

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0286/L	Greg Detre	11/02/2024 20:41:30	OBJ	I object to the proposed plans. They're environmentally unfriendly, will cause enormous disruption, they'll be ugly, expensive, and have a poor track record elsewhere.
2024/0286/L	Shannon Green	11/02/2024 15:32:31	OBJ	<p>I am a new resident to the estate and am dismayed to hear of these proposals. Having come from a different council estate in Islington the situation on the Alexandra and Ainsworth Estate is significantly better despite our old residence being on a newer system. I do not believe the implementation of a similar system here will do anything to resolve the issues that many have and in all likelihood will create more issues.</p> <p>Having done my own research I see that the current system is well past its expected service life, why then knowing this day was coming for many many years have the council failed to do anything? We are now at a point where the council is using the urgency of the matter to try and enforce a universally unpopular plan.</p> <p>These buildings were wonderfully designed to give all of us a good amount of space within a unique and interesting structure meant to evoke the best of futurism and a world in which social housing is an equal and valued part of the community. These proposals completely ignore this intent instead focusing only on cost effectiveness for the council.</p> <p>There is simply no space for the internal work required in each flat under these proposals and it is not fitting that residents should have to deal with so much disruption and additional personal costs because the council did not plan properly.</p> <p>Furthermore I was shocked to hear the council propose such an unsustainable and environmentally questionable solution. Given the council's commitment to significant climate goals I just do not see how these two issues square.</p> <p>Finally I really think this whole situation shows a lack of leadership and imagination at Camden council. You have such a unique and wonderful site and community that has so much potential for innovative ideas and pilots schemes. Why not partner with the amazing minds at The Bartlett School of Sustainable Construction, what a project this would be for them and we could benefit from the world's most advanced knowledge on the topic.</p> <p>I really do hope to see a change in direction here, we expected a lot more from Camden council.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2024/0286/L	James Stevens	11/02/2024 22:00:02	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the specifics of the planned work detailed in this application, and to the wider approach being taken to addressing the inadequacies of the existing system.</p> <p>They do not account for the essential needs of residents, holistically address the problems of the existing system, respect the buildings listed status, or our collective responsibility in today's climate emergency. In both their specifics and generalities, they appear to be a costly, inconvenient, and ineffective short-term focused attempt at addressing just the symptomatic issues plaguing the existing system, rather than a systemic replacement that would solve the core problems, and set us up for a financially and environmentally responsible future.</p> <p>The works would severely and irrevocably harm the buildings external appearance and character, and more importantly, the appearance and function of the interiors of the hundreds of homes on Alexandra &amp; Ainsworth Estate. The work proposed will create a series of temporarily, and inevitably longer than planned inconveniences as it's done, permanently alter the lived experience within people's flats, perpetuate the use of environmentally unfriendly solutions and, based on the performance of similar works undertaken in similar buildings (e.g. Whittington Estate) not guarantee any kind of future reliability of service or expense.</p> <p>A bolder vision befitting a boldly envisioned building, and a community invested in it and the planet's future is needed, thus I object to the current approach proposed.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0286/L	Michael Hall	11/02/2024 12:01:18	OBJ	<p>After more than 8 years, I've come to appreciate Rowley Way for its amazing grade-II* listed architecture and supportive community. I'm writing to express my opposition to Camden's proposed heating work because I believe it will negatively impact the internationally significant listed building and its interiors, it is not in line with the stated or environmental goals of the community, and Camden has disregarded the wishes of the residents, who are almost all in agreement that this is the wrong course of action. ??</p> <p>In addition:?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the identical system was implemented at Whittington (Highgate New Town) seven years ago, they have been dealing with the same issues as we are: days or weeks without heat or hot water, hot water flowing from cold water faucets, etc.</li> <li>• It will require approximately two years to construct new outside plumbing throughout the complex before moving on to our apartments.</li> <li>• The heating system will run from October through May. Aside from this, in the event of a cold snap, we won't be able to switch on the heating.</li> </ul> <p>Our hot water and heating will also be impacted if our boilers malfunction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HIU will be in the bedside cupboard in the bedroom. The manufacturer advises against doing this because it will be noisy and disrupt your sleep.</li> <li>? • Everywhere we look, there will be pipes and radiators, which limits the space we have for furnishings.?</li> <li>• We will have to pay for the heating we consume since Camden is going to install metres. Our flat will lose a lot of heat if they don't install insulation, which will increase our expenses.?</li> <li>• When the boilers become obsolete in ten to fifteen years, we will need a new system and go through much more turmoil.?</li> </ul> <p>I hope the collective response from all kinds of estate residents will show you how terribly misguided and ill-advised an approach Camden has attempted to push through without the backing of the people it will adversely affect. ?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0286/L	Nicola Countouris	10/02/2024 16:53:31	OBJ	<p>I object to these works.</p> <p>While the double glazing is long overdue, the proposed heating interface unit, emitters and associated pipework (leading to new radiators), and other alterations would severely and irreversibly harm all 520 listed interiors.</p> <p>There is also no evidence that Camden has considered the disproportionate impact that these works and the individual control system of the radiators would have on residents under the PSED imposed by the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>The works proposed do not appreciate the unique architectural and social value of the building. This is a II* listed building, and it is so in recognition of the unique architectural and engineering features it displays, including of course its communal heating system. The system was designed as a low key, concrete embedded/radiant wall one, precisely to allow the brutalist features of the building to manifest themselves in all their unique character. The new heating system, and in particular the surface distribution network and radiators being proposed, would irremediably and irreversibly alter that. The flats are minimalist (small) and clear walls, unhindered by piping work and radiators, are essential for residents to be able to enjoy some comfort.