

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Jackie Webb	56 Dobson close	16/08/2015 20:17:00	OBJ	<p>I think the proposed cladding will take away the beauty of the estate. The block has just been decorated to a high standard. The money could be much better spent on things that the estate actually needs, garden walls need repairing, garages and their doors need repairing, drainage improved, bins improved, the road and pavements improved. Creating sills on the windows will make them more vulnerable to burglary. I don't want this work done, I want the appearance of the estate to stay the same and the cladding will dramatically change this for the worse. There must be better ways to improve sustainability, that should be investigated first. I do not suffer from fuel poverty. I have not been consulted prior to this application in any way. I believe that the harm to the appearance of our estate can not be justified by proposed speculative fuel savings and sustainability benefits.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Joanne Blagden	14 Dobson Close	17/08/2015 11:43:25	OBJLETTE R	Regeneration and Planning Development Management London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street LONDON WC1H 8ND

17 August 2015

For the attention of Ian Gracie, case officer

Dear Sir

PLANNING APPLICATION NO 2015/4041/P

Proposed external insulation cladding of 11-78 Dobson Close by the London Borough of Camden

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I live in Dobson Close. I wish to object to this retrofitting of insulating material to the flats in Dobson Close.

The ostensible reason for undertaking this work is to reduce the carbon footprint of Camden's housing stock (of which Dobson Close is part) and to tackle fuel poverty. On the latter, the local authority does not know who - if any - in Dobson Close is in fuel poverty, nor does it know the average fuel bill of the flats, nor the fuel efficiency of the heating systems used. On the former, the carbon reductions forecast are speculative as the calculations are based purely on modelling and not empirical research; under an FOI request, Camden has advised me that the actual energy reductions are unable to be predicted and the CO2 footprint for installation and maintenance is not known. Alternative and less intrusive sustainable methods of reducing the carbon footprint of Dobson Close, for example, solar panels have not been examined.

I am concerned that the proposals are being pursued in haste and with inadequate consideration in order that they are eligible for funding from the Energy Company Obligation towards the cost of the cladding.

–Appearance: Dobson Close – indeed the whole Hilgrove Estate – was designed in the mid 1950s by the respected architectural firm, Louis de Soissons, Peacock, Hodges and Robertson. The design is a typical understatement of the era, particularly the concrete detailing around openings (windows, entrance doors, open walkways) and the tiled ledges to the window sills. This will all be lost under and marred by the proposed thick cladding. [The Louis de Soisson partnership are still in existence, but have not been consulted on this major change to what is classic architecture of the 1950s.]

The architecture of the 1950s is much underrated and consequently is overlooked when allocating conservation areas. I am very concerned that the aesthetics of the Close - the beauty and charm of the simple brickwork (which is in excellent condition), the subtlety of design – will all be destroyed should

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

Comment: **Response:**

this proposed work proceed. The freehold properties in the Close will escape cladding and will only emphasise the vandalism of the clad blocks.

Permanent detriment to the design and fabric of the original buildings: The application of cladding will damage the existing brickwork and so will preclude reversal of this 'improvement'. The lifespan of the cladding is just 30 years; at some point the whole system will need to be replaced causing further damage to the original buildings. Any failure of the cladding such as water getting into/behind it, would not be immediately detectable and would certainly result in further damage to the original structure.

Loss of daylight: the windows being recessed by 10.5cms will significantly reduce light into the flats. An additional worry is that the deep ledges created will become colonised by pigeons.

Increased fire risk : The insulating materials being used, even if they meet the relevant fire regulations as a construction material, are not as resistant to fire as brick and so residents are being placed in greater danger. Gas pipes are not being re-sited to be outside the cladding but are to be 'boxed in' (less insulation, potential for gas build-up unless vents are checked)

Evacuation in case of fire will be impeded as the cladding will narrow the decks on the upper floors by 10.5 centimetres (from 101 to 90.5cms). This narrowing of the decks will also hamper fire-fighters and other emergency services. In addition, residents will have less room to manoeuvre large deliveries such as fridges, beds etc, increasing the risk of damaging the protective rendering over the insulating material.

Condensation & mould risk: There are issues concerning the breathability of cladding. Currently the solid brick walls allow for a level of transfer of moisture outwards that will be curtailed with the proposed insulating material and rendering – increasing the risk of condensation and mould inside the dwellings. The cladding is also to be pierced by numerous existing airbricks and vents and re-sited satellite dishes that increase the possibility of water ingress behind the rendering where hidden mould could develop.

