

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	Cara O'SULLIVAN	13/02/2021 15:28:48	COMMNT	<p>Cheaper cladding after Grenfell? Seriously?</p> <p>No affordable allocation? Camden, wake up! Do not let this become another empty foreign investor building. There is already one right next to it.. no lights go on at night as no one lives in them.</p> <p>The times we live in have illustrated how important HOMES (not commodities) are. Use your powers to ensure they do at least what was agreed. If they make less profit this is not your concern. They are investor/gamblers and if the gamble didn't pay off that was their risk. Offer them what you can afford as a borough and you can build a community space and council homes.</p>
2021/0025/P	G Power	13/02/2021 13:11:34	OBJ	<p>Why is this being diluted? Surely when you take over a project you do your due diligence, and that part of being a property developer is that you need to build in the risk? By lowering the number of affordable dwellings, you are not providing housing for people born and brought up in Camden, many of whom have to move out of the area as a result. Communities then get destroyed. Projects of this scale should be about building on community and not scattering it and not just earning money for private companies, who are not even located in the area. Us as Camden residents and tax payers are not responsible for underwriting such developments that are purely speculative.</p>
2021/0025/P	JEAN FRENCH	12/02/2021 11:10:03	OBJ	<p>2021/0025/P</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application.</p> <p>The applicants proposal to renege on their affordable housing obligation is predictable and was predicted. The provision of affordable units was a key factor in granting consent and if they are not provided then the considerable harm generated by this development will not be in any way justifiable and therefore it will not constitute sustainable development. The applicants claim that unless the s106 is rewritten to replace thirty six affordable units with private rental units the scheme is unviable and unlikely to proceed. Presumably the developer decided to include their obligations under s106 in order to achieve consent and made appropriate calculations as to the viability of the scheme taking into account risks associated with development. If the scheme is unviable if the application is refused and as they claim, they might not continue, they will have to explore other avenues.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	Peter Symonds	14/02/2021 14:15:15	OBJ	<p>I write to register in the very strongest possible terms my objection to this latest application from Essential Living.</p> <p>It can surely come as no surprise to the Camden planning department that Essential Living now claim that they are unable to afford the 36 affordable housing units included in the original application for a 24-storey tower block at 100 Avenue Road. This was probably the very conditions of that application which persuaded the then Secretary of State for the Environment, Greg Clark, to support the Planning Inspectorate's regrettable decision to allow EL's appeal against Camden's original refusal. Since that reversal, Camden has been too terrified of the possible costs of further appeal reversals to confront EL over their many subsequent applications for penny-pinching economies and health and safety regulation-busting alterations to call out this disreputable company for its repeatedly unscrupulous and mendacious actions. Throughout the lengthy planning process, Save Swiss Cottage Action Group repeatedly warned Camden that - given EL's dubious business practices elsewhere in the UK - there was very little likelihood of the social benefit of affordable homes for local people. So no one should be in the least surprised that Essential Living is acting true to form. Local residents will never forget how disdainful EL were of every single local concern raised throughout the planning process nor the farce of their so-called 'consultation' process. It has been clear from the moment they won their appeal that Essential Living was determined to dismantle every single condition which would minimise the vast profits they intended to make out of this development. If, as they now claim, they are unable to develop the site without the expected margin of profit, Camden council tax payers must not be expected to take up the slack. Nor must Camden Council now agree to reduce its requirement of affordable housing units or reduce in any way the legal obligations required of EL as a condition of the negotiated agreements they undertook from the moment permission was approved.</p> <p>Camden must no longer allow Essential Living to ride roughshod over the wishes and concerns of local residents. It is time our Council found the guts to stand up to such disreputable practices and refused this application.</p>
2021/0025/P	MJ Boettcher	12/02/2021 18:43:25	OBJ	<p>This application should not be approved. The original application was approved on condition that 36 affordable housing units be included. If this obligation can not be met by the developer, then it shouldn't be built. REMOVING the affordable housing is a fundamental change in purpose and thus can not be allowed. The developers claiming financial difficulties is no reason to allow them to negate on their obligations. Camden Council should not have to bail out a developer for getting their finances wrong. Any major change, which this is, must go before the community and council again for consultation. Work on the site stopped well before the full extent of the pandemic and construction was one of the industries allowed to continue more or less as normal throughout the pandemic, both suggesting that the original plans were never financial viable in the first place. With this in mind, I object to this application.</p>
2021/0025/P	Luke Axford	13/02/2021 18:51:20	APP	<p>Irrespective of whether this is the first occasion of such an amendment request from a property developer, it sets an incredibly dangerous precedent that property developers can con their way into producing property that at its foremost does NOT focus on the housing needs and requirements of both the council, nor home-seekers.</p> <p>Absolutely this request should be refused; it solely has an undertone of maximising profit margins and negates to - in any way - benefit the society it sits to serve.</p> <p>If this is approved, it may as well remove building regs for bedrooms as well, because no one will be using these properties as a home at all - merely an investment scheme for the already-rich.</p> <p>There is a social responsibility when building such schemes. This cannot be pushed aside.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	n der Pump	13/02/2021 16:49:09	COMMNT	I wish to add my personal support to the strongly -worded objection sent in by CRASH against the proposed development of 100 Avenue Road by Esssential Living.
2021/0025/P	Anthony Woolf	13/02/2021 14:41:11	OBJ	I object to the cost saving proposals and in particular to the loss of affordable housing. If things go well developers take all the profit, but if profitability is lower than forecast, the public absorb the loss by foregoing agreed benefits such as affordable housing. The inevitable result is that developers will promote schemes that are more risky than they would otherwise do, knowing that they can offload some of the risk if things go badly. When applied to the poor this is called moral hazard and Camden should not collude in it.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	T Ewing	14/02/2021 23:28:45	OBJ	<p>9c Lawn Road London NW3 2XS</p> <p>14th February 2021</p> <p>Mr. Jonathan McCue Planning Department London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 8ND</p>

