

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/5372/P	Michael Tite	Stoneleigh Terrace	26/10/2015 13:14:02	OBJ	<p>The Mansion Blocks are within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and as such, the buildings should be treated with special attention.</p> <p>Although due care has been given to the layout of the flues, the introduction of the flues in themselves are at odds with the historic elevations of these buildings and break with the originally intended design of communal heating. This principal has had a direct effect on the forms of these mansion blocks.</p> <p>It is fair to say that the introduction of flues is usually quite jarring on historic building facades and although they appear in the drawings as quite small components, they are often very noticeable once they contrast with the original materials of the facade.</p> <p>I believe that the introduction of white uPVC infill panels in place of glazed panels will be at odds with the historic character of those windows.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/5372/P	Ahilan Sooriasegaram	124,E Croftdown Road London NW5 1HB	26/10/2015 13:05:56	OBJEMPER	<p>Dear Fiona Davies, please consider the following.</p> <p>- We are deeply concerned about the environmental impact of installing these boiler flues and the acidic plume they produce, containing a mixture of carbon dioxide and acidic fluid - there is no contingency for how these harmful plumes will actually flow out of the flues and there are many plants and trees around each block. If it should turn out for example that the acidic condensation from the flues do in fact have an adverse effect on the external brick work and mortar as some evidence suggests, we will be in a very difficult position thereafter, so it would be in our"s and the council"s interest to eliminate any chance of long-term damage to these buildings which sit with in a designated conservation area. The fact that the lower level flues will inevitable emit such acidic plumes at ground level could effect local residents passing by and well as cause damage to any surrounding metal work such as gates and ever car bodywork.</p> <p>-We are challenging the overall works to install individual boilers as the council is yet to prove the new systems will work in terms of efficiency and savings. We were promised in July/August the chance to assess a trial block which was meant to be ready by mid September (Block 118) but have heard or seen nothing since. And even if we were in a position to carry out a full assessment now I believe the trial period should run for a minimum of six to twelve months to really gauge the value and sustainability of the new boilers both in terms of cost effectiveness, sufficient heating and hot water etc and all the niggly things that are only likely to reveal themselves over time and seasonal change. I therefore believe it is crucial that before planning permission is considered for the whole of Brookfield estate that a successful trial period is run with minimal impact as previously agreed on a "test block" with willing residents.</p> <p>-We are also deeply skeptical about the capabilities of Apollo/Keepmoat/Lakehouse in providing a high quality construction/installation service after the appalling and unnecessary major works carried out to the roofs and windows on our block. We received an official apology due to the oversight in caulking and insulating our traditional sash windows (which were designed to permit limited air flow) resulting in excess condensation which over time will rot the hardwood framework.</p> <p>I hope that you will consider all of the above and look forward to the findings of the consultation and the planning department.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>-We also question the validity of the long term agreement between Camden and Apollo and the consultation process as a whole (points reflected in the list of queries we sent out collectively as an RTA for Block 124)</p> <p>- We have been in touch with the 20th Century Society and we are going ahead with an application to Historic England for listed status on the grounds that Brookfield Estate as well as being a positive contributor to the conservation area is a valuable and unique estate and needs protection especially now that so much decision-making is driven by Apollo/Keepmoat who have purely commercial interests,</p>

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

rather than Camden who have a responsibility as custodians of their historic buildings.

We have been researching the architect of Brookfield Estate AJ Thomas who was the St Pancras Borough chief architect at the time and designed what is now Camden's Old Town Hall Building on Euston Road. He was the long term assistant to the celebrated Edwin Lutyens and was heavily influenced by the Hampstead Garden Suburb project they both worked on. As well as being a RIBA Fellow, he was the Architect to the French Institute (Queensberry Place South Kens) and awarded the Chevalier de la Legion d'honneur. We believe he is a key figure in Camden's built history and his work should to be preserved.

-It is not just the aesthetic and environmental impact of the flues, we feel it will be so much more expensive to run individual boilers that vulnerable tenants will turn the heat off. Apart from the human element, the buildings will get cold once the the hot water tanks and airing cupboards are ripped out and will be subject to damp and condensation.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/5372/P	Mal Mitchell	Flat C 124 Croftdown Road London NW5 1HB	26/10/2015 22:57:54	COMMNT	<p>Problems with and associated with the proposed flue terminal installations:</p> <p>We were promised in July/August the chance to assess a trial block, 118 Croftdown Road, which was meant to be ready by mid-September. There has been no trial at block 118. I made a 'site visit' earlier and learnt that the work has NOT been done apart from drilling holes in their walls a while ago which have since been taped over. We (along with many other leaseholders) are waiting to see the results of full trial operations. It is yet to be demonstrated whether the new systems will work in terms of efficiency and savings. A proper trial period should run for a minimum of twelve months to really gauge the value and sustainability of the new systems in terms of cost effectiveness, sufficient heating and hot water, etc., and all the diverse and unpredictable things that are only likely to reveal themselves over time and seasonal change. The potential damage to the external brick mortar from acidic residue is a crucial factor which needs fully addressing, with due guarantees.</p> <p>If it should turn out for example that the acidic condensation from the flues does in fact have an adverse effect on the external brick work and mortar (as it has been suggested), leaseholders will be in a very difficult position subsequently.</p> <p>Any long-term damage to these buildings which sit within a designated conservation area would be unacceptable. Drawings sent to us show the rough positioning of the flues/ boilers but this has apparently changed since. We understand that plans for the internal pipe work will only be drawn up after the first internal assessment occurs. This is a conservation area adjacent to listed buildings and external flues are a visual negative and also a pollutant in terms of acidic fumes and condensation over the walls, detrimental to the fabric of the building.</p> <p>We have close to zero faith in the competence of Apollo and its general capacity to provide even a reasonable quality of construction/installation service after the appalling major works carried out to the roofs and windows on our block. The only real guarantee with their operations is that works will be disruptive, badly carried out and overpriced.</p> <p>We question the validity of the long-term agreement between Camden and Apollo and the consultation process as a whole (see further points below).</p> <p>Camden has not provided sufficient or clear information regarding the ramifications of our accepting a change to the terms of our lease agreement. In general we are strongly dissatisfied with the way in which Camden has been conducting the communication process and ignoring our various emails and information requests over the course of the last several months, including a pseudo-consultation period.</p> <p>Many queries collectively gathered from local leaseholders remain unanswered. These heating replacement schemes appear to be being rushed through without proper consultation. (IS THIS TO MEET A GOVERNMENT GRANT DEADLINE?)</p> <p>As a general point (which we know as widely agreed by local leaseholders) we object to the pursuit of such activity without a well defined and properly costed overall proposal. Whilst objecting to the way</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