Subsidence risk: There is known to be an issue of ground instability in Dobson Close and the Greater London Council carried out sample bore drillings in the late 1970s (documents held at the London Metropolitan Archives). There are tubes lines and covered railways running either side of Dobson Close. More recently Camden Council has had to investigate subsidence affecting the stairwells for the lower lying blocks. It is therefore a concern that additional weight is to be added to the buildings without careful examination of the increased hazard of land collapse and compression. Cladding will mask any future episodes of cracking or shift and so hamper and delay investigations and remedial action.

Flooding risk: Dobson Close is in an identified flood risk area (contrary to applicant's claim) and any change of water run off could have dire consequences. The present brick exterior takes up some water from rainfall that is then lost through evaporation; the proposed cement rendering will be impervious

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>and water will immediately run off. The additional weight of the buildings will also have an effect on natural soak away. All this will change the drainage dynamics of the Close, increasing the risk of flooding and could affect land stability through land dissolution.</p> <p>I understand that I am not alone and that the majority of the leaseholders and tenants in Dobson Close share these concerns; currently 44 are opposed, 0 are for and 22 unknown.</p> <p>Camden Civic Society is concerned about the change in appearance of the estate and has recommended the involvement of the Twentieth Century Society.</p> <p>If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I would like to attend the meeting of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. Please let me know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>J E Blagden 14 Dobson Close LONDON NW6 4RS</p>

2015/4041/P	Anna Capri	54 Dobson close	13/08/2015 19:14:00	OBJ	<p>I don't like any of the proposals made by the council. I don't like the new appearance at all. I am very concerned about the possible decrease in natural light. The property is never cold or noisy, I have experienced no issues with fuel costs and have lived here for 43 years. I do not feel that any of the sustainability arguments for the works outweigh the damage to the appearance of my home. I have been happy here for many years and am opposed to these plans.</p>
-------------	------------	-----------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Izabela McFarlane	41 Dobson Close	17/08/2015 11:46:19	OBJ	Regeneration and Planning Development Management London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street LONDON WC1H 8ND

17 August 2015

For the attention of Ian Gracie, case officer

Dear Sir

PLANNING APPLICATION NO 2015/4041/P

Proposed external insulation cladding of 11-78 Dobson Close by the London Borough of Camden

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I live in Dobson Close. I wish to object to this retrofitting of insulating material to the flats in Dobson Close.

The ostensible reason for undertaking this work is to reduce the carbon footprint of Camden's housing stock (of which Dobson Close is part) and to tackle fuel poverty. On the latter, the local authority does not know who - if any - in Dobson Close is in fuel poverty, nor does it know the average fuel bill of the flats, nor the fuel efficiency of the heating systems used. On the former, the carbon reductions forecast are speculative as the calculations are based purely on modelling and not empirical research; under an FOI request, Camden has advised me that the actual energy reductions are unable to be predicted and the CO2 footprint for installation and maintenance is not known. Alternative and less intrusive sustainable methods of reducing the carbon footprint of Dobson Close, for example, solar panels have not been examined.

I am concerned that the proposals are being pursued in haste and with inadequate consideration in order that they are eligible for funding from the Energy Company Obligation towards the cost of the cladding.

–Appearance: Dobson Close – indeed the whole Hilgrove Estate – was designed in the mid 1950s by the respected architectural firm, Louis de Soissons, Peacock, Hodges and Robertson. The design is a typical understatement of the era, particularly the concrete detailing around openings (windows, entrance doors, open walkways) and the tiled ledges to the window sills. This will all be lost under and marred by the proposed thick cladding. [The Louis de Soisson partnership are still in existence, but have not been consulted on this major change to what is classic architecture of the 1950s.]

The architecture of the 1950s is much underrated and consequently is overlooked when allocating conservation areas. I am very concerned that the aesthetics of the Close - the beauty and charm of the simple brickwork (which is in excellent condition), the subtlety of design – will all be destroyed should

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

Comment: **Response:**

this proposed work proceed. The freehold properties in the Close will escape cladding and will only emphasise the vandalism of the clad blocks.

Permanent detriment to the design and fabric of the original buildings: The application of cladding will damage the existing brickwork and so will preclude reversal of this 'improvement'. The lifespan of the cladding is just 30 years; at some point the whole system will need to be replaced causing further damage to the original buildings. Any failure of the cladding such as water getting into/behind it, would not be immediately detectable and would certainly result in further damage to the original structure.

Loss of daylight: the windows being recessed by 10.5cms will significantly reduce light into the flats. An additional worry is that the deep ledges created will become colonised by pigeons.