</p> <p>I am also persuaded that Camden has failed to appreciate the social implications of its proposed works. The majority of residents are council tenants, many of them from a disadvantaged socio-economic background. Radiators and individual controls would have a detrimental impact on them. It would also have a detrimental impact on the concrete fabric of the building as residents facing a choice between heating or eating would switch off their radiators which can compromise the ability of concrete to 'dry' in the winter months. It would of course also compromise the health of residents. They now have no choice as there are no individual controls. So they are obliged to leave in warm homes and the 'state' is obliged to assist them with paying the heating. That would change once 'choice' is introduced in this complex equation.</p> <p>While s. 1 of the EaA2010 has not been implemented, there is still a PSED for Camden to discharge in respect of a number of other characteristics, including race, that strongly intersect with socio-economic disadvantage. I have seen no evidence that Camden has discharged its PSED and believe that the application should be refused until it does.</p> <p>This application should therefore be unconditionally refused</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0286/L	Eliza BonhamCarter	11/02/2024 12:15:19	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to this application.</p> <p>The plans introduce new pipework to the exterior and interiors of Grade 2* listed buildings, fundamentally impacting on the appearance of this important building; this should not be allowed.</p> <p>The plans do not respond to the climate emergency, instead they lock the estate into an out of date system that pumps hot water long distances.</p> <p>Other than the introduction of double glazing, there is no ambition to look at insulating the fabric of the building - this should be the first step.</p> <p>There is concern that the loss of the heated walls will result in condensation and mould. This is not currently a problem on the estate.</p> <p>The proposals if effected, would require regular maintenance. Camden has proved incapable of maintaining the current system.</p> <p>There has been no meaningful consultation with residents.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0286/L	Adrian Bucher	10/02/2024 23:46:54	OBJ	<p>I am writing this in strong opposition to the planning applications intended for the estate - which includes 2024/0286/L.</p> <p>I would firstly like to start this by stating that I am appalled by the actions of Camden council to produce these applications without consulting residents appropriately. No one on the estate that I have spoken to were consulted on these very significant changes to the places that we are living. This is undemocratic.</p> <p>While residents have indeed experienced issues with heating and hot water, the solutions being proposed by the council are problematic for a variety of reasons including (but not limited to) being environmentally unsustainable; having been brought about by largely disregarding the views and preferences of those on the estate that have been working on the issue for many years; and ultimately introducing a situation which inevitably will not only fail to fix the issues, but actively harm the living standards of residents.</p> <p>From a financial perspective, this proposal is destined to fail. What is being proposed is tens of millions of tax-payers' money to be spent on a system that cannot and will not be able to heat homes properly or anywhere near as evenly as the present system (even with its faults) due to the inability of Camden's proposed system to avoid draughts, condensation, and (therefore) black mould; as well as the hesitancy and outright inability for some residents to afford even the most basic of heating with the seemingly never-ending energy price increases. For anyone that has ever lived in the estate, it is clear why this is an important issue due it being built using concrete. I would rather not be sentenced to having poorer health in my own home.</p> <p>Compounding this issue is that, what Camden council are proposing isn't even fixing the present problem - simply putting shiny new equipment while the underlying infrastructure, where the issues lie, remains the same. This is absurd. The present issues will continue to persist meaning that Camden will continue to spend money and valuable resources on maintenance trying to fix the present issues that will persist (not to mention any new ones that may arise) - but the only difference is that millions will have already been wasted on implementing this doomed proposal. It is puzzling as to why anyone would waste this much money on a system that is worse - and one that nobody wants. The only reason that I can think of as to why anyone would want to implement this is from the perspective of the council that wants to shift even more costs to residents. I (perhaps naïvely) hope that this isn't the case as the council are supposed to help the people of Camden instead of making their lives harder. However, that's how life seems to go more and more these days.</p> <p>Furthermore, speaking to neighbours, it becomes clear that the council has a bad reputation as far as maintenance of the present system is concerned. If the council cannot be relied upon to fix the present system, then there is no guarantee that the future maintenance of an inferior system can be depended upon. In fact, it would be foolish to think that this would change.</p> <p>The amount of work and disruption that this would cause is also unimaginable - not just when the actual work is being done (issues like property being left unlocked all day, furniture moved, the noise, the mess, etc.) but once the work has been completed (layout of properties will be completely changed that will, in several cases, need further work). This will have significant financial implications for residents - for which I'm sure that the council will absolutely not volunteer compensation. What of properties with older adults? Younger children? People with disabilities? Pets? People who work from home? People who work late shifts? It is impossible that these groups were not considered when this planning application was submitted...but it just feels like someone just doesn't care. This last remark may seem harsh, but is not without grounds. No one that I have spoken to</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0286/L	Greg Detre	11/02/2024 20:43:55	OBJ	<p>wants this new system.</p> <p>The Tenants and Residents Association, who have tried to work with the council on this for years (even being consulted via a workshop), have had their views all but disregarded - and they are people who actually live here, which, I recently found out, is not the case with employees of Camden council. How can such a significant change be proposed by people who don't even live here?</p> <p>I also understand that the council have also hid behind the estate's listed status to avoid doing work in previous years but then decide when it does or does not apply. I cannot believe that the council seriously intends to add external piping to the building. The estate is an architectural beauty, so why does Camden Council seem hell-bent on defacing the buildings?</p> <p>We accept that there are present issues - but what is being proposed in the planning applications makes absolutely no sense. Especially since the residents at Whittington Estate had simialr works forced upon them to dire results. Again, is the main aim for Camden to waste money?</p> <p>I, along with many other residents, firmly object to these plans by the council.</p>
<b>Total: 12</b>				