Dear Sir

100 AVENUE ROAD LONDON NW3 – APPLICATION NO 2021/0025/P

I write regarding the above applications by Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) submitted by Savills to vary the planning conditions imposed by the Planning Inspector in his decision dated 2016 regarding the provision of social housing in clause 3.2 the section 106 Agreement.

As the Planning Inspector clearly considered the provision of social housing to be one of the major benefits for the local community, it must follow that any departure from this would be detrimental to the social benefits aspect of this scheme as originally approved, and will not be compliant with paragraphs 61-64 of the NPPF requirement for “Delivering a sufficient supply of homes”.

The Inspector’s decision at paragraph 9 clearly gave great weight to the requirements of the NPPF.

The Inspector considered in details “Housing Issues” and the proposals for the provision of affordable housing at paragraphs 42-43 of his decision, and it is contended that the proposed changes to the provision for affordable housing to nil will totally undermine the Inspector’s findings in this part of the decision, and in effect will re-write it.

This will also represent a serious attack on the local community when such accommodation is in short supply, and all developers recognise that they have a duty to provide affordable housing.

The Applicants in fact on many occasions and at many past meetings remonstrated that objectors to their scheme were in effect attacking their proposed provision for much needed social housing in the local community. Now however, it appears that they now wish to renege from their previous commitment to the serious detriment of the local community and the council.

The Planning Inspector in his decision gave great weight to the provision of social housing in the proposed scheme, and it is clear from his decision that this factor was a major factor in the decision to grant planning permission in the face of the most fervent of opposition from members of the local community.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

As such, if the council were to grant the Applicant's request to vary this condition, they would in effect be overturning the whole basis of the Planning Inspector's decision. Such a decision would also undoubtedly be liable to be Judicially Reviewed in the High Court as mounting a collateral attack on the Planning Inspector's decision, apart from being perverse and "Wednesbury" unreasonable.

This application is in both substance and reality a completely new planning application with proposals different from those approved by the Planning Inspector.

As such, it is an abuse of the planning system to seek in effect by a side wind to circumvent the substantive conditions imposed by the Planning Inspector in this case.

The application should therefore be refused, and if the Applicants wish to pursue their scheme along the proposed amendment to the conditions, then they should be required to submit a completely fresh planning application, in which case the new proposals can be considered completely de novo.

They will then be able to make out their completely new case that their present scheme should be considered afresh in relation to the proposed change to the cladding materials and the now proposed lack of social housing.

