of information in such a short space of time. If Urbanlab (now Spacelab) are keen to work alongside with local communities, why are they not giving us a chance to both have time to properly assess and digest these revised matters and adequately communicate with them?</p> <p>ii/There are still inaccuracies in the developers report which need correcting, listed below.</p> <p>1. Contrary to: 1606_GA_003_Rochester Sq_Site Images 02 There is NO access to green space in Rochester Square for anyone on this terrace except for our already small gardens. The square itself has been privately owned for many years. The Square as far back as we can remember (we have owned our house since 1996) has always been dilapidated, neglected and the gates chained in one form or another. Camden Square residents are very lucky to have green space in their Square, we only what is available at the rear of our houses-on the terrace that numbers 29-36 that means our scant but precious garden space. The only communal green space that we had access to was the beautiful and tranquil garden of the RSST, which we were readily welcomed into by our neighbours the Spiritualists and so of course ideally, we would prefer it to remain that way, in their hands and for the site to continue in its previous use. This green space will no longer be available to us if this proposed plan goes ahead.</p> <p>2. Trees have now been included on Spacelab's design proposals. However the trees that feature in the back gardens of the terrace on Spacelab's designs far outnumber the reality, giving a deceptive impression to the planners and making our tiny garden spaces look a lot greener</p>
2017/7020/P	Adam Straw and Tom Gentleman	32b Rochester Square London NW19RZ	19/01/2018 07:19:45	OBJLETT ER	Please see attached word document, which contains our objections.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7020/P	melody boon	entrance des artistes 214 A camden Rd Camden Town nw19hg nw19hg	19/01/2018 18:55:33	OBJ	<p>It seems that the Congregation of this extremely popular Temple- have not been considered- There IS no other temple in Camden-Elderly and Disabled members will suffer as they will not be able to attend services-for lots of people this was a very significant part of their lives-a place of Comfort to often lonely and bereaved vulnerable older residents-Despite it being a very popular faith it has been often overlooked-but is coming to the Fore again -In a CONSERVATION AREA -Let's not forget-The Temple provided Solace and a safe haven for people -who sought Spiritual Healing for many different conditions -it provided a much needed oasis of Peace and calm -in frenetic Camden - Meditation and Development circles were held -training Mediums that would eventually take the Platform themselves-to give messages of Upliftment-Encouragement and Healing -Often there was laughter and tears during a service uniting people in a common bond -most often the one of the pain of losing their loved ones.This place of Reverance of the Spirit -feels to so many people a very very personal loss as though part of their own home was being built upon against their deepest wishes- I have heard it widely said that this would never happen were this a Mosque-People would be up in arms over it-But it seems to be o.k to dismiss The Spiritualist Faith as though it isn't as Important as any other Faith-I would strongly suggest that this is Discriminatory - Camden was once known as an Inclusive Borough but sadly it seems that cold hard cash wins over principles -Conservation Area/ Faith/-To see the building of more dwellings which will destroy the conservation area at the back of the Church is deeply depressing.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7020/P	Coral Temple	34b Camden Square London NW1 9XA	17/01/2018 14:54:02	OBJ	<p>3.1</p> <p>Yes, the Temple began construction in 1926, however what has been omitted is the fact that Sir Arthur Conan Doyle provided the main cash injection for this to happen. Mr and Mrs Ellis rendered themselves homeless in order to bring to the community a sanctuary of healing and new spiritual hope to a society ravaged by war losses and grief. This was a Christian Spiritualist Temple, it had no connection whatsoever with the the so called "Spiritualist National Union" and the SNU certainly never paid a penny for its construction. They have never paid a penny towards its upkeep.</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>The Temple was in use well up until the final AGM in early 2014.</p> <p>At this AGM the members and congregation were advised by the SNU's then "trust property co-ordinator", Mr. Graham Hewitt, (a disbarred solicitor,)that "not one brick would ever be removed from the Temple". This gave the congregation and members the confidence to leave their sacred building in the "trusted hands" of the Spiritualist National Union. Their proposal States that the SNU "had hoped to raise funds to undertake improvement work to the building". Exactly what were they hoping for? Companies House auditors reveal that the SNU have 13 million in their coffers. What exactly were they hoping for? Let's guess, another few cool million to add to their portfolio of selling off Churches under their guardianship...</p> <p>Also, It must be noted that professional builders and even a stonemason in the congregation offered their services for free to attend to any reparations of the building , but their offers were unceremoniously rebuffed.</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>The building was not squatted by a rival religious sect. It was understandably squatted by a peaceful group of environmentalists who opened the church for yoga classes and musical groups. The building was certainly not in a very poor condition. The reason that the building began to deteriorate was because the SNU allowed a building to be erected up against the actual walls of the Temple. This group of people left the building under a court order stating that the SNU needed the building back to REFURBISH IT. There are local newspaper articles available online that verify this. These are also accompanied by photographs of the inside of the Temple , showing it certainly to be fit for purpose.</p>

