

---

**From:** Susan Zur-Szpiro [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 February 2021 01:07  
**To:** McClue, Jonathan; Planning; Susan Zur-Szpiro  
**Subject:** re Camden Planning re Essential Living's application to 100 Avenue Road application numbers 2021/0025/P and 2021/0022/P

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr McClue and Camden planning department

I am aware of the effort of Essential Living to reduce the obligations of the planning permission granted for the development of 100 Avenue Rd. I have always thought that it was a dreadful plan, spoiling the centre of our beloved Swiss Cottage. Rather than creating a wonderful, distinctive development that is inspirational, a distinctive landmark, a central place in Swiss Cottage for all nearby residents and visitors, of all ages, stages of life, nationalities, for all weathers, and inclusive for my adult aged son who has severe disabilities, and our family, a wonderful place where our family could walk or take our son on his adult aged tricycle, to bring our 3 young grandchildren and more reasons to come to the heart of Swiss Cottage instead of a carbuncle I squeeze my eyes shut to escape as quickly as possible, with feelings of sadness, anger, disappointment, aggravation and so much more.

The response below sums up my feelings and thoughts so well that I am copying it in here. I cannot see how Camden, in setting out its requirements, which were already too lenient, could possibly allow Essential Living to get away with reducing the quality of the build and also to side step the obligation to provide social housing.

I hope that you will not let Camden down in order to enrich a company called Essential Living that has no interest in Camden, only to reap as much profit as it can from our unique Swiss Cottage.

There are too many ugly, over large developments mushrooming around Camden forcing too much density of population with too few resources for inhabitants creating soulless developments that are not designed for the positive wellbeing for any sector of the population - young families, elderly, the disabled, and more, one after the other huge overbuilds with a strip of greenery crammed in to tick a box, not organic safe places for low income families, places to enjoy nature, to learn, to breathe good air, to form bonds with other residents and circles of support, going through life stages together over years and encouraging long stay, stable communities, not a development designed to force short term habitation, and rents beyond most people.

With the recent pandemic people's living needs have changed radically - I won't describe the impact on what people need from the living abodes, spending more time working at home, living at home, teaching at home, needing to exercise and get fresh air, and to occupy children outdoors and to meet people outdoors. There is nothing about 100 Avenue Road that meet the needs of a changed world that will never be the same.

Please do not let me down, and everyone else who cares so deeply, and who is affected by 100 Avenue Road's future.

Susan Zur-Szpiro

Goldhurst Terrace  
NW6 3EP

"Dear Camden Planning,

As the primary Residents' Association for South Hampstead, we wish to file an objection to the attempt by Essential Living to evade the obligations which they willingly shouldered as part of the planning consent which they have previously received for the site at 100 Avenue Road, NW3.

During that planning process the consent was referred to a Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State, and both their assessments made clear that the consent was dependent on the S106 agreement, on the (already inappropriately) small proportion of affordable housing, and on the other material qualities of the proposed development.

The residents and Council Tax payers of Camden are not responsible for underwriting the finances of this development, and all developers undertake a financial risk in return for their potential rewards. If Essential Living have failed to plan and execute this project with an appropriate margin of financial security, it is not for the residents and Council Tax payers of Camden to "bail them out", or to help educate them in the business of property development, and therefore this is not a cause for reducing their legal obligations under the planning approval. The project is already poorly conceived and an offence to the neighbourhood and the community, and yet it was explicitly approved in return for these negotiated agreements which Essential Living willingly undertook.

Therefore, there should be no further negotiation or reduction of obligations on the planning consent and, if Essential Living find themselves unable to fulfil their legal obligations, they should sell the site to someone else who will either do so, or who will amend and restructure the project accordingly, both to provide a more humane and sympathetic building, and to fulfil the necessary legal obligations to the community.

Finally, we notice a number of other excellent and detailed objections have already been filed, in particular from the Belsize Society and others: we would not wish to burden the Camden planning officers with unnecessarily repeating the relevant quotes and arguments from these and from the original planning process, but please accept them as an inherent part of our submission also.

Yours faithfully, etc