

To Mr Predag Suzic

OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSALS PUT FORWARD BY MARCUS COOPER

I understand that Marcus Cooper's company obtained the "Freehold of the Square" within a package of properties put together by the Derwent organisation when divesting itself of private/residential remnants of the New River Company portfolio. This should not have been on offer in the first place as the land was designated for the public use of residents of the Square when the properties were originally built, and was a condition for allowing those houses to be built (together with the provision of a church for the area)

The suggestion that Mr Cooper now has the right to require property owners in the Square to pay a sum based on the current worth of the dwellings is ludicrous. These places are not commercial investments, they are the homes of people who have lived in them for many years in some cases, and who have no wish to realise their worth. The fact that Mr. Cooper has bought flats in the area and is prepared to pay up should have no bearing on the decision which will affect the majority of owners. The price which was affordable 50 years ago has escalated out of all proportion, and even the amount paid as recently as the beginning of this century by people moving to the area as a result of new local employment does not indicate that they have the wherewithal to produce sums in the region of £10,000 in order that Islington Council should obtain a Leasehold.

Why should homeowners be asked to line Mr. Cooper's pockets when the Square is a public amenity, protected under the Public Squares Act? As such, it is used by many different people from the wider community. The local "kindergarten" bring their toddlers to the playground frequently, as do the parents of the children from Clerkenwell Parochial School when school closes in the afternoons. Trinity Church Islington holds "Family Fun Days" and pre-church picnics on Sundays, and their congregation assembles from other Boroughs. The Square is used by the Angel Building as an emergency evacuation area.

The requirement for a sub-soil depth clause makes no sense if Mr. Cooper were aiming to build an underground carpark ... the area is crisscrossed by service conduits for amenities such as gas, water and electricity; there is also, for consideration, the crypt of St Mark's Church, which contains more than 100 bodies which are below the sub-soil designation.

I sincerely hope that Islington Council (Litigation) will continue to fight to resist the outrageous proposal put forward by Robert Orr-Ewing on behalf of Marcus Cooper.

Yours faithfully,

Gillian M.P. Courtnell.