We live at 13 Hornby Close and wish to submit comments,
from the perspective of being the immediate neighbours
to the proposed construction at No.12 Hornby Close.

We consider that the additional height of the proposed extension would be aesthetically ugly and out of character within the visually harmonious terracing of 25 well-designed flat-roofed, 3 bedroomed houses. They are sited around a peaceful green space, carefully planted with grass, trees, shrubs and flowers environmentally beneficial to birds, insects and human residents, within a highly polluted urban environment.

Material considerations:

Figure 1

1] We are imminently due, at considerably cost, to have our uninsulated, severely leaking roof removed and replaced with a fully insulated seamless covering constructed to prevent heat loss and water ingress. The seamless feature is imperative to its effectiveness, but that would be severely impacted at best and damaged at worst. Having noted with dismay that other houses elsewhere within Chalcots Estate Ltd, where similar constructions are being erected (see photo left) have supporting scaffolding sited on neighbouring roofs. Apart from being an importunate, objectionable imposition, there is every possibility that during the building works, and the erection and dismantling of scaffolding, objects will be dropped on the adjoining roofs.
This cannot be permitted on our new roof.

Figure 2

2] The boundaries on the rooftops between each Hornby Close house are defined by a parapet wall (see photo left). Our roofer plans to install timber boarding to cover this parapet wall; it will be trimmed and laminated to become part of the roofing membrane, with a final seamless isophthalic topcoat extending across, thus eliminating the risk of any water ingress. The proposed construction of the neighbouring extension will necessitate removal of the parapet wall. Therefore, upon completion of that extension, our new roof will have to be modified to incorporate an upstand at the 90° angle created by the new wall. That will not only be a major inconvenience but also an additional expense and a potential future source of water ingress.

3] Rainwater on Hornby Close roofs has one single outlet for running off down a pipe that descends internally in each house. When overloaded or blocked by leaves this can – and indeed has – caused flooding inside the house. London's prevailing wind is west-southwest; the flanking wall of additional storey will be west facing, therefore a far greater quantity of water will runoff when rain from that direction strikes against the wall. That potentially provides an increased risk of internal flooding.

4] Loss of Light. The planning proposal states: "The proposal will not give rise to any detriment in relation to sunlight or daylight from the newly created additional floor. Given the orientation and distance of the application site from its neighbours, sunlight and daylight issues are not considered to be an issue. The additional floor would not result in any loss of light to the immediately adjoining neighbours."

That statement is not only incorrect, but also deliberately misleading.
There would in fact be severe loss of sunlight and daylight. Our roof has three skylights. Given the distance and orientation of the most important skylight – approximately 50cms from that newly created west-facing wall, it would be exceedingly detrimental and would result in a great deal of loss of daylight and sunlight, from the east and overhead. The light via this skylight is vital, providing the only source of daylight/sunlight and indeed moonlight to the bedroom landing and two flights of stairs below it, as well as part of the living room. The negative impact would result in electric lights being utilised all day – wasting a great deal of energy and increasing annual electricity costs.
The other two skylights are situated above bathroom toilets, therefore while builders are working on the construction above, there will be a complete lack of privacy.

5] At AA.1(k) the Planning Proposal states: "The proposal does not include any engineering operations outside of the curtilage of the house to strengthen existing walls or foundations."

This is an admission that the proposal fails to take into consideration the possible impact not only on the adjacent buildings, but on the entire terrace, none of which were structurally designed to bear the considerable weight of an additional storey. Over time, that could eventually destabilise the entire terrace, ultimately causing walls and foundations to collapse. There is substantial evidence that the relaxation of Building Regulations, and lack of investment in understanding the ground are invariably the cause of developments that create trouble for neighbours.
Relaxation of Building Regulations allows developers to ignore the incontrovertible fact that subsidence in North London is more common than elsewhere in the UK due to its geology, making the area susceptible to increases or decreases in volume depending on moisture content. Furthermore, with the extremes of heat, cold and rain due to climate change, subsidence and heave are more prevalent than ever. According to an engineering geologist, many of the responses of the silts and clays in the ground are time-dependent because they occur in response to the decay of pore water pressure in the clay horizons of the Claygate Beds and in the London Clay itself. This means that the ground will continue to respond to developments **long after the work is completed**. The response may be small in absolute terms, but it may not be uniform, meaning that neighbouring properties can be gradually distorted as the ground nearest the excavation moves more than that furthest from it.[1]

[1] Extract from a *talk to the Heath & Hampstead Society on 23 May 2013 by Dr Michael de Freitas, Chartered Geologist and Emeritus Reader of Engineering Geology at Imperial College London.*