Increased fire risk : The insulating materials being used, even if they meet the relevant fire regulations as a construction material, are not as resistant to fire as brick and so residents are being placed in greater danger. Gas pipes are not being re-sited to be outside the cladding but are to be 'boxed in' (less insulation, potential for gas build-up unless vents are checked)

Evacuation in case of fire will be impeded as the cladding will narrow the decks on the upper floors by 10.5 centimetres (from 101 to 90.5cms). This narrowing of the decks will also hamper fire-fighters and other emergency services. In addition, residents will have less room to manoeuvre large deliveries such as fridges, beds etc, increasing the risk of damaging the protective rendering over the insulating material.

Condensation & mould risk: There are issues concerning the breathability of cladding. Currently the solid brick walls allow for a level of transfer of moisture outwards that will be curtailed with the proposed insulating material and rendering – increasing the risk of condensation and mould inside the dwellings. The cladding is also to be pierced by numerous existing airbricks and vents and re-sited satellite dishes that increase the possibility of water ingress behind the rendering where hidden mould could develop.

Subsidence risk: There is known to be an issue of ground instability in Dobson Close and the Greater London Council carried out sample bore drillings in the late 1970s (documents held at the London Metropolitan Archives). There are tubes lines and covered railways running either side of Dobson Close. More recently Camden Council has had to investigate subsidence affecting the stairwells for the lower lying blocks. It is therefore a concern that additional weight is to be added to the buildings without careful examination of the increased hazard of land collapse and compression. Cladding will mask any future episodes of cracking or shift and so hamper and delay investigations and remedial action.

Flooding risk: Dobson Close is in an identified flood risk area (contrary to applicant's claim) and any change of water run off could have dire consequences. The present brick exterior takes up some water from rainfall that is then lost through evaporation; the proposed cement rendering will be impervious

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>and water will immediately run off. The additional weight of the buildings will also have an effect on natural soak away. All this will change the drainage dynamics of the Close, increasing the risk of flooding and could affect land stability through land dissolution.</p> <p>I understand that I am not alone and that the majority of the leaseholders and tenants in Dobson Close share these concerns; currently 44 are opposed, 0 are for and 22 unknown.</p> <p>Camden Civic Society is concerned about the change in appearance of the estate and has recommended the involvement of the Twentieth Century Society.</p> <p>If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I would like to attend the meeting of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. Please let me know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Izabela McFarlane 41 Dobson Close LONDON NW6 4RT</p>

2015/4041/P	Jack Xin Hao Tan	30 Dobson Close NW64RT	13/08/2015 23:47:33	OBJ	<p>I strongly disagree with the plan to install external wall insulation on my property block. I am deeply concerned with the excessive costs involved versus the minimal benefits of such a project. I have no confidence in the timely completion of this project and the scaffolding that will be present for the duration of this project. Ultimately I dont see that this project is necessary as there is nothing wrong with the existing building.</p>
-------------	------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Carol Salter	63 Dobson close Swiss Cottage NW6 4RU NW6 4RU NW6 4RU	13/08/2015 17:27:29	OBJ	<p>The ostensible reason for undertaking this work is to reduce the carbon footprint of Camden's housing stock (of which Dobson Close is part) and to tackle fuel poverty. On the latter, the local authority does not know who - if any - in Dobson Close is in fuel poverty, nor does it know the average fuel bill of the flats, nor the fuel efficiency of the heating systems used. On the former, the carbon reductions forecast are speculative as the calculations are based purely on modelling and not empirical research; under an FOI request, Camden has advised me that the actual energy reductions are unable to be predicted and the CO2 footprint for installation and maintenance is not known. Alternative and less intrusive sustainable methods of reducing the carbon footprint of Dobson Close, for example, solar panels have not been examined. I am concerned that the proposals are being pursued in haste and with inadequate consideration in order that they are eligible for funding from the Energy Company</p> <p>Obligation towards the cost of the cladding. Appearance: Dobson Close – indeed the whole Hilgrove Estate – was designed in the mid 1950s by the respected architectural firm, Louis de Soissons, Peacock, Hodges and Robertson. The design is a typical understatement of the era, particularly the concrete detailing around openings (windows, entrance doors, open walkways) and the tiled ledges to the window sills. This will all be lost under and marred by the proposed thick cladding. [The Louis de Soisson partnership are still in existence, but have not been consulted on this major change to what is classic architecture of the 1950s.]</p> <p>The architecture of the 1950s is much underrated and consequently is overlooked when allocating conservation areas. I am very concerned that the aesthetics of the Close - the beauty and charm of the simple brickwork (which is in excellent condition), the subtlety of design – will all be destroyed should this proposed work proceed. The freehold properties in the Close will escape cladding and will only emphasise the vandalism of the clad blocks.</p> <p>Permanent detriment to the design and fabric of the original buildings: The application of cladding will damage the existing brickwork and so will preclude reversal of this 'improvement'. The lifespan of the cladding is just 30 years; at some point the whole system will need to be replaced causing further damage to the original buildings. Any failure of the cladding such as water getting into/behind it, would not be immediately detectable and would certainly result in further damage to the original structure.</p> <p>Loss of daylight: the windows being recessed by 10.5cms will significantly reduce light into the flats. An additional worry is that the deep ledges created will become colonised by pigeons.</p> <p>Increased fire risk : The insulating materials being used, even if they meet the relevant fire regulations as a construction material, are not as resistant to fire as brick and so residents are</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