This is especially so if as the Applicant maintains, their originally approved scheme is no longer financially viable in the present changed circumstances.

Unfortunately, a change of financial circumstances is not a valid planning reason for varying previously imposed planning conditions, and all of the arguments that they put forward to justify this here must not be taken into consideration by the council.

The Applicant ventured into the original scheme under the conditions prevailing at the time, and if they can no longer pursue the scheme along those lines, then they will have to withdraw and allow another developer to come along and submit a completely new costed scheme that will be both good design and financially viable for the site in accordance with the financial circumstances now prevailing.

The Applicants should clearly have thought more carefully at the time whether or not their scheme was financially viable with the conditions that were imposed, and someone in Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) has got their figures wrong.

However, they now have to bear the brunt of this and not the council and the local community. It may well turn out that they have been extremely badly advised by those advising them at the time regarding the viability of this scheme in the first place.

It will then be for the council to consider whether such a proposal is satisfactory, although they will again have to have regard to the previous imposition of the planning conditions imposed in the original scheme, which were imposed as safeguards for both the council and the wider community.

Yours faithfully

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				Terence Ewing
2021/0025/P	Tanya Luthra	13/02/2021 18:17:20	OBJ	I object on the basis that the original application that was approved had affordable housing as part of it and now the developer has conveniently changed their minds. that is not ok. also, they have changed the cladding to a cheaper version which should not be allowed. take the permissions away if they are changing their proposals. I agree completely with the much better objections made by CRASH and Belsize Society - this developer is taking the piss -they cannot expect to have all the rewards but carry none of the risks.
2021/0025/P	Mark Spurlock	13/02/2021 16:41:08	OBJ	<p>The application is filed as a result of the developer arguing that the scheme as originally approved is unviable. The rise in estimated costs to complete the scheme is cited as an important factor in the scheme allegedly no longer being viable.</p> <p>I object to the application on the grounds that the developer's negligence in managing its risks related to completing the development as originally approved (and as originally costed) is no reason to reward it my diminishing the developer's obligations. In my opinion, the application does not make a sufficient case to demonstrate that the factors that make the scheme allegedly unviable were materially outside of the developer's influence or control or that the developer could not have reasonably anticipated these factors and incorporated them into its original viability assessment.</p>
2021/0025/P	Dr Shelagh Weir	13/02/2021 16:27:45	INT	<p>I am appalled that this developer is attempting to renege on their commitments to social housing (so desperately needed) and downgrade their building materials (shocking in the post Grenfell period). The building proposed is already a monstrosity which will dominate the Avenue Road and overshadow a play area, and cause increased traffic around Swiss Cottage.</p> <p>Camden Council should insist on some benefit to locals whose lives will be adversely affected, and that the previously agreed proportion of social housing units be adhered to.</p>
2021/0025/P	Susan Wilson	13/02/2021 22:11:00	OBJ	Alongside many of the residents of Camden, I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to reduce the affordable housing element in the development at 100 Avenue Road. We are proud to be living in a borough which embraces its diversity and to ensure the wellbeing of our community we need more housing available at affordable prices. I live near the Alexander Road Estate, a legacy of building affordable housing that Camden can be rightly proud of. I trust that councillors today still have a vision for building homes for those who need them, and will reject any proposal that seeks to reduce the number of affordable housing units. I understand that there is a total of 184 residential units approved in the whole scheme which means the number of affordable units already approved is less than it should be under current guidelines. To reduce this further would be to betray all our aspirations to make London a vibrant and inclusive world city. Camden has a clear role: to hold the developer to account to deliver on the plans agreed.
2021/0025/P	MC Seminario	12/02/2021 19:33:13	OBJ	This application must be refused. Providing 36 units of affordable housing was a fundamental condition of the original planning permission. If this promise can no longer be fulfilled, then EL may want to rethink the project or the original planning permission withdrawn. They cannot now pick and chose which part of the original planning app. to implement just because their Financial Viability Assessment was wrong. Camden must refuse this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	belinda lees	13/02/2021 15:51:05	COMMNT	<p>I would support the objections to the amendment raised by CRASH namely:</p> <p>"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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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"</p>