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

3.5

The live in guardians placed there by the SNU have in fact been employed to keep the congregation and members out of their Church so that the SNU can assure their impending profit.

3.6

Rochester Square Spiritualist Temple may indeed be surplus to the SNU's requirements. However, it never will be surplus to the requirements of its over 300 strong congregation. When the SNU closed the Temple on the pretext of refurbishment, no correspondence was sent out to anybody on the progress and intentions of the SNU. People travelled from as far as Greenland and America for services only to find closed doors.

As for the "SNU's decision to dispose of this site last year", It never was theirs to dispose of. The church belonged solely to the congregation and members. The SNU have never paid one penny towards its construction or upkeep. I spoke at length with the Vice President of Rochester Square Temple, Derek O'Neil, who was also head of their wonderful healing team. He stated that the Temple always covered its costs. It did not make a vast profit because it was not in the business of gain, but in the materialisation of healing, hope and compassion for all of its congregation from all walks of life, culture, creed and financial strata. He recorded a week when the Temple coffers were £21 down, and he just could not understand why. But then the penny dropped so to speak. Mr O'Neil recorded that Mr. Braeme, an SNU inspector, had come to "inspect" the premises and charged the Church £21 for the pleasure.

TREE WORKS

3.7, 8, 9 and 10

The Lime tree may well have been diseased and Camden Council did authorise its removal.

However, Camden Council did NOT authorise the removal of 2 other mature trees in the Garden Of Remembrance.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					When contacted Camden Council were extremely displeased with this unnecessary and harsh act of tree demolition in a conservation area.

3. 11

Where is the Hornbeam replacement for the lime tree? OH YES, OF COURSE, IT WAS PLANTED WITH IT'S ROOTS IN SUNKEN TREE PITTS TO PREVENT ROOTS SPREADING AND HAD TO BE REMOVED. SILLY ME.

PLANNING APPLICATION (LPA REF: 2016/7088/P)

3.12

The local neighbourhood were quite horrified by this proposal. Camden Planning were inundated with a record number of objections. The neighbourhood are still waiting for these awful plans to be rejected. Everybody thought they had a little breathing space as these earlier plans are still waiting rejection. But no, the plans were put up over the Christmas period. I for one am signed up for email alerts about any developments in my area, which is very close to the Temple, and I received nothing. The only way I knew about these plans going up was from a friend who saw a small notice on a lamppost.

The original 2016/7088/P plans included a conciliatory art facility to make it look like it was a community project to fit in with council guidelines and property usage. At the planning meeting for this proposal in the Irish centre interestingly, everybody there turned out to be some sort of artist , including myself , and NOBODY wanted the facility.

3.13

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

I have spoken to neighbours since this new set of plans have been drummed up and not one of them has been consulted by anyone.

3.14

I have spoken to neighbours since this new set of plans have been drummed up and not one of them has been consulted by anyone.

3.15

I am unaware of whom these third parties might be. Investors?

4.4

I am appalled that the Spiritualist National Union would consider not only robbing the congregation of their Church, but also pirating away Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's foundation stone engraved with his details. The Great Man must be turning in his grave. This Temple was dedicated to the people as an eternal temple of healing light and hope, NOT AS A CASH COW FOR AN ORGANISED CRIME SYNDICATE.

4.8 AND 4.9 PLEASE REF TO 3.11

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION (OCTOBER2017)

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

4.18 TO 4.23

The basement works are something that nobody in this conservation area wants at all. The wonderful old houses surrounding the Temple have no foundations and will be devastatingly put under threat if basement works go ahead. There actually is no existing yardstick for the safety of basements adjacent to the surrounding historical domiciles. The water table will certainly be affected.

I attended this meeting. The plans were certainly NOT well received, they were just slightly less unwelcome than the absolute demolition of the whole Temple.

