

| <b>Application No:</b> | <b>Consultees Name:</b> | <b>Consultees Addr:</b> | <b>Received:</b>    | <b>Comment:</b> | <b>Response:</b>   |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 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     | Ross Broadstock  | 23 Dobson Close<br>London<br>NW6 4RS | 20/08/2015 09:11:01 | OBJ      | <p>Breach of procedure by consultation process by Camden.</p> <p>John Rutter was appointed as consultation officer for this process and was to handle queries and supply responses.</p> <p>This is the automatic email received from him on August 14th.</p> <p>Automatic reply: Collections Officer<br/>People<br/>Rutter, John Aug 14 at 11:18 AM<br/>To<br/>Ross Broadstock<br/>Thank you for your e-mail.</p> <p>I am away from Friday 14th August until Tuesday 2nd September. I will reply then or you can redirect your query to <a href="mailto:capitalservices@camden.gov.uk">capitalservices@camden.gov.uk</a> if you wish.</p> <p>You can contact the council at <a href="http://www.camden.gov.uk">www.camden.gov.uk</a> or contact our switchboard 020 7278 4444.</p> <p>No-one on that phone number is aware of the project or has been instructed where to redirect John Rutter's enquiries. I have emailed the address given but received no reply and do not believe anyone there has been briefed on this project is or able to answer questions.</p> <p>John Rutter attended the public meeting on August 12th and gave no warning at all that he was about to go on holidays. This leaves us with no consultation officer for this project to answer comments.</p> <p>We were promised answers within 10 days of asking questions.</p> <p>There are questions submitted before his departure that have not been answered and clearly will not now be answered until AFTER the consultation process has closed.</p> <p>This also means that there is no one to answer phone calls on this project until after the consultation period has closed.</p> <p>It should also be realised that even if answers are supplied on his return if these answers are not satisfactory or do not address the relevant issues (as has been the case with most answers so far) there is no opportunity to respond or make a follow-up question.</p> <p>Camden has timed this process to take place in August where the maximum people will be away on holidays or not organised to respond. The minimum possible time has been given for consultation and this period has not been extended even though the original quote was incorrect by 17% and the original plans were not posted correctly and were not available for viewing.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr:                     | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
|                 |                  |                                      |                     |          | <p>There are emails and comments on the consultation website that have not been addressed.</p> <p>Camden are using a series of underhand tactics such as this to try and push through this loathsome project against the universal wishes of the residents and leaseholders at enormous cost and with complete disregard for the people the council is supposedly representing.</p> <p>Bills have been issued up to £20,400 for some individuals and it is grossly unfair for this to be rushed through with all of the breeches mentioned above and against everyone's wishes.</p> <p>Its a scandal</p>  |
| 2015/4041/P     | Ross Broadstock  | 23 Dobson Close<br>London<br>NW6 4RS | 20/08/2015 09:29:39 | OBJ      | <p>Addition:</p> <p>Here is the current reply received to questions from the email address left by John Rutter-</p> <p>no-reply@camden.gov.uk Today at 9:15 AM<br/>To<br/>rossyb@yahoo.com<br/>Thank you for your email, which has been received by the Capital Services team within Leaseholder Services. Your correspondence to us is very important and will be logged and assigned to the appropriate officer within the team.</p> <p>We aim to respond to all correspondence within ten working days. This response time frame is within the range agreed across the London Borough of Camden and is due to the sheer volume of correspondence we receive. We trust you will bear with us.</p> <p>In the meantime you may find some information relevant to your query by visiting our website:<br/><a href="http://www.camden.gov.uk/homeownership">http://www.camden.gov.uk/homeownership</a></p> <p>With kind regards.</p> <p>Leaseholder Services</p> <p>Not helpful or useful when there the consultation period is so short.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr:                     | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2015/4041/P     | Ross Broadstock  | 23 Dobson Close<br>London<br>NW6 4RS | 20/08/2015 08:45:12 | COMMNT   | <p>I am the leaseholder for 23 Dobson Close. My original quote for this work was over £20,000!</p> <p>The reason for the quote for the block 17-24 Dobson Close being even higher than the other blocks is that the works must be hidden by "Brick skins."</p> <p>The brick skins are quoted at £34,482.09 for a block of 8.</p> <p>The brick skins are considered necessary as the block is overlooked by Finchley road and the render is considered unsightly. This is a clear acceptance by the council that the rendered finish is unsightly. Rendered finishes are only to be applied where it is away from the main roads where only the residents must suffer it.</p> <p>As well as being prohibitively expensive the brick skins are also unsightly. The 10.5cm boxing around the building will ruin the original lines of the buildings and the samples shown are a poor match.</p> <p>It will also further contribute to the "dog's dinner" finish this project will bring to the street. Before the project the street is a series of attractive brick structures designed to be in harmony and makes for an attractive street. After the project some properties will remain brick (freeholders), some properties will be covered in render and no doubt attract graffiti and some properties will be covered in brick skins.</p> <p>The contractor has also explained in the public meeting that there will be a fourth type of finish either side of walkways as the full render is too deep and will make the thoroughfares too narrow.</p> <p>It should also be noted that 7 of the 8 flats in this block are leaseholder owned and a bill of over £17,000 will plunge people into fuel poverty - the complete opposite of the claimed objectives of the project.</p> <p>All 8 of us are unanimously opposed to these works.</p> <p>It is outrageous to force us into works that we cannot afford and would not want even if they were free.</p> |

---