

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Murat Koc	46 Langhorne Court Dorman Way NW8 0SD NW8 0SD NW8 0SD	07/09/2015 11:16:31	OBJ	This is outrageous, unnecessary, and highly overpriced. I cannot afford to pay 17,400 for pure nonsense, Camden should at least consult us before advancing on such things.
2015/4041/P	Juliette Bray	50 Tayler Court Dorman Way London NW8 0SB	07/09/2015 16:37:22	OBJ	<p>I would like to raise an objection to this planning application. I feel this work is not justified and opinions of the tenants across the whole of the Hilgrove Estate have not been consulted (only those being currently affected have been consulted).</p> <p>Expected charges of £17,000 (or thereabouts) in order to prevent fuel poverty is absurd. I'm unclear if anyone is currently facing fuel poverty, but I am certain this amount of cost to a leaseholder will in fact just create leaseholder poverty. In order to see if this kind of expenditure is warranted, I would like to see evidence to show the expected reduction in cost of fuel due to rendering, a cost benefit analysis, and the length of return on this huge investment. According to http://www.under-one-roof.org.uk/Cost+of+a+new+home/Water,+gas+and+electricity+costs.aspx, the average expected expenditure for dual fuel for a 1-2 bedroom flat per year is £725. This means that in order to feel the benefit of having spent £17,000, a household would need to have NO fuel costs for 23 years before any benefit would be felt. With councils across the country having reduced finances and budget issues, I feel this is a gross misuse of funds, and a request of this sum of money from leaseholders is appalling and completely unreasonable.</p> <p>On top of the cost of the work, the brick work on the outside of the building is what makes this estate look different to other estates, and a place where people want to live. Covering this up with render will change the appearance dramatically, and I feel for the worse.</p>
2015/4041/P	Ms A McLaughlin	47a Sandringham Road London NW2	07/09/2015 10:24:44	OBJEMAIL	<p>I wish to make strong objections to Camden's plans for cladding this estate.</p> <p>It is part of an overall policy that Camden seems to be pursuing across the borough despite objections from tenants and leaseholders. This cladding of brick built buildings goes against its own publicly stated policy of not using cladding which will damage the character of blocks/estates. The council seems determined to destroy the character of several estates across the borough.</p> <p>Camden has also failed to answer questions about value for money in the sweeping statements it make regarding saving fuel costs. It has either not done any investigation into this issue or it refuses to release any data to back up these assertions. Nor do they address concerns about consequences of this work such as issues of damp and mould.</p> <p>This seems to be just a tick box exercise on the part of Camden to show, superficially at least, compliance with CO2 emissions targets with no regard to the actual wishes or needs of tenants or residents and is not the actions we should be able to expect of a responsible social landlord.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4041/P	Mark Hutchinson	53 Dobson Close	07/09/2015 10:26:29	OBJ	<p>It has become increasingly clear that this proposal is completely unreasonable on economic grounds. There has been no empirical research into whether there is any actual fuel poverty in the estate or Dobson Close, as opposed to extrapolation from general statistics which do not take into account the particular circumstances of properties affected by this proposal. There has been no empirical research into what effect on actual bills this proposal will have; figures quoted by Council representatives vary considerably, none of which predict the scheme being cost-effective within the 25 years for which the work is guaranteed. There has been no empirical test of how the cladding performs over a time scale of decades, neither in terms of the benefits which might accrue from insulation nor of detrimental effects it might have in terms of diminishing light, effects on the fabric of the building and exacerbating existing problems of condensation. There has been no empirical research into the potential costs of maintenance, in terms of repairing vandalism, removing graffiti and the repair of accidental damage, which is especially likely in the diminished space which would become available on walkways for moving furniture. At the leaseholders meeting the salesman for the cladding claimed the material was durable despite the evidence provided by the sample he had brought, which was dirty and badly broken only from being taken to meetings. There has been no empirical research into alternative ways in which the vast amount of money involved could be spent on more efficient and beneficial environmental proposals.</p> <p>It is unreasonable to have made this proposal, which will have such devastating financial consequences for so many residents, without having a much longer process of consultation, to allow for the proper research which could determine whether the proposal is, in fact, reasonable or not. The lack of reasonable planning, research and consultation, together with the haste with which this proposal has been imposed, strongly imply that whatever the reasons for this proposal they are not reasonable on economic nor environmental grounds.</p>