The Greed and Cunning of the "Spiritualist" National Union is without precedence.

No wonder their is currently a complaint lodged against them with the Serious Fraud Squad.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7020/P	kay lacey	47 weavers way nw1 0xf	19/01/2018 10:13:54	OBJ	<p>I am objecting to the new application. I am personally familiar with this Church.</p> <p>I applaud the retention of the Chapel area but the rear part of the building forms an integral part of the Church and its history. The rear houses the lavatories, the kitchen, the office and most importantly the meeting room where mediums and ministers prepared before services and also the library with its bookcases donated by one of the main supporters of Spiritualism Arthur Findlay. The building needs to be preserved in entire otherwise it is like preserving a nave and knocking down a chancel.</p> <p>The SNU a registered Charity have some serious questions to answer as to how Urban Labs became involved. I have not seen the Church advertised for sale. No one else appears to have had a chance to buy and save the Church despite there being former members of the Church being keen to do so. I contacted senior SNU leaders about the sale of the Church but never received a response from them.</p> <p>This site should ideally continue as a community resource and not be converted into yet more expensive housing. The Church has an important history and the main cost of its construction was paid by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. It is a heritage resource for Camden and would be ideal as a spiritualist museum and community space.</p> <p>The owners of the Church the SNU hold property in trust for the Charity and may not be acting in the best interests of that charity either in terms of its constitution or its finances. The Charity has sufficient reserves to restore the Church but chose not to do so.</p>
2017/7020/P	James woods	332 limes avenue chigwell Essex Ig7 5nb.	17/01/2018 22:27:17	APP	I object to this application on grounds of disruption to residents and spiritualist history destroyed church needed in area upliftment to people in area.
2017/7020/P	James woods	332 limes avenue chigwell Essex Ig7 5nb.	17/01/2018 22:25:59	APP	I object to this application on grounds of disruption to residents and spiritualist history destroyed church needed in area upliftment to people in area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7020/P	Soraya Syed and Graham Coxon	36 Rochester Square	19/01/2018 15:52:07	COMMNT	<p>i/The first thing that we want to highlight is that the timing of this second application, entered just days before Christmas. The first one in July/August. Entering these applications at the two significant periods of the year when people are very likely to be away or distracted is very unfair-we cannot be expected to ably digest this incredible amount of information in such a short space of time. If Urbanlab (now Spacelab) are keen to work alongside with local communities, why are they not giving us a chance to both have time to properly assess and digest these revised matters and adequately communicate with them?</p> <p>ii/There are still inaccuracies in the developers report which need correcting, listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contrary to: 1606_GA_003_Rochester Sq_Site Images 02 There is NO access to green space in Rochester Square for anyone on this terrace except for our already small gardens. The square itself has been privately owned for many years. The Square as far back as we can remember (we have owned our house since 1996) has always been dilapidated, neglected and the gates chained in one form or another. Camden Square residents are very lucky to have green space in their Square, we only what is available at the rear of our houses-on the terrace that numbers 29-36 that means our scant but precious garden space. The only communal green space that we had access to was the beautiful and tranquil garden of the RSST, which we were readily welcomed into by our neighbours the Spiritualists and so of course ideally, we would prefer it to remain that way, in their hands and for the site to continue in its previous use. This green space will no longer be available to us if this proposed plan goes ahead. 2. Trees have now been included on Spacelab's design proposals. However the trees that feature in the back gardens of the terrace on Spacelab's designs far outnumber the reality, giving a deceptive impression to the planners and making our tiny garden spaces look a lot greener

