

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Amiel Ziv	44 Dobson Close London	01/09/2015 16:51:48	OBJ	<p>There are a few points I want to raise regarding this application:</p> <p>1. The cladding of brickwork does not comply with the Camden Planning Guidance, which was published in July 2015. Paragraph 4 specifically states that "Alterations should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings".</p> <p>The planning guidance further states that "Painting, rendering or cladding of brickwork will normally be resisted, as it is often unsightly and can damage the appearance of a building by obscuring the texture and original colour of the facade. Painting, rendering or cladding may also trap moisture, which can cause major damp problems in the masonry".</p> <p>These works would indeed ruin the beautiful character of Dobson Close. At the moment, all the buildings are in the same style. This would be replaced with a horrible mish mash of different styles. The buildings in our street all have a brick exterior, as do the buildings in the surrounding streets and the wider neighborhood in Swiss Cottage.</p> <p>The cladding could cause a serious damp problem and would also make it harder to ventilate the properties.</p> <p>It would be unacceptable to proceed with a planning application which blatantly goes against Camden's own planning guidance on protecting the character of Dobson Close and its surroundings; and against Camden's planning guidance regarding the cladding of brickwork.</p> <p>2. At no point did Camden Council consult me regarding my fuel bills. I know exactly what my fuel bills are: they are very low. I can provide all my fuel bills going back 5 years to prove my point. The cost savings from extra insulation would be negligible. The savings figures that the planning application quotes are derived from a model and do not relate to my building in Dobson Close, as the applicant has acknowledged. No measurement of actual fuel usage has even been attempted. It is wrong for Camden Council to rely on a model rather than actual fuel bills which can easily be obtained. No evidence has been provided that residents in Dobson Close suffer from fuel poverty.</p> <p>The official consultation process has been a sham, with the applicant, Ms Angela Murphy, and the person in charge of the consultation process, Mr John Rutter, being on holiday and unavailable for a big part of the consultation period. At no point was there a serious dialogue on the very valid concerns raised. In fact, the works were already pencilled in to start at the end of September-beginning of October before the consultation took place!</p> <p>The freehold building opposite my building has not been consulted. Considering the far-reaching nature of the proposed changes, this is a grave dereliction of duty.</p> <p>Important issues such as the loss of light have not been addressed.</p> <p>3. The cost of these proposed works is exorbitant and unreasonable, leaseholders face crippling bills</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>ranging from £8,400 to £17,400. This would cause real hardship to many people. Considering the miniscule fuel savings the works would bring, it would be grossly irresponsible to proceed.</p> <p>The applicant's assertion that the cladding would not need any maintenance is not supported by evidence. Cladding that Camden Council recently installed in Malden Crescent has already been defaced with graffiti and is dirty. The cladding would need regular maintenance, with all the additional costs that would involve.</p> <p>This planning application is flawed on so many levels: it contravenes Camden's own planning guidance, no evidence of fuel poverty has been provided, it would cause grave damage to the character of the street and surrounding area, consultation has been lacking and the cost involved would be exorbitant. I strongly oppose these proposed works.</p>
2015/4041/P	Andreas Yennadiou	11 Langhorne Court Dorman Way NW8 0SD	01/09/2015 16:47:00	OBJ	<p>How are these people expected to pay £17,400...or anything near that? Some time ago the internal area of the Blocks in NW8 Hilgrove Estate were re-floored. Within ten years, the areas are being done again. Why? Because the original flooring was not "fit-for-purpose". This is highly relevant to this discussion: it is an example of the zero-democracy policy operated towards lease-holders and tenants {at the time we could only vote on the colour}. The areas should have been tiled, not pasted with floor-like paste that now looks like it was laid down when the blocks were first built. These blocks were built around 1954 and as far as I know were awarded a prize for the "Best Council Estate in the Country" back then. People admire the blocks as they are. If there are any plans to change the look of these blocks why have I not heard of it? Residents are currently under-going major refurbishment works to the interior of the blocks including the lifts. If you plan to change the look and feel of the blocks for the purposes of lagging, then don't ask the residents to contribute. Up and down the country lagging is being fitted for free in most cases. You are creating lease-holder poverty by embarking down this route. Would you like more people to move out {like a neighbour has done recently, due to these cost}? Are you planning for making people home-less who cannot pay? Effectively we are all subject to higher energy bills and now, on top of that a proposed huge economic burden that {on a per unit / flat basis} will never be re-couped through reductions in heating bills for leaseholders. I suspect you will have an answer for all of this. So do I...it's called "rip-off Britain". Owning a "Lease" is unheard of in most European Countries - we don't even own the flats we live in. Before replying "you knew that when you moved in" doesn't make it right. People have to live somewhere on this Monopoly board called the UK. This will place people into a debt that they may not be able to pay off for years, if at all. The look of the estate will be altered irrevocably. Does the council not have a tight budget to stick to instead of trying to ruin the aesthetics of a perfectly good estate? The outlook for resident leaseholders is nothing but misery if this goes ahead.</p>
2015/4041/P	Robert Moore	28 Sherlock Court Dorman Way NW8 0RU NW8 0RU NW8 0RU	01/09/2015 11:58:37	JUST	<p>I have just learnt of these plans from a neighbor and am highly opposed to both the cost and nature of these works, which are extremely unaffordable for myself and many other residents, as well as damaging the appearance of the block and encouraging graffiti - I am not seeing any positive to this work continuing and would like to see the project cancelled.</p>