

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Mark Hutchinson	53 Dobson Close	21/08/2015 14:11:08	OBJ	<p>Proposed external insulation cladding of 11-78 Dobson Close by the London Borough of Camden</p> <p>Lis Fields and I have already registered our objections to the proposed cladding for Dobson Close but following the recent meeting between Leaseholders and council representatives from the Housing department further objections have arisen.</p> <p>It became quite clear at the meeting that there was no sound financial reason for carrying out this work for either the council or leaseholders: the expenditure would far outweigh the savings made over the 25years for which the work is guaranteed. It was admitted that no alternative environmental proposals for the money had been considered. It can only be concluded that the sole reason for proposing the work is to meet arbitrary quotas imposed by central government regarding insulation. The council has already insulated all the homes which can be insulated in a non-intrusive way.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate that this puts the Council in a difficult position, it is no reason for imposing a scheme which is unwanted and would be to the great detriment of Estate and the area as a whole. Dobson Close has beautiful architecture which the proposed cladding would destroy. The samples of cladding we were shown were hideous and had become badly damaged merely from being taken to meetings. What happens to the cladding in situ can be seen from the state of cladding in Malden Crescent. The cladding is obviously vulnerable to vandalism and accidental damage. However, even in its pristine state it is utterly unacceptable for Dobson Close, being completely out of keeping with the aesthetics of its architecture. Moreover, the intricate and detailed architecture is not suitable for any sympathetic imposition of the this thick, unwieldy material.</p> <p>We do not believe there has been proper planning, sufficient consultation with residents nor long enough given for proper consideration of these proposals. The council officials attending the meeting were unable to answer the question of why this work has been proposed immediately following the repainting of our properties.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	I McFarlane on behalf of Dobson Close Residents	Dobson Close	24/08/2015 20:39:45	OBJ	<p>Planning application by London Borough of Camden – number 2015/4041/P</p> <p>List of key points in Objections Submission</p> <p>The purpose of External Wall Insulation (EWI) is to save costs and so the question of whether it does, needs to be considered at the planning stage.</p> <p>The twin overriding objectives of EWI are: -minimising fuel poverty; and -reducing carbon emissions and these need to be born in mind when considering the objections.</p> <p>The failure to notify interested parties of the correct date of the planning application for work of significant value is highly prejudicial to residents and the wider community. It is unfair to expect to receive objections when residents do not even know an application for planning has been made. Many residents have no idea that changes are planned to be made to their homes.</p> <p>There is a feeling that the Council wants to rush this initiative through as fast as it can and that the processes in place for challenge are a sham.</p> <p>Residents have been treated unfairly by the lack of information on the planning portal when the application was first registered on the 22 July as they cannot properly object within time without that information.</p> <p>No supporting design information has been sent to residents. Potentially removing the ability to hang cherished plant boxes on the window sills, removing the coal bunkers which provide invaluable storage and restricting important access are all very undesirable.</p> <p>The Estate is privileged to have been built under the auspices of one of the most honoured and revered architects of the post-war period – Sir Robert Matthew OBE. To vandalise Sir Robert Matthew's Estate by covering it with bland, featureless render and fake brick is seriously dishonouring this passionate socialist and his ideals: high quality, practical, nicely proportioned social housing for the working class. Not only that but these rendered buildings will deteriorate, become dirty and stained in no time whereas the original brick still looks good after 60 odd years. The Estate will be ruined and will have degenerated into a hotchpotch of uncoordinated buildings with a prefabricated aura. This Estate is sufficiently worthy to be left alone and admired as a good representation of the era.</p> <p>Condensation can result from the cladding but the Council has not produced a report stating the extent of it and the remedies implemented to combat it. The Council should be guaranteeing that EWI will not result in condensation or that it will not worsen. Render is also associated with very difficult damp problems.</p> <p>There has been no reassurance from the Council that this insulation project will not be adversely</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

affected by the HS2 train.

The energy survey of the Estate by a chartered surveyor or a Green Deal expert as required by ECO containing EWI as the “recommended measure” has not been produced despite requests and, unusually, a grant is being sought after the work has been completed even though the ECO rules state that the measure needs to be approved before work commences.

The Council charges leaseholders on some estates for energy-efficient measures whilst not on others and so its commitment to any kind of alleviation of hardship for all is called into question.

The eradication of fuel poverty is a nonsense given the enormous number of years of savings it would take to recover the project cost. A condensing boiler provides more or less the same energy savings as EWI but is far, far cheaper to install. The installation of EWI is, therefore, an unreasonable service charge for which the Council should not be able to recover.

In seeking to reduce fuel poverty, the Council has not earmarked energy-efficient solutions to those properties with the highest fuel bills, for example, Victorian properties and importantly has not explained what makes one estate rather than another eligible for EWI. It has not targeted estates which have a very low number of leaseholders on them, as would be expected.

An A-rated condensing boiler is far cheaper to install than EWI and is even better as is more effective at reducing carbon emissions. It is easy to install, compatible with other technologies, there are no on-going maintenance costs and can be replaced at a later date in keeping with new technology without a huge investment having been wasted.

A report containing various energy-efficient options well in advance of this initiative was never made available to residents so as to encourage debate as to which would be the most appropriate. The Council does not respect residents of council estates who are presented with faits accomplis unlike residents of conservation areas to whom the Council curtsies.

Rendered buildings which require on-going maintenance are not improvements and leaseholders are only required to pay for improvements.

The Council will be the major funder of the EWI but its resources would be better put towards essential needs, such as, helping the homeless. Alternatively, towards essential works. The Council is very likely to regret saddling itself with future maintenance obligations particularly in times of austerity when the Estate would most definitely deteriorate.

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

2015/4041/P	Zainab Jama	40 Dobson Close	24/08/2015 14:46:05	OBJ	24th 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 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.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

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 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.

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. Camden Civic Society is concerned about the change in appearance of the estate and has recommended the involvement of the Twentieth Century Society.

If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I would like to attend

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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>Zainab Jama 40 Dobson Close</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Gazmend Pylla	42 Dobson Close	24/08/2015 14:34:43	OBJ	24 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 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.

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

Comment: **Response:**

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 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.

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. Camden Civic Society is concerned about the change in appearance of the estate and has recommended the involvement of the Twentieth Century Society.

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.

Yours faithfully
Gazmend Pylla

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					42 Dobson Close