being placed in greater danger. Gas pipes are not being re-sited to be outside the cladding but are to be 'boxed in' (less insulation, potential for gas build-up unless vents are checked) Evacuation in case of fire will be impeded as the cladding will narrow the decks on the upper floors by 10.5 centimetres (from 101 to 90.5cms). This narrowing of the decks will also hamper fire-fighters and other emergency services. In addition, residents will have less room to manoeuvre large deliveries such as fridges, beds etc, increasing the risk of damaging the protective rendering over the insulating material.

Condensation & mould risk: There are issues concerning the breathability of cladding. Currently the solid brick walls allow for a level of transfer of moisture outwards that will be curtailed with the proposed insulating material and rendering – increasing the risk of condensation and mould inside the dwellings. The cladding is also to be pierced by numerous existing airbricks and vents and re-sited satellite dishes that increase the possibility of water ingress behind the rendering where hidden mould could develop.

Subsidence risk: There is known to be an issue of ground instability in Dobson Close and the Greater London Council carried out sample bore drillings in the late 1970s (documents held at the London Metropolitan Archives). There are tubes lines and covered railways running either side of Dobson Close. More recently Camden Council has had to investigate subsidence affecting the stairwells for the lower lying blocks. It is therefore a concern that additional weight is to be added to the buildings without careful examination of the increased hazard of land collapse and compression. Cladding will mask any future episodes of cracking or shift and so hamper and delay investigations and remedial action.

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

Flooding risk: Dobson Close is in an identified flood risk area (contrary to applicant's claim)

and any change of water run off could have dire consequences. The present brick exterior takes up some water from rainfall that is then lost through evaporation; the proposed cement rendering will be impervious and water will immediately run off. The additional weight of the buildings will also have an effect on natural soak away. All this will change the drainage dynamics of the Close, increasing the risk of flooding and could affect land stability through land dissolution.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Alex Fugallo	57 Dobson Close	14/08/2015 20:43:30	OBJ	<p>Further to my earlier comments having attended a meeting with leaseholder services and the sustainability officer I would like to add the addition comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The projected carbon savings are based on modelling of available housing stock data rather than actual data. The calculations that have been used to justify the sustainability argument are therefore unreliable and potentially inaccurate. • An example of this is the fuel cost saving figures supplied in the Hilgrove Estate planning statement (7th July) application document (£240) differ from those sent to the tenants and residents in the FAQ's External wall insulation (EWI) Hilgrove Estate 2 document (£145-£240) • Is there fuel poverty? I have come across no examples of this either in my own case or in questioning any of tenants and leaseholders on the estate. • We have been offered no other options to reduce carbon emissions nor are we aware of the council investigating any alternatives to reach government targets. • Dobson Close has just been decorated (May-June of this year) at considerable expense. It seems senseless that the proposed work is taking place almost immediately following this redecoration. This is hardly an example of sustainability. 2. Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council will not be replacing/covering like for like. In Dobson Close they propose to cover attractive yellow London brick with Flemish bond and smooth finish magnolia render, both in excellent condition, with an off-white, rough render. • Brick slips have not been proposed for the vast majority of the current brick walls in Dobson Close. The proposed brick slips, where they are being used, are a poor match for the existing brickwork. • As well as an off-white render finish the council are proposing a grey colour for the projecting window and door surrounds. At no point have the residents been consulted about these colours or changes. • The rough render is being manually applied and despite being assured by the Lake House representative that all work would be carried out by skilled labour it would appear that they are not skilled enough to apply a smooth float finish. 3. Appearance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dobson close is a particularly attractive estate, the look of which Camden should be proud of, its residents certainly are. The simple 1950s architectural style will be lost under the cladding. The proposed work is extraordinarily ugly and all the charm and style will be lost. • The proposed colours and finish are quite frankly depressing. • There is ample evidence to show the negative impact upon a community living in an unsightly and unpleasant environment, which I can produce if required.