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7020/P	Clive Bennett	35 Rochester Square London NW1 9RZ	19/01/2018 14:38:30	COMMNT	<p>Planning Application 2017/7020/P. Spiritualist Temple Rochester Square, London NW1 9RY</p> <p>We are the owners and occupiers of 35 Rochester Square London NW1 9RZ. Our house directly abuts the site which is the subject of this planning application.</p> <p>As with the previous proposal for this site by these developers (2016/7088/P), the scheme is contrary to Camden's own published regulations and guidelines – inter alia, the proximity of the proposed residential units and the loss of light and amenities at the northern end of the site. These issues are being addressed in detail by neighbours in houses towards the north of the square that are more directly affected. We support all their observations and arguments.</p> <p>All the houses in the terrace (numbers 29 – 36 Rochester Square) benefit from an unusually quiet and peaceful environment; this is an important asset for the residents. So while we welcome the proposal to preserve and re-purpose the disused Temple, we are very concerned about the aesthetics of the proposal, the noise pollution such a project will generate and its effect on our right to a peaceful home existence. The eastern wall of the Temple is also the boundary wall of Numbers 34, 35 and 36 Rochester Square and is only nine meters from the rear of the houses. These houses will bear the brunt of any increase in noise and disturbance.</p> <p>There is a major absence of details concerning this proposed Community Space. Given the significant errors of fact and the inaccuracies in the developer's previous application for the development of this site it is crucial that this proposal be scrutinised minutely. Planning Statement 5.5, amplified in 7.10 – 7.12, says the community space will 'operate as a multi-purpose community centre' with a 'core element of classes dedicated to 'the arts' including ...the performing arts'. The Heritage Statement (5.3.1) says that it 'will be available for hire to local residents'. Planning Statement 7.13 says "noisy or disruptive uses will be avoided"; it also claims 'it is premature to confirm the final use'.</p> <p>This must be clarified; the developers cannot be given carte blanche regarding its actual use.</p> <p>'Performing arts' could embrace keep fit classes, dance classes - from Aerobics to Zumba - rehearsal space for rock bands, drumming circles, classical chamber music, choral groups etc., all activities which will need or generate loud music. Even ostensibly 'quiet' events like yoga classes have risks; for example, kundalini yoga requires participants to bash large gongs as well as strike tuning forks and crystal bowls. And were local residents to hire the space for crèches (for example) our peaceful lives will be negatively affected.</p> <p>The spatial volume of a building of 208.4 m2 of useable floor space with a 2.5 storey height, even broken up with a large mezzanine, will create a very reverberant building. Without proper sound insulation, there will inevitably be an unacceptable level of noise pollution which will adversely affect the right of peaceful enjoyment of the residents of Rochester Square.</p> <p>We argue that professionally evaluated and installed sound insulation be a prerequisite for approval being granted, in accordance with the proposed change to the national planning policy currently being advocated by the Communities Secretary.</p> <p>Additional noise pollution and disturbance will be caused by the arrival and departure of users, large group conversations outside in the street, while smoking and taking tea and coffee.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Were permission to be granted we submit that the Centre be required to commit to strict operating hours and a stipulation that it may not apply for a license to serve/sell alcohol. Planning Statement para 4.4 proposes "internally and externally a light touch refurbishment of the existing building". We request that the Council demand more details of what the developers actually mean by this before granting planning permission.</p> <p>We further ask the Council to make it a condition that the building's intrinsic value, however slight in the terms of Historic England's Conservation Principles, is not destroyed or compromised by (for example) insensitive repainting of walls and the destruction of existing features and decorations. The photographs in the submitted Heritage Statement (pages 18-20) show that the building has the potential to be an inspirational artistic and performance space.</p> <p>Additionally, we suggest that this refurbishment requirement should be amplified to make mandatory the following repairs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the repair of the roof using identical slates (several of which have fallen off into the gardens of Nos 33 – 36) • the cleaning of the moss from the slates • the removal of the two large buddleias growing from the roof of the southern aspect. • The repair and repointing of the brickwork on the parapet and under the guttering on the east side of the building and the closing off of the spaces where squirrels nest. • The renovation or replacement of the guttering along the length of the temple • The renovation and repointing of the brickwork on the entrance porch and the south facing wall of the temple. <p>The proposed bicycle parking point should be re-sited. The plans show it tucked into a space on the right hand of the front door of the Temple. In this position it will look tawdry and reduce the impact of the south facing entrance.</p> <p>Should the building be found to be in too dilapidated a condition to make re-purposing possible the Council should stipulate that any rebuilding must retain the same architectural style and envelope of the existing temple. It should then ensure that such a requirement be monitored, to avoid any similarity to the privately owned building that has been allowed to abut the left hand wall of the Temple.</p> <p>If against all these compelling arguments the Council decides that permission for the development should be granted we respectfully submit that such permission should reflect all the reservations expressed herein.</p> <p>We may wish to make oral representations at the Planning Meeting when this is discussed. Please consider this as two separate objections submitted on behalf of the two owners of this house,</p> <p>Clive Bennett and Mike Lackersteen. 35 Rochester Square London NW1 9RZ</p>