

FAO: Stephen Platt & Fiona Joseph
London Borough of Camden
Leasehold Services
Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
London, WC1H 9JE

24th December 2015

Dear Fiona and Stephen,
CC: Stuart Dilley, Cllr Lorraine Revah, Kuldip Bhamra, Pat O'Niell, Anna Roe

RESPONSE TO LETTER DATED 16.12.15 | REF: 17-79 MANSFIELD ROAD

We are writing as a leaseholders group to voice our frustration and to formally object to the changes in scope highlighted in the letter from Fiona Joseph dated 16.12.15. The principle change we object to is the change in scope of window works to include all windows on the front elevation facing onto Mansfield Road.

It is our understanding (following a advice given by The Leasehold Advisory Service), that if there has been a change in the scope of the works or the process, then this would indicate that a new consultation process must be started. At the very least, we have been advised that it may be prudent for Camden to reissue the stage one notice again.

Please let it be noted that having already come so far in the process this is clearly not something we want to see happen. No-one wants a further delay in the works, we merely want to due process to be followed and decisions that have previously been agreed to during the consultation framework to be adhered to.

We would like to make the following points:

01. Changes in scope coming after the Schedule 3 Notice of Intent under Section 20

The inclusion of front elevation windows facing Mansfield Road (apart from A flat upper windows) and the cavity wall insulation was not included as part of the Schedule 3 Notice of Intent and as such we have not been consulted on this matter. This changes the scope of work and does not follow the section 20 notices. As you are aware, this has legal implications on our liability for costs. We believe that the consultation has been carried out incorrectly. However, please let it be noted that although we do not believe we should bear the costs for this newly proposed work, we do have comments on what is being proposed and will be giving our feedback and comments within the planning application response framework.

We would also remind Camden of our independent survey report dated 21.09.15 from Ian Pearce Property Partnership submitted as part the leaseholder consultation - the following points were made and are being ignored:

Overall Window and External Door Conclusions (Section 2 Page 15)

- *None of the windows or doors that we inspected to type 'B' flats in our opinion are in significant disrepair in respect to timber decay or general condition/operation to warrant replacement.*
- *The front elevation kitchen windows to flat type 'A' are in satisfactory condition and are not in need of replacement.*
- *The front bedroom windows to flat types 'A' are borderline, some requiring replacement. Others have been replaced and some will be in satisfactory condition if they are eased and adjusted and recoated.*
- *The small hall windows at low level to the rear terraces of flat 'A' either comprise decay or not, the ones comprising decay are in need of replacement and the ones not comprising decay are in need of redecoration.*
- *The kitchen roof lights to flat type 'A' are generally in relatively good condition. Re-weathering/re-sealing works are recommended to the perimeter ... there is no business case for replacing these roof lights to improve thermal performance.'*

02. Consultation – breach of trust

We have been through a lengthy consultation process with Camden, both before and after the issuing of the official notices, which began in April 2015. It had been previously agreed, and confirmed by Camden, that the front elevation windows facing Mansfield Road (to A flat kitchens and B flat Kitchens, bathrooms and bedrooms) did not need to be replaced and as such would be repaired. We would refer to the minutes of our consultation meeting on 09.09.15 in which Camden stated that they would not be replacing the front walkway windows of Flat As or the front elevation windows to Flat Bs.

This change in scope fundamentally goes against all of the agreements we believe we have discussed and made. As such, we feel that there has been a breach of trust by Camden and that the consultation to date has been a waste of our time.

03 Rationale for the newly proposed works

We do not believe that this work is required and that the changes to the scope - as well as the process itself - are entirely unreasonable. In the 6 months since we have been discussing this matter with you, it has also been Camden's stated position that any windows not being replaced would be subject to repair only. It is an obvious point to make that the windows will be a point of heat loss, this is the case with all buildings and any thermo-graphic survey would demonstrate this point, particularly if undertaken during the winter months as you have done. If this is such an area of concern for Camden then why was this thermo-graphic survey not undertaken 6 months ago?

Generally, the flats are warm and require little heating. We have raised the issue of damp/mould internally caused by cold bridging on several occasions but have been met with no response. This is predominantly on the soffits and requires vapour barriers and warm board insulation to be installed internally. This issue is not resolved by the proposed changes to scope. We do not believe that you understand the true issues that face your building.

We have also previously raised the issue of bulk gas supply and lack of metering. As you are aware, a key way of reducing energy bills is to meter cost by household. Again this issue has been consistently ignored by Camden.

04 Conflicting and Confusing Communications

We would also like it noted that throughout the consultation period, we have been given inaccurate reasons for why work is required. This has either been done intentionally or due to a lack of knowledge. We would cite the following examples;

- Requirement for existing balustrading to meet current building regulation
- The need for the existing building to meet Part L requirements
- The need for the gas pipe to be replaced/surface mounted due to safety fears

We view the rationale for these new changes in scope as another such statement.

05 Timings of changes

We feel the timings represent ambush tactics by Camden and this is most disappointing. You have had 6 months to determine the scope and therefore changing the scope at this stage is wholly unacceptable. It has caused much concern to all of us. To be clear, you issued the update on 16.12.15 notifying residents of the changes to the scope (with scaffolding provisionally scheduled for 11.01.16) but then indicated that you would not be able to answer any questions until 04.12.16. This does not in any way give residents a reasonable amount of time to seek answers to their questions and concerns.

NEXT STEPS - We would like to request the following as a matter of urgency:

- That Camden reverts to the original scope as set out in the Section 20 Schedule 3 Notice of Intent (for which consultation period ended on 28.09.15), *albeit excluding the full roof replacement and gas pipe works as formally agreed in the consultation period.*
- If the above cannot be immediately achievable then we would request a meeting for the week commencing 04.01.16. We believe it would be beneficial to have a mediator present at this meeting

We do not feel Camden is listening or cooperating with us and we are strongly challenge both the changes in scope, reasonableness and method of consultation followed by Camden. Finally, we would like to re-iterate that we are extremely disappointed and upset by Camden's actions and we object to the proposed new changes to the scope. We look forward to hearing from you and your full response.

Yours Sincerely,

The undersigned leaseholders of 17-79 Mansfield Road:

- | | |
|--|---|
| - 23B Violet Oruwi-McCabe | - 51B Matt Thornley & Juliet Aston |
| - 23A Elaine Spraggan & J Reynolds | - 53A Marcella & Paul Anstatt |
| - 27A Anne Tallentire & Cordelia Mayfield | - 53B Sumaya Partner |
| - 29A Margot Rose Palmer | - 55A Julia Wilson |
| - 35A Irene Fox | - 69B Stefi Orazi |
| - 41A Bruce & Penelope Rowland | - 71A Elizabeth Pearson |
| - 41B Tim & Emma Robinson | - 75A Leigh Johnson |
| - 43A Tania Fauvel | - 77B Fatima Lamraoui |
| - 45A Jack Trench & Julie Chan | - 79B Catriona Hill |
| - 51A Arran Whitney | |