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

4. Impact to host building

- The proposed works would damage the original 1950s London yellow stock brickwork, which is in extremely good condition.
- Thickness of the cladding will reduce natural light in the properties. The north facing windows of the ground and second levels are partially covered by the projecting walkway and third floors respectively and already have reduced light.
- Walk-ways and private external spaces will be reduced by the cladding.
- Access to gas and water pipes becomes difficult and a potential fire issue. Access to existing cabling will be very difficult.

Summary

In my opinion none of the sustainability arguments outweigh the harm to the character, appearance and integrity of the estate. I strongly object to the work being carried out.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Carol Salter	63 Dobson close Swiss Cottage NW6 4RU NW6 4RU NW6 4RU	13/08/2015 17:27:30	OBJ	<p>The ostensible reason for undertaking this work is to reduce the carbon footprint of Camden's housing stock (of which Dobson Close is part) and to tackle fuel poverty. On the latter, the local authority does not know who - if any - in Dobson Close is in fuel poverty, nor does it know the average fuel bill of the flats, nor the fuel efficiency of the heating systems used. On the former, the carbon reductions forecast are speculative as the calculations are based purely on modelling and not empirical research; under an FOI request, Camden has advised me that the actual energy reductions are unable to be predicted and the CO2 footprint for installation and maintenance is not known. Alternative and less intrusive sustainable methods of reducing the carbon footprint of Dobson Close, for example, solar panels have not been examined. I am concerned that the proposals are being pursued in haste and with inadequate consideration in order that they are eligible for funding from the Energy Company</p> <p>Obligation towards the cost of the cladding. Appearance: Dobson Close – indeed the whole Hilgrove Estate – was designed in the mid 1950s by the respected architectural firm, Louis de Soissons, Peacock, Hodges and Robertson. The design is a typical understatement of the era, particularly the concrete detailing around openings (windows, entrance doors, open walkways) and the tiled ledges to the window sills. This will all be lost under and marred by the proposed thick cladding. [The Louis de Soisson partnership are still in existence, but have not been consulted on this major change to what is classic architecture of the 1950s.]</p> <p>The architecture of the 1950s is much underrated and consequently is overlooked when allocating conservation areas. I am very concerned that the aesthetics of the Close - the beauty and charm of the simple brickwork (which is in excellent condition), the subtlety of design – will all be destroyed should this proposed work proceed. The freehold properties in the Close will escape cladding and will only emphasise the vandalism of the clad blocks.</p> <p>Permanent detriment to the design and fabric of the original buildings: The application of cladding will damage the existing brickwork and so will preclude reversal of this 'improvement'. The lifespan of the cladding is just 30 years; at some point the whole system will need to be replaced causing further damage to the original buildings. Any failure of the cladding such as water getting into/behind it, would not be immediately detectable and would certainly result in further damage to the original structure.</p> <p>Loss of daylight: the windows being recessed by 10.5cms will significantly reduce light into the flats. An additional worry is that the deep ledges created will become colonised by pigeons.</p> <p>Increased fire risk : The insulating materials being used, even if they meet the relevant fire regulations as a construction material, are not as resistant to fire as brick and so residents are</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

being placed in greater danger. Gas pipes are not being re-sited to be outside the cladding but are to be 'boxed in' (less insulation, potential for gas build-up unless vents are checked) Evacuation in case of fire will be impeded as the cladding will narrow the decks on the upper floors by 10.5 centimetres (from 101 to 90.5cms). This narrowing of the decks will also hamper fire-fighters and other emergency services. In addition, residents will have less room to manoeuvre large deliveries such as fridges, beds etc, increasing the risk of damaging the protective rendering over the insulating material.

Condensation & mould risk: There are issues concerning the breathability of cladding. Currently the solid brick walls allow for a level of transfer of moisture outwards that will be curtailed with the proposed insulating material and rendering – increasing the risk of condensation and mould inside the dwellings. The cladding is also to be pierced by numerous existing airbricks and vents and re-sited satellite dishes that increase the possibility of water ingress behind the rendering where hidden mould could develop.

