

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Cyril Keenan	18 langhorne court Dorman way	06/09/2015 21:56:58	COMMNT	I wish to object to the EXTERNAL WALL INSULATION which is due to be carried out on the hill grove estate. I am upset with the lack of communication regarding these works and also about the way it will make the estate look and how it will block light through the windows. We have a lovely looking estate and cannot understand why the aesthetic appearance will be drastically changing. I am appalled at what camden are trying to do to our estate. I did not know anything about cladding being put on the outside of the blocks. I look forward in hearing from you and would like to know what I can do to help stop this from happening.
2015/4041/P	Oscar Farias	49 Farjeon House London NW6 4TL	05/09/2015 11:39:45	COMMNT	I am against this installation mainly because it will change the character of the buildings becoming an eye sore in the area. I find my flat warm enough, except the kitchen (I doubt you are going to clad that part of the building. There are other factors like water sipping through creating oxidation, more condensation etc. Lost of light as well since walls will be thicker. I think that instead of spending money on this, in Farjeon House there is more need to put new floors and doors and new lightning at the entrance; and new paint.Entering this building is scary.there is a clear sense of neglect.The building needs repairing in other areas as well, like corridors outside entry doors to flats. All this would be cheaper and clearly more necessary.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Diana H.C. Pao	70 Dobson Close London NW6 4RU	03/09/2015 08:58:33	OBJ	Application number : 2015/4041/P

Dear Mr. McClue,

I wish to make some further comments on this application to register my objection to the proposed insulation work.

It has recently come to my attention that the proposed cladding of Dobson Close has probably contradicted Camden Council's Planning Guidance on Design. In section 4.7 of the document (p.28), it is clearly pointed out that cladding of a building should be avoided:

- 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 façade. Painting, rendering or cladding may also trap moisture, which can cause major damp problems in the masonry.

Given that one of the key messages of this guidance is that "alterations should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings" (p.25) as a "good practice principle" (p.26), the proposed cladding of part of the buildings in Dobson Close and not the houses will definitely destroy the consistency in the architectural style and ruin any character or design. The proposed work is highly undesirable given the practical and aesthetic concerns.

Furthermore, in the Planning Guidance on Sustainability, there are a lot of suggestions for how to make an existing building more energy efficient (p.22), such as draught proofing doors, using energy efficient lighting, second glazing of windows, using high efficiency condensing boilers etc. Instead of cladding the buildings, I would suggest that any grant Camden Council can obtain may be better spent on upgrading tenants' boilers, draught proofing residents' doors and windows and helping residents to collectively switch to better dual fuel deals. As the Sustainability department has no actual data on residents' energy consumption and cannot really deduct from computer modelling that people are in fuel poverty, simple measures to save energy may be more efficient than cladding.

In the same guidance (p.23), the section on solid wall insulation has also raised a question on "boxing in" service pipes and drainpipes :

- Solid wall insulation, whether internal or external, will require relocation of the services attached to the wall e.g. radiators, electrical sockets, drainpipes.

If the relocation of drainpipes or service including gas pipes is the recommended practice, then the costs of the proposed work will spiral out of control and increase the financial burden for the residents. Everyone will be plunged into poverty, fuel or otherwise, because of this. Does not this guidance note imply that "boxing in" the pipes is not good practice?

I hope the Planning department will look closely at the contradictions embedded in the proposed work when considering this application.

Yours faithfully

Diana H.C. Pao

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Ellen Monaghan	Flat 37 Tayler Court Dorman Way London NW8 0SB	06/09/2015 18:21:06	OBJ	70 Dobson Close London NW6 4RU I understand that external cladding for Hilgrove Estate buildings has been planned with the cost to leaseholders of over £17,000 along with an incurred negative impact on the character of estate, as well as reduction of natural light. I am a leaseholder and I have not received any notification or consultation papers on this matter. I object strongly to the plan for any external wall insulation system planned. And I would like to know why no consultation process has been put in place and when it will be put in place for this major works.

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:
2015/4041/P	Hilgrove Estate Residents	Hilgrove Estate Residents	02/09/2015 11:04:23	COMMNT	<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> <p>Under the terms of the leases, leaseholders are obliged to pay only for improvements. This means something which is "better". Paying for an exterior which will need regular maintenance, the cost of which in fuel benefit savings would take from around 30 to 50 years to recoup, is NOT an improvement.</p> <p>If planning is granted, the Council is likely to have borough-wide problems of non-payment as people will be led into undoubted poverty by these works.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Andreas Yennadiou	11 Langhorne Court Dorman Way NW8 0SD	01/09/2015 16:47:00	OBJ	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.
2015/4041/P	Rose brown	Flat 44 langhorne court Dorman way	03/09/2015 18:49:27	OBJ	I dont want it. It will create damp not reduce it
2015/4041/P	Ian Butler	flat 44 langhorne court dorman way	03/09/2015 12:21:16	OBJ	To whom it may concern, I would like to discuss the points mentioned below. This will ruin the building as we know it and has no benefits whatsoever I have had these suspicions verified by a member of RICS (royal institute of chartered building surveyors). The forementioned surveyors were adamant that the cladding will have no benefit to the building, It will reduce light, increase graffiti risk and overall be an eyesore to the neighbouring buildings. The proposed improvements make no attempt to integrate with the surrounding dominant architecture. Yours Faithfully

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Chris Coggins	Flat 20 Freeling House	05/09/2015 07:51:24	OBJEMAIL	I strongly oppose these proposed plans. Not only for the reported high costs to the leaseholders but also the visual impact these works will have. This is a landmark estate and the council needs to communicate with the residents on the whole estate about these plans, which are listed as minor works, but seem anything but that.
2015/4041/P	Robert Moore	28 Sherlock Court Dorman Way NW8 0RU NW8 0RU NW8 0RU	01/09/2015 11:58:37	JUST	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.