2021/0025/P	Kakatherine Woolf	13/02/2021 14:46:36	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to object about the application to remove the requirement to provide affordable housing on this project and to replace the cladding with a cheaper version. Camden is already desperately short of council and social housing (not helped by austerity which has resulted in the selling off of council housing), and need for affordable housing in the borough is increasing rather than decreasing as a result of the pandemic. The removal of the requirement to provide affordable housing would also send the message to all developers that it does not matter if they mismanage their finances because Camden will effectively bail them out. We are still seeing the huge and tragic repercussions of previous attempts to save money on cladding in other buildings and it is inconceivable that the Council should allow this.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Dr Woolf</p>
2021/0025/P	Tim Herbert-Smith	13/02/2021 16:58:00	COMMNT	<p>As a Camden Council Tax payer & resident of South Hampstead I endorse the many objections to this application by residents & community groups in the area. Reduction in affordable housing is against policy & goes back on the commitments made by the developer which enabled them to obtain the original consent . The risks of property development have to be borne by the developer , not the public . If EL cannot carry out the original scheme profitably they must redesign or drop it , not seek to boost their financial margins by reducing the public benefit of affordable housing. The Council must stand up to the developer & refuse this application</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	Fiachra Pilkington	14/02/2021 23:08:50	PETITNOBJ E	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	J Woolf	13/02/2021 14:10:33	OBJ	<p>This is an objection to Essential Living's attempt to dodge the community obligations which they repeatedly referred to obeying, as a reason for letting them go ahead with their planning application for 100 Avenue Road.</p> <p>A Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State both made it very clear that consent for the original application depended on the S106 agreement re the amount of affordable housing etc.</p> <p>Essential Living are presumably efficient enough at their business to be able to evaluate if they can afford to do what they legally agree to do. This application has dragged on for years and all that time they have been making the point that the development is needed because of the affordable housing they would be providing for people in this borough. If they can't organise themselves sufficiently well to fulfil their obligations, then this is not our problem, I am sure everyone would be delighted if they sold the site to someone else. We, as residents of this borough are looking to councillors NOT to help them to wriggle out of their legal obligations under the planning approval. They willingly undertook them and it is up to them to run their business in order to be able to deliver them. The project was rejected initially by the council and has been consistently opposed by local people, it is impossible to imagine a reason why any responsible councillors would still favour this project.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to have any further negotiation and Essential Living's obligations should in no way be reduced. If Essential Living cannot do what it promised, it should sell the site to someone who can make a profit from it, and, we hope, put forward a far more appropriate development for the site, one which will use this precious space for people who live here.</p> <p>I notice that there are other detailed objections which have been filed, particularly CRASH and Belsize Society, I would like to make the point that I agree with both submissions from these organisations, so please consider them included in my objections</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	CRASH Combined Residents Associations of South Hampstead	13/02/2021 10:41:29	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Planning,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Eric Bergsagel, Chair for and on behalf of CRASH, the Combined Residents Associations of South Hampstead</p>

2021/0025/P	Kate Marston	14/02/2021 18:36:09	OBJ	<p>The original Essential Living scheme was met with many objections but as it offered much needed 36 units of affordable housing, it was one of the reasons it was allowed & now they wish to renege on this original agreement. I object to the removal of these much need affordable housing units and the application should be refused.. I also understand that Essential Living wish to switch to cheaper cladding, this does not sit comfortably after the disaster of Grenfell Tower & the repercussions to many more tower blocks .This amended application should be refused on both accounts.</p>
2021/0025/P	Susan Hadida	13/02/2021 13:32:51	COMMNT	<p>I totally agree with the OBJECTION and comments lodged by CRASH.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0025/P	Susan Zur-Szpiro	14/02/2021 12:47:44	OBJ	

From Susan Zur-Szpiro
231 Goldhurst Terrace
NW6 3EP
07973835102

Dear Mr McClue and other decision makers in Camden's 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. We go down Finchley Rd, Adelaide Rd, turning to Wellington Road, up to Belsize Park on a daily basis, including using the library and leisure centre when open so we are frequent visitors to the 100 Avenue Road area and all around Swiss Cottage.

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
07973835102

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

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.