Subsidence risk: There is known to be an issue of ground instability in Dobson Close and the Greater London Council carried out sample bore drillings in the late 1970s (documents held at the London Metropolitan Archives). There are tubes lines and covered railways running either side of Dobson Close. More recently Camden Council has had to investigate subsidence affecting the stairwells for the lower lying blocks. It is therefore a concern that additional weight is to be added to the buildings without careful examination of the increased hazard of land collapse and compression. Cladding will mask any future episodes of cracking or shift and so hamper and delay investigations and remedial action.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Flooding risk: Dobson Close is in an identified flood risk area (contrary to applicant's claim)</p> <p>and any change of water run off could have dire consequences. The present brick exterior takes up some water from rainfall that is then lost through evaporation; the proposed cement rendering will be impervious and water will immediately run off. The additional weight of the buildings will also have an effect on natural soak away. All this will change the drainage dynamics of the Close, increasing the risk of flooding and could affect land stability through land dissolution.</p>
2015/4041/P	Shailesh Malde	11 Boycroft Ave NW9 8AH NW9 8AH NW9 8AH	13/08/2015 18:02:26	OBJ	<p>Observations re EW1 Dobson Close</p> <p>I hereby formally register my objection to this charge. The proposed works cannot be considered 'maintenance' or 'repairs' within the terms of my lease, and therefore I dispute whether I have a liability to pay for the proposed works.</p> <p>In the event that the Council claims a power to make improvements in the property and to charge this to the leaseholders (a right not contained in the lease, and thus one which I dispute, as noted above), I would dispute whether the proposed works constitute an improvement. My objections to the aesthetic and practical aspects of the proposal are already set out in my objection to the planning application (copy attached). The positive effects on energy conservation of the proposed works, the primary reason provided for them, will be minimal (raising the standard of the flats merely from EPC band D to band C/D borderline). In financial terms the works are vastly disproportionate to the benefits that will accrue: in property law terms, they are not an 'improvement'.</p> <p>I must also object on the grounds that Dobson Close has just undergone major works ie a major redecoration after 18 years for which the budget has nearly doubled and for which I, as a leaseholder, am being asked to contribute between £1,500 and £2,000.</p>
2015/4041/P	Frances Coleman	58 Dobson close	13/08/2015 20:03:47	OBJ	<p>I am against the appearance of the proposed exterior cladding. I think it is ugly and looks like a prison. It's going to stand out from the buildings that aren't being cladded. My energy bills are completely manageable. I have concerns about the possibility of damp problems as a result of the works. The money could be better spent improving the drains which have been a constant problem and still not resolved by Camden. I am very concerned about the boxing of pipes and cables as access will be limited. The block has just been redecorated and looks very attractive and it is ridiculous and hardly in the interests of sustainability to carry out this work, wasting money and resources. I have not been convinced by the durability of the cladding beyond the 25 year warranty period. I believe that other sustainability schemes should be considered where the money could be better spent. I am also worried by the potential loss of natural light into my flat by the increased recesses around the windows and doors. I am not convinced that this proposal has been sufficiently thought out or that the tenants have been involved in the decision process. I strongly object to this proposed work.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Amiel Ziv	44 Dobson Close London	13/08/2015 19:45:28	OBJ	<p>There is an important point which I have not raised in my previous objections, which is the permanent loss of light in our homes as a result of these proposed works. We would be living in darker homes, which would have a very detrimental effect on our quality of life.</p> <p>The loss of light would mean that we would have to put the lights on instead of using natural lighting, thereby increasing our electricity bills.</p> <p>I reiterate my objections to this scheme in the strongest possible terms.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Carol Salter	63 Dobson close Swiss Cottage NW6 4RU NW6 4RU NW6 4RU	13/08/2015 17:27:06	OBJ	<p>The ostensible reason for undertaking this work is to reduce the carbon footprint of Camden's housing stock (of which Dobson Close is part) and to tackle fuel poverty. On the latter, the local authority does not know who - if any - in Dobson Close is in fuel poverty, nor does it know the average fuel bill of the flats, nor the fuel efficiency of the heating systems used. On the former, the carbon reductions forecast are speculative as the calculations are based purely on modelling and not empirical research; under an FOI request, Camden has advised me that the actual energy reductions are unable to be predicted and the CO2 footprint for installation and maintenance is not known. Alternative and less intrusive sustainable methods of reducing the carbon footprint of Dobson Close, for example, solar panels have not been examined. I am concerned that the proposals are being pursued in haste and with inadequate consideration in order that they are eligible for funding from the Energy Company</p> <p>Obligation towards the cost of the cladding. Appearance: Dobson Close – indeed the whole Hilgrove Estate – was designed in the mid 1950s by the respected architectural firm, Louis de Soissons, Peacock, Hodges and Robertson. The design is a typical understatement of the era, particularly the concrete detailing around openings (windows, entrance doors, open walkways) and the tiled ledges to the window sills. This will all be lost under and marred by the proposed thick cladding. [The Louis de Soisson partnership are still in existence, but have not been consulted on this major change to what is classic architecture of the 1950s.]</p> <p>The architecture of the 1950s is much underrated and consequently is overlooked when allocating conservation areas. I am very concerned that the aesthetics of the Close - the beauty and charm of the simple brickwork (which is in excellent condition), the subtlety of design – will all be destroyed should this proposed work proceed. The freehold properties in the Close will escape cladding and will only emphasise the vandalism of the clad blocks.</p> <p>Permanent detriment to the design and fabric of the original buildings: The application of cladding will damage the existing brickwork and so will preclude reversal of this 'improvement'. The lifespan of the cladding is just 30 years; at some point the whole system will need to be replaced causing further damage to the original buildings. Any failure of the cladding such as water getting into/behind it, would not be immediately detectable and would certainly result in further damage to the original structure.</p> <p>Loss of daylight: the windows being recessed by 10.5cms will significantly reduce light into the flats. An additional worry is that the deep ledges created will become colonised by pigeons.</p> <p>Increased fire risk : The insulating materials being used, even if they meet the relevant fire regulations as a construction material, are not as resistant to fire as brick and so residents are</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

being placed in greater danger. Gas pipes are not being re-sited to be outside the cladding but are to be 'boxed in' (less insulation, potential for gas build-up unless vents are checked) Evacuation in case of fire will be impeded as the cladding will narrow the decks on the upper floors by 10.5 centimetres (from 101 to 90.5cms). This narrowing of the decks will also hamper fire-fighters and other emergency services. In addition, residents will have less room to manoeuvre large deliveries such as fridges, beds etc, increasing the risk of damaging the protective rendering over the insulating material.

Condensation & mould risk: There are issues concerning the breathability of cladding. Currently the solid brick walls allow for a level of transfer of moisture outwards that will be curtailed with the proposed insulating material and rendering – increasing the risk of condensation and mould inside the dwellings. The cladding is also to be pierced by numerous existing airbricks and vents and re-sited satellite dishes that increase the possibility of water ingress behind the rendering where hidden mould could develop.

Subsidence risk: There is known to be an issue of ground instability in Dobson Close and the Greater London Council carried out sample bore drillings in the late 1970s (documents held at the London Metropolitan Archives). There are tubes lines and covered railways running either side of Dobson Close. More recently Camden Council has had to investigate subsidence affecting the stairwells for the lower lying blocks. It is therefore a concern that additional weight is to be added to the buildings without careful examination of the increased hazard of land collapse and compression. Cladding will mask any future episodes of cracking or shift and so hamper and delay investigations and remedial action.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Flooding risk: Dobson Close is in an identified flood risk area (contrary to applicant's claim)</p> <p>and any change of water run off could have dire consequences. The present brick exterior takes up some water from rainfall that is then lost through evaporation; the proposed cement rendering will be impervious and water will immediately run off. The additional weight of the buildings will also have an effect on natural soak away. All this will change the drainage dynamics of the Close, increasing the risk of flooding and could affect land stability through land dissolution.</p>

2015/4041/P	Carol Salter	63 Dobson close Swiss Cottage NW6 4RU NW6 4RU NW6 4RU	13/08/2015 17:27:10 OBJ
-------------	--------------	---	-------------------------

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

2015/4041/P Dr Lisa Thorn 57 Dobson Close 13/08/2015 17:37:18 OBJ 1. Sustainability

The projected carbon savings are based on modelling of available housing stock data rather than actual data, and there is no information regarding sample size for this data. There have been no calculations based specifically on 1950s buildings, let alone on Dobson Close itself.

The calculations that have been used to justify the sustainability argument are therefore unreliable and potentially inaccurate.

The council state that the buildings offer poor thermal performance and the residents within are generally suffering from elevated levels of heat loss, high fuel bills and general issues surrounding fuel poverty. This is simply untrue in my experience of living in Dobson Close. We are a close community and I am not aware of any residents in Dobson Close who have expressed problems with fuel poverty or cold. Most of the complaints have been about damp or drainage issues. As far as I know the council has not approached the residents in order to assess fuel bills or poverty, or to assess their requirements at all.

We have been offered no other options to reduce carbon emissions nor are we aware of the council investigating any alternatives to reach government targets.

Dobson Close has just been decorated (May-June of this year) at considerable expense. In terms of sustainability it seems senseless that the proposed work is taking place almost immediately following this redecoration – a total waste of money, manpower and resources.

2. Materials

The council will not be replacing/covering like for like. In Dobson Close they propose to cover attractive yellow London brick and magnolia render (smooth finish), both in excellent condition, with an off-white, rough render. Brick slips have not been proposed for the majority of the current brick walls in Dobson Close. The proposed brick slips, where they are being used, are a poor match for the existing brickwork. As well as an off-white render finish the council are proposing a grey colour for the projecting window and door surrounds. Residents have not been consulted about these colours.

At the leaseholders meeting (12/8/15) I had the opportunity to view the cladding materials and they appeared to be quite easily damaged and stained. The main example was both damaged and dirty, apparently from being in the boot of a car for only two years. I was not at all impressed.

3. Appearance

The appearance of my property and the surrounding properties will be fundamentally altered. As it has been recently decorated the block currently looks very attractive, exemplifying the simple 1950s architectural style. This would be lost under the proposed cladding work. In my opinion the community is particularly proud of the appearance and character of Dobson Close and the impact of this fundamental change could potentially affect residents health and well-being. As a psychologist, I am

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

Comment: **Response:**

well aware of the evidence for environmental effects on welfare. Also, if the proposed works go ahead I am concerned about the impact of perceived powerlessness on stress levels in the community. The community is largely static and a number of residents have been living here since the properties were built in the 1950s. I am particularly concerned about the effect of the proposed changes on our elderly residents.

Although I am aware that monetary value is not a planning consideration I do think that the proposed cladding will affect the value of the property negatively (I personally would not have bought the property had this work already been done), but also the property will be devalued in the eyes of tenants, leaseholders and the community at large. At the moment we have very little issue with vandalism on this part of the estate. Evidence suggests that anti-social behaviour could potentially increase if the perception of the block is negatively affected.

4. Impact to host building

It is my understanding gained from the leaseholders meeting on 12th August that the proposed works would damage the original 1950s London yellow stock brickwork, which as stated above is in extremely good condition.

I am concerned also about the thickness of the cladding, which could potentially lead to reduced natural light in the properties. I understand that that there has been no investigation regarding this potential natural light reduction. There is a wealth of evidence showing a beneficial effect of natural light on health and well-being and the negative effects of reduced daylight. Walk-ways and private external spaces will also be reduced by the cladding and access to pipes and cabling will be limited.

Summary

There is no evidence for the council's statement that the proposed works will enhance the "welfare of residents" by improving the thermal efficiency of housing stock, reducing fuel bills and tackle the issue of fuel poverty.

These works will impact negatively on resident welfare. Residents are already upset and angry. I am not sure why residents were not surveyed or consulted prior to the planning application being made. It would be crucial to assess the impact on residents, as well as on fuel saving, should the works go ahead. I sincerely hope they do not.

As well as the impact on residents the works will have a detrimental effect on the appearance, experience and perception of the estate.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Lis Fields & Mark Hutchinson	53 Dobson Close London NW6 4RU	13/08/2015 14:11:03	COMMNT	<p>Mark Hutchinson and myself hereby formally register our objections to this charge.</p> <p>The proposed works cannot be considered 'maintenance' or 'repairs' within the terms of our lease. We therefore dispute whether we have a liability to pay for the proposed works.</p> <p>In the event that the Council claims a power to make improvements in the property and to charge this to the leaseholders (a right not contained in the lease, and thus one which we dispute, as noted above), we would dispute whether the proposed works constitute an improvement.</p> <p>Our objections to the practical as well as the aesthetic aspects of the proposal are already set out in our objection to the planning application (copy attached).</p> <p>The positive effects on energy conservation of the proposed works - the primary reason provided for them - will be minimal: raising the standard of the flats merely from EPC band D to the Band C/D borderline.</p> <p>In financial terms the works are vastly disproportionate to the benefits that will accrue: in property law terms, they do not constitute an 'improvement'.</p> <p>We must also object on the grounds that Dobson Close has just undergone major works, i.e. a major redecoration for which the budget has nearly doubled and for which we, as leaseholders, are being asked to contribute between £1,500 and £2,000.</p> <p>We understand that the second floor walkways in my block (49-78 Dobson Close), which had to be re-rendered prior to being repainted, are now also to be clad.</p>