in which Camden has conducted things so far and objecting strongly to Apollo carrying out the work under any circumstances, this does not mean to say that we necessarily reject in principle the replacing of existing communal heating systems with individual systems.

The proposal for work with the flues can't really be discussed without reference to the context in terms of the associated operations planned.

More generally, then, as leaseholders have repeatedly stated to Camden:

At the meeting with Derek Wells and Steve Gozdz on 9 July, the leaseholders expressed their concerns regarding the estimated costs and lack of detailed information on the proposed system. We followed up with an email to Mr. Chew, Mr. Wells and Mr Gozdz on 13 July, and reiterated it on 18 July, requesting soft copies of various documents and asking various questions. We received emails from Mr Chew on 23 July and from Mr Wells on 27 July, but the general consensus amongst leaseholders was that the vast majority of our concerns and questions were not addressed. This was mentioned in our email of 23 July to Mr. Chew, Mr. Wells and Mr Gozdz. As stated then and above, we believe that it is unrealistic to expect leaseholders to complete the options form or make more specific observations without a well defined and properly costed proposal.

Once again, we would appreciate it if you could send us the requested information and reply to the questions we sent in our email of 13 July.

We also expect that a proper consultation process will be conducted once the requested information is sent and the questions raised answered (see below).

Section 20 compliance

Do the works that you propose require compliance with section 20 regulations (this is not very clear from the documents sent)?

Assuming they do, and that you decide to use Schedule 3 to consult with and inform leaseholders of qualifying works that are to be carried out under an existing long-term agreement, we understand that, in order to comply with the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002, Camden (the Landord) must serve a consultation notice on tenants that needs to include the following:

Describe the works proposed to be carried out, or specify a (reasonable) place and hours at which a description of the works may be inspected; give the reasons why it is considered necessary to carry out the proposed works; contain a statement of the total amount of the expenditure estimated by the landlord as likely to be incurred by him on the proposed works; invite observations in writing on the proposed works or the estimated expenditure; give the address to which such observations must be sent; state that they must be delivered by the due date; give the date on which the consultation period ends; if facilities to provide copies of the documents referred to in the notice are not available at the place specified there, then copies must be provided to the tenant free on request.

We consider that the meeting with Mr Wells and Mr Gozdz did not give us enough information regarding the works proposed to be carried out nor did it address our concerns regarding the estimated costs. As stressed above, we followed up the meeting with various emails requesting information and asking questions, for which we have not received any satisfactory response. Some leaseholders did not receive a written confirmation of the new date on which the consultation period ends. We consider that the consultation notice has not complied with the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002 and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>request that a proper consultation process is conducted once we receive all the requested information.</p> <p>Current Camden Partnering Agreements</p> <p>We understand that Keepmoat was formed in 2012 following the merger between Apollo and the Keepmoat Group of companies. We would like to be provided with a copy of the existing partnering agreement with Apollo Group and Lakehouse.</p> <p>In principle Apollo is a different legal entity from Keepmoat. Was the partnering agreement with Apollo transferred to Keepmoat without any competitive procurement process?</p> <p>What are the consequences of any leaseholders not agreeing to the works?</p> <p>New procurement strategy:</p> <p>Camden Council's two partnering contracts with Apollo Group and Lakehouse to deliver the current mechanical and electrical (M&E) planned maintenance and repairs for its housing stock are due to expire in March 2016. As a result, the Council is developing a new procurement strategy which involves the letting of 5 separate long term (5 years extendable to 10) mechanical and electrical maintenance and repair contracts. According to Camden's Notice of Intent- Mechanical, Electrical, Lift Services & Ancillary Services- (issued on 4 December 2014) "by removing the 'middle man' ...and by creating a larger number of smaller contracts, the council hope to manage individual specialist contracts for each service (such as lifts and individual boilers). As a result, the council will indeed increase its ability to directly manage the suppliers. The council feel that the separation of these services into individual contracts is the best approach in providing value for money and service delivery".</p> <p>If the Council feels that "the removal of the middle-man...and the separation of Mechanical, Electrical, Lift Services, Ancillary Services & Heating Services into individual contracts is the best approach in providing value for money and service delivery", we submit that it doesn't make sense to do other than wait until the new procurement strategy (i.e from March 2016) is in place rather than rushing through the works under the existing partnering agreement